



# Minutes of the Global Nutrition Report Stakeholder Group meeting held online on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2020

Location: Online

Chairs: Lucy Sullivan (Stakeholder Group Chair)

Minutes: Nathalie Willmott (GNR Project Manager, Development Initiatives)

## Attendees

Abi Perry (AP) FCDO	Kedar Mankad (KM) Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation)
Charlotte Martineau (DI)	Lawrence Haddad (LH) GAIN
Cornelia Loechl (International Atomic Energy Agency)	Lucy Sullivan (LS) Feed the Truth
Deborah Di Dio (DDD) SUN	Mary McCarthy (MMC) Irish Aid
Erin Milner (EM) USAID	Pam Gordon (PG) GAC
Ferew Lemma (FL) (Gov of Ethiopia)	Rachel Toku-Appiah Oppong (RO) Graça Machel Trust
Harpinder Collacott (DI)	Renata Micha (GNR)
Helena Guarin Corredor (HGC) EC	Simone Gie
Katherine Richards (SCUK)	Tadashi Sato (JICA)
	Victor Aguayo (VA) UNICEF

## Stakeholder Group leadership

- Shawn Baker (USAID) will be taking up a co-chair role on the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2021.
- LS thanked Abi Perry for the time, energy, dedication and passion Abi has dedicated to the GNR as SG co-chair.
- LS offered to continue as SG co-chair for continuity and to identify a second co-chair until 1<sup>st</sup> January 2021. No objections were made. Volunteers were invited to announce themselves at the meeting, no volunteers came forward. Volunteers were encouraged to contact Lucy after the meeting if interested in the second co-chair role.

## The strategic vision of the GNR

- The GNR mandate has evolved since its inception, grown from an information tool, to a policy tool, and more demands at present for GNR to be an accountability mechanism.
- The current strategic vision ends in 2022. DI summarized the current strategic vision, mission, and strategy.
- CM summarized the main outputs of the GNR as it currently stands. Each product has grown in reputation and reach, and the audience has grown. The outreach and communications strategy is stronger, as is the governance function, and we are strengthening the programme management approach to meet the need.
- As the demands on the GNR are growing, the SG were asked to reflect and advise on the appropriate scope and mandate of the GNR.
  - Is this strategy still relevant? Can we adjust it to extend until 2025?
    - AP: The key role is ensuring we have a tool to inform, shape and influence action around nutrition. Retain the original intent. The global space is 'messy', we need a clear moment and opportunity to send a strong message about importance of malnutrition, progress and action. LS: GNR mandate isn't to add to the research, analysis of existing research is core, LS invited comments on this.
    - PG asked about the use of GNR tools. The use of the three products has increased, CNPs are extremely popular, N4G commitment tool is used by more specific audiences.
      - ➔ **DI to share further analytics with the SG.**
    - KR: added value of GNR is autonomy, independent, and should consider this when embarking on politically sensitive strategic partnerships, approach in the spirit of what we want to achieve, diverse and representative, consider decision making.
  - Can/Should GNR develop joint products with external groups?
    - RM summarized the 'Standing Together for Nutrition (STfN)' proposal from GAIN. A consortium which convenes multi-disciplinary experts to generate data and evidence to assess and evaluate scale and effect of COVID related nutrition challenges. We are waiting for their proposal to the GNR.
    - LH: GNR fills an accountability gap as a core function and should remain independent. Also translates current research with financial implications to popularize new research that can help advocacy, making research easy to understand. Spotlights democratize the space. There are other CNPs, GNR is among the best, but

accountability is the unique function. Approaching GNR with strategic partnerships taints the independence.

- VA: referring to 'independence' what do we mean? Important to retain focus; diversifying could dilute impact.
- LS: independence comes from the independent expert group (IEG) who develop content and interact very little with the SG.
- KM: accountability is critical and core to the GNR and is the core mandate. We should consider branding for specific advocacy tasks carefully in light of this. The data is critical in keeping the message of the GNR fresh.
- RO: maintain brand by not becoming too diffuse with partnerships and scope of work. We are credible and have the trust of the global community.
- HG: core mandate should remain a global accountability tool. Suggests a review of challenges and learn from each other.
- Preserving and strengthening core accountability function, GNR as a translator of cutting-edge research for policy, advocates, implementers. Translate, popularize the research. Clear independence is critical. Co-branding is not recommended, GNR must preserve independence. Next step will be SG reviewing the ToR for the NAF by email.
- Should GNR provide Technical Assistance?
  - RM: GNR is increasingly being asked to sit on technical or advisory groups, feedback and consult for reports and technical questions from the public, and provide support to commitment makers. This has been ad-hoc but increasing and becoming difficult to meet requests.
  - RM: Accountability is GNR's core function but hasn't been strengthened much over the years, less involvement from IEG and the majority has been outsourced, this will be revisited during the IEG refresh.
  - RM: If the aim is to be more efficient, meet standards the GNR represents, this needs to be captured in the strategic vision and additional resources provided.
- Proposed way forward
  - Review the current strategic vision document in light of the responses discussed
  - ➔ **DI and IEG chair to present draft revised strategic vision to Lucy and final draft to be approved by the SG group by the end of October.**

## IEG refresh

- RM presented an update on the IEG refresh;
  - The proposal for how to strengthen role and function of IEG is based on best practices and other models.
  - Rationale to align with the periodicity change, ensure continuity, balance the expertise and support the functions and products of the GNR.
  - Hoping to have a small new IEG in place in mid-Feb 2021, to support the wireframe development of the next GNR, with a view to having a full IEG in place by April.
  - The IEG has moved to a single chair model and will be clarifying the IEG role and function through a full criteria, rules, procedures, etc., document which

captures the full governance picture to IEG members and for transparency. RM working with the DI team to finalise this by December, and advertise in December,

### **GNR plans for the final quarter of 2020**

- This part of the call was skipped due to time constraints, information is available on the associated presentation.

### **N4G extended role and other GNR plans for 2021**

- CM presented on the extended role and GNR 2021 plans.
- GNR On going commitments
  - Q1: ongoing promotion CNP and N4G commitment Tracking tool and Insight research to improve these products
  - Q2: ongoing promotion CNP and N4G commitment Tracking tool // World Health Assembly
  - Q3: 2021 GNR // UNFSS
  - Q4: CNP and N4G commitment Tracking tool // Cop26; Tokyo N4G Summit
- Planning and Governance – Already started but will run throughout 2021
  - Strategic vision; results framework; CN; Budget; Fundraising
  - Review governance bodies TOR; IEG refresh ; SG leadership
  - Definition of processes
- GNR 2.0 N4G and NAF – Some activities already started
  - Set up the NAF
  - Form the TAWG
  - Commitment making tools and TA to commitment makers
- The NAF activities have implications for funding: funding is sought to cover the bridge and the strengthened role, a revised concept note will be shared with donors.