

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2017

LESOTHO

2017 Reporting template: Joint-Assessment by National Multi-Stakeholder Networks in line with the SUN Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) System

April 2016 to April 2017

Process and details of the 2017 Joint-Assessment Exercise

To help the SUN Movement Secretariat better understand how your inputs for the Joint-Assessment 2017 were compiled by 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	10
Civil society	1
Science and academia	2
Donors	0
United Nations	5
Business	1
Other (please specify)	0

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? How many were women and how many were men? 19 participated 4 male and 15 women.

Process

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

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

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

Utility

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

Yes/No

Why?

_____yes/ because it presented us with an opportunity to reflect on our achievements and gaps and also to identify our priorities for this year. _____

Utilisation by the SUN Movement

Please note that the filled-in reporting template will be put on the SUN Movement website, unless notified otherwise. Analysed results of this Joint-Assessment Exercise will also be included in the 2017 SUN Movement Annual Progress Report.

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/Targets are 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 networks enable the delivery of joint results, through facilitated interactions on nutrition related issues, among sector relevant stakeholders. Functioning multi-stakeholder networks (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 Please give one score per progress marker	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
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,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structures in place and functioning, such as a high-level convening body from the Government (political endorsement) ▪ Official nomination of a SUN Government Focal Point ▪ Appoint Focal Points/conveners for key stakeholder groups, i.e. a donor convenor, civil society coordinators, UN focal points, business liaison persons, academic representative ▪ Convene MSP members on a regular basis: please provide the number of meetings for each identified coordination structures ▪ Institutional analysis conducted of the design and/or performance of the high-level MSP, or relevant structures, also in terms of 	2	Lesotho is in the process of establishing national SUN networks with financial support from REACH, UNICEF and WFP. The first meeting of CSO was held on 30 th May. Draft TOR for the platform was shared and participants sensitised about the role they can play in addressing malnutrition in the country. A meeting to finalise the establishment of this platform (as well as sensitization and validating the TOR's for the other networks) is projected to take

<p>donors, civil society organisations and businesses have organised themselves in networks with convening and coordinating functions.</p>	<p>ensuring gender equality, at all levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish or refine the terms of reference, work plans and other types of enabling arrangements <p>(Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Terms of Reference, work-plan or Supporting documents requested)</p>		<p>place during the middle of July 2017 due to snap elections on 3rd of June.</p> <p>Mr. Tiisetso Qonda Elias has been nominated as the SUN Government Focal Point although an official letter is yet to be send to the SUN secretariat.</p> <p>Appointment of other Focal Points/conveners has not yet been carried out but will be done as soon as the networks have been established.</p> <p>The plan is also to establish the MSP as soon as the other relevant networks have been set-up.</p> <p>Terms of reference for all national SUN networks (CSO, Business, Academia etc.) have been drafted.</p>
<p>Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence</p>			
<p>This progress marker</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand MSP to get key members on board, i.e. Development 	<p>2</p>	<p>The old list of multi-stakeholders (which</p>

<p>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 networks).</p>	<p>partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors ▪ Actively engage executive-level political leadership ▪ Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity and non-discrimination, WASH etc. ▪ Ensure that the MSP membership is expanded to – or better able to – support women’s leadership ▪ Establish decentralised structures and/or processes that support planning and action locally (please provide number of existing decentralised structures if applicable, and Terms of Reference if they exist) ▪ Involve representatives from local levels in the national mechanism or create feedback mechanisms between the central and local levels, including the community and vulnerable groups. (Provide examples, if available) 		<p>was predominantly nutrition specific in nature) has since been updated and more Ministries such as that of Finance, development planning etc. have been duly added. The same applies to development partners, civil society organizations including those specialised in WASH such as Technologies for Economic Development (TED). Private sector and media. These list will also be shared in our submission.</p> <p>FNCO has actively engaged executive-level political leadership, as the launching of the COHA report, membership in the SUN movement and national nutrition policy in October last year was graced by the presence of His Majesty King Letsie III, Ministers and senior officials of the Government of Lesotho, Senior UN representatives and members of the diplomatic corps. Several presentations during this event were actually made by Ministers of relevant Ministries such as the Minister in the Prime Minister’s Office, Minister of Development Planning and the Minister of Agriculture and Food Security.</p> <p>In collaboration with the SUN secretariat, FNCO has also had the rare opportunity of hosting the SUN coordinator and Assistant UN Secretary, Ms. Gerda Verburg on the 1st to 3rd May 2017. FNCO and the Government Focal Person took full advantage of the Coordinator’s visit to</p>
---	--	--	---

		<p>advocate for more involvement at the highest level of the Lesotho Government. During this visit the Coordinator, FNCO director, Government Focal Person and representatives from WFP and UNICEF had a series of meetings with high level Government Personnel including a visit with His Majesty King Letsie III, several Ministers from relevant ministries and Principal Secretaries from those ministries.</p> <p>The Ministry of Gender, and youth, sports and recreation and has been added to the list of key stakeholder ministries to ensure that gender is appropriately mainstreamed in addressing malnutrition in the county.</p> <p>Several nutrition related district structures are already operating in the 10 districts of Lesotho. In particular there is the FNCO led Multi-stakeholder District Nutrition Teams and the District Disaster Management Teams that are led by the Disaster Management Authority which is also under the Prime Minister’s Office. The plan is to consolidate these teams so as they also take the role of the SUN networks at the district level soon after we have established the networks at the Central level. The terms of reference for the multi-stakeholder district structures will also be shared in our submission.</p>
--	--	--

Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/contribute to the 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 networks to actively engage all stakeholders, set significant agendas, reach consensus to influence decision-making processes 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 and legal documents, 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, such as deciding which nutrition problems to emphasise, choosing between possible nutrition actions, or prioritising target regions or groups for actions, among others ▪ 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>Even though the MSP and other SUN networks have not been established, FNCO have convened multi-stakeholder meetings from time to time when it is considered necessary to do so. The drafting and validation of the Lesotho National Nutrition Policy for example involved intensive and inclusive collaboration of multi-stakeholders.</p> <p>The drafting of His Majesty’s national work plan was also just as inclusive and the implementation of the work plan is planned to follow the same pattern.</p>
<p>This progress marker looks at the capacity of the Multi-Stakeholder Platform, as a whole, to be accountable for collective results. It implies that constituencies within the MSP are capable to track and report on</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) ▪ Existence of newsletters, activity and monitoring reports of the MSP or the nutrition coordination system (please share, if available) ▪ Key stakeholder groups tracking commitments and are able to report on an annual basis, at a minimum, such as financial commitments, Nutrition for Growth commitments, etc. 	1	<p>The FNCO undertakes a Nutrition Surveillance System that produces quarterly bulletins and disseminates these to all relevant stakeholders on the same regularity. The system however, has been experiencing challenges, especially as a result of lack of resources though these challenges are presently being addressed with assistance from development partners.</p>

<p>own contributions and achievements.</p>			<p>FNCO and other stakeholders get regular slots in our local media, including radio, TV and print media in an effort to advocate for nutrition issues at different levels.</p> <p>It is still difficult to get a reliable reflection of how much investment Lesotho is committing to nutrition. The three step approach can only tell us so much, but cannot give a clear picture due to the way our national budget is made, where the break of the budget is too general to allow for specific isolation of nutrition investment in the country. There is however an annual Resource Mapping Exercise carried out by the Ministry of Health that though not specific to resources related to nutrition, provides a glimpse of investments where nutrition is concerned.</p>
<p>Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at how the multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is institutionalised in national development planning mechanisms and in lasting political commitments, not only by the Government executive power but also by the leadership of agencies and</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 commitment, also toward gender equality, from key stakeholder groups 	<p>1</p>	<p>The national nutrition policy already provides a basis through which multi-stakeholder structures for nutrition including those of the SUN can be mainstreamed into national development planning mechanisms.</p>

organisations.			
----------------	--	--	--

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS

<p>If the country or part of country face certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) in the recent past or currently, elaborate about the types of partnerships you have in place.</p>	<p>1) Please can you explain if you are engaging with the humanitarian partners? How? Do you face any challenges?</p>	<p>Yes. Several humanitarian partners are part of our regular meetings and we also carry-out relevant field activities together. Some are for example when it comes to the rolling out of school feeding programme that is now being readopted into home-based school feeding programme. Within this programme FNCO will convene multi-sectoral meetings that will plan appropriate menus for the programme and even arrange for all related logistics of distributing food throughout the country’s schools. Joint monitoring and evaluation activities for the impact of this programme are also undertaken on a regular basis.</p>
--	---	---

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS you have in place:

<p>Compliance of partners with the SUN Movement Principles of Engagement</p>	<p>1) Do you assess or analyse how your MSP and/or its members abide by the SUN Principles of Engagement? If so, can you share the results of these assessments?</p> <p>2) Specifically, do you, within the MSP and with partners, act in accordance with a commitment to uphold the equity and rights of all women, men and children?</p> <p>3) Do you promote compliance of stakeholders – and sectors with which you engage – with the SUN Principles of Engagement?</p>	<p>Even though Lesotho has not yet set-up an MSP, enough multi-stakeholder advocacy has been undertaken to indicate that yes regular forums organised by FNCO do observe SUN principles of engagement.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>No</p>
--	---	--

	4) Are there cases of incompliance? How do you deal with them (please describe any specific feedback or complain mechanism that are in place or envisaged by the MSP?)	
--	--	--

Stakeholders	Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FNCO convenes all the various stakeholder meetings. • FNCO ensures that the list of participation in all of the meetings is continually expanding, this includes participation from both government and other sectors. • The process of establishing an MSP has already began with one sensitization meeting and validation of the TOR for Civil Society Organization held and others for all the other networks lined up for July.
UN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from their continued participation in regular meetings, UN partners assist with technical assistance and funding.
Donor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have not interacted directly with this category at the national level.
Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have enjoyed a lot of support from the business sector during the launching of the National Nutrition Policy, membership to the SUN movement and the report of the Cost of Hunger in Africa Study. We are hoping to capitalise on this relationship through the soon to be established business platform at the national level.
CSO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been participation from some local CSO yet this has not been very significant in terms of inclusivity, the CSO platform will very hopefully advance corporation from a wider portion of this sector.
Others	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017) 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)
<p>Achievements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launching of the National Nutrition Policy and the Cost of Hunger in Africa Study report went a long way into bringing on board a lot of stakeholders that were before not very actively involved, notably the coming on board of the Private Sector especially the active involvement of several banks and other local financial institutions which has the promise of future participation once the business platform is established. • Many more stakeholders have been added on FNCO list of stakeholders, notably the Ministries of Finance and that of Development planning. • Receiving funding from REACH. Lack of funding for the establishment of national SUN networks has been a key obstacle in the past, yet due to this fund a costed work plan is already under implementation where the first of several meetings (Sensitization and sharing of TOR for the CSO national platform) with the different sectors (business, UN, Academia, Media) has already successfully been held. We expect the exercise of forming the national networks to be complete by end of July 2017. <p>Key Challenges and suggestions for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key challenge in this regard is that many potential stakeholders especially those that are nutrition sensitive are yet to appreciate the roles that they can play to address nutrition in the country. The main suggestion in this regard is to do more aggressive advocacy nationwide, this is included in the National work plan for His

Majesty King Letsie III which so far has no budget and hence is uncertain to roll-out, this will also be enhanced by the establishment of district SUN networks.

- Government's commitment does not keep pace with emerging nutrition challenges that the country is experiencing as such funding for effective operation of the SUN networks both at the central and district levels remains doubtful. In this regard, development partners from the UN and other organization may have to carry a good part of the needed funds. However one suggestion would be that this support will have to be systematised so that for every unit of support that the Government receives would require a certain amount for Government to commit.

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/Targets are 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 conflict 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 Please give one score per progress marker	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
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 inform and guide policy-making.	<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 policies and legislation analysed</p>	1	The drafting, reviewing and validating of the national nutrition policy was a process that required intensive scrutiny of other relevant policies to make sure that it incorporates all relevant facets of these policies. This process have also considered the nature of nutrition issues either as specific or sensitive as the latest reviews of the policy took place after Lesotho had already joined the SUN movement.

Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, updating 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 updated or new policy and legal frameworks for improved nutrition and its dissemination (i.e. advocacy and communication strategies in place to support the dissemination of relevant policies).It focuses on how countries ascertain policy and legal coherence across different ministries and try to broaden political support by encouraging parliamentarian engagement. It also focuses on the efforts of in-country stakeholders to influence decision makers for legislations and evidence-based policies that empower women and girls through equity-based approaches.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy ▪ Existence of a national gender equality and women’s empowerment strategy ▪ Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and legal frameworks with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality and whether they are fit-for-purpose to ensure gender-sensitive nutrition actions ▪ Develop a common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy-making that is pro-female ▪ 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 the gender-responsive integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions ▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, social media outreach, 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</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>In progress</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Yes (APRM)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Structures present but not active</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>

	impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies		
Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholder efforts			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders – the 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 I.e. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines/ advice/support for mainstreaming nutrition into sectoral policies. ▪ Key stakeholder groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition-related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive) ▪ Develop/update policies/legal frameworks, with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality, especially those that can be seen as harmful or in conflict with the rights of women and girls ▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies that are nutrition relevant (specific and sensitive) ▪ Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes, food fortification and maternal leave and policies that empower women ▪ Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, etc. <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Lesotho launched its national nutrition policy in October 2016 and all relevant stakeholders both from Government and outside were consulted and indeed made their inputs into the process.</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 Substitutes, maternity and parental leave laws, food fortification legislation, they right to food, among others.</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>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence (relevant reports/documents) of law enforcement</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Lesotho’s nutrition policy that was launched in 2016 was the first of its kind. As such we have not yet reached the actual stage where we will align or develop new legislation that is now informed by the policy.</p>
<p>Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing policies and legislations have been reviewed and evaluated to document good practices and the extent to which available lessons are shared by different constituencies within the Multi-Stakeholder Networks.</p>	<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>	<p>1</p>	<p>Regular impact evaluation reports are produced and effort is made to ensure that they appropriately inform policy decisions.</p>

<p>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us you view on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS</p>		
<p>If the country or part of the country faces certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) recently or at present, elaborate about the integration of mitigation measures into policies and legal frameworks</p>	<p>1) Are mitigation measures clearly integrated in nutrition relevant policies and legal frameworks?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your view on HOW WE CAN MEASURE ADVOCACY EFFORTS AND SUCCESSES		
<p>Mobilisation of high-level advocates (including champions, parliamentarians, media)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Have you tracked “success” moments with the engagement of high-level advocates? Please consider their public statements, attendance at high-level events, mentions in Parliament of nutrition, etc. and share sources demonstrating their advocacy impact. 2) Have you organised a high-level event on nutrition? If yes, please provide details 	<p>No</p> <p>Nutrition week. During this week FNCO in collaboration with other stakeholders, will conduct street nutritional status assessments and counselling, a football tournament is planned in honour of His Majesty- The King’s Champion Cup where other willing teams from the SADC will be invited. The king will then give out the cup and awards to the ‘winners’ in person all along passing relevant nutrition messages to the gathering. Also planned is a nutrition champion festival where competition in several categories such as music, poetry etc. will be held.</p>
<p>SMART-ness of nutrition commitments by high-level representatives of Governments and networks/ alliances (CSOs, business, the UN system, donors) made since the beginning of 2016</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Do you have experience with tracking nutrition commitments made by high-level representatives of Governments and networks/alliances? If so, can you explain how you collect these commitments and how you report on them? 2) Do you assess the <i>existing</i> commitments and analyse whether (a) they are still valid (e.g. aligned with an up-to-date action plan); (b) they are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Bound (SMART). 	<p>No</p> <p>Yes</p>

	<p>Please share any available evidence of commitments made since the beginning of 2016. Kindly note that the evidence could be looking at new commitments made or changes to existing commitments, to make them more SMART.</p>	
--	--	--

Stakeholders	Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Two
Government	Organising and coordinating to make sure that all stakeholders have ownership of related policy activities and hence policies themselves. , providing the budget for activities under this process. Enforcing related legislation.
UN	Providing technical assistance where necessary and providing budget support to the government
Donor	-
Business	- Assist in the dissemination of relevant messages to the public through their products - Volunteer to fortify even in the absence of related legislation
CSO	- Assist with advocacy for policy related issues at the outreach level
Others	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017) 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)

For a long time the main challenge has been the absence of the national nutrition policy. However now that it is in place this will hopefully pave a way towards a much more effective and coherent policy and legal framework.

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/Targets are 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 improvements in nutrition 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, women and children in particular, benefit from improved nutrition. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into actions¹. 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 Please give one score per progress marker	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
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	<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 	2	<p>Nutrition policy launched with COHA report and SUN movement in late 2016. Review of national nutrition policy not yet complete, but many sectors already implementing against the policy.</p> <p>Other policies are nutrition sensitive and nutrition</p>

¹ ‘Actions’ refer 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>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 review of programmes and implementation capacities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions ▪ Map existing gaps and agree on gender-sensitive core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</p>		<p>specific, or have sections that are nutrition sensitive or specific such as school feeding policy, IECCD policy, food security policy, draft RMNCAH&N policy.</p> <p>Private sector already engaged in supporting nutrition specific interventions such as fortification and nutrition sensitive such as child ambassador support to the ECCDs.</p> <p>UN and NGOs are also providing support for nutrition specific and sensitive interventions, including supporting activities of multiple line ministries such as MOET, MOH, and MOAFS. For example national breastfeeding week, nutrition mass screening assessment, and the Lesotho Vulnerability Assessment.</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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives ▪ Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups² ▪ 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 	<p>2</p>	<p>Inside the Nutrition Policy, there is an M&E framework. But there are additional policies with additional frameworks e.g. RMNCAH&N policy, IECCD policy, drought response plan. There is still a need to put together the Common Results Framework that would guide the multisectoral response.</p> <p>A draft Cross-Sectoral Nutrition Action Plan was developed in 2014 but is not in use</p>

² This assumes existence of multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination and engagement under Process 1.

<p>implementation matrix, an M&E Framework and costed interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.</p>	<p>and M&E, capacity strengthening needs and priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>Please let us know if you have used the checklist for quality national nutrition plans in a bid to review your plans</p>		
<p>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the national and local capability to sequence and implement 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 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 workplans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national levels ▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>One example of coordinated actions is quarterly child well-being days conducted in collaboration between NGOs, MOH, MOAFS, and Ministry of Social Development, and MOET, and CGPU in 4 out of 10 districts. There is also coordination at district level among different agencies related to nutrition and the District Child Protection Team. There is also the Positive Deviance approach and formation of nutrition clubs at community level.</p> <p>However, there is still opportunity to improve coordination among different implementing actors for different activities, and bringing priority actions to scale.</p> <p>In response to 2016 drought - there was a national coordination forum and common plan with clearly defined accountabilities and budget. However drought response is now coming to a close.</p>

	of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work-plans or implementation plan		
Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition. It looks specifically at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform the adjustment of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information systems (e.g. multi-sectoral networks and portals) in place to regularly collect, analyse and communicate agreed upon 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 ▪ 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>Nutrition surveillance is not conducted on an annual basis, but has recently been revived to have quarterly meetings where ministries report on their pre-selected indicators. No quarterly joint progress reports are generated at present.</p> <p>MOH is collecting data through the DHIS2, and the first nutrition TWG was held in March 2017. However, this data is not routinely monitored and extracted at present.</p>
Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate the 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 dissemination of findings of population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research ▪ Capture and share lessons learned, good practices, case studies, stories of change – especially those that empower women and girls – and implementation progress 		<p>Lesotho conducts 5-yearly DHS study which includes nutrition assessments, and which all stakeholders use to monitor progress on nutrition and IYCF indicators. Lesotho also annually conducts the Lesotho Vulnerability Assessment Committee.</p> <p>COHA study was completed and disseminated and is being used to advocate for increased impact in nutrition.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>Some major programs have not been adequately evaluated.</p> <p>The country has not been using the evaluation results to inform policy implementations.</p>
--	---	--	---

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Give your view on partnership in EMERGENCY SETTINGS

<p>If the country or part of country face certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) in the recent past or at present, please elaborate on the alignment of mitigation/emergency measures</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Are mitigation/emergency measures implemented in a coordinated way? 2) Is there a minimum multi-sectoral package for emergency that is being implemented? If so, can you elaborate? 	<p>In response to 2016 drought - there was a national coordination forum and common plan with clearly defined accountabilities and budget. This coordination brought together line ministries, UN, donors, and others to plan together, coordinate actions, and to mobilize resources. The drought response is now coming to a conclusion.</p>
---	---	--

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
Government	Bringing together and coordinating all related activities
UN	- Providing technical and budgetary support
Donor	-
Business	- Supported the launching of the COHA report and commemorating of His Majesty's championship
CSO	- Participate in all related activities
Others	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017) 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)

Lesotho does not yet have an 'official' common results framework. But progress toward developing it are already under way. FNCO, with support from the REACH is in the process of developing a national nutrition strategic plan. Recruitment process has already began. Once the strategic plan is in place the CFR will then be drawn in line with the strategic plan. Currently the CSNAP is being largely adopted to facilitate nutrition programming in the country.

Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

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/Targets are 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 of the CRF

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE Please give one score per progress marker	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
This progress marker looks at the extent to which the Government 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 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 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>	1	There is no overall costed implementation plan. Unicef led an assessment in 2015 of the resources available for nutrition in Lesotho. Ministries and individual projects have budgets related to nutrition specific and sensitive interventions.

Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to track their allocations and expenditures (if available) for nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions in relevant sectors. This progress marker also aims to determine whether the financial tracking for nutrition is reported and shared in a transparent manner with other partners of the MSP including the Government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reporting of nutrition-sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector and sex, where relevant, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planned spending ○ Current allocations ○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period) ▪ Existence of reporting mechanisms including regular financial reports, independent audit reports, cost effectiveness studies, multi-sectoral consolidation of the sectoral nutrition spending (including off-budget), and others. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information ▪ Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>There is no joint reporting format for financial expenditures at this time.</p> <p>Ministries with some nutrition portfolio would have a hard time tracking expenditure that is nutrition-focused. For example, MOH does not have nutrition as a cost center.</p> <p>Nutrition is not always prioritized in budgets.</p> <p>In the future, FNCO may become an independent Ministry and thereby be able to develop common financial reporting format and consolidate reports.</p>
Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the capability by governments and other in-country stakeholder to identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, setting-up of specific mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps ▪ Government and other in-country stakeholders assess additional funding needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions ▪ Strategically increasing government budget 		<p>Due to no costed implementation plan and no tracking of available resources on a routine basis, financial gaps have not been identified.</p> <p>With His Majesty as the Nutrition Champion, there are opportunities to advocate for more resource mobilization. For example, NEPAD nutrition fund will provide funding windows that allow the</p>

	<p>allocations, and mobilising 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>		<p>opportunity to apply for funds. There may be other opportunities to apply for funds.</p> <p>Need for a coordinated body to support businesses for local production of nutrition products, particularly through access to finance.</p> <p>Need engagement by Ministry of Finance – although they are invited to participate in our coordinating forums, they rarely attend.</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 another in-country stakeholder <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</p>	0	<p>During drought response, multiple donors both pledged and disbursed based on a coordinated plan, but in general we do not have that coordinated plan or means of tracking commitments and disbursements.</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</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 	0	<p>At the moment, we do not have a resource mobilization strategy. Most of the contributions to nutrition are voluntary by donors, not actively mobilized.</p> <p>Most nutrition activities are donor funded, which makes availability of resources more unpredictable.</p>

<p>humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.</p>	<p>resolutions/projections Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms</p>		<p>Not known if funding for nutrition is increasing in the national budget over time, as requests for nutrition across sectors are not consolidated, and budgets are frequently cut after the initial submission. In addition, even when included in the approved budget, sometimes technical staff are not able to access the budget for their planned nutrition activities when it is time to utilize it.</p> <p>One-off donations are sought from local businesses and CSOs for specific events, but more support could be sought and PPPs developed.</p> <p>It would be possible to fund a nutrition fund using taxes, but this has not started.</p>
---	---	--	--

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS

<p>If the country or part of country face certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) in the recent past or ongoing, elaborate about the finance of mitigation measures</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Is there clearly identifiable funding for emergency situations? 2) Do emergency funds complement mainstream funding for nutrition? If so, how? 	
--	--	--

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 2016 to April 2017) FOR PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvement/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

No significant and systematic effort has been applied to track financial and costs and mobilise resource. The Clinton Health Access Initiative supports the Ministry of Health carry out an annual assessment of Government investment on health related issues and this gives a small clue about annual investments in this sector specifically. Also tracking financial investments through the 3 step approach will capture only nutrition specific investments. As for nutrition sensitive investments, tracking becomes almost impossible to carry –out due to the nature of Lesotho’s national budget where there are not clear budget lines that can be associated with nutrition and the break down is so general that one cannot tell which amount goes to nutrition sensitive activities.

Annex 1: Common priorities for 2017-2018

2015-2016 priorities	Please reflect on the completion of the work vis-a-vis your priorities:
<p>Were you able to respond to and address the identified priorities for the year ahead, as per your 2016 Joint-Assessment? Which ones were realised and which ones were not? What went well? What went wrong?</p>	<p>Due to unforeseen challenges we were not able to carry-out the joint assessment. However, our key priorities are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing national SUN networks • National nutrition policy dissemination • Development of the nutrition strategy and costed action plan • Implementation of prioritised sensitive and specific nutrition interventions
<p>Could the Multi-Stakeholder Platform coordinate the response of the actors to the identified annual priority action areas?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>If not, were you able to access external technical assistance as required? What went well? What went wrong?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Please list your key priorities for 2017-2018, providing details, as required</p>	

Please list your key priorities for the coming year, providing specific details, including if support from the SUN Movement support system (SUN Movement Secretariat, Executive Committee, Lead Group, Coordinator, Global Networks, experts) is foreseen to achieve the latter

- Functional MSP
- Strengthening capacity for scaling up nutrition with clear financial frameworks.
- Prioritising nutrition specific and sensitive interventions and their implementation (The 10 key nutrition interventions)
- Building an enabling environment e.g. advocacy, communication and knowledge sharing legislation and coordination

Do you plan on organising a high-level event on nutrition in the upcoming period? If yes, provide details.

Yes. National nutrition symposium. Competitions for innovative nutrition entrepreneurs where His Majesty will present prizes.

Provided funds are available organise International symposium for leaders to commit to nutrition as a centre for development and incremental budgetary allocation.

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Specific SUN Role (if applicable)	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in the SUN mailing list?
1.	Ms	'Makananelo Semuli	MOET-ECCD		makamohelosemuli@yahoo.co.uk	58023287	
2.	Ms	'Maneo Jane	MAFS-Nutrition		maneojane@yahoo.com	57059459	
3.	Ms	'Maletsie Molapo	DAR-Nutrition		maletsiemolapo@gmail.com	58929273	
4.	Ms	Bernadett Bereng	LCS		Molata.bereng@yahoo.com	63107679	
5.	Ms	Lisemelo Seheri	MOH-FHD		seheriswimi@gmail.com	50269413	
6.	Ms	Mohlakotsana Mokhehle	MOH		hlakomok@gmail.com	58900297	
7.	Mr	Rethabile Mkorosi	REMOK Foods		rmkorosi@gmail.com	58740001	
8.	Ms	Mpho Lifalakane	FNCO		mpholifalakane@yahoo.com	58818388	
9.	Mr	Jubilee Ntloana	MOET-SSRFU		Jntloana70@gmail.com	58787962	
10.	Mr	Mpaki Makara	MAFS- Nutrition		makaramo@yahoo.com	22314231	
11.	Ms	Emily Kobayashi	CHAI		ekobayashi@clintonhealthaccs.org	58880851	
12.	Ms	Pulane Makitle	DMA		p.makitle@live.com	58068509	
13.	Dr	Mpolai Moteetee	Consultant (FNCO/UNICEF)	Advisory and Support to FNCO and Focal Person	mmoteetee@gmail.com	58855359	
14.	Mr	Tiisetso Elias	FNCO	Sun Focal Person	qondaelias@gmail.com	5897765	YES

15.	Ms	Rose Dufe Turkson	National University of Lesotho	Lecturer	prafrose@yahoo.com		
16.	Mrs	Maseqobela Williams	FNCO/WFP	REACH Facilitator	Maseqobela.williams@wfp.org	57372888	
17.	Ms.	Merlyn Chapfunga	WFP		Merlyn.chapfunga@wfp.org		
18.	Ms.	Lineo Mathule	UNICEF	Health & Nutrition Advisor	lmathule@unicef.org		YES
19.	Ms.	Mantsane Tsoloane-Bolepo	WHO	RH	tsoloanebolepo@who.int		