

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

Mozambique

2016 Reporting Template: Joint-Assessment by National Multi-Stakeholder Platform

April 2015 to April 2016

Process and Details of the 2016 Joint-Assessment exercise

To help the SUN Movement Secretariat better understand how your inputs for the Joint-Assessment 2016¹ were compiled from stakeholders, and to what extent the process was useful to in-country stakeholders, please provide us with the following details:

Participation

1. Did the following stakeholder groups provide specific inputs, whether in writing or verbally, to the Joint-Assessment?

Group	Yes (provide number) / No (= 0)
Government	6
Civil Society	2
Science and Academia	0
Donors	1
United Nations	2
Business	0
Other (please specify)	0

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? __15__

¹ Please note that the analysed results of this Joint-Assessment exercise will be included in the SUN Movement Annual Progress Report 2016 along with the details of how the exercise was undertaken in- country.

Process

3. Was the Joint-Assessment data gathered and/or reviewed during a face-to-face meeting, or via email?

Step	Format	
Collection	Meeting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Email <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Review, validation	Meeting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Email <input type="checkbox"/>

4. If a collection or validation meeting did take place, please attach a photo of it if possible

The validation meeting took place on May 26, in the meeting room of the SETSAN but unfortunately did not take photographs

Usefulness

5. If a collection or validation meeting did take place, would you say that the meeting was useful to participants, beyond the usual work of the MSP?

Yes / No

Why?

We think that the meeting was very useful but because it served as a space for sharing information on different interventions that are underway in the country referring specifically to SUN assessment indicators.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	On-going	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational /Target achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/ Validated/ Evidence provided

Process 1: Bringing people together in the same space for action

PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space for action

Strengthened coordinating mechanisms at national and sub-national level enable in-country stakeholders to better work for improved nutrition outcomes. Functioning multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral platforms enable the delivery of joint results, through facilitated interactions on nutrition related issues, among sector relevant stakeholders. Functioning multi-stakeholder platforms (MSP) enable the mobilisation and engagement of relevant stakeholders, assist relevant national bodies in their decision making, enable consensus around joint interests and recommendations and foster dialogue at the local level.

Progress marker 1.1: Select / develop coordinating mechanisms at country level

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordination mechanisms are established at government level and are regularly convened by high-level officials. It indicates if non-state constituencies such as the UN Agencies, donors, civil society organisations and businesses have organised themselves in networks with convening and coordinating functions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structure in place and functioning, such as a high level convening body from government (political endorsement) ▪ Official nomination of SUN Government Focal Point as coordinator ▪ Convene MSP members on a regular basis ▪ Appoint Focal Points/conveners for Key Stakeholder Groups e.g. Donor convener, Civil Society Coordinators, UN Focal Point, Business Liaison Person, Academic representative ▪ Institutional analysis conducted of capacity of high-level structure ▪ Establish or refine terms of reference, work plans and other types of enabling arrangements [Supporting documents requested] 	4	<p>Establishment of Technical Working Group of the Multisectoral Action Plan to reduce Chronic Undernutrition (GT-PAMRDC) in 2012 as coordination mechanism under SETSAN and GTs was created at all 11 provinces.</p> <p>Decentralization of PAMRDC was expanded to all 11 provinces of the country and which have been approved 9 provincial plans by the respective Governments. Is in the approval process the two remaining provinces (Maputo and Inhambane provinces)</p> <p>It should be noted that still a great challenge to expand the decentralization of PAMRDC at district level</p>

Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence

<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordinating mechanisms established by the government and by non-state constituencies are able to reach out to relevant members from various sectors, to broaden the collective influence on nutrition-relevant issues. It also analyses the extent to which local levels are involved in the multi-stakeholder-sector approach in nutrition (e.g. decentralisation of platforms).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand MSP to get key members on board ▪ Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors ▪ Actively engage executive level political leadership ▪ Key stakeholder groups working to include new members e.g. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics ▪ Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity, WASH etc ▪ Establish decentralised structures and/or processes that support planning and action locally, and create a feedback loop between the central and local levels, including community, and vulnerable groups. [Provide examples, if available] 	<p>3</p>	<p>Through the government MSP (GT-PAMRDC) relevant line Ministries such as Ministry of Health, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Action; Ministry of Education; Ministry of Public Works, Housing and Hydric Resources; Ministry of Industry and Commerce; Ministry of Economy and Finance and Ministry of Youth & Sports are engaged, as well as the All SUN Country platforms like Civil Society platform, Partner platform and Private Sector platform, recently created, works in coordination with the SETSAN.</p> <p>The Government's platform is also set at the level of all provinces through the provincial technical working groups and the civil society platform has already been established in some provinces such as Maputo, Inhambane, Tete and Nampula</p> <p>Although we have the technical groups at the central level and in the provinces, remains a major challenge to insure the constant and active participation of all members of the sectors</p>
<p>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the actual functioning of the MSP to facilitate regular interactions among relevant stakeholders. It indicates the capacity within the multi-stakeholder platforms to actively engage all stakeholders, set significant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work-plans ▪ Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy/legal framework, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews. ▪ Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders 	<p>4</p>	<p>Working Groups, formed by technicians from different sectors and institutions, act as a forum for interaction and information sharing on issues related to nutrition to obtain consensus among stakeholders</p> <p>The reports submitted to the Council of Ministers are the result of the interaction of different sectors and translate into concrete</p>

<p>agendas, reach consensus to influence decision making process and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Get platform to agree on agenda / prioritisation of issues ▪ Use results to advocate / influence other decision-making bodies ▪ Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement 		<p>recommendations to be implemented by sectors as well as an advocacy vehicle on nutrition issues in the country</p> <p>The PAMRDC implementation report that is produced annually is the result of the contribution of all sectors.</p>
<p>Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the capacity of the multi-stakeholder platform as a whole to be accountable for collective results. It implies that constituencies within the MSP are capable to track and report on own contributions and achievements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis [Supporting documents requested from the latest reporting cycle] ▪ Key stakeholder groups tracking commitments and are able to report on an annual basis, at a minimum e.g. financial commitments, Nutrition for Growth commitments, etc. 	<p>3</p>	<p>The members of the technical working group has the duty to report to the group (considered a national platform) the nutrition actions and the process of implementation of PAMRDC of their sector. They take the information from the MSP to be sheared at their sectors through different mechanisms (Ministerial Consultative Councils, emails, workshops, etc.)</p>
<p>Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at how the multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is institutionalised in national development planning mechanisms and in lasting political commitments, not only by the government executive power but also by the leadership of agencies and organisations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms ▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover ▪ Institutional commitments from key stakeholder groups 	<p>2</p>	<p>Since the creation of multisectoral group for the planning and budgeting of food and nutrition security at the central level (GT-POSAN) in 2014, the inclusion of issues of nutrition in sectoral plans noted significant progress and all the key sectors include aspects of nutrition in its economic and social annual plans. SETSAN has conducted training activities of the provincial technical groups on issues of inclusion of nutrition in provincial and district economic plans.</p>
<p>Stakeholders</p>	<p>Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One</p>		
<p>Government</p>	<p>-</p>		
<p>UN</p>	<p>-</p>		
<p>Donor</p>	<p>-</p>		

Business	-
CSO	-
Others	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	On-going	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational /Target achieved/On-going with continued monitoring / Validated/ Evidence provided

Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

The existence of a coherent policy and legal framework should inform and guide how in-country stakeholders work together for improved nutrition outcomes. Updated policies, strategies and legislations are fundamental to prevent conflicts of interest among the wide range of actors involved in a complex societal topic such as nutrition. This process focuses on the enabling policy and legal environment.

Progress marker 2.1: Continuously analyse existing nutrition-relevant policies and legislations

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing nutrition-relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations are analysed using multi-sectoral consultative processes with representation from various stakeholders,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regular multi-sectoral analysis and stock-take of existing policies and regulations ▪ Reflect on existing policies and legal framework ▪ Existence of review papers ▪ Indicate any nutrition relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations identified, analysed during the reporting period and specify the type of consultative process that was applied 	3	<p>In addition to the national PAMRDC which is the framework in terms of the country nutrition policies in the period under review were approved laws, strategies and plans all designed using the multi-sectoral approach such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PAMRDC the provinces of Cabo Delgado, Niassa, Nampula, Gaza and Maputo city

<p>especially civil society representatives. It indicates the availability of stock-taking documents and continuous context analysis that can inform and guide policy making.</p>	<p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the analysed policies and legislations</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law of food fortification • Strategy of social action • Communication strategy and behavior change • PES sectors and provinces with nutrition Plano Operativo para o Desenvolvimento Agrário
<p>Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, update and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to contribute, influence and advocate for the development of an updated or new policy and legal framework for improved nutrition and its dissemination (i.e. advocacy and communication strategies in place to support the dissemination of relevant policies).It focuses on how countries ascertain policy and legal coherence across different ministries and try to broaden political support by encouraging parliamentarian engagement. It also focuses on the efforts of in-country stakeholders to influence decision makers for legislations and evidence-based policies that empower the most vulnerable and disadvantaged (children and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy ▪ Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality ▪ Develop common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy making ▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes) ▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies ▪ Key stakeholder groups promote integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions ▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, workshops ▪ Dissemination and communication of policy / legal framework by key stakeholders among relevant audiences <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Advocacy and Communication Plan of PAMRDC was adopted in February 2014 whose the motto is “Nutrition is Development, a Commitment to All”. This plan targets basically the decision makers to influence them to be sensitive to a nutrition issues. In this context, it was recorded Televisive Spots with national Champions to disseminate key messages to combat chronic malnutrition such as the First Lady of the Republic, Their excellences Minister of Agriculture and Food Security and Minister of Health, one Bishop Emeritus, one Sheik and one singer. Is being Conducted campaigns and festivals of nutrition (in the provinces, in schools, at fairs like FACIM, etc.) to advocate and disseminate information about nutrition in the country. We are conducting training activities to provincial governors and district administrators in matters of nutrition so that they are more sensitive to the subject The Platform of Civil Society for Nutrition has been developing advocacy campaigns with the aim of ensuring greater ownership and accountability of policy makers in relation to the problem of chronic malnutrition, positioning nutrition as a key factor for the well-being, income and development of the</p>

<p>women) through equity-based approaches.</p>			<p>child, family, community and country. In this context they were developed communication materials such as Television Advertising, Posters and Ad press, billboards (fixed and digital), and fold brochure.</p> <p>A meeting was held between the Prime Minister and the civil society, led by Mrs. Graça Machel (President of the Fund for the development of the Community) which aimed to share information about the processes of implementation and coordination of PAMRDC and suggest some approaches performance for rapid acceleration in the reduction of chronic malnutrition in Mozambique.</p>
Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholders efforts			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders - government (i.e. line ministries) and non-state partners - coordinate their inputs to ensure the development of a coherent policy and legislation framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries E.g. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines / advice / support for mainstreaming nutrition in sector policies. ▪ Key Stakeholder Groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive) ▪ Develop/update policies / legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality. ▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies relevant (specific and sensitive) ▪ Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for BMS, food fortification and maternal leave and policies that empower women ▪ Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, other 	3	<p>In this period of analysis they were developed or adjusted some documents that make up the legal framework that are embodied in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decree of Fortification of food, • Guiding strategy of communication and change behavior in nutrition • Social Protection Strategy • In 2015 the National PAMRDC was deployed in provincial plans and were approved five plans (PAMRDC) namely Niassa, Cabo Delgado, Nampula, Gaza and Maputo. The development of these plans is the result of work of coordination and harmonization of information made by the technical groups that are composed of all stakeholders

	Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts		
Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise / enforce the legal frameworks			
This progress marker looks at the availability of mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislations such as the International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes, Maternity Leave Laws, Food Fortification Legislation, Right to Food, among others.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation ▪ Existence of national / sub-national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation [Please share any relevant reports/documents] Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of law enforcement	2	The operationalization of PAMRDC is made through the national plan unfolding in provincial plans that begin to contain specificities of own provinces (decentralization) as well as through joint planning and the inclusion of nutrition actions in the sectoral economic and social plans (PES). In this period we have as an example the plans approved at the provincial level, sectoral PES with nutrition actions such as the cases of Ministry of Health, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Action; Ministry of Education and Human Development; Ministry of Public Works, Housing and hydric Resources; Ministry of Industry and Commerce; Ministry of Sea, Interior Water and Fisheries and Ministry of Youth & Sports
Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact			
This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing policies and legislations have been reviewed and evaluated to document best practices and the extent to which available lessons are shared by different constituencies within the multi-stakeholder platforms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc. ▪ Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports	2	There is an indicator assessment framework that evaluates the progress in implementing the PAMRDC annually. Based on the assessment we produce a report that is submitted to Cabinet for decision making and guidance on actions to be taken. The last report referent to 2014 was submitted in August 2015. Currently is in process the 2015 report which will be presented to the Council of Ministers in August 2016. Mid-term review of the PAMRDC was concluded and the results were released in November 2015. Mid-term review of the PAMRDC was Concluded and the results Were released in November 2015. These results will form the basis for adjustments in

			the plan that eventually are necessary for effectiveness in achieving the plan's objectives.
Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two		
Government	-		
UN	-		
Donor	-		
Business	-		
CSO	-		
Others	-		

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 2: Coherent policy and legal framework (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	On-going	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational /Target achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/ Validated/ Evidence provided

Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework (CRF – please see ANNEX 4 for the definition)

The alignment of actions across sectors that significantly contribute to nutrition improvement demonstrates the extent to which multiple sectors and stakeholders are effectively working together and the extent to which the policies and legislations are operationalised to ensure that all people, in particular women and children, benefit from an improved nutrition status. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into actions². The term 'Common Results Framework' is used to describe a set of expected results agreed across different sectors of Governments and among key stakeholders through a negotiated process. The existence of agreed common results would enable stakeholders to make their actions more nutrition driven through increased coordination or integration. In practice, a CRF may result in a **set of documents that are recognised as a reference point** for all sectors and stakeholders that work together for scaling up nutrition impact.

Progress marker 3.1: Align existing actions around national nutrition targets/policies

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholder groups take stock of what exists and align their own plans and programming for nutrition to reflect the national policies and priorities. It focuses on the alignment of actions across sectors and relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews ▪ Analysis of sectoral government programmes and implementation mechanisms ▪ Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping ▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions 	3	Through the technical group of planning and budgeting (SAN GT-POSAN) have made alignment of activities of the different sectors with the actions defined in PAMRDC having as one of the results the inclusion of such actions in the sectoral Economic and Social Plans. Sectoral policies and plans have been be designed taking into account the guarantee food and nutrition security and reducing chronic

² 'Actions' refers to interventions, programmes, services, campaigns and enacted legislation or specific policy. The 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition provides a set of evidence-based high-impact specific nutrition actions including the uptake of practices such as 'exclusive breastfeeding for six months'

<p>Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the review of programmes and implementation capacities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map existing gaps and agree on core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</p>		<p>malnutrition in the country. This is the case of policies and plans set out in paragraph 2.3 above. One of the examples that can be cited is the alignment done in the United Nations agenda for the reduction of malnutrition.</p>
<p>Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to agree on a Common Results Framework to effectively align interventions for improved nutrition. The CRF is recognised as the guidance for medium-long term implementation of actions with clearly identified nutrition targets. Ideally, the CRF should have identified the coordination mechanism (and related capacity) and defined the roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder for implementation. It should encompass an implementation matrix, an M&E Framework and costed interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups³ Agree on CRF for scaling up nutrition. Elements of a CRF would include: Title of the CRF; implementation plans with defined roles of stakeholders in key sectors (e.g. health, agriculture, social protection, education, WASH, gender); cost estimates of included interventions ; cost estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E; capacity strengthening needs and priorities Assessment of coordination capacity to support CRF <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a robust plan that has been technically and politically endorsed</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The national and provincial PAMRDC has clearly defined the objectives to be achieved in the medium and long term and this has also the specific actions for each sector or intervening. To ensure the achievement of common outcomes there is the SETSAN that running through multi-sectoral working groups such as the group of coordination, monitoring and evaluation (GT-PAMRDC), the group of planning and budgeting (GT-POSAN), the group of Communication and Advocacy (GTCA) and the group of training (GTF) that works to ensure that the areas for which they were created are integrated in the operationalization of PAMRDC.</p>

³ This assumes existence of multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination and engagement under Process1

Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the national and local capability to sequence and implement the priority actions. This requires, on the one hand, a clear understanding of gaps in terms of delivery capacity and, on the other hand, a willingness from in-country and global stakeholders to mobilise their technical expertise to timely respond to the identified needs in a coordinated way.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources ▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements ▪ Existence of annual detailed work plans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national level ▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism 	3	<p>Regarding the organization for better implementation we can highlight the Establishment of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA), by the Government of Mozambique, that will allow greater visibility and prioritization of food and nutrition security agenda in the country; the creation of the Department of Nutrition and School Health in the Ministry of Education and Human Development (MINEDH); the establishment of provincial technical working groups that culminated in the design and approval of provincial multisectoral plans; the existence of provincial and district economic and social plans that ensure the planning and alignment of interventions; as well as the training in food safety and nutrition issues and their inclusion in the provincial and district plans that are carried out in the provinces and districts having as beneficiaries the local technical teams.</p>
Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition. It looks specifically at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform the adjustment of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information System (e.g. multi-sectoral platforms and portals) in place to regularly collect, analyse and communicate the agreed indicators focusing on measuring implementation coverage and performance ▪ Existence of regular progress reports ▪ Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits ▪ Adjustments of annual plans, including budgets based on analysis of performance 	2	<p>There is an indicator assessment framework that evaluates the progress in Implementing the PAMRDC annually. Based on the assessment we produce the report That Is Submitted to the Council of Ministers for decision making and guidance on actions to be taken. Based on these indicators we are preparing the 2015 report to be presented in August. At provincial level is being disseminated the same instrument to allow alignment Civil society has been involved in the monitoring of the operations process. In Tete province, for</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of participatory monitoring by civil society <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of regular/annual joint review of implementation coverage and performance of prioritised actions</p>		<p>example, the Platform of Civil Society (PSC-SUN) is involved in monitoring the PAMRDC, participating in the Joint Committee of Management and PAMRDC Assessment, where besides the provincial government also attended by partners such as DANIDA. In addition, in partnership with the provincial SETSAN were carried out monitoring visits and evaluation of activities.</p> <p>It should be noted that under the coordination of activities and the production and sharing of information to feed documents as the plan's implementation report, the difentes existing platforms in the country also often exchange information</p>
Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision making and create evidence for public good.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reports and disseminations from population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research ▪ Capture and share lessons learned, best practices, case studies, stories of change and implementation progress ▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society ▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of evaluation of implementation at scale that demonstrates nutrition impact and are made available publicly</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>In the context of the implementation of PAMRDC communication and advocacy plan we have been disseminating information and message about food security and nutrition at different levels and for different stakeholders through the Champions and through the speeches of government leaders. Regarding the reports or dissemination of population-based studies we can refer the cases of vulnerability analyzes that are carried out, at least, three times per year. These analyzes brings as a result, information about the situation of food and nutritional security of the populations in the country. These information is also used for decision making.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
Government	-
UN	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	-
Others	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 3: Common Results Framework for National Nutrition Plan (aligned programming)

(i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	Ongoing	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational /Target achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/ Validated/ Evidence provided

Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

Assessing the financial feasibility of national plans to implement actions for improved nutrition is essential to determine funding requirements. The latter is based on the capability to track planned and actual spending on nutrition across relevant government ministries and from external partners. The existence of plans with clearly costed actions helps government authorities and key stakeholders (e.g. UN, Donors, Business, Civil Society) to align and contribute resources to national priorities, estimate the required budget for implementation and identify financial gaps.

Progress marker 4.1: Cost and assess financial feasibility

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to provide inputs for costing of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions across relevant sectors (costing exercises can be performed in various ways including conducting a review of current spending or an estimation of unit costs).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of costed estimations of nutrition related actions [please provide the relevant documentation] ▪ Existence of costed plans for CRF implementation ▪ Stakeholder groups have an overview of their own allocations to nutrition related programmes/actions [please provide the relevant documentation] <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</p>	2	<p>The national plan (PAMRDC) was budgeted and provincial plans are also designed and approved with their budgets</p> <p>It remains a major challenge to identify the real costs incurred by the sectors for nutrition because we have not yet a specific financial line for nutrition in the public finance system; There is still no clear mechanism for financing nutrition actions. Most nutrition actions in the sectors are financed by the budgets allocated by the Government to sectors but without a clear identification of the amount allocated specifically for nutrition.</p> <p>It should be noted that there are already some sectors that can capture information from the amounts allocated for nutrition but are not the majority.</p>
Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to track their allocations and expenditures (if available) for nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions in relevant sectors. This progress marker also aims to determine whether the financial tracking for nutrition is reported and shared in a transparent manner with other partners of the MSP including the government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planned spending ○ Current allocations ○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period) ▪ Existence of reporting mechanisms including regular financial reports, independent audit reports, cost effectiveness studies, multi-sectoral consolidation of the sectoral nutrition 	2	<p>There is a system of information of the funds allocated to the balance sheets of the PES. The PES contains nutrition actions but the information is not only or specifically nutrition.</p> <p>Though capturing information about the specific funds allocated to nutrition remains a challenge, we can say that the tracking and transparency is ensured by the fact that most of the funds that are allocated for nutrition, Whether from government or partners, are channeled through the Public Finance system (e-SISTAFE), Which Allows better viewing of funds assigned.</p>

	<p>spending (including off-budget), and others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information ▪ Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending</p>		
Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the capability by governments and other in-country stakeholder to identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, setting-up of specific mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps ▪ Government and other In-country stakeholders assess additional funding needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions ▪ Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</p>	1	<p>We continue to work to guarantee resources for nutrition and to identify longer available external financing and costs of interventions in order to expand nutrition interventions in the country. We do continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions</p>
Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements			
<p>This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders are able to turn pledges</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments 		<p>Resources for implementation of PAMRDC comes both from the Government and from the various cooperation partners. The Partners who are</p>

<p>into disbursements. It includes the ability of Donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the fiscal year in which they were scheduled.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through: Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related implementing entities ▪ Specific programmes performed by government and/or other in-country stakeholder <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>currently committed to support are DANIDA, EU, World Bank, Irish Aid, UNICEF, REACH, FAO, WFP, the Belgian Embassy, and others, who has made disbursement which allows carrying out the actions.</p> <p>We have several other donors who are also working in the provinces that support the implementation of PAMRDC at provincial level.</p>
<p>Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how governments and in-country stakeholders collectively engage in long-term predictable funding to ensure results and impact. It looks at important changes such as the continuum between short-term humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy ▪ Coordinated reduction of financial gaps through domestic and external contributions ▪ Stable or increasing flexible domestic contributions ▪ Existence of long-term/multi-year financial resolutions / projections <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The Government has been to ensure the resources for nutrition through the annual allocation of funds to different sectors to finance the sectoral economic and social plans (PES) in order to operationalize the five-year Government program. It should be noted that SETSAN has been developing actions to ensure that PAMRDC actions are included in the sectoral PES in order to ensure that they have financing guarantees.</p> <p>On the side of the partners previsivilidade of funds are ensured by the commitments they have signed with the Government for the implementation of PAMRDC actions both in terms of sectors and in the provinces. We have as examples of financing agreements between the governments of the provinces of Maputo, Gaza, Tete and DANIDA for funding provincial PAMRDCs.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
Government	-
UN	-
Donor	-

Business	-
CSO	-
Others	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

Annex 1: Details of Participants

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.		Almeida Tembe	Technical Secretariat for Food Security and Nutrition - SETSAN	almeida.tembe@setsan.gov.mz	+258 823952760	Yes
2.		Marla Amaro	Ministry of Health	marlaamaro80@gmail.com	+258 824883690	Yes
3.		Castilho Bande	Ministry of the Sea, inland waters and fisheries	ccome@mozpesca.gov.mz	+258 840241117	Yes
4.		Jafar Aly	Ministry of Education and Human Development	Jafar.Aly@mined.gov.mz	+258 828862720	Yes
5.		Carlos Valente Mulhovo	Ministry of Public Works, Housing and Hydric Resources	carlosvalentem@gmail.com	+258 823817490	Yes
6.		Carlota Benjamin	Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Action	Carmybc13@gmail.com	+258 828046060	Yes
7.		Anina Manganhela	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security	amanganhele@yahoo.co.uk	+258 827633080	Yes
8.		Paula Machungo	REACH	paula.machungo@wfp.org	+258 827771260	Yes
9.		Carina Ismael	ANSA – CS Platform	carinaismael@gmail.com	+258 828863110	Yes
10.		Saquina Mucavel	CS Platform	mugede@gmail.com	+258 820644737	Yes
11.		Filipo Dibari	WFP- SBN	filippo.dibari@wfp.org	+258 823089483	Yes
12.		Fernando de los Rios	MDG1 Technical assistant	fdelosrios@eptisa.com	+258 825946880	Yes
13.		Vânia Tembe	DANIDA	vantem@um.dk	+258 820634878	Yes

14.	Lara Machuama	Irish Aid - Mozambique	Lara.machuama@dft.ie	+25821491440	Yes
15.	Felicidade Panguene	FAO - Mozambique	Felicedade.panguene@fao.org	+258823293300	Yes

Annex 2: Focus Questions:

1.	How many time has your MSP and/or its associated organs met since the last Joint-Assessment? Please provide details of the meeting, where applicable, i.e., Technical committee meetings, inter-ministerial meetings, working groups meetings, etc.	Our MSP has made regular meetings every two months and from the last joint assessment up to now we had been conducted six meetings.
2.	Is your MSP replicated at the decentralised levels ? Or is there a coordination mechanism for nutrition at the sub-national level? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the coordination mechanism, composition and roles, etc.	Yes. We have coordination mechanism at the provincial level. The structure is the same that we have at the central level where we have a technical group composed by various sectors and coordinated by SETSAN. In the province the highest level of coordination of food security and nutrition issues are under provincial governor's responsibility. We hope to develop the same structure at district level
3.	Have you organised any high level event since the last Joint-Assessment? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event organised, i.e., Forum on Nutrition, Workshop for high-level officials, etc.	SETSAN, in coordination with the provincial governments, has organized galas and festivals nutrition where participating members of the provincial government. An event example was the launch of Nutrition Gala on 16 October 2015, attended by senior government dignitary. The Galas are being replicated throughout the country.
4.	Are you planning to organise any high level event in the coming months (April 2016 – April 2017)? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event to be organised	There are some events such as the launch of the 2016/2017 agricultural campaign, the World Food Day celebrations that take place in October, involving members of the government at the highest level.

5.	Do you have identified Nutrition Champions in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	We identified 5 champions of nutrition in the country that has been disseminating information linked to problems of chronic malnutrition in the country. It should be noted that one of champions is a singer who did a song that speaks of chronic malnutrition problems.
6.	Are Parliamentarians in your country engaged to work for the scale up of nutrition in your country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Parliamentarians for nutrition.	Parliamentarians are to be involved in the process and in 2015 were trained in food and nutrition security and human right to adequate food 171 members of the Provincial Assemblies of Nampula and Cabo Delgado.
7.	Are journalists and members of the media involved in keeping nutrition on the agenda in your country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the media and journalists for nutrition.	Parliamentarians are to be involved in the process and in 2015 were trained in food and nutrition security and human right to adequate food 171 members of the Provincial Assemblies of Nampula and Cabo Delgado.
8.	Is there any reported Conflict of Interest within or outside your MSP? (Yes/No) If Yes, how was the Conflict of Interest handled?	We do not have information of any conflict of interest within or outside the multisectoral platform
9.	Do you have a Social mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication policy/plan/strategy? (Yes/No) If Yes, kindly attach a copy or copies of the documents	We have a communication and advocacy strategy for nutrition adopted in February 2014 whose motto is "Nutrition is Development, the Commitment to All". This plan targets Basically the decision makers to influence them to be sensitive to the nutrition issues. We also have the Guiding strategy of communication and behavior change in nutrition which was approved recently
10.	Do you use the SUN Website , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	Yes
11.	To support learning needs , what are the preferred ways to: – Access information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders? – Foster country-to-country exchange?	We think that depending on the subject matter all forms are important to meet the learning needs whether by experience exchange between countries as well as the availability and access to information.
12.	Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility?	We think that reflect and exchange of experiences with those countries is always

		relevant because our country is also likely to have such problems so to share our experiences with others and learn a little more about these matters is always important
13.	What criteria for grouping with other SUN countries with similar challenges and opportunities would be most useful for your country? i.e. federal, emerging economies, maturity in the SUN Movement, with double burden, etc. (for potential tailored exchanges from 2017 onwards)	It would be very important because it would be a place to learn more from each other but would also be good we exchange experiences with SUN countries that already have some maturity to learn a little more from their experiences.

Annex 3: Common Priorities For 2016-2017:

The table below provides a basic overview of services available to support SUN Countries in achieving their national nutrition priorities in 2016-17. Please review the list below and record your key priorities for the coming year, providing specific details, so the SUN Movement Secretariat can better appreciate how to maximise delivery of relevant support.

The Policy and Budget Cycle Management – from planning to accounting for results	Social Mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication	Coordination of action across sectors, among stakeholders, and between levels of government through improved functional capacities	Strengthening equity drivers of nutrition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Review relevant policy and legislation documents ✓ Situation/Contextual analysis ✓ Mapping of the available workforce for nutrition ✓ Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF) ✓ Development of a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework ✓ Support better management of data (e.g. National Information Platforms for Nutrition - NIPN) Estimation of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Engaging nutrition champions to position nutrition as a priority at all levels ✓ Engaging parliamentarians for legislative advocacy, budget oversight and public outreach ✓ Engaging the media for influencing decision makers, accountability and awareness ✓ Utilising high level events, partnerships and communication channels for leveraging commitments, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs ✓ Strengthening of skills of key actors, such as Multistakeholder Platform member. Skills could include communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination. ✓ Support with strengthening capacity of individuals or organization to better engage with: themes (like WASH), sectors (like 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Develop or review mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies. ✓ Ensuring participation of representatives from marginalised and vulnerable communities in decision-making processes ✓ Adapting, adopting or improving policies that aim to empower among women and girls

<p>costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level)Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with the development guidelines to organise and manage Common Results Framework (CRF) at sub-national levels ✓ Financing of selected programmes (due diligence) ✓ Support with the design and implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making ✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence 	<p>generating investment and enhancing data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Building national investment cases, supported by data and evidence, to drive nutrition advocacy ✓ Developing, updating or implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies ✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation. 	<p>Education or Business), or groups (like scientists and academics)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Analysis/ guidance for institutional frameworks at national and subnational levels, including MSP, Coordination Mechanisms, stakeholder groups, or others ✓ Prevention and management of Conflicts of Interest (COI) ✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis 	
<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support better management of data (e.g. National Information Platforms for Nutrition - NIPN) Estimation of costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level)Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level) ✓ Support with the development guidelines to organise and manage Common Results Framework (CRF) at sub-national levels <p>The support is not available at all the country</p>	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ All the proposed points. Some work has been done but it is still a challenge. 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Strengthening of skills of key actors, such as Multistakeholder Platform member. Skills could include communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination. ✓ Analysis/ guidance for institutional frameworks at national and subnational levels, including MSP, Coordination Mechanisms, stakeholder groups, or others ✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Develop or review mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies. ✓ Adapting, adopting or improving policies that aim to empower among women and girls

		commitment, or stakeholder group analysis	
--	--	---	--

Annex 4 – Scaling Up Nutrition: Defining a Common Results Framework

The SUN Movement Secretariat has prepared this note to help you take stock of progress with the development of a Common Results Framework

1. Within the SUN Movement the term ‘common results framework’ is used to describe a set of expected results that have been agreed across different sectors of Government and among other stakeholders.
2. The existence of a negotiated and agreed Common Results Framework helps different parts of Government and other Stakeholders (including development partners) to work effectively together.
3. The ideal is that the Common Results Framework is negotiated and agreed under the authority of the highest level of Government, that all relevant sectors are involved and that other stakeholders fully support the results and their implementation.
4. The Common Results Framework enables different stakeholders to work in synergy, with common purpose. It combines (a) a single set of expected results, (b) an plan for implementing actions to realize these results, (c) costs of implementing the plan (or matrix), (d) the contributions (in terms of programmes and budget) to be made by different stakeholders (including those from outside the country), (e) the degree to which these contributions are aligned – when designed and when implemented, (f) a framework for monitoring and evaluation that enables all to assess the achievement of results.
5. When written down, the Common Results Framework will include a table of expected results: it will also consist of a costed implementation plan, perhaps with a roadmap (*feuille de route*) describing the steps needed for implementation. There may also be compacts, or memoranda of understanding, which set out mutual obligations between different stakeholders. In practice the implementation plan is often an amalgam of several plans from different sectors or stakeholders – hence our use of the term “matrix of plans” to describe the situation where there are

several implementation plans within the Common Results Framework. The group of documents that make up a country's Common Results Framework will be the common point of reference for all sectors and stakeholders as they work together for scaling up nutrition.

6. The development of the Common Results Framework is informed by the content of national development policies, strategies of different sectors (eg. health, agriculture, and education), legislation, research findings and the positions taken both by local government and civil society. For it to be used as a point of reference, the Common Results Framework will require the technical endorsement of the part of Government responsible for the implementation of actions for nutrition. The Common Results Framework will be of greatest value when it has received high-level political endorsement – from the National Government and/or Head of State. For effective implementation, endorsements may also be needed from authorities in local government.
7. It is often the case that some sectoral authorities or stakeholders engage in the process of reaching agreement on a Common Results Framework less intensively than others. Full agreement across sectors and stakeholders requires both time and diplomacy. To find ways for moving forward with similar engagement of all sectors and stakeholders, SUN Countries are sharing their experiences with developing the Frameworks.
8. SUN countries usually find it helpful to have their Common Results Frameworks reviewed by others, so that they can be made stronger – or reinforced. If the review uses standard methods, the process of review can also make it easier to secure investment. If requested, the SUN Movement Secretariat can help SUN countries access people to help with this reinforcement.