

SUN SELF ASSESSMENT REPORT, 2016

UGANDA

2016: Joint-Assessment by National Multi-Stakeholder Platforms

April 2015 to April 2016

Process and Details of the 2016 Joint-Assessment exercise

To help the SUN Movement Secretariat better understands 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 provides 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 | yes |
| Civil Society | yes |
| Science and Academia | no |
| Donors | yes |
| United Nations | yes |
| Business | no |
| Other (please specify) | |

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

¹Please 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? **We held a meeting and discussed and agreed on assessment**

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

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

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 (YES IT WAS)

Why?

_____ IT GAVE US AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW OUR PARTNERSHIP, HOW WE RELATE AND HOW WE WORK TOGETHER- ALSO WE GOT TO LOOK INTO WHAT AND HOW MUCH WE HAVE DONE TOGETHER _____

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------|----------------|---|--|---|
| 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] | 3 | <p>Structure in place where Quarterly meetings are regularly held.</p> <p>OPM convenes MSP members</p> <p>No analysis conducted though high level structure in place</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>Strong MSP in place</p> <p>District Nutrition coordination Committees in place (DNCC's) in over 100% of all the Districts</p> <p>District Nutrition coordination Committees strengthened and capacity built to support development of nutrition action plans</p> <p>Actively engaging political leaders in all platforms e.g. ministers officiating at launch of important policies and guidelines, Permanent Secretary of Office of the Prime Minister chairs all quarterly meetings</p> |
| Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP) | | | |
| <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 agendas, reach consensus to influence decision making process and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.</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 ▪ 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 | <p>3</p> | <p>Regular co-ordination meetings held</p> <p>Individual sectors have operational frameworks though Joint monitoring framework not yet operational</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments | | | |
|--|--|----------|---|
| <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>Multisectoral quarterly meetings held by Office of the Prime Minister where IP's are able to give commitments for nutrition</p> <p>Sector routine information system in place though national nutrition specific reporting system not yet in place but in progress</p> |
| Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform | | | |
| <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>4</p> | <p>Nutrition is now priority in all policies e.g. National Development Plan 2, Uganda Vision 2040, Health Sector Strategic Plan, Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan.</p> |

| Stakeholders | Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One |
|-------------------|--|
| Government | - Infrastructure, Human Resource, Material, participation and creation of enabling environment |
| UN | - Financial, Material, Participation, technical support |
| Donor | - Financial, technical support |
| Business | - N/A |
| CSO | - Advocacy |
| Others | - |
| Academia | - Research, Capacity buildings, trainings |

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)

Overall score—3

Bringing people together for nutrition coordination is happening both at the centre and local level through established and strengthened coordination structures. DNCC's in place though challenges still exist in HR capacity, UNAP secretariat at OPM still very weak in terms of numbers and business platform inactive, National monitoring system not yet in place and coordination mechanism needs to be strengthened further

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, especially civil society representatives. It indicates the availability of stock-taking documents and continuous context analysis that can | <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 <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the analysed policies and legislations</p> | 4 | <p>Nutrition issue paper guided the NDP development process</p> <p>It's a consultative process when developing all relevant documents & policies e.g. roadmap, IMAM guideline, ASSP, Enterprise mix, community mobilization guide, community empowerment process, school feeding guideline e.t.c.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|----------|--|
| <p>inform and guide policy making.</p> | | | |
| <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 parliamentary 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 women) through equity-based</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, pressengagement 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>4</p> | <p>National Nutrition Advocacy Strategy in place</p> <p>Nutrition issue paper used during NDP development</p> <p>Presence of nutrition champions in parliament e.g., King of Toro</p> <p>Policy briefs on nutrition</p> <p>Commemoration of important days e.g. World Breastfeeding Week, IBFAN, African Food and Nutrition Day e.t.c.</p> |

| | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|
| approaches. | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|

| 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 <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts</p> | <p>4</p> | <p>Policy enabling environment in place</p> <p>Participatory process in development of policies e.g. roadmap, enterprise policy, IMAM Roadmap e.t.c.</p> <p>Sectoral Investment plans updated e.g. HSSP, ASSP</p> <p>Existence of code of regulation of marketing of BMS though enforcement needs to be done</p> |
| Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise / enforce the legal frameworks | | | |
| <p>This progress marker looks at the availability of mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislations such as the International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk</p> | <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 <p>[Please share any relevant reports/documents]</p> <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Enforcement is still weak much as policy and legal framework is in place.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Substitutes, Maternity Leave Laws, Food Fortification Legislation, Right to Food, among others. | are required to provide evidence of law enforcement | | |
| 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 <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports</p> | 3 | <p>Regional specific surveys done every 6 months on food security though need to be distributed to stakeholders</p> <p>Best practices in Partnership for HIV free survival, food fortification and pathways for better nutrition</p> <p>Conferences attended by important people</p> |

| Stakeholders | Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two |
|-------------------|--|
| Government | - Infrastructure, Human Resource, Material, participation and creation of enabling environment |
| UN | - Material, Participation, technical support |
| Donor | - Financial, technical |
| Business | - N/A |
| CSO | - Advocacy |
| Others | - |
| Academia | - Research, Capacity buildings, trainings |

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)

Overall Score 3

Enabling policy framework is in place however, Challenges exist in terms of implementation and enforcement despite existence of policies, Political interferences and Weak penalties given to law breakers.

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 |
|---|---|----------------------|---|
| <p>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.</p> <p>Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the</p> | <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 ▪ Map existing gaps and agree on core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks | 3 | <p>Mapping done by WHO/ANI/ REACH in 6 districts and FAO in 34 districts</p> <p>Individual sectors submit reports routinely these are shared as briefs in the coordination meetings</p> |

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>review of programmes and implementation capacities</p> | <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</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>CRF of UNAP in place though there is need to build capacity for coordination and M&E</p> |
| <p>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</p> | | | |

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

| | | | |
|---|--|----------|--|
| <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 <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work plans or implementation plan</p> | <p>3</p> | <p>District Nutrition action plans in 10 districts have their plans approved. UP TO 55 districts have been supported to develop district nutrition action plans and M&E frameworks</p> <p>Existence of ministerial work plans</p> <p>Scale up of DNCC capacity building planned for since it is still in pilot phase starting with the 55 districts out of 110</p> |
| <p>Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework</p> | | | |
| <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 | <p>3</p> | <p>Draft M&E framework in place and nutrition information system to be put in place.</p> <p>Checklist for community mobilization in place</p> <p>Sector specific information reporting systems in place e.g. DHIS-2</p> <p>Joint supervisions through various projects e.g. MNPs, GAFSP</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> | | |
| 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> | 3 | <p>Surveys of Food security done every 6 months in Karamoja, FACT survey in existence, MNPs e.t.c</p> <p>DNCC initiative, PFHS, Consumption level</p> |

| Stakeholders | Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three |
|-------------------|--|
| Government | - Infrastructure, Human Resource, Material, participation and creation of enabling environment |
| UN | - Material, Participation, technical support |
| Donor | - Financial, technical |
| Business | - N/A |
| CSO | - Advocacy |
| Others | - |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Academia | - Research,Capacity buildings,trainings |
|-----------------|---|

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)

Overall score 3

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 |
|---|---|----------------------|--|
| 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). | <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> | 3 | UNAP costed which is the overall CRF and work plans which are sector specific are costed |

Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| 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 | <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 | 3 | <p>Sectors do quarterly reports where they show planned expenditure</p> <p>Audit reports are available and are made public</p> |
|---|---|---|--|

| | | | |
|---|--|----------|--|
| <p>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"> ○ 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 spending (including off-budget), and others. ○ 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> | | |
| <p>Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls</p> | | | |
| <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 | <p>3</p> | <p>Existence of partners who are able to identify weaknesses and gaps and mechanisms available for addressing the gaps</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>additional domestic and external resources.</p> <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</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 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"> ▪ Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments ▪ 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> | 3 | <p>Pledges given but not in adequate amount as requested by sectors</p> <p>Fulfil pledges and follow up commitments e.g forums attended e.g ICCN</p> |
| Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact | | | |
| <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</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</p> | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| the sustainable addressing of funding gaps. | evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms | | |
|---|---|--|--|

| 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. | | Siti Halati | WFP | Siti.halati@wfp.org | | |
| 2. | | | | | | |
| 3. | | | | | | |
| 4. | | | | | | |
| 5. | | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | | |
| 7. | | | | | | |
| 8. | | | | | | |
| 9. | | | | | | |
| 10. | | | | | | |
| 11. | | | | | | |
| 12. | | | | | | |
| 13. | | | | | | |
| 14. | | | | | | |
| 15. | | | | | | |

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. | OPM |
| 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 |
| 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. | YES |
| 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 | YES |
| 5. | Do you have identified Nutrition Champions in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions. | YES |
| 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. | Yes. Nutrition Forum now vibrant in Parliament. |
| 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. | Yes. Uganda civil society coalition has its members from Journalism sector. |
| 8. | Is there any reported Conflict of Interest within or outside your MSP? (Yes/No) If Yes, how was the Conflict of Interest handled? | NO |
| 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 | YES |
| 10. | Do you use the SUN Website , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement? | YES used by UCOSUN |
| 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? | WEBNIR Country visits |
| 12. | Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility ? | Yes |
| 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) | Emerging, maturity double burden |

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 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 ✓ Financing of selected programmes (due diligence) ✓ Support with the design and | <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, generating investment and enhancing data ✓ 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 | <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 Education or Business), or groups (like scientists and academics) ✓ 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 | <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>implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence | <p>implementation.</p> | <p>analysis</p> | |
| <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>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Engaging parliamentarians for legislative advocacy, budget oversight and public outreach ✓ Building national investment cases, supported by data and evidence, to drive nutrition advocacy | <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 Multi-stakeholder Platform member. Skills could include communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination. ✓ Analysis/ guidance for institutional frameworks at national and sub national levels, including MSP, Coordination Mechanisms, stakeholder groups, or others | <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. |

Annex 4 – ScalingUp 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.