

The 17th meeting of the SUN Movement Network of SUN countries took place from January 26th to February 2nd 2015. The meeting involved 9 two-hour sessions by tele and videoconference: five in English, three in French and one in Spanish.

In all, there were 251 participants in the meeting from 47 countries [Bangladesh; Benin; Burkina Faso; Burundi; Cameroon; Cambodia; Chad; Comoros; Congo, Brazzaville; Congo, DRC; Costa Rica; Côte d'Ivoire; El Salvador; Ethiopia; Ghana; Guatemala; Guinea-Bissau; Guinea-Conakry; Indonesia; Kenya; Lao Republic; Lesotho; Madagascar; Malawi; Mauritania; Mozambique; Myanmar; Namibia; Nepal; Nigeria; Pakistan; Philippines (The); Rwanda; Senegal; Sierra Leone; South Sudan; Somalia; Sri Lanka; Swaziland; Tajikistan; The Gambia; Togo; Vietnam; Yemen; Zambia; Zimbabwe and the Indian state of Maharashtra] including 12 who joined by videoconference system. Participants from Haiti, Kyrgyz Republic, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Peru, Tanzania, Uganda, were not able to join.

45% of the participants were employed by their national governments, 35% came from United Nations entities, 12% from civil society, 4 % from donors and 3% from business.

The Meeting agenda was as follows: 1) thematic discussion on the SUN Movement Independent and Comprehensive Evaluation (ICE) report and Movement Response Methodology; 2) thematic discussion on the acceleration of country efforts to report on nutrition-relevant budget allocations; 3) 2015 Priorities and provisional calendar of the SUN Movement key milestones;

Given the time needed to cover points 1 and 2, the third point is presented as a note that will be shared by the Head of the Secretariat in a separate email.

1) Thematic discussion: SUN Movement Independent and Comprehensive Evaluation (ICE) report and Movement Response Methodology

I) Presentation of the ICE and Movement Response Methodology

The Independent Comprehensive Evaluation (ICE) was released (in English) on Monday 19th January 2015. Translations (French and Spanish) have been shared (week of 26th January).

The report was delayed to enable comments from the independent quality assurance advisors (QAA) to be taken on board. The QAA have assessed the report and have stated that they are: *'impressed by the evaluation team's ability to deliver such a complex evaluation in a very short period of time. The report is a massive document with a wealth of information assembled and presented within the six months accorded to the SUN ICE.... The report adequately fulfils the terms of reference and provides reasonably credible evidence to answer the major evaluation questions, and to assess the validity of the implicit theory of change and its underlying assumptions. The report manages to combine the summative and formative aspects of the assignment, and the recommendations appear justified'*.

Way forward: The next task is to elicit a Movement-wide response to the evaluation. This will involve **consultation** amongst SUN country multi-stakeholder platforms and the Movement's networks. **A methodological note** has been shared by Tom Arnold on the 4th of February.

To summarize the process:

- **Feedback on the ICE is being sought from all SUN countries, networks and the Secretariat.** The Lead Group will also provide input through its Visioning Sub Group (VSG).
- **The responsibility for the SUN country responses lies with the SUN government focal point.** The SUN focal point is encouraged to discuss the findings with the MSP to reach a consensus opinion. The response from the government focal point should ideally include consolidated input from members of the MSP.
- **The SUN Movement Secretariat (SMS) is seeking structured feedback on the Conclusions (Chapter 7) and Recommendations (Chapter 9) of the report.** There will be also an opportunity to comment on all chapters and annexes of the report.
- **The SMS has circulated an online survey** to each of the government focal points and the network facilitators. It will be up to each focal point to decide whether this survey is circulated further or adapted. However, to ensure that the consultation process provides useful- and comparable – input- the SMS asks that the original survey is completed only by the nominated focal points. The SMS would therefore expect to receive 55 country surveys and 4 network facilitators’ surveys.
- The survey seeks to answer whether there is agreement or disagreement on the conclusions and recommendations. There will also be some follow up questions.
- There is also an option of ‘no consensus reached’. This is reserved for where there is insurmountable differences in opinion amongst the members of the country multi-stakeholder platform or within the networks as to whether there is agreement on the answer. It is OK not to reach consensus – but please provide a further explanation of your answer!
- **The deadline for this feedback is 2nd March.** This cannot be extended as there are some hard deadlines to respect.
- **The Secretariat will synthesize the responses** from the 55 SUN countries – the network facilitators will do the same for their membership.
- **The Secretariat would also like to receive written comments that have been provided – through government focal points and network facilitators - by individual members of the MSPs and the networks.** These will be compiled in an unabridged document for all to see- as a transparent record of the consultation process. The Secretariat will not accept individual responses from Movement members.
- Should there be factual inaccuracies in the main text or annexes, please flag these as appropriate.
- **An online chat-room for SUN focal points has been created to post reactions, ask questions, and discuss answers.**
- **A consultation meeting with SUN government focal points, network facilitators and members of the Visioning Sub Group will be organised in April to finalize the recommendations** to be put forward to the Lead Group. The details are still being worked out and the Secretariat will communicate further on this shortly. However, it is likely that there will be limited room/budget available – so not all focal points will be invited to attend.
- **The Lead Group will reply to the evaluation on behalf of the Movement, submitting their response to the UN Secretary General in mid-May.** The evaluation, and the Movement’s response will then be made ‘public’.
- The ICE and the Movement’s response, **will be the basis by which an updated strategy for the Movement is developed.** This will be developed – in consultation with focal points and networks- between May and September 2015 with the objective to release it in September when UNGA will be discussing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

This conference call provided an opportunity- albeit very limited- for participants to gauge others initial reactions to the report. **The evaluators present on the call briefly summarized their findings,** focusing

in particular on their conclusions and recommendations (please refer to Conclusions (Chapter 7) and Recommendations (Chapter 9) of the report).

II) Observations from countries

SUN countries had the opportunity to discuss the findings of the ICE with the evaluators. As the report was only released a week before the calls, countries had just begun discussing the findings with their MSPs. Globally, countries congratulated the evaluators for the quality of the report, which focuses on a set of relevant points often corresponding to national priorities.

ICE Methodology:

- Four countries **raised potential shortcomings of the ICE** (inaccuracy of some of the profiles of the visited countries; limited number of case studies; globalized approach which did not give enough possible directions for the future or was not adapted to context specific countries) **but the majority of countries appreciated the robustness of the methodology that was developed;**
- Seven countries said **the conclusions and recommendations resonated directly within their countries.**

Future of the SUN Movement (Recommendations 1 and 2)

- Most of the countries agreed that a strengthened **SUN Movement should go on for another 5 years.**
- Two countries thought **the word ‘failure’ in conclusion 7** (*“SUN will ultimately be a failure unless its weaknesses are seriously and urgently addresses”*) **was too strong;**
- Two countries suggested a mid-term evaluation should happen within these 5 years.
- One country highlighted that the sustainability of the SUN Movement would depend on the outcome of the negotiations on 2015 SDGs.
- Several countries highlighted that the Movement developed huge capacities for advocacy at high political level but that the new strategy should be more operational and results-oriented and more focused on mobilizing financing and increasing investments.

Priority areas of work for the SUN Movement:

- 15 countries agreed with the recommendation according to which the SUN Movement should **focus more on resource mobilisation** (including 4 countries suggesting the creation of a global fund).
- 10 countries agreed on the recommendation 4 **regarding gender** (better consideration and definition in practical terms).
- 6 countries stressed **that experience sharing between countries** needed to be sustained and improved;
- 2 countries mentioned that the SUN Movement needs **to integrate the double burden malnutrition** (recommendation 3) while another one expressed the worry that it might jeopardize the coherence of the Movement.

Operationalization of the SUN Principles:

- 4 countries supported **the idea of operationalizing** the SUN principles in order to provide more support at country level.
- 8 countries agreed with the recommendation 5 according to which **more guidelines and support on the elaboration of Common Results Framework and costed plan** and their implementation are needed; 4 countries also felt the need to get guidelines specific to the implementation of SUN principles;
- 8 countries stressed the need for **more flexibility in the implementation of SUN principles as it depends on the contexts** (recommendation 7);
- Out of the 3 countries which expressed that the **SUN Movement has a role to play in the rationalization of the international nutrition architecture** (recommendation 10), 2 mentioned the need for better articulation between SUN and the Zero Hunger Challenge.

Accountability:

- Six countries agreed with the recommendation according to which **more accountability is needed** within the SUN Movement (recommendation 5);
- Eight countries agreed with the recommendation according to which **the Monitoring and evaluation system should be redefined** (recommendation 9), either **to push for more in-country accountability or to enable comparison across them.**
- 2 countries mentioned that they agreed on the need to **reform the Lead Group** (recommendation 8) in order to clarify its role and to better help SUN countries.

2) Thematic discussion: Acceleration of country efforts to report on nutrition-relevant budget allocations

1) Presentation of the initiative to accelerate country efforts to report on nutrition-relevant budget allocations:

- **SUN countries have received the “call of interest”** regarding reporting of nutrition-relevant budget allocations (and spending if available), looking at historical changes over time.

- The **timeframe is very tight** for the validated figures and trends to be reflected in the 2015 Global Nutrition Report and in the 2015 SUN Movement Progress Report. In addition, countries with available data will be able to show case at major events during 2015 such as the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (Addis Ababa, July 2015) or the fall meeting of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (Lima, November 2015).

- Participating SUN countries will receive **remote support from the SUN Movement Secretariat and partners in the Community of Practice 1.** In particular, data experts will be made available by the Global Nutrition Report Team and the Institute for Development Studies (IDS) to support with populating the reporting templates that are required to analyze and present the data.

- What is asked from the interested Focal Points and supporting partners is to organize **in-country consultations** so that the agreed parameters for the analysis are reflecting the country ownership.

- Countries are asked to identify where they are at with the gathering and reporting data on nutrition-relevant budget allocations. Below are three possible scenarios:

1. **The country has already data and trends on budget allocations and/or spending:**

The Secretariat would like to get a better understanding of the methodology and the data source.

2. **The country is already in the middle of a data gathering exercise:**

The Secretariat would like to understand if the country will have data to report by the end of April and also how the process can be supported.

If the data gathering exercise is part of the National Health Account, the Secretariat will work together with our colleagues in WHO.

3. **The country is interested but has not started yet:**

The Secretariat would like to work with the country using a 3-step approach to identify, classify and weight allocations in the national budgets or other relevant official financial documents.¹ This methodology is aligned with the one developed by the Donor Network.

One essential first step will be the identification of the data sources (e.g. national budgets) and the sharing of the electronic copies. Access to data will kick start the remote support.

- **UNICEF with support from the SMS and the SUN MPTF will organize regional workshops** for the countries who are interested to validate and report their data by the end of April 2015. These workshops will take place between March and April depending on the countries' readiness.

=> If a country is interested but cannot be engaged now, the SUN Movement Secretariat will work with him after May 2015.

• Some of the **key messages that emerged from the discussion during the November Global Gathering are below:**

- Build on the country fiscal system to ensure replicability.
- **Start with something** – don't worry about perfection. Be transparent and put the information out publicly.
- **Look everywhere for nutrition spending:** use this as an opportunity to dialogue with other sectors on their programmes.
- Look at **country-specific issues and causes of malnutrition** to see what should be included and tracked for nutrition-sensitive approaches.
- It is important for countries to be able to look at **comparable analyses over time in their own countries**, and not worry about comparing with other countries.

• **Interested countries were asked to kindly confirm their interest during the call.**

2) **SUN countries:**

34 countries out of the 47 present were able to confirm their interest during the call:

-- In Asia, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Laos, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Vietnam and the Indian state of

¹ The 3-step approach will provide an estimate that is not comparable across countries, as in-country participants will have decided on their key words and their weighting. In many cases, the 3-step approach will only provide an estimate on budget allocation, unless the country publishes actual expenditure. In many countries, actual expenditure differs significantly with budget allocations. The identification of the budget allocations will however provide an entry point to track actual expenditures having identified the programme and implementing agency. The document presenting the 3-step approach is available at http://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/140703_EN_SUMMARY-3-STEP-APPROACH_Tracking_Domestic_Investments_for_Nutrition.pdf

Maharashtra, Yemen have confirmed their participation to the exercise and some of them have already been engaged in similar kind of work with different partners.

-- In Africa, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Comoros, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Mauritania, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Swaziland, The Gambia, Togo, Namibia and Zambia have confirmed their participation to the exercise and will be sharing the relevant information with the SUN Movement secretariat.

-- In Latin America, Costa Rica and Guatemala have confirmed their interest.

Out of the countries who could clearly mark itself in a scenario,

- 11 countries identified themselves as being in Scenario 3 of the exercise (no financial tracking exercise was ever started) and will use the three steps approach.

- 3 countries are currently engaged in a financial tracking exercise and will share the relevant document with the SUN Secretariat to evaluate the synergies. (Scenario 2)

- 5 countries already have data and trends on budget allocations and/or spending and will share their sources and results with the Secretariat of the SUN Movement. (Scenario 1)

ANNEX 1: the 4 strategic processes of the SUN movement

During conference calls, Government Focal Points share their experience in advancing nutrition efforts at country level, reviewing the four SUN processes defined in the SUN Strategy to Scale Up Nutrition which indicate the stage of a country's preparedness. These four processes have been translated into four indicators agreed upon with the SUN Movement Secretariat, which are:

Process One: Bringing people into a shared space for action:

This process describes the progressive changes needed to bring stakeholders into a Multi-Stakeholder Platform (MSP) in order for them to align activities behind country-led policies and plans and to take joint decisions for action. The MSP is convened by a government body with a multi-sectoral mandate able to engage relevant line Ministries and key partners from civil society, donors, business, UN system organisations and universities.

Process Two: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

This process describes the progressive changes needed to create a legal and policy environment where nutrition action is prioritized and enabled. Such a legal environment is created by the existence of legislation related to nutrition. In addition, an enabling environment for nutrition is created through the existence of nutrition-specific policies, strategies and plans, as well as updated nutrition-sensitive policies in areas such as agriculture, education, social protection and others.

Process Three: Aligning around a Common Results Framework

This process contains a description of the progressive alignment of programs around shared goals captured in a Common Results Framework (CRF), for both nutrition-specific interventions and for nutrition-sensitive programs in other sectors. The CRF is based on consensus across the Government and non-Government partners (bilateral Donors, UN, civil society organisations, etc.) on the contribution that each stakeholder can bring to improved nutrition outcomes. The CRF helps to align existing strategies and programs and draws on relevant targets, indicators and means of verification.

Process Four: Financial Tracking and Resource Mobilization

This process focuses on the progressive changes needed to ensure programs are clearly costed, gaps are identified and domestic and external resources are mobilized and tracked.