

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2017

Name of Country

2017 Reporting template: Joint-Assessment by National Multi-Stakeholder Platforms 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 | 1 |
| Civil society | 2 |
| Science and academia | 0 |
| Donors | 0 |
| United Nations | 1 |
| Business | 2 |
| Other (please specify) | 2 National Fortification Alliance (NFA) |

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

8

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 type="checkbox"/> |
| Review, validation | Meeting | <input type="checkbox"/> | Email | <input 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 but the MSP is still limited to few INGOs, and NGOs, line Ministries and UNICEF. Active participation from Line ministries and partners is still an issues

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 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 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, donors, civil society organisations and | <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 convener, 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 ensuring gender equality, at all levels | 1 | <p>Liberia is still in the process of setting up the SUN Movement Secretariat and engaging political will for nutrition</p> <p>Working with the office of the chief medical Officer to appoint a national SUN Coordinator, Person Identified and waiting appoint when appropriate</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|----------|--|
| <p>businesses have organised themselves in networks with convening and coordinating functions.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish or refine the terms of reference, workplans and other types of enabling arrangements <p>(Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Terms of Reference, work-plan or Supporting documents requested)</p> | | |
| <p>Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence</p> | | | |
| <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, i.e. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics 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. <p>(Provide examples, if available)</p> | <p>1</p> | <p>Still in Process, not open to many sector</p> |
| <p>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/contribute to the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)</p> | | | |
| <p>This progress marker looks at the actual</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed workplans | <p>0</p> | <p>Not Applicable</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|----------|-----------------------|
| <p>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 processes and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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>Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments</p> | | | |
| <p>This progress marker looks at the capacity of the Multi-Stakeholder Platform, as a whole, to be accountable for collective results. It implies that constituencies within the MSP are capable to track and report on own contributions and achievements.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis) ▪ 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. | <p>0</p> | <p>Not Applicable</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-</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms | <p>0</p> | <p>Not Active</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>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"> ▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover ▪ Institutional commitment, also toward gender equality, from key stakeholder groups | | |
|--|--|--|--|

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> | |
|--|---|--|

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> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 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? 3) Do you promote compliance of stakeholders – and sectors with which you engage – with the SUN Principles of Engagement? 4) Are there cases of non-compliance? 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 | - Was able to engage line ministries and identified focal point each. Initiated the policies mapping and review at their level. |
| UN | - UNICEF involvement as a donor convener and UN lead in the process |
| Donor | - NA |
| Business | - Established Through the NFA |
| CSO | - CSO alliance formed: Name: SUN Civil society Alliance (SUNCSA) |
| Others | - |

| |
|---|
| <p>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> |
| |

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> | 0 | Every sector has individual policy and strategies, implementation is still individual sector specific. |

| 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 impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</p> | 1 | Still engaging with other sector on policy update |

| 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> | 0 | Still engaging with relevant Sectors |
| Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise/enforce the legal frameworks | | | |
| <p>This progress marker looks at the availability of mechanisms to operationalise and enforce</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation | NA | |

| | | | |
|--|--|-----------|--|
| <p>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"> ▪ 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>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 Platforms.</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>NA</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>NA</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>Process just started, coordination meeting on engaging with key people in society is ongoing</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>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> | <p>NA</p> |

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

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

Was able to complete process of the establishing the CSO group with a leadership in place and now receiving some level of support for activities implemented in their domain. Coordination very active with all sectors.

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 | 1 | Zero Hunger Strategic plan development ongoing, developed by Subah Belleh and Associate headed by Dr. Amos Sawyer |

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>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</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 and M&E, capacity strengthening needs and priorities | <p>0</p> | <p>No Progress yet</p> |

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

| | | | |
|---|--|----------|--|
| <p>estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.</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 of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work-plans or implementation plan</p> | <p>0</p> | |

| Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>This progress marker looks specifically at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition. It looks specifically at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform the adjustment of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information systems (e.g. multi-sectoral platforms 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> | 0 | |
| 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 ▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society | 0 | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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> | | |
|--|---|--|--|

| ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Give you view on partnership in EMERGENCY SETTINGS | | |
|--|---|----|
| 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 | 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? | NA |

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

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

No Major Progress yet

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> | 0 | |

| 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> | 0 |
| 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 | 0 |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</p> | | |
| 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 | |
| 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</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 | 0 | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps. | Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms | | |
|--|--|--|--|

| ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS | | |
|---|--|----|
| 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 | 1) Is there clearly identifiable funding for emergency situations? 2) Do emergency funds complement mainstream funding for nutrition? If so, how? | NA |

| 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 Progress yet

Annex 2: Details of Joint-Assessment of National Multi-Stakeholder Platform participants

| No. | Title | Name | Organisation | Specific SUN Role (if applicable) | Email | Phone | Should contact be included in the SUN mailing list? |
|-----|-------|------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|---|
| 1. | | | | | | | |
| 2. | | | | | | | |
| 3. | | | | | | | |
| 4. | | | | | | | |
| 5. | | | | | | | |