



# Minutes of the Global Nutrition Report Stakeholder Group meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2021

Chairs: Shawn Baker (Stakeholder Group Co-chair)

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

## Attendees

### Official representatives

Cornelia Loechl, International Atomic Energy Agency

Francesco Branca, WHO (FB)

Lawrence Haddad, GAIN (LH)

Mohamed Abdi Farah, SUN and Federal Republic of Somalia (MF)

Ferew Lemma, MoH, Ethiopia

Gerda Verberg, UN and SUN

Katherine Richards, Save the Children UK (KR)

Lucy Sullivan, Feed the Truth (LS)

Renata Micha, GNR Independent Expert Group (IEG) Chair (RM)

Tadashi Sato, JICA (TS)

Victor Aguayo, UNICEF

### Additional representatives

Allison Oman, WFP

Anna Horner, WFP

Charlotte Martineau, Development Initiatives (DI) (CM)

Debora Di Dio, SUN

Elizabeth Heidbrink, BMZ

Jeffrey Arthur Tudor, SUN

Julia Movshovich, WFP

Kedar Mankad, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) (KM)

Kellie Stewart, USAID

Meera Shaakar (World Bank) (MS)

Megumi Shuto, JICA

Melissa Hisko, Global Affairs Canada (GAC) (MH)

Nancy Abruto, FAO (NA)

Takano Mamoru, JICA

## Apologies

Abigail Perry, FCDO

Ben Siddle, Irish Aid

Carla da Silva, EC

Erin Milner, USAID

Frits van der Wal, MoFA, Netherlands

John Cordaro, Mars inc.

Juliane Friedrich, IFAD

Kate Houston, Cargill inc.

Lauren Landis, WFP

Martin Hoppe, BMZ

Máximo Torero Cullen, FAO

Neil Watkins, (BMGF)

Rachel Toku-Appiah, Graça Machel Trust

## Actions

- Any comments on the self-assessment process and content of the pre-circulated documents to be sent to Shawn by the 29<sup>th</sup> January.
- SB will seek a minimum of one further volunteer to work on the renewal of the ToR and SG so please contact SB if interested.
- Other willing volunteers to join a small task-team to lay out options, discuss with stakeholders and FSS, and present the options to SG for decision, to please contact Kedar.

## Introductions

- SB gave thanks to Abi and Lucy for their leadership of the SG and continued support as group members, and members introduced themselves.

## Proposed self-assessment

- SB will request members complete a self-assessment. SB welcomed any concerns on the proposed process to be raised, none were raised.
- DI will share the assessment form once finalized.
- Any comments on the self-assessment process and content of the pre-circulated forms to be sent to Shawn by the 29<sup>th</sup> January.

## Updating and renewal of membership

- The SG ToR contains guidelines on membership. SB would like to refresh the SG to ensure representation of constituencies. One co-chair candidate is currently in post. SB proposes a small group (minimum 3) to work with SB to review the ToR and propose changes back to the SG.
- Volunteers: Katherine Richards, Lawrence Haddad.
- SB will seek a minimum of one further volunteer to work on the renewal of the ToR and SG so please contact SB if interested.
- The renewal will be informed by the self-assessment. The GNR is seeking underrepresented constituencies. Whether to lead with a Co-chair or Chair and Vice Chair model is to be decided after the refresh, and new leads to be drawn from new members. No objections were raised.

## Nutrition for Growth Commitment Making and the UN Food Systems Summit

- Role of GNR vis-à-vis academia; bringing academia voices to the table. GNR leadership did not feel GNR could convene academia due to GNR being an accountability mechanism; KM and AP are continuing this conversation. Please send any suggestions from SG members to KM (not GNR's role to clarify, but welcome suggestions).
- LD suggests Saskia Osendarp as chair of Standing Together for Nutrition as an academia representative on the N4G advisory committee.
- MS: there are also other groups within academia who have expressed interest.
- Commitment tracking came from N4G 2013. UNFSS is a key moment with overlap with nutrition commitments. AP and KM developing a thought piece on interface between nutrition commitments at FSS and the GNR.



- LH: UNFSS has six thematic communities. The right commitment mechanism builds on individual communities' existing mechanism and will share a table with the SG highlighting communities, their accountability mechanisms, and proposing a countdown to 2030 report. GNR would fit within that mechanism (along with ATNI).
- FB: we have tried to drive accountability; the gap is acknowledging the commitments of the private sector. FS Supports bringing perspectives of communities together, a technique to analyze policies in a unified way, a mechanism to do so would be useful, we do not need to reinvent the wheel. GNR could also relaunch as an accountability mechanism for the private sector.
- SB: shaping of commitments is as important as tracking, to shape commitments that can be tracked.
- MS: GNR not designed to play a role in commitment shaping; we must clearly distinguish the two roles and ensure representation across further sectors. It is not GNR's role to frame commitments – Government of Japan (GoJ) should lead this.
- SB hoping to designate a small task-team to lay out options, discuss with stakeholders and FSS, present the options to SG for decision. SG needs to define the scope of GNR's role, consult with DI and the IEG regarding resourcing – SG will not give an unfunded mandate to GNR; it is critical the GNR is appropriately resourced to act on the SG's decision. UNFSS is a subset of the broader conversation on accountability mechanisms and GNR's scope.
- MH: it is important that GNR maintain independence in its original role, but with fear that donors may help countries shape commitments, it is important to have an independent mechanism. This concern arises from GAC's outreach work on this so far.
- Volunteers: Mellissa Hisko, Abi Perry, Kedar Mankad.
- ➔ **Other willing volunteers to join a small task-team to lay out options, discuss with stakeholders and FSS, and present the options to SG for decision, to please contact Kedar.**
- RM: The Nutrition Accountability Framework was proposed by the Technical Accountability Working Group as part of N4G process under GoJ: vision is for GNR to be at the center, a primary mechanism, but a cost-effective system leveraging existing mechanisms, aligning where possible to limit accountability fatigue (well documented) and minimize conflicting messages, assessments, and outcomes. Final WG paper presented and approved by the SG. IEG and DI have kept our vision on N4G roadmap focusing on registration until decision from SG in terms of any role of GNR if should lead the framework, this requires more discussion.
- The issue to address is the role of GNR in nutrition accountability, but with a quick turnaround of decisions regarding the UNFSS. No objections to this action were made.

## GNR funding and fundraising

- CM from DI presented the funding confirmed for GNR in 2021.
- CM refreshed the group on the three scenarios proposed by GNR in December facing a number of possible fundraising outcomes, outlining where additional work registering new commitments is able to be funded and where other activities require further decision-making and funding.
- GNR are comfortable that we will reach scenario 2 (as described during the presentation) but are presently unlikely to reach scenario 3, which leads GNR to ask for the SG prioritization of activities.

- SB: promising pipeline, but small number of donors leaving GNR fragile, which is not appropriate for such a core accountability mechanism designed for the global good.
- BMZ confirmed that there will be funding for GNR in 2021, GAC confirmed they are working through an internal sign off process to award GNR funds in 2021.
- SB raised the question of SG's role as opposed to the Donor Group role. LS sees that SG should ensure GNR has appropriate resources and that the mandate aligns with the resources, DI are responsible to undertake fundraising but the SG has a supportive role to play as well as an oversight role.
- The SG ToR states; "... 4. To act as a champion, and build support and demand for the report ....".
- GNR will be providing a one-page summary of fundraising responsibilities in GNR. SB highlights the SG's need to be stewards of the GNR to help ensure adequacy and stability of donor base.

## Key moments for GNR in 2021

- CM from DI relayed the key moments for GNR in 2021 for visibility to the SG via slideshow.
- SB emphasized the need to review the scope of the GNR in line with funding available, and support GNR seek funding if possible.
- MS: if GNR does not perform the additional functions, who will? There may not be any other institution identified to help with commitment registration in this crucial year for nutrition.
- NA: regarding the key external moments and milestones, NA wonders how the move to virtual meetings affects the budget.
- FB: an opportunity for GNR to develop a position through its products. We are in a mid-term in the year of action for nutrition, we were sustaining bi-annual reporting to the UNGA, having input to that process would be helpful as part of GNR, not a parallel stream but integral part.
- KM pointed out that there is a minimum viable product (the registration page) that has already been developed by GNR.
- RM: it would be difficult for the GNR to retreat from the formal commitment registration process due to the formal mandate from GoJ, the effort already committed, and the external communications made by various parties which poses a reputational risk. Therefore we need to agree on the scope of other products to work within the budget available. Perhaps ensuring registration of commitments is the key focus for GNR in 2021 if it is the SG's priority.
- SB summarized that the commitment registration should be considered non-negotiable within the GNR scope, the scope of the other GNR core functions needs to be agreed and the IEG and DI will seek validation from the SG should trade-offs need to be made. SG needs to commit to assisting with resource mobilization.
- CM: there is currently no funding to support commitment making.
- SB: the process of soliciting commitments may rest with the SUN.