

Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement

Discussion paper: future options for the SUN movement

*This is the concise version, without supporting annexes; a
version which includes the annexes is also available.*

Mokoro Limited

in partnership with

Valid International



FEG Consulting



Mokoro Ltd, The Old Music Hall, 106-108
Cowley Road, Oxford, OX4 1JE, UK
Tel: +44 (0) 1865 403179
Email: mokoro@mokoro.co.uk
Website: www.mokoro.co.uk

4 November 2014

Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement – Discussion Paper: future options for the SUN movement

The evaluation is being undertaken by Mokoro Ltd in partnership with Food Economy Group (FEG) Consulting and Valid International. The team of evaluators and researchers comprises Stephen Lister (team leader), Stephanie Allan, Zoe Driscoll, Alta Fölscher, Chris Leather, Lilli Loveday, Mirella Mokbel Genequand, Robrecht Renard, Stephen Turner, and Muriel Visser. Additional support is provided by Philip Lister.

The internal quality assurance panel comprises Stephen Anderson and Alistair Hallam.

The Independent Comprehensive Evaluation was commissioned by the SUN Movement's Lead Group and is overseen by its Visioning Sub-Group (VSG). Three quality assurance advisors, Julia Compton, Chris Gerrard and Eva Lithman, have been appointed to assist the VSG. Funding for the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation is provided by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The evaluation manager is Ruwan de Mel.

This paper should be cited as:

Mokoro, 2014. *Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement: Discussion paper – future options for the SUN movement*. Oxford: Mokoro Ltd, 4 November 2014.

The evaluation team has sole responsibility for the opinions expressed in this report, which is circulated to stimulate discussion without prejudice to evaluation's final conclusions and recommendations.

Contents

1.	Context and Role of this Discussion Paper	1
2.	SUN's current strategy and objectives	3
3.	Critical issues and choices SUN faces	5
4.	Next Steps	12
	Annex A Main Evaluation Questions	13
	Annex B Visioning Process and Management Response to ICE	13
	Annex C Origins and Evolution of the SUN Movement	13
	Annex D Global Initiatives on Nutrition and Food Security	13
	Annex E How the SUN Movement Seeks to Add Value	13
	Annex F References	14
	Acronyms	16

1. Context and Role of this Discussion Paper

Evaluation objectives and timetable

1. The Lead Group (LG) of the Scaling Up Nutrition movement (SUN) has commissioned an Independent Comprehensive Evaluation (ICE). The Terms of Reference (TOR) stipulate that the ICE:

"is to consider all aspects of SUN – its institutional structure, objectives, working model(s), decision processes, role within the wider architecture of international development, relevance, value-added, efficiency and effectiveness. It will address how effective SUN has been in carrying out its objectives -- concerned with accelerating the reduction of undernutrition -- and to pose options for evolution of the SUN movement to build on strengths and address weaknesses. It will provide an independent assessment of what SUN has accomplished and is accomplishing, the efficiency and effectiveness of its different components (its governance, networks and secretariat), its current functioning and to the extent feasible, its contribution at country, regional and global levels. It will examine the extent to which SUN is helping national governments, and other stakeholders, to contribute to transformations in the way nutrition is being addressed. And it will assess the role of SUN in increasing attention to women's empowerment and gender equality and in catalyzing nutrition-sensitive approaches in agriculture, health care, water and sanitation and other sectors." (TOR ¶7)

2. The evaluation's final report by the end of 2014 will feed into a "Visioning" exercise commencing in January 2015. The ICE team has already produced an **Inception Report** (Mokoro 2014a¹) which provides a detailed methodology and workplan. The evaluation questions to be addressed are summarised in 0 of this paper.

3. Ahead of the September 2014 meeting of the Lead Group, the ICE team also submitted an **Interim Progress Report** (Mokoro 2014b²). This was mainly to provide an interim assessment of the SUN movement secretariat (SMS), but also included a brief discussion of emerging issues for the evaluation.

4. There is agreement across all stakeholder groups that the crucial test of the SUN movement's added value will be the difference that it makes at country level. Eight **country case studies** are being undertaken, across a range of SUN countries (Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Indonesia, Mozambique, Senegal and Tanzania). Box 1 below explains why these countries were chosen and the Inception Report describes how the case studies are being conducted.³ Country visits took place between 8th September and 31st October 2014, and the ICE team is still

¹ Available at: www.scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/2014.08.08-SUN-ICE-Inception-Report.pdf

² Available at: www.scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/141003-SUN-ICE-Interim-Progress-Report.pdf

³ The aim is to provide systematic evidence that can feed in to the overall evaluation; the ICE will not publish separate case studies for each country.

analysing and consolidating the evidence gathered. First impressions have influenced the present paper, but it does not attempt to present country-level findings. The ICE team is also undertaking extensive interviews, documentary research and data analysis. The inaugural Global Nutrition Report (GNR) to be published in mid-November will provide additional relevant data.

Box 1 Country Case Study Selection criteria

The overarching rationale for the country case study selection was to ensure that the focus of the evaluation is on SUN's added value beyond what countries are able to achieve independently (TOR ¶19). As such, only countries which joined SUN not later than 2012 were considered, as they were likely to provide more valuable lessons than recent joiners (the e-survey will test case study findings in countries which joined the movement more recently). Deliberate efforts were made to include countries with largest vulnerable populations (hence Indonesia, Bangladesh and Ethiopia), balanced with some smaller countries. At the same time, the selection ensured a balance of countries of different income status and geographic regions, and included both fragile and stable state contexts. To enable an assessment of the interaction of SUN with the REACH initiative, some REACH countries were included in the sample; and similarly some countries with active business networks. Some countries which were MPTF recipients were also included. A spread across the range of scaling up preparedness levels enabled the evaluation to understand how SUN adds value in countries at different ends of the preparedness scale, and an effort to focus on countries where the team had existing expertise, was a pragmatic response the limited time in-country available.

5. In early November, the team will conduct an **electronic survey** to test the wider relevance and comprehensiveness of preliminary findings as they have emerged to date, and to get stakeholder views on the movement's future. Through the survey, it is hoped that the evaluation will be able to capture the opinions of a larger group of stakeholders than it is possible to reach through individual interviews. However, all previous interviewees are also being requested to complete the survey in order to build on their views shared in a systematic manner. The survey will be sent to stakeholders at country level (government focal points, donors, UN agencies, private sector entities and NGOs) and at global level (including members of the global networks, Lead Group members, SMS staff and other relevant parties). Efforts are also being made to reach stakeholders in non-SUN countries.

6. Members of the ICE team will attend the SUN **Global Gathering** (Rome: 16–18 November). As well as learning by participating and observing the gathering, the ICE team will facilitate some sessions designed to encourage feedback on SUN's performance to date and discussion of its possible future role. The present paper is therefore, among other things, one of the preparatory documents for the Global Gathering.

7. After the Global Gathering, the key remaining steps for ICE will be:

- Submission of a **draft evaluation report** to the LG's Visioning Sub-Group (VSG): 15 December. There will be an opportunity for stakeholders to

comment on the draft, but the compressed timetable means that responses will need to be very rapid. However, as noted below, there will be further opportunity to discuss and debate the issues raised by the evaluation in the course of the visioning exercise which follows it.

- Submission of **Final Evaluation Report**: 31 December (taking account of comments received on the draft).

8. The final evaluation report will include options and recommendations for SUN's future, which will feed into the **visioning exercise** that commences in January 2015. Annex B explains the visioning exercise and how it will link to the collection of responses to the ICE conclusions and recommendations.

Role of this Discussion Paper

9. A crucial part of the evaluation is to seek a wide range of stakeholder views, not only about how well (or poorly) SUN has performed up to now, but also about what (if any) SUN's future roles and priorities should be. The next section of this paper provides a brief overview of SUN's current structure, strategy and aims. Section 3 then draws on the ICE team's work so far to describe the key choices that the SUN movement will need to consider as it decides its future.

2. SUN's current strategy and objectives

10. The SUN movement's evolution as described in the Inception Report is reproduced as Annex C. SUN was not pre-planned to emerge as it has; it has always been fluid and, partly for that reason, remains complex to analyse. Annex D charts significant global initiatives on nutrition and food security that preceded and followed the emergence of the SUN movement.

11. SUN's initial framing documents were the 2010 *Framework for Action* (SUN 2010) and the first edition of *A Road Map for Scaling Up Nutrition* (SUN Road Map Task Team 2010). In 2012, following the Stewardship Report (Isenman et al 2011, SMS 2011), a more formal governance structure was adopted, with the SUN movement secretariat (SMS) reporting to a Lead Group (LG) appointed by the UN Secretary General.

12. Under the Lead Group's auspices a *Scaling Up Nutrition Movement Strategy (2012–2015)* (SMS 2012b) was adopted, linked to a *Revised Road Map* (SMS 2012a). These two documents are the most authoritative statement of the SUN movement's current vision and goals, its strategic approaches and objectives, the way it is organised (including the roles of its constituent networks,⁴ the principles of

⁴ Listed in the Strategic Plan as:

- The SUN Country Government Focal Points Network
- The SUN Donor Network
- The SUN Civil Society Organisations' Network

engagement that guide their work, the functions of the Secretariat and the systems of accountability across the movement). They also set out the expected achievements of the SUN movement from 2012–2015 and the ways in which it intends to add value.

13. SUN's strategic objectives are described in the Revised Road Map as follows:

"The Movement's strategic objectives to the end of 2015 focus on increasing support and demonstrating effectiveness through:

1) **The creation of an enabling political environment**, with strong in-country leadership, and a shared space (multi-stakeholder platforms) where stakeholders align their activities and take joint responsibility for scaling up nutrition;

2) **The establishment of best practice** for scaling up proven interventions, including the adoption of effective laws and policies;

3) **The alignment of actions** around high quality and well-costed country plans, with an agreed results frameworks and mutual accountability;

4) **An increase in resources**, directed towards coherent, aligned approaches." (SMS 2012a, p8, ¶17)

14. The Revised Road Map also summarises SUN's intended value added as follows:

Strategic Objective	Added Value of the Movement
Enabling Environment	1: Aligning stakeholders for rapid scaling up of selective evidence-based policies and interventions to enhance nutrition activities and joint action.
	2: Facilitating and convening of stakeholders, to broker interactions within and across SUN countries and Networks.
Shared Practices	3: Identifying and sharing of evidence-based good practice to enable the prioritisation of actions and resources.
	4: Promoting women's empowerment and emphasising gender approaches to under-nutrition that enable a transformative effect on sustainable and resilient nutrition security.
Aligned Actions	5: Accepting and implementing mutual accountability on behalf of the intended beneficiaries, using the SUN accountability framework.
	6: Tracking and evaluating performance to provide a robust understanding of what is driving impact and proving to be effective versus what is not.
Increased Resources	7: Advocating to increase political commitment and Mobilising technical and financial resources that enable societies to scale up action to improve nutrition.

Source: SMS 2012a, p9.

15. At Annex E we reproduce from the Revised Road Map its elaboration of the different ways in which the SUN movement seeks to add value. A key task for the ICE is to assess the extent to which SUN has succeeded in adding value in each of these ways.

- The SUN Business Network and
- The SUN UN System Network.

3. Critical issues and choices SUN faces

Approach

16. As the ICE team noted in the Interim Progress Report:

"We have found hardly anyone who considers the SUN such a failure that it should be terminated as early as 2015. Even those who worry that it may not be achieving enough traction at country level do not consider that it has had long enough to prove itself. Almost everyone therefore considers that SUN should continue, in some form, for several years beyond 2015.⁵" (Mokoro 2014b, ¶3.9a)

17. Assuming therefore that SUN will continue for a further phase, this section identifies some of the critical choices that will need to be made in shaping its future. Choices will need to be made at the level of the movement as whole, at the level of its constituent networks, and concerning the movement's governance.

18. SUN is one among a number of initiatives in the field of nutrition and food security (at Annex D we chart the major initiatives since the 1992 International Conference on Nutrition, and our full evaluation report will include a broader overview of SUN's role vis-à-vis the nutrition-related mandates and activities of the other major international bodies in the sector⁶). Choices will need to take account of related developments that affect the question of where SUN's comparative advantages may lie: what can SUN do that can't be (or isn't being) done better by another agency, or under another initiative? What is the right division of labour, where are the complementarities?

19. The ICE will provide evidence on which functions SUN has performed relatively well, and some evidence on which functions may be demanded in the future. The ICE team is still gathering evidence and not yet in a position to make specific recommendations, but in the following paragraphs we try to identify the key dimensions of those choices. In doing so, we hope to stimulate discussion about what SUN has done well, or failed to do well, up to now, as well as the things that it ought (or ought not) to attempt in the future.

20. The issues raised below are not in a particular order of priority – indeed, many of them are interconnected. Where possible they are illustrated with material emerging from the evaluation.

⁵ Estimates from interviewees of how long might be long enough to make such a judgement have ranged from 5 to 25 years.

⁶ These include the main UN agencies concerned (WHO, WFP, FAO, UNICEF) and international forums and coordinating agencies including the World Health Assembly (WHA), the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), the UN Standing Committee on Nutrition (SCN), the Inter-Agency Steering Committee (IAS C) Global Nutrition Cluster (GNC) etc.

Key choices and issues for consideration

Objectives and Areas of Focus

Which nutrition issues?

21. SUN has focused strongly on undernutrition, drawing on compelling evidence about the causes and effects of stunting and the importance of the 1000 days from pregnancy to a child's second birthday. But there is increasing scientific evidence that issues of over- and under-nutrition are intertwined over the life-course and therefore logically inseparable⁷ (see Box 2 below). How should SUN address this?

Box 2 The Double Burden of Malnutrition⁸

The Double Burden of Malnutrition (DBM) is the coexistence of both undernutrition and overnutrition in the same population across the life course.

“Across the life course” refers to the phenomenon that undernutrition early in life contributes to an increased propensity for overnutrition in adulthood. (page iii)

The double burden of malnutrition (DBM) is undernutrition, including micronutrient deficiencies, coexisting with overnutrition: overweight and obesity. Malnutrition refers to nutritional excesses of macronutrients and micronutrients as well as deficiencies (WHO 1995). Undernutrition is the result of insufficient intake, poor absorption, and/or poor biological use of the nutrients. This can result in impaired body functions, impaired growth, and underweight. Overnutrition is the result of excess or imbalanced nutrient intakes, which can result in impaired body functions, as well as overweight and/or obesity. The individual suffers negative consequences from either form of malnutrition, but so does the nation's economy due to lost GDP and higher health care costs. (p3)

Source: Shrimpton and Rokx 2012 (emphasis added)

22. Few would dispute that comprehensive nutrition plans and policies should be encouraged to address overnutrition.⁹ A review of the coexistence of stunting, wasting and overweight in the forthcoming Global Nutrition Report (GNR) is expected to show that countries with more than one malnutrition burden are in the

⁷ There are also debates about the right balance between attention to stunting and wasting (which was a principal topic at the Technical Meeting on Nutrition hosted by the Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN) in Oxford, UK from 7–9 October 2014), and the particular importance of maternal nutrition, from girls' adolescence onwards (Mason et al 2014). However, acknowledging these issues poses no difficulties for the SUN movement, whereas full attention to the double burden implies a change of scope.

⁸ The term *malnutrition* correctly embraces both overnutrition and undernutrition as well as micro-nutrient deficiencies, although the standard terms *severe acute malnutrition* (SAM) and *moderate acute malnutrition* (MAM) connote undernutrition.

⁹ cf. Sixty-fourth World Health Assembly, Geneva, Switzerland, May 2012 (see Annex D), which urged Member States, to put into practice, as appropriate, comprehensive implementation plans on maternal, infant and young child nutrition, including developing or strengthening nutrition policies so that they comprehensively address the double burden of malnutrition and include nutrition actions in overall country health and development policy.

majority. In the country case studies and a review of a similar number of other countries' planning and policy documents, we found varying, but increasing, levels of awareness and attention to the significance of the double burden and its implications for non-communicable diseases (NCDs). Only occasionally was this accompanied by proposals for specific interventions, but the double burden seems certain to gain more attention in future.¹⁰

23. SUN needs to consider some wider implications:

- Overnutrition is a lot harder to "sell" than undernutrition. (To paraphrase one interviewee, being undernourished is regarded as a misfortune, but being overweight is taken as a sign of gluttony and sloth.) SUN has benefited from having a very clear message about undernutrition and the need to address stunting: how can it incorporate proper attention to overnutrition without compromising effective advocacy?
- Overnutrition affects countries of all income levels, and high income countries are experiencing an epidemic of obesity and associated non-communicable diseases (NCDs).¹¹ Should SUN therefore be more explicit that its focus is only on low and middle income countries?
- Many students of obesity implicate food systems and large-scale processed food industries in particular as contributing factors to a global obesity epidemic and argue that such food industry interests are not well aligned with the pursuit of better nutrition.¹² This is likely to reinforce concerns about the potential conflicts of interest in SUN's engagement with the private sector. How can such conflicts be effectively managed within the SUN movement?

Rolling out national policies to sub-national level

24. Our country case studies suggest a mixed picture in terms of the SUN movement's direct effects on national-level nutrition policies and plans. In some cases credible plans and policies have not yet been developed and the SUN movement seems to have had relatively little traction so far. In some there has been strong progress in addressing undernutrition, but this was under way before SUN's inception and it is difficult to give SUN a large share of the credit ("SUN joined us" was a comment from one such country). But there are also cases where SUN clearly has energised recent attention to nutrition and influenced the adoption of multi-sectoral approaches.

25. However, there is concern across all categories that planning and implementation at sub-national level (especially for nutrition-sensitive interventions) lags behind the national-level adoption of policies and plans for

¹⁰ See the WHA 2012 resolution quoted in footnote 9 above.

¹¹ See IASO 2014.

¹² See for example the review by Shrimpton and Rokx 2012, and the proceedings of a conference of the World Public Health Nutrition Association (WPHNA) at <http://www.wphna.org/Oxford2014/>.

scaling up nutrition. This relates both to advocacy (spreading understanding of what is required) and to capacities for implementation at local level.¹³ How can SUN effectively support roll-out to local levels? (Among other things, what may this imply for the role and configuration of the Secretariat and the various SUN networks?)

Mobilising Finance

26. As countries make progress towards scaling up it will become increasingly important to ensure mobilisation of the financial resources required. At the Nutrition for Growth summit in 2013 (see Annex D) commitments to increase resources for nutrition were made by 19 donors and 25 partner governments.¹⁴ The inaugural Global Nutrition Report finds it is too early to collect meaningful data on these financial commitments. Among the ICE case study countries, the middle income countries' expectations about external resources were, predictably, different from those of more aid-dependent countries. However, in neither group as yet can we point to an unequivocal "major increase" in either external or domestic resource commitments.

27. The *Revised Road Map* (SMS 2012a) commits that the Secretariat "will work with the Lead Group to explore and pursue options for major increases in resources for countries that are ready to significantly scale up efforts to ensure better nutrition for all". How can this undertaking be effectively carried through?

Country Membership of the Movement

Country-centred or country -driven?

28. The SUN movement has had a strong focus on being country-centred. It has emphasised support for government-led plans, while it has deliberately avoided being very prescriptive about the structure or the content of those plans (as opposed to the issues they should address). The country network appears to be SUN's central focus with the other networks in a supporting role.

29. However it is not clear that the "country-driven" description fits so well. The implications of "membership" of the SUN movement were well understood in some of our case study countries; in others there was much less understanding of SUN – as a movement and not an organisation, as a catalyst and not a funder. (Interestingly, countries that had provided members of the Lead Group fell into both categories.)

¹³ For example, in the case of Ethiopia, there is a well-articulated structure of national policy-making and planning for nutrition, but the task of rolling this out to 11 Federal regions and about 500 districts, is in its early stages. This concerns communicating the basic messages about nutrition priorities – e.g. the nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive distinction – as well as setting up mechanisms for planning, implementing and monitoring progress.) Tanzania, too, has a challenge of getting a well-articulated national policy reflected in its district plans. (But Ethiopia nevertheless has an impressive record of effective local level action to address stunting. And in Senegal there has since 2002 been a successful vertical programme (the *Programme de Renforcement de la Nutrition* – PRN) that implements at the community level (subcontracting to NGOs or local communes).

¹⁴ Not all of them SUN member countries.

And where there was a clear understanding of SUN it was often restricted to key individuals and agencies (such as the Ministry of Health) at national level.

30. The configuration of the Lead Group that was adopted in 2012 was meant to reflect a "country-led" movement, but it is not clear to what extent this carries through into the way the LG actually operates. For example, the participation rate of country representatives seems to be lower than for other groups.¹⁵ Going forward, SUN needs to consider carefully what being country-driven means. This links the issues of membership criteria which we discuss next.

Which countries?

31. Despite SUN's rapid growth, there remain questions about which countries SUN should serve or engage with. Thus:

- What should be SUN's approach to countries which have not joined but which have significant burdens of undernutrition? Some of our interviewees have pointed to specific non-member countries (large and small) which they feel could benefit from participation within SUN. Others have been more concerned by the risk that an ever larger membership will stretch and dilute the capacity of the SMS and the support networks to provide meaningful assistance to individual member countries.
- What forms of engagement should SUN seek with middle income countries (MICs) including those like Brazil and India which haven't joined SUN – and may not wish to – but which might nevertheless be engaged in experience sharing?
- Should there be more attention to the needs of fragile and conflict-affected states? How can coordination between SUN and the Global Nutrition Cluster (GNC) be improved? (See Box 3 below.)

¹⁵ There have been six LG Meetings to date, for which the overall attendance rate by named LG members stands at 57%. For the nine country representatives (from eight partner country governments plus NEPAD) the attendance rate is lower, at 14%. The attendance rate by a named alternate representative (or his/her representative), is significantly higher: 88% overall, but only 27% for country representatives.

Box 3 Fragile and Conflict Affected States and the SUN Movement

A report commissioned by World Vision on Scaling Up Nutrition in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States (FCAS) set out the growing body of evidence around the importance of addressing undernutrition in these countries. It notes that the prevalence of child undernutrition is comparatively high in FCAS, which is directly attributable to the disruption of food production and supply, destruction of household assets and livelihoods, mass displacement of population, and degradation of vital services including health associated with conflict. At the same time, it is increasingly recognised that food and nutrition insecurity are associated with heightened risk of violent social unrest and conflict.

Despite this, of 42 countries classified as FCAS at the time the report was written, a minority (16) had, so far, joined the SUN movement.¹⁶ Moreover, the research report found that those FCAS remaining outside SUN had systematically weaker economic indicators and poorer governance capacity than those within the movement.

The report concludes that the reason why so many FCAS are excluded is that undernutrition there continues to be seen, fundamentally, as a problem of acute undernutrition, whose solution lies in an increase in the provision of food. This emphasis on sector-specific humanitarian treatment inhibits intersectoral and interministerial incentives to collaborate. It recommends that donors and technical agencies partnering government in FCAS should be more consistent in adopting and promoting the SUN model of integrated action which addresses both acute and chronic undernutrition, by incorporating interdependent interventions in health, food security and agriculture.

Source: Taylor 2013

Performance standards for SUN member countries?

32. The requirements for countries wishing to join the SUN movement are not onerous, in line with its deliberately inclusive approach. As yet, there are no set standards of performance nor any procedure for reviewing or renewing membership. However, the *Revised Road Map* hints at such standards (especially in point (c) below):

"The Movement's members will concentrate support on countries that have demonstrated a readiness to scale up nutrition. To enable this to happen, the Movement's Secretariat will ensure the development of (a) consistent approaches to calculating costs of scaling up nutrition and to tracking expenditure, (b) preliminary estimates for the costs of implementing nutrition-sensitive strategies, (c) a system for independent reviews of country plans and activities, and a mechanism for recourse (d) alternative approaches for the provision of external funds to countries – especially when they are unable to access external resources through in-country mechanisms e) an operating and investment plan based on evaluations of progress." (SMS 2012a, ¶10)

¹⁶ At the time of the research (January 2013), 33 countries had joined SUN. As of October 2014, SUN had 54 members. Of 53 countries which count as FCAS by Taylor's criteria (listed as FCAS by one of WB, OECD or DFID), 32 are now SUN members.

33. Can the SUN movement remain vibrant if it sets no standards for its member countries? If standards are set, can this be done in a way that is consistent with SUN's aspiration to be country-driven?

Required Support to SUN Countries

34. What kinds of support will SUN countries need in the coming period? For each type of support that is required SUN has to consider whether its role is to facilitate, catalyse or provide such support. There are further implications for the roles of the SMS and various support networks. Categories of support include, but may not be limited to:

- advocacy and convening stakeholders;
- technical support (e.g. more guidance on the development of nutrition-sensitive policies and programmes);
- standard-setting and monitoring (as raised above);
- financial support (should there be more emphasis on mobilisation of finance for nutrition as a criterion of success?).

Organisation and Governance

35. The Stewardship Report expressed concern not to adopt a rigid form too early in the life of a fluid movement, but there are issues now about whether SUN needs a more mature organisation and governance, and whether this can be achieved without compromising the country-centred nature of the movement. In particular:

- a) Is the Lead Group sustainable in its current form?
 - The current LG configuration has, in effect, merged the roles of oversight and champions (which the Stewardship Report saw as quite distinct) and –in principle at least – its members act in their individual capacities rather than as representatives of the organisations and networks they come from.¹⁷ Arguably, this risks compromising both the legitimacy and efficiency of SUN's governing body, and it is not clear how the present membership of the LG should be renewed or rolled forward.
 - There is a case for smaller executive body that might be more effective and efficient in holding SMS accountable, but how would the legitimacy of such a body be ensured?

¹⁷However, the attendance records cited in footnote 16 indicate that members have frequently sent representatives rather than joining personally. And in a number of cases an original member has been replaced by his/her successor in an official position.

- b) How satisfactory are the current roles and structure of the four supporting networks:
- the donor network?
 - the UN network?
 - the CS network?
 - the business network?
- c) Does the SMS have the skills it needs? Few if any interviewees have questioned the energy and competence of SMS staff, but several have argued that it needs more nutrition expertise, or more understanding of country-level political economy. Answers will, of course, depend on the responses to the other issues raised above, since these will determine the role that the SMS is required to play.

Time-scale and Indicators of Success

36. For how long is there a clear role for SUN? What are the success indicators to show that SUN is no longer needed?

4. Next Steps

37. The paper is intended to stimulate discussion, both at the Global Gathering and more generally. The ICE team will use the feedback it generates to assist both our assessment of SUN performance to date and our conclusions and recommendations about SUN's next phase.

Please note that a version that includes the following annexes is also available.

Annex A Main Evaluation Questions

**Annex B Visioning Process and Management
Response to ICE**

**Annex C Origins and Evolution of the SUN
Movement**

**Annex D Global Initiatives on Nutrition and Food
Security**

**Annex E How the SUN Movement Seeks to Add
Value**

Annex F References

"Location" in the listing below refers to folder and document numbers in the evaluation team's electronic library.

short ref	full ref	location
IASO 2014	<i>The prevention of obesity and NCDs: Challenges and opportunities for governments.</i> IASO Policy Briefing, IASO Policy Briefing, International Association for the Study of Obesity, January 2014.	5.4-1
Isenman et al 2011	<i>Stewardship of the SUN Movement: Taking SUN to the Next Level.</i> Paul Isenman, Keith Bezanson and Lola Gostelow, 30 September 2011.	0.3-4
Mason et al 2014	<i>The first 500 days of life: policies to support maternal nutrition.</i> John B. Mason, Roger Shrimpton, Lisa S. Saldanha, Usha Ramakrishnan, Cesar G. Victora, Amy Webb Girard, Deborah A. McFarland and Reynaldo Martorell. Global Health Action, 6 June 2014.	5-27
Mokoro 2014a	<i>Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement: Inception Report.</i> Oxford: Mokoro Ltd, 01 August 2014.	
Mokoro 2014b	<i>Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement: Interim Progress Report.</i> Oxford: Mokoro Ltd, 03 October 2014.	
Morris et al. 2008	<i>Maternal and Child Undernutrition 5. Effective international action against undernutrition: why has it proven so difficult and what can be done to accelerate progress?</i> In <i>'The Lancet'</i> Vol. 71, February 16, 2008, pp.608–621. Saul S. Morris, Bruce Cogill, Ricardo Uauy, for the Maternal and Child Undernutrition Study Group. The Lancet, 16 February 2008.	5.3-7
Shrimpton and Rokx 2012	<i>The double burden of malnutrition: A review of global evidence.</i> Roger Shrimpton and Claudia Rokx, HNP Discussion Paper, November 2012.	5.4-3
SUN 2010	<i>Scaling Up Nutrition: A Framework for Action.</i> 2010 (Reprint April 2011.)	0.0-1
SMS 2011	<i>Stewardship of the Scale Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement. Submission to the UN Secretary General.</i> Pre-Final Draft: November 16 th 2011: 1400hrs CET.	0.3-2
SMS 2012a	<i>SUN Movement: Revised Road Map.</i> Secretariat of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement. September 2012.	0.0-2
SMS 2012b	<i>Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement Strategy [2012-2015].</i> September 2012	0.0-3
SMS 2013	<i>SUN Movement Monitoring & Evaluation Framework. Final Draft.</i> SUN Movement Secretariat, 10 April 2013.	0.6-1
SMS 2014a	<i>Scaling Up Nutrition.</i> PowerPoint Presentation. SUN Movement Secretariat, April 2014.	0.1-5
SUN Road Map Task Team 2010	<i>A Road Map for Scaling-Up Nutrition (SUN). First Edition.</i> Scaling Up Nutrition Road Map Task Team, September 2010.	0.0-5
Taylor 2013	<i>Fragile but not helpless: Scaling Up Nutrition in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States.</i> Dr Sebastian Taylor, World Vision UK, June 2013.	5-28

short ref	full ref	location
The Lancet 2008	<i>The Lancet's series on Maternal and Child Undernutrition: Executive Summary.</i> The Lancet, 2008.	5.3-1
The Lancet 2013	<i>Maternal and Child Nutrition.</i> Executive Summary of <i>The Lancet</i> Maternal and Child Nutrition Series. The Lancet, 2013.	5.2-2
WHO 1995	<i>Physical Status: Uses and Interpretation of Anthropometry.</i> WHO Technical Report Series, Report No. 854. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization 1995..	

Acronyms

AAHM	Alliance Against Hunger and Malnutrition
AFSI	l'Aquila Food Security Initiative
AGRA	Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CCS	Country Case Study
CFA	Comprehensive Framework for Action
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
COP	Community of Practice
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DP	Development Partner
EQ	Evaluation Question
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FCAS	Fragile and Conflict Affected States
FFA	Framework for Action
FIVIMS	Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping Systems
FNS	Food and Nutrition Security
GAFSP	Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme
GINA	Global database on the Implementation of Nutrition Action
GNC	Global Nutrition Cluster
GNR	Global Nutrition Report
GPAFS	Global Partnership for Agriculture and Food Security
GPAFS	Global Partnership for Agriculture and Food Security
HLPF	High Level Political Forum (on Sustainable Development)
HLTF	High Level Task Force (on Global Food Security)
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
IASO	International Association for the Study of Obesity
IBFAN	International Baby Food Action Network
ICE	Independent Comprehensive Evaluation
ICN	International Conference on Nutrition
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IPPF	International Planned Parenthood Federation
IPR	Interim Progress Report
IR	Inception Report
LG	Lead Group
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
M4DR	Managing for Development Results
MSP	Multi-Stakeholder Platform

NCD	non-communicable disease
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPAN	National Plan of Action for Nutrition
N4G	Nutrition for Growth
ODA	Official Development Assistance
REACH	Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger and undernutrition
SCN	(UN) Standing Committee on Nutrition
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SMS	SUN Movement Secretariat
SUN	Scaling Up Nutrition movement
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNSG	United Nations Secretary-General
VSG	Visioning Sub-Group
WASH	Water, sanitation and hygiene
WB	World Bank
WFS	World Food Summit
WHA	World Health Assembly
WHO	World Health Organisation
WPHNA	World Public Health Nutrition Association