

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

VIETNAM

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	1
Civil Society	7
Science and Academia	1
Donors	0
United Nations	1
Business	0
Other (please specify)	0

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? ___20_____

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?

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

Why?

It made the members feel more engaged and committed to a common goal. The exercise helped us together review the progress and see what the positive changes and what the remaining challenges so that we can make a better plan for the coming period

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Nutrition Strategy 2011-2020 is in place. NIN is the focal point for the NNS and SUN. Line ministries have defined roles and responsibilities ▪ MSP is the Nutrition Working Group, an official technical working group within Health Partnership Group. It meets once every 6 weeks ▪ National Nutrition Action Plan 2016-2020 is in the process of development (first draft is to be shared)

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>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not much progress on involving local levels or relevant other stakeholders (such as local CSO, Private sector, Academia) ▪ No donor is interested to be the donor convener ▪ Recent efforts to get other ministries on board (Education, Agriculture, Social Affairs...) but a stronger commitment should be made through a clear cooperation mechanism and coordination. ▪ For the health sector, there is a decentralized structure to 63 provinces/cities. At provincial level, annual planning and action have taken place but major budget for nutrition (specific) is from the central government budget allocation
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 e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement 	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MSP meets regularly and works on prioritized agenda. Interaction among stakeholders across sectors has no further progress since last year. ▪ In early 2016, the NNS has mid term review by international consultant and local team. The results will shape up the next NPAN. It is expected that the dissemination will take place in Quarter 4 of 2016, thus more advocating work will be involved by then to improve the PM 1.3

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. 	0	No progress since last year
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 	0	No progress since last year

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
Government	- Key actor, coordination, convener
UN	- Advocacy, Policy development, networking (internal and external)
Donor	- Not yet defined and networking
Business	- No transparent mechanism and coordinating forum for fair and legal participation
CSO	- Not strong commitment, act on voluntary basis
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)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NNS is having midterm review by international consultant and local team. Objectives of NPAN 2012 – 2015 were tracked to identify achievement and challenges thus to shape up the next NPAN. MSP is trying to reconnect and setting up mechanism to work across ministries and sectors and to advocate the put nutrition higher in Government Agenda with the engagement of Government Bureau.

- Successful advocacy work in putting stunting as an indicator in the 5-year Action Plan of the Health Sector and the Socio-Economic Plan of the Government 2016 – 2020.
- New government is taking place and the election for National Assembly will be in May 2016. A new opportunity to advocate and influence key policy and decision makers is to be taken. Vietnam needs external supports to raise the importance of investment in nutrition in new government so that MSP will be more effective and active. A high level nutrition meeting or visit by SUN high level officer to Vietnam could be an entry point for advocacy.

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 acoherent 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 policies and programmes that have been endorsed by the Government were kept track and analysed</p> <p>Recent review paper is the Midterm Technical Review of NPAN 2012-2015 (Draft attached)</p>

inform and guide policy making.			
Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, update and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks			
<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.</p> <p>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 approaches.</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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are certain advocacy and communication efforts in country but no formal written strategy in place ▪ There is no formal mechanism and structure to coordinate ▪ Parliamentary attention and supports ▪ Publication, policy briefs, workshops to influence the development, update and dissemination of relevant policy.

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>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NPAN 2016 – 2020 is in the process of development, which serves as the national ministerial guidelines for mainstreaming nutrition in sector policies ▪ The operation and enforcement of legal framework (The Code, Maternity Leave Laws, Food Fortification Laws) are in place. In Jan 2016, Food Fortification Laws was ratified with mandatory fortification of certain nutrients (iron, zinc, vitamin A, iodine in identified food vehicles. ▪ Ratification of Children’s Laws in favour of nutrition care for pregnant women, infants and young children ▪ The initiation of Zero Hunger Action Plan (by Agriculture sector) with Pillar 2 on Zero Nutrition ▪ National Health Action Plan 2016 - 2020 include stunting as one of the indicators, it will work forwards the inclusion of this indicator in SEDP
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 Substitutes, Maternity Leave Laws, Food Fortification Legislation, Right to Food,</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 [Please share any relevant reports/documents] <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of law enforcement</p>	1	<p>MSP, particularly MOH and UNICEF work on this but no formal mechanism is in place</p>

among others.			
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>	2	A&T/MOH/UNICEF have published and disseminated polices studies, monitoring reportsm impact evaluation, public dissemination. Other partners also contribute via MSP

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two
Government	- Policy development, operation
UN	- Advocacy and technical and financial supports
Donor	- Funding
Business	- Join model development for Promotion of social marketing of nutrition products
CSO	- Research report, evaluation
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)

1. Government Decree 2015/85 on female workers regulating mandatory establishment of daycare centers/kindergartens and lactation rooms in workplaces with many female workers (Oct. 2015). The new decree will serve as a strong legislative ground to promote ECD, breastfeeding....in workplaces with many female workers. The new Decree regulates:
 - equal employment rights of female workers
 - working regime of female workers
 - mandatory establishment of daycare centers, kindergartens and lactation rooms in enterprises with many female workers
 - Partial support of child care cost and job security for female employees on maternity leave.
2. Program practical guide on Social marketing in nutrition (2016)

3. Government decree 2016/09 on food fortification (Feb. 2016) regulates **MANDATORY iodization of salt for human consumption and food processing and wheat flour fortification with zinc and iron and fortification of cooking oil with vitamin A**. With this new government decree, Viet Nam's legislation now more closely aligns with international recommendations on micronutrient deficiencies control. This is indeed a critical milestone and will help us reactivate and strengthen the national micronutrient deficiencies program in Viet Nam.

The adoption of this new decree will timely contribute to addressing micronutrient deficiencies among population especially pregnant women and children under 5. According to MICS 2011, the USI coverage was only 45%. The 2014 National Micronutrient Survey findings showed severe levels of micronutrient deficiencies among women and children under 5 at levels of public health significance:

- Anemia and iron deficiency prevalence among pregnant women was 54.3% and among children under 5 was 63.6%.
- Zinc deficiency among pregnant women was very high at over 80% while among children under 5 was 69.4%.
- Prevalence of low concentration of vitamin A in breast milk of lactating women was 34.8%. Micronutrient deficiencies during pregnancy have negative consequences on child growth and development and mothers' health.

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. Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the	<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	NPAN 2012-2015 is evaluated, involving different stakeholders and sectors. Gaps and challenges are identified Multi-stakeholder consultation workshop was organized NPAN 2015 – 2020 is being developed with core actions and revised indicators.

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification and definition of roles and tasks are initiated at the early stage of development of NNS. Resource for implementation is mobilized and allocate in alignment with CRF ▪ Costing was not included in the previous NPAN but it is planned to do in the next NPAN 2016 – 2020 ▪ Coordination, M&E are issues that need to be improved

³This 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 <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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Midterm review is on the way for sharing lessons. 5-year NPAN is to be developed (no annual detailed work plan, except for a National Nutrition Program operated by Health sector with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national level)
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</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 	3	<p>Information system in place (Nutrition Surveillance system) to collect, analyze and communicate the agreed indicators</p> <p>Regular progress reports are disseminated</p> <p>Joint reviews/visits made by MOH/UN/NGO</p> <p>National Nutrition Budget was reviewed and adjusted based on analysis of annual reports</p>

<p>and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits ▪ Adjustments of annual plans, including budgets based on analysis of performance ▪ 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>Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact</p>			
<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>3</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 via scientific conferences, workshops, MSP regular meetings ▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
Government	- Development and Implementation,
UN	- Alignment

Donor	- Alignment
Business	- Promotion of the use of local nutrient rich food via social marketing approach (fortified fish sauces, cookies, iron folic supplement, home food fortification)
CSO	- Alignment
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)

- Nutrition information system is in place and keeps track of key indicators
- Research findings are shared, providing evidence to influence stakeholders.
- New NPAN is on the way, costing exercise is planned
- Challenges: engagement of other sectors in CRF, no operationalized mechanism to work across sectors and monitor activities in sectors other than Health (difficult to conduct financial tracking on nutrition investment)

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>	2	No costed plan in place but it is planned for 2016

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 	2	Poor tracking at non-health sectors
---	---	---	-------------------------------------

<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>2</p>	<p>Not a formal process However, gaps are identified and resources are mobilized at national and sub-national level</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>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are Government and ministerial budget allocations to nutrition activities. External funding is reducing. Not strong commitment on funds
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>	0	<p>No plan/strategy to develop long-term financial resolutions/projections</p>

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

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
Government	- Leading, mainly health sector
UN	- Alignment
Donor	- Alignment
Business	- Few involved companies (food, pharmaceutical) have joint their part of funds (small scale) in promotion of social marketing approach for nutrition (training, IEC materials development and distribution in the project location)
CSO	- No
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)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MOH was able to mobilize external resource to scale up IMAM model to 12 disadvantaged provinces - Difficult to track financial investment in nutrition of other non-health sectors because no mechanism in place - No long term strategy to mobilize resources for nutrition

Annex 1: Details of Participants

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.		Do Hong Phuong	UNICEF	dhphuong@unicef.org		
2.		Aisling Daly	UNICEF	andaly@unicef.org		
3.		Dr. Friday Nwaigwe	UNICEF	fnwaigwe@unicef.org		
4.		Truong Tuyet Mai	NIN	Truongmai1976@gmail.com		
5.		Huynh Nam Phuong	NIN	hnphuong@gmail.com		
6.		Nguyen Viet Luan	NIN	Nguyenvietluan.nin@gmail.com		
7.		Nguyen Viet Dung	NIN	Nguyenvietdung195@gmail.com		
8.		Hoang Thi Hao	NIN	hoangthihao@dinhduong.org.vn		
9.		Nguyen Huu Bac	NIN	Nguyenhuubac2001@yahoo.com		
10.		Nguyen Minh Ngoc	NIN	minhngocvdd@gmail.com		
11.		Nemat Hajeebhoy	A&T	nhajeebhoy@fhi360.org		
12.		Vu Ha	A&T	vha@fhi360.org		
13.		Tran Van Thong	HealthBridge	thongtv@healthbridge.org.vn		
14.		Matthew Brown	NIN/Ryerson	Matthewbrown@gmail.com		
15.		Marie Nguyen	GAIN	Marienguyen21@yahoo.fr		
16.		Nguyen Quynh Nga	Path	nnguyen@path.org		

17.	Nguyen Thi An	Plan International	An.nguyenthi@plan-international.org		
18.	Bui Van Nam	Samaritans Purse	bvnam@samaritan.org		
19.	Le Thi Xuan Quynh	Helen Keller International	lquynh@hki.org		
20.	Hoang Ngoc Lan	Helen Keller International	hlan@hki.org		

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.	7 Technical working group on Nutrition (TWGN) meetings since April 2015 1 inter-ministerial meeting
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.	No
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.	Technical workshop for midterm review of National Nutrition Strategy 2012-2020
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	No
5.	Do you have identified Nutrition Champions in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	No
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.	1. Mr. Duong Trung Quoc 2. Mr. Dinh Xuan Thao 3. Ms. Hoang Thi Hoa 4. Ms. Bui Thi An
7.	Are journalists and members of the media involved in keeping nutrition on the agenda in your country?	No

	(Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the media and journalists for nutrition.	
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	No
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – access information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders? – foster country-to-country exchange? 	Yes Yes (especially to engage high ranking government officers)
12.	Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility ?	No
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)	Double burden Effective Multi-sectoral coordination and National Nutrition Committee at PM office

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 implementation of contextual research to inform implementation 	<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 implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs ✓ 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. ✓ 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 analysis 	<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>decision-making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence 			
<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Development of a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework ✓ Estimation of costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level)Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level) 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Engaging nutrition champions to position nutrition as a priority at all levels ✓ 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 ✓ Developing, updating or implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs ✓ 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 	<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.