

SUN Self-Assessment Report, 2017

Uganda

2017: 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	Yes (7)
Civil society	Yes(1)
Science and academia	Yes (1)
Donors	Yes (1)
United Nations	Yes (1)
Business	No (0)
Other (please specify) USAID Implementing Partners	Yes (2)

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? How many were women and how many were men? 12participants (6 Females and 6 Males)

Process

3. Was the Joint-Assessment data gathered and/or reviewed during a face-to-face meeting, or via email? **A meeting was held to discuss and agree on assessment**

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; **the meeting was useful;**

Why? Enabled us to reflect back on the 10 principles of engagement, appreciating the steps of theory change for achieving results and impacts.

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,	<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 	4	<p>Structure in place where Quarterly meetings are regularly held. OPM convenes MSP members.</p> <p>Annual work plans for the UNAP is in place to guide coordination</p> <p>Meeting Minutes are in place Parliamentary forum on Nutrition formed and oriented on nutrition programming in the country and this will promote increased</p>

<p>donors, civil society organisations and businesses have organised themselves in networks with convening and coordinating functions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 ▪ 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>debate on the floor of parliament on nutrition issues.</p> <p>Nutrition development/Donor partner group (NDPG) in place and meet on a monthly basis with an agreed work plan</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>4</p>	<p>The Nutrition Development partners group, UNAP secretariat and other government sectors have platforms for engaging with other members e.g. the civil society and academia</p> <p>Membership expanded at national level and district levels for example trade and industry has been brought on board and water department at LGs level</p> <p>Implementing Partners platform on advocacy has engaged youth (University students of Nutrition) in advocacy activities</p> <p>Regional DNCC experience sharing events held in two regions (South West and North)</p>
<p>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/contribute to the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the actual functioning of the MSP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work plans 	<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regular co-ordination meetings held

<p>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 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual sectors have operational frameworks though Joint monitoring framework not yet operational ▪ Development Partners` platform plays a key role on decision making especially critical decisions that require resources e.g. jointly engaging in supporting the nutrition policy that is currently being developed, supporting the nutrition advocacy platform. ▪ At District level, 10 approved Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Action Plans exist, 45 draft nutrition plans ▪ 10 out of all the districts have developed District Nutrition Advocacy plans
<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>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports from joint field visits are shared with partner. • District reporting mechanism not fully developed but planning to begin • National level quarterly/monthly reports • DNCC meetings held but feedback not shared with OPM • Support supervision and tracking held in 10 Districts, technical briefs covering 10 Districts • Commitment tracking not done • Tracking of progress of annual work plan is not regularly done although activities are implemented.

Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform		
<p>This progress marker looks at how the multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is institutionalised in national development planning mechanisms and in lasting political commitments, not only by the Government executive power but also by the leadership of agencies and organisations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms ▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover ▪ Institutional commitment, also toward gender equality, from key stakeholder groups 	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contiguous engagement of parliament and executive ongoing • Nutrition is reflected in the Ruling Party Manifesto • The executive is involved – The Rt Honourable Speaker of Parliament, Parliamentary Forum on Nutrition Hon Rt Prime Minister, Local Government political leaders in Nutrition programmes • Gender equality is a principle used in all planning and policy frameworks

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Please can you explain if you are engaging with the humanitarian partners? How? Do you face any challenges? SUN Platforms partially engaged but weak linkages with the directorate of disaster preparedness, relief and refuges. 2) The country is engaged with FAO, WFP, China, USAID, Korea, Egypt, during food shortage/insecurity situation. They have also give soft skills to adopt to the situation 	<p>The coordination is led by another group through office of the prime minister, although information regarding the response is available within the donor/development partner's and to other stakeholders. The response is happening and addressing the following nutrition areas: 1) Treatment of MAM/SAM 2) Micronutrient supplementation 3) Supplementary feeding programmes targeting the most vulnerable groups. Other nutrition sensitive interventions include investments in broader preventive and curative health interventions, WASH, gender, education, etc</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 incompliance? How do you deal with them (please describe any specific feedback or complain mechanism that are in place or envisaged by the MSP?) 	<p>The current work plan is built around SUN objectives as agreed on by the partners. We have yet to conduct a full assessment and document adherence to SUN principles although we are aware that members complying.</p> <p>No assessment so far done on these principles but Partly more emphasis at OPM level but limited analysis of member’s capacities and challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It’s a constitutional principle, • To some extent ongoing by OPM
--	--	---

Stakeholders	Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall coordination and oversight, putting in place policy and legal frameworks for nutrition - Infrastructure, Human Resource, Material, participation and creation of enabling environment
UN	<p style="text-align: center;">Financial and Technical support , Advocacy, support program implementation</p>
Donor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial, technical support
Business	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p>
CSO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advocacy
Others, academia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research, Capacity buildings, trainings

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)

Country ownership of nutrition action plan has been well accomplished as reflected in the current sectoral policies and strategies reflecting nutrition issues. There has been an increased human resource with two Officers (Programme and Monitoring & Evaluation Officer) to support the UNAP Secretariat team at OPM to run daily business ogf Multi-sectoral Nutrition Coordination at National and sub national levels.

Overall score; 4

Key areas of sustained action

- Continue building the knowledge base on how to effectively integrate nutrition considerations across sectors to ensure coordinated country level roll-out;
- Ensured mutual accountability among development partners to achieve nutrition (development) results;
- Improved coordination, planning and information sharing of DPs involved in nutrition in Uganda (sharing of best practices, lessons learned and mapping of interventions;
- Enhance policy dialogue on nutrition between DP and GOU mandated institutions at central and local levels and other stakeholders (civil society, private sector)
- Work plans from various stakeholders need to be collected by the SUN focal point and collated into one country work plan clearly showing responsibility for each stakeholder-this way tracking performance will be more straight forward, and easy to determine who has not submitted their performance.

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>	4	<p>Through a multi-sectoral engagement by National Planning Authority the strategic review SDG2 in Uganda has been done.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Strategic Review of SDG2 has examined Uganda's preparedness in achieving the goal and its five (5) targets. In this review an in-depth analysis of the Food and Nutrition Security situation in Uganda, the extent to which existing policies, legal and institutional frameworks and programmes have addressed the food and nutrition issues in the country has been done. • In addition, gaps and recommendations of strategic interventions to facilitate the achievement of SDG2 and its targets in an inclusive manner have been provided.

Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, 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>	<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The major focus this year has been the support both technical and resources (workshop support) towards the development of the multisector nutrition security policy that is currently in the final stages of development and coordinated through office of the prime minister. • Development partners (USAID and UNICEF) are supporting the implementation and operationalisation of the roll out of the national advocacy and communication strategy by supporting workshops critical for this activity. • Nutrition champions e.g. the parliamentary nutrition committee has been formed and trained • The national gender equality & women’s empowerment and programmes in MOGLSD • The parliamentary forum on nutrition has been established by the Hon Speaker of parliament, oriented with support from OPM by MDAs and is due for launching in June 2017 • Ongoing advocacy at district and national level • Working towards identification of nutrition champions at National and LG level

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>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process of developing the multisector nutrition policy has engaged all the key sectors. • The OPM has been working with the sectors and development partners to agree on the quality of the policy and as a result this has caused a major delay in order to reach consensus. • The UNAP was extended to avoid a gap as we wait for the completion of the policy to inform the countries next strategy • The Nutrition Policy being developed is aligned with the Global, continental and national frameworks and 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 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines for nutrition and very comprehensive ones exist although the monitoring and supporting of their implementation remains a gap e.g. the

<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>enforcement of the mandatory food fortification guidelines remains weak.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing regulations on Fortified foods, Code of marketing Breastmilk substitutes not fully operational • Mechanism in place but inadequate
<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>3</p>	<p>Learning events have taken place at regional and national level</p>

<p>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your 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? YES and planning has begun</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition policy currently in final stages of development, this has been included. • Uganda signed up to the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) which encompasses comprehensive services (including nutrition) to refugees and host communities • Draft National Food security action plan under OPM (DPRR)
<p>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your view on HOW WE CAN MEASURE ADVOCACY EFFORTS AND SUCCESSES</p>		

<p>Mobilisation of high-level advocates (including champions, parliamentarians, media)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>2) Have you organised a high-level event on nutrition? If yes, please provide details</p>	<p>YES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level orientation of MPs • Formation of Parliamentary Forum on Nutrition • PFN participate in national and District level nutrition events • Implementing partners are work with OPM to organise experience sharing events at National and district levels
<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>	<p>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?</p> <p>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> <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	Develop policy and legal frameworks to guide implementation ; Infrastructure, Human Resource,
UN	- Support development and implementation of policies and legal frameworks ; and technical support
Donor	- Technical and financial support
Business	-
CSO	- Advocacy
Others-academia	- Research, Capacity buildings, trainings

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)
<p>Overall Score 4</p> <p>Achievements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNAP extended to 31st Dec 2017, • Community mobilisation for Nutrition and ECD under MOGLSD, • The Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Coordination Committees Orientation Guide for LGs finalised, • The Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Action Planning Module Guide for LGs finalised • Implementing partners under the advocacy platform has been formed to partner with NA &CS taskforce to implement the Advocacy and communication strategy for the UNAP • Orientation guides for Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Coordination committees at sub national level have been prepared • Checklists for use by national and sub national level stakeholders to monitor implementation of nutrition activities in the districts have been developed • Orientation guides on Multi-Sectoral Nutrition action planning for Local Government developed <p>Next steps</p> <p>Review UNAP I and prepare UNAP 2</p> <p>Roll out Nutrition Governance and leadership from District to lower local Governments</p>

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 	3	<p>Nearly completed as most stakeholders have aligned to UNAP & NDPII</p> <p>SDG2 review report provides an analysis of nutrition situation and implementation mechanism for the country</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>The mapping of nutrition stakeholders existing in the country supporting multi-sectoral nutrition interventions has been made a coverage report exist Gaps in analysis as well as stakeholder mapping at national level remains a big gap that needs to be addressed</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>4</p>	<p>Activities and interventions aligned to the country specific documents mainly the Uganda nutrition action plan 2011-2016 (with current 1-year extension) in which roles of stakeholders e.g. development partners and donors is well defined</p> <p>UNAP 2011-17 defines the long term objective for scaling up nutrition, the implementation process, the coordination mechanism as well as the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders</p> <p>An assessment of functionality of coordination framework at District level is conducted during support supervision visits</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 <u>checklist for quality national nutrition plans in a bid to review your plans</u></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 work-plans 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>4</p>	<p>Multi-sectoral Nutrition action plans have been developed aligned with District Development plans their plans approved.</p> <p>Ministry of Health, Ministry of Gender Labour & Social development and MAAIF have their interventions designed based on the Sectoral plans and policies whose M&E speak to the NDP II implementation strategy. The National Standards Indicators list available has the nutrition sensitive and specific indicators</p> <p>What needs to be done is to popularise these indicators and activities at Local government level to enable Nutrition committees to report on them through the technical planning meetings</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>	3	<p>Joint field visits are conducted through the Multi-sectoral nutrition technical committee and discussions during the visits are guided by the supervision checklist</p> <p>Discussions around supporting the nutrition surveillance system in Uganda were also held and progress has been made. However, broad participation and sharing of reports remains a gap</p> <p>Joint assessment of DNCCs conducted twice using a checklist developed at national level</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 ▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society 	3	<p>Individual partners do undertake studies including surveys in their areas of operation.</p> <p>UDHS and panel surveys studies on projects and nutrition programs</p>

	<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	<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? 	YES, and this is through various coordination mechanisms including office of the prime minister and other stakeholders. To note, Uganda has invested and is doing a lot through UNHCR and OPM coordination OPM managing under DPRR YES, OPM target 2100Kcal on relief rations

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

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)

Overall score; 3

The focus areas of the FY17 work plan included:

- Nutrition information and knowledge-sharing mechanism among development partners
- Identify opportunities for financial resource mobilization to scale up UNAP implementation.
- Identify possible entry points for enhanced multi-sectoral nutrition dialogue at all levels.
- improve documentation, reporting and also increase monitoring at field level.
- Develop TORs for review of UNAP 1 based on the SUN Checklist for quality national plans

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>	3	Costed sectoral plans for UNAP implementation sectors in place. These plans need to be analysed to identify the funding gaps for MSN 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>3</p>	<p>The minister of Finance and other sectors are informed about on budget and off budget support for nutrition interventions, although at donor's/development partners track this independently and not shared through the platform annually.</p> <p>Sectors do quarterly reports where they show planned expenditure</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 	<p>3</p>	<p>No analysis of the funding gap for Nutrition interventions</p>

	<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>	3	<p>For this progress marker, interventions planned by the donors on this platform were implemented based on availability of funds for both nutrition sensitive and specific interventions.</p> <p>Donors supporting and pledging however, there is limited availability of information on donor budgets and expenditures</p>
Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how governments and in-country stakeholders collectively engage in long-term predictable funding to ensure results and impact. It looks at important changes such as the continuum between short-term humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but</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 	3	<p>The Uganda Nutrition Action Plan includes a cost of implementation that provides a guide on funding requirements. However, it would be more useful to have clear sources of these funds and commitments either domestic or external.</p> <p>Ongoing process to build a coordinated mechanism for multi-year funding</p>

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?	YES- contingency fund under PDRR YES –Through food relief and linkages with other sectors

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)

Overall score 3

Challenges

- **Financing mechanisms i.e. tracking and resource mobilisation are still weak**
- **Limited domestic financing and tracking for nutrition**
- **Low efforts in resource mobilisation**
- **Low understanding of the multi-sectoral nature of nutrition financing monitoring and evaluation**

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>Could the Multi-Stakeholder Platform coordinate the response of the actors to the identified annual priority action areas?</p> <p>If not, were you able to access external technical assistance as required? What went well? What went wrong?</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</p> <p>The priorities as articulated in the 2017 work plan are focused around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nutrition information and knowledge sharing mechanisms • Resources mobilisation to und the gaps in nutrition financing • Enhanced multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder dialogues • Coordination of partners • Capacity building for nutrition at national and district level • Improved data use and evidence for nutrition programming • Sector commitments to plan and track nutrition interventions 	

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

- **Hosting the National Nutrition Forum in September**
- **High level meeting to orient Ministers who form the Policy Coordination committee for the UNAP**
- **Launching the Parliamentary forum in Nutrition**

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.	Ms	Sheila Nyakwezi	USAID		snyakwezi@usaid.gov	+256772138511	Yes
2.	Ms	Sylvia Magezi	USAID Harvest Plus		s.magezi@cgiar.org	+256772483304	Yes
3.	Dr	Hanifa Bachou	USAID FANTA		hbachou@fhi360.org	+256772509088	Yes
4.	Mr	Victor Draman Afayo	OPM		dvyo@yahoo.com	+256772439641	Yes
5.	Dr	Peter Milton Rukundo	KYU		prukundo@kyu.ac.ug	+256782425076	Yes
6.	Ms	Connie Namutebi	MoITC		Connieta2010@yahoo.com	+256772632463	Yes
7.	Ms	Maureen T Bakunzi	OPM	Sun Focal Person	bakunzim@gmail.com	+256772539113	Yes
8.	Mr	Galiwango Samuel	OPM		galisam@gmail.com	+256783661606	Yes
9.	Mr	Asiimwe Charles	OPM		charlesasiimwe@yahoo.com	+256774018236	Yes
10.	Mr	Baguma T Richard	CSO		mafundi@yahoo.com	+256785653599	Yes
11.	Ms	Beatrice Okello	FAO		Beatrice.okello@fao.org	+256776502504	Yes
12.	Mr	Albert K lule	MOH		lulealbert@yahoo.com	+256782302776	Yes