

# **Terms of Reference for the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement**

Prepared by:

Keith Bezanson, Lola Gostelow and Paul Isenman  
(independent consultants)

March 31, 2014

# Table of Contents

	Page
I. Background	1
II. Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation	2
III. Methodology of the Evaluation	6
IV. Deliverables and Timetable	9
V. The Evaluation Team and Role	10
 <b>Annexes</b>	
A. Terms of Reference for the Quality Assurance Advisors	12
B. Evaluation Core Team: Qualifications	14
C. Example of Scorecard to Assess Proposals	15
D. Requirements for a Mid-Term Evaluation of SMS within ICE	16
E. Listing of Indicative Issues/Questions	17
F. Definitions of Terms	21
G. Bibliography	23



## Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement (SUN): Terms of Reference

### I. Background

1. In January 2008, The Lancet, one of the world's most respected medical journals, published a special five part series on nutrition<sup>1</sup>. The publication provided robust estimates of the potential benefits of implementing a range of direct nutrition interventions in high-burden countries.
2. The Lancet lamented, however, that nutrition was regarded for the most part as an afterthought in development priorities and that it has been seriously underemphasized by both donors and developing countries. It went further, underscoring that the existing international institutional architecture to address under-nutrition was "dysfunctional" and that "...the international nutrition system is broken. Leadership is absent, resources are too few, capacity is fragile, and emergency response systems are urgently needed."<sup>2</sup> The Lancet series also made clear that many of the Millennium Development Goals would not be achieved in the absence of significant improvements in nutrition.
3. The publication proved instrumental to a new international effort to address under-nutrition. It resulted in increasing calls in 2008 and 2009, spearheaded initially by the World Bank, for global coordinated action focused on nutrition. There emerged both a moral and economic imperative to engage global leaders to place nutrition high on the international political agenda and scale up effective interventions at a country level. In April 2010, the SUN Movement was launched when over 100 governments, development agencies, businesses and civil society organizations endorsed a proposal for a new global effort titled 'Scaling Up Nutrition: A Framework for Action'. SUN's current institutional structure was established in early 2012 under the aegis of United Nations Secretary-General, Ban Ki Moon.
4. SUN, however, is not a new institution or financial mechanism. It is a very broad multi-stakeholder partnership to support national plans to scale up nutrition. It is a voluntary movement that has no legal charter or legal status. It does not directly furnish financial or technical resources, but seeks to catalyze their availability in response to country needs. SUN is open to all countries whose governments commit themselves to scaling up nutrition and to all stakeholders committed to providing support.
5. Thus, there are unique features of SUN that differentiate it from other international development institutions and initiatives. Its structural features include:
  - a. **Fifty Countries and the Country Networks** - The heart of the SUN Movement is to support country efforts to address malnutrition. Fifty countries, plus the state of

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Lancet*, Maternal and Child Undernutrition, January, 2008

<sup>2</sup> *The Lancet*, Maternal and child undernutrition: an urgent opportunity; Maternal and Child Undernutrition, January, 2008, page 1.

- Maharashtra<sup>3</sup> in India, which is home to well over 80m stunted children (nearly half the world's total) have formally become members of SUN and the number keeps growing. Each undertakes to scale up nutrition through their own national movements which are led by the government and supported by a range of different stakeholders.
- b. **Five Global Networks** – A very large number of actors now participate in SUN through five global networks: The Country Network, the Donor Network, the Business Network, the UN System Network and the Civil Society Network. There is no template for the ways in which these networks should be structured or operated. Each has established its own approaches towards contributing to the scaling up of nutrition. SUN members are required, however, to abide by a social contract that pledges them to mutual accountability and to the shared goals of improving health, saving lives and eliminating the scourge of malnutrition, as well as to the SUN's Principles of engagement, Road Map and Strategy.
  - c. **The Lead Group** – The Lead Group is responsible and accountable for the overall governance of SUN. It is comprised of 27 members from government, civil society, international organizations, donor agencies, businesses and foundations, appointed by the UN Secretary General. The Executive Director of UNICEF chairs the Lead Group on behalf of the UN Secretary-General.
  - d. **The Secretariat** – The SUN Movement Secretariat operates under the strategic guidance of the Lead Group. It has no operational role, but seeks to link together countries and networks in the SUN Movement, to ensure that support requested to intensify actions and achieve nutrition objectives is received in a coordinated and coherent way and to track and report on progress. It also facilitates the management of the Multi Partner Trust Fund (MPTF). The Fund is used for catalytic actions to enable, initiate or develop SUN Movement activity at country or regional level and provide appropriate global-level support, when other funding is not available. The Sun Movement Coordinator and head of the Secretariat is Dr. David Nabarro, Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Food Security and Nutrition.
6. As part of the establishment of the SUN stewardship (governance) structure in 2011, it was agreed that there would be an in-depth evaluation within three years with an eye to assessing its progress, whether it should continue in its current form, and what adjustments should be made to assure and improve its effectiveness. This 'Independent Comprehensive Evaluation' has been commissioned by the Lead Group.

## II. Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

7. The Independent Comprehensive Evaluation (ICE) of the SUN Movement is to consider all aspects of SUN – its institutional structure, objectives, working model(s), decision processes, role within the wider architecture of international development, relevance, value-added, efficiency and effectiveness. It will address how effective SUN has been in carrying out its objectives -- concerned with accelerating the reduction of undernutrition -- and to pose options for evolution of the SUN movement to build on strengths and address weaknesses. It will provide an independent assessment of what SUN has accomplished and is accomplishing, the efficiency and effectiveness of its different components (its governance, networks and secretariat), its current functioning and

---

<sup>3</sup> Maharashtra is the second most populous state in India with a population of over 115 million.

to the extent feasible, its contribution at country, regional and global levels. It will examine the extent to which SUN is helping national governments, and other stakeholders, to contribute to transformations in the way nutrition is being addressed. And it will assess the role of SUN in increasing attention to women's empowerment and gender equality and in catalyzing nutrition-sensitive approaches in agriculture, health care, water and sanitation and other sectors.

8. The ICE will reflect the aspirations and concerns of all stakeholders of the Movement. Its findings, conclusions and recommendations will be directed to the Lead Group and thence to all stakeholders for their review and action. They will also contribute to informing the policy debate of SUN member countries as well as that of the external partners and the wider international system, on how to maximize SUN's contribution to the reduction in undernutrition.
9. ***Summative and normative evaluation:*** The evaluation will be both "summative"(i.e. looking back and assessing the strengths and weaknesses of what has been done to date) and "formative" (i.e. looking forward, examining needs, gaps, changes in overall context and suggesting options and recommendations for the future).
10. It would, however, be premature to attempt to measure the impact on nutrition, let alone to attribute these to SUN, given that the Movement has been in operation for only four years. Also, it is very difficult to separate out the impact of SUN from that of other determinants of nutrition outcomes. Rather, the ICE will need to focus on inputs, outputs and intermediate outcomes (such as the expansion of coverage of nutrition-related programs) to assess that impact indirectly, and asking what would not have occurred in the absence of SUN. It will need to assess: what difference SUN has made on institutional behaviors and programs; what has worked well and badly; and what can be done to build on strengths and address weaknesses.
11. The ICE will need to take into account the rapid changes occurring in the landscape of international development and new realities and challenges in nutrition. Overnutrition, obesity and their associated non-communicable diseases are now widespread and increasing so rapidly that the World Health Organization refers to this phenomenon as a new pandemic. Moreover, obesity is growing in all developing regions, even in countries beset by high levels of poverty where increasingly there is a double burden on the healthcare system from under-nutrition and obesity. The focus of SUN thus far has been almost exclusively on the challenges of under-nutrition. A central question for the future will be whether the next stage in SUN's evolution should include a broader nutrition objective that would also specifically address overnutrition.
12. A further central issue is the place and comparative advantage of SUN in relation to changes in other institutions and initiatives in nutrition, including: i) the six global targets on nutrition established at the World Health Assembly in 2012; ii) the commitments in the Nutrition for Growth Compact; iii) proposed mechanisms for catalytic financing of nutrition; iv) in-country nutrition information systems; v) work underway to track investments in nutrition; vi) plans for a global report on the state of the world's nutrition; and vii) changes underway in the UN Standing Committee on Nutrition and in REACH.
13. It is in the context of these major changes and challenges that the SUN Lead Group has mandated a 'visioning' exercise on the future of SUN. This is to follow directly from, and be heavily informed by, the ICE which will be a principal component of the visioning exercise.
14. In analysing past and present processes and activities, therefore, the evaluation is expected to present findings, conclusions and targeted recommendations that would allow the Lead Group and all stakeholders to chart the way forward for the SUN Movement. Consequently, the evaluation should be regarded as a milestone for SUN and nutrition, reinforcing SUN's potential

to meet the overarching purposes for which it was established. That purpose entails helping the SUN countries themselves – which are at the centre of the SUN movement -- to accelerate and maximize progress toward eliminating the scourge of malnutrition. The ICE should help to strengthen the sense of unity among stakeholders to achieve that purpose and to help make SUN fit for the challenges ahead.

### ***Assessing SUN Progress and Strategic Focus***

15. The evaluation will seek indications of progress in SUN countries in implementing the agreed SUN aims of (i)- Rapid scaling up of specific nutrition interventions of proven effectiveness; and (ii)- Implementation of sectoral strategies that are nutrition-sensitive.
16. In this regard, the evaluation will also track progress (by identifying and measuring intermediate outcome indicators) on the four strategic objectives of SUN that are set out in the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Strategy 2012-2015. These are:
  - a) Create an enabling political environment, with strong in-country leadership, and a shared space (multi-stakeholder platforms) where stakeholders align their activities and take joint responsibility for scaling up nutrition;
  - b) Establish best practice for scaling up proven interventions, including the adoption of effective laws and policies;
  - c) Align actions around high quality and well-costed country plans, with an agreed results framework and mutual accountability;
  - d) Increase resources, directed towards coherent, aligned approaches.
17. The evaluation will seek evidence on whether these strategic objectives represented the best choice for SUN strategy (this should also include a balanced scorecard of stakeholder assessments on the current strategy); whether they have proved or are proving the most conducive choices to support rapid scale up; whether they comprise an adequate theory of change to guide SUN to its principal goal of impact at country level in reducing undernutrition; and the extent to which they are appropriate for the next stage in the SUN effort.

### ***Key Components of the Evaluation***

18. The principal focus of the evaluation will be on the SUN countries and on the added value of the Movement over and above what countries can achieve on their own. This, together with the need for comprehensiveness, requires that the evaluation encompasses the following:
  - a) ***The Governance of SUN:*** The Stewardship study that was prepared to assist in the establishment of SUN suggested “the need for the group to be small if it is to be strategic and effective”...“comprised of no more than 15 members”. The study also recommended that “meetings of the Leadership Group would involve principals only, and would not be transferable”. In the end, it was decided that a much larger group of high-level leaders would be more appropriate as this would accord SUN a high profile and international gravitas. Thus, there are currently 27 Lead Group members, comprised of high-level leaders that represent the array of partners engaged in SUN – government, civil society, international organizations, donor agencies, businesses and foundations. The evaluation will examine the nature, value and effectiveness by the

stewardship of the Lead Group, including its leadership in and accountability for the overall effectiveness of the Movement. It will also consider possible changes that might strengthen future governance arrangements.

- b) ***The Work of the Secretariat:*** The SUN Movement Secretariat operates under the strategic guidance of the Lead Group. It has no operational role, but functions to link together the countries and networks that make up the SUN Movement with a view to achieving coordination, coherence and alignment and to the timely provision of support requested by countries. Although the size of the Secretariat has increased steadily since 2012 in order to respond to the needs, growing size and complexity of the Movement, it nonetheless remains small (approximately 12 staff) in comparison to the secretariats of other international partnerships. It is funded by several donor agencies on the basis of voluntary contributions. The evaluation will assess the work and performance of the Secretariat, which will take into account the specific evaluation requirements set out in the funding agreements signed between the secretariat and its donors agencies (see Annex C). The evaluation will include an assessment of whether the Secretariat has been/is adequately staffed and recommendations on its future shape.
- c) ***The Country Network:*** The Country Network is made up of the Government Focal Points from each SUN country. The Network meets through a series of conference calls every eight weeks and at an annual gathering. Regional meetings take place when the opportunity arises. The Network provides a forum for SUN Government Focal Points to share experience and benefit from mutual learning, advise and provide analyses of country progress in scaling up nutrition, and seek advice or assistance from others. The evaluation will report on the value and specific benefits of this forum from differing country perspectives, the needs and interests that it helps to serve and any recommendations for modifications or adjustments.
- d) ***The Donor Network:*** The evaluation will examine the performance and outcomes attained by the Donor Network against its stated objectives (to facilitate resource availability, align efforts and financing behind national plans, and to track programs and resources) and against the principles of development effectiveness to which they have pledged. This will include analysis of the role played by the “donor conveners” and donor networks in each SUN country.
- e) ***The Civil Society Network:*** As would be expected given the diversity of civil society organizations, this network includes a wide variety of different national and international organizations. It is by far the biggest of the SUN networks. Its principal purposes include alignment of the strategies, efforts and resources of civil society with country plans for nutrition, joint work to build capacity and maximize resource commitments and conduct effective advocacy both nationally and internationally for greater commitment, including political commitment, to improved nutrition. Some civil society organizations have been quite critical of SUN, viewing it as not sufficiently inclusive and as being mainly donor or UN led. Some have been critical of private sector involvement in SUN due to what they view as conflicts between profit making and reducing malnutrition. The ICE will need to take account of divergent assessments and viewpoints.
- f) ***The SUN Business Network:*** The Sun Business Network aims to harness business expertise and apply its strengths and comparative advantages to improve nutrition. Its stated purposes are to advance opportunities for the business community to support efforts around agriculture, product development, infrastructure systems, distribution channels, or research and innovation. It has developed a public register of commitment to encourage transparency and accountability. To address possible concerns over any conflict of interest, the network requires each organization wishing

to become a member to provide a statement of support and compliance with the SUN and network “Principles of Engagement” and a statement of commitment of its planned or actual contribution. As of March 14, eight developing countries had signed up for specific activities that the network is facilitating at country level and discussions are underway with several others. The evaluation will examine the working model of this network, the extent to which it has advanced/is advancing business opportunities to support nutrition in different sectors and its overall contribution to the SUN Movement.

- g) ***The United Nations Network:*** The work of many UN system agencies and other international organizations, funds and programs has a direct bearing on nutrition, both at the policy and norm-setting level and through direct interventions in countries. Five UN agencies have specific normative, capacity building or programmatic mandates in nutrition (FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO). The UN System Network is seeking to broaden this by including other UN agencies with mandates that bear on nutrition in complementary ways in order to increase broad based support to reducing malnutrition in SUN countries. The evaluation will consider the effectiveness of the UN Network in leading to greater collaboration of UN agencies at the country level, in the broader context of alignment with country programs and harmonisation with other external development partners.

### **III. Methodology of the Evaluation**

19. Utmost care will be taken in the detailed design and execution of the evaluation: (i)- to maintain the comprehensiveness required; (ii)- to secure a holistic approach to the evaluation; (iii)- to assure that synergies are explored and fully developed; (iv)- and that the interconnectedness of the different components and processes of the SUN Movement are adequately reflected. The core team (see below) will have responsibility for this task.
20. Although the evaluation will be comprehensive, it is important to emphasize that the evaluation team will have the independence and degree of flexibility, within the scope of the ToRs, to define and concentrate on those areas in which it feels there are particular strengths to be built and weaknesses to be addressed, and to explore in greater depth those issues which it identifies as being of importance. The team will ensure, however, that this process will be free from any biases that could undermine the independence, impartiality and credibility of the evaluation, and that it has the expertise and time to deal with the issues selected.
21. It is expected that the evaluation will apply established norms, standards and principles for evaluation<sup>4</sup>. There are a number of standard elements of evaluation methodology that would need to be drawn on: well-tested social science methods for sampling; the identification of indicators; benchmarking where appropriate; guidelines for interviews (open, structured or semi-structured; face-to-face, by telephone, or in group sessions); the use of questionnaires and their design; triangulation of different sources of evidence; validation and weighting and triangulation of conclusions. The range of methods available also includes simple tools for cost–benefit analysis; participatory data collection; the design of an overall evaluation matrix; and stakeholder verification and peer review workshops.

---

<sup>4</sup> These include: Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, as approved by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in April 2005. These are largely in accordance with the OECD-DAC Principles for Evaluation. It should also draw on: (i)- the World Bank’s Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnerships as well as good practices in comprehensive evaluations available at the website of the “Comprehensive Evaluation Platform for Knowledge Exchange”; and (ii)- “Improving the Quality and Impact of Comprehensive Evaluations of Multilateral Organizations”, by Paul Isenman.

22. Specific attention is required to test the ‘theory of change’ on which SUN’s priorities and processes are based. There is not an explicit agreed theory of change for SUN. Rather, the theory of change is implicit in the four agreed strategic objectives outlined earlier. Their sequencing can be broadly summarized: (i)-‘Begin by creating an enabling political environment at international as well as national levels, that creates space and opportunity for political and other leaders within countries to raise the priority given to nutrition; (ii)-then establish national plans, programs and policies to translate that priority into action; (iii)-then align the efforts of multiple stakeholders (at international as well as national levels) behind national plans and priorities; (iv)-then increase financial and other resources for successful implementation of those plans and priorities. By these means reductions in undernutrition will be achieved.’ A fundamental assumption within this theory of change is that the Movement’s stakeholders are prepared to act in a coordinated, cooperative and collaborative manner so that nutrition is truly prioritized. The ICE should make its own assessment of the implicit theory of change and its adequacy to achieve the overall objective of the SUN Movement at country and global level. Based on this, the ICE might propose an explicit theory of change that would take account of risks and suggest additional strategic priorities as necessary to sustained success in scaling up nutrition – such as a more explicit focus on results or on quality of country programs. A fundamental assumption within this theory of change is that the Movement’s stakeholders are prepared to act in a coordinated, cooperative and collaborative manner so that nutrition is truly prioritized in the way they engage. This now needs to be tested through the evaluation.

#### *Maximizing the use of existing information*

23. The ICE is conceived as maximising the use of existing information. This will start with the preliminary review necessary to prepare the Inception Report and will be continued throughout the evaluation process. The core team will initially carry out a desk review of SUN documents, including strategy documents, summaries of the proceedings of meetings and teleconferences, M&E reports, etc. (to be made available by the SUN Secretariat) and of other relevant documentation from the SUN networks tracing the course of activities since the initial launch of SUN. This will be supported and complemented by initial structured interviews with Secretariat staff during the inception phase.

#### *Assessing intermediate outcomes*

24. Identification and assessment of intermediate outcomes by the evaluation team will have to derive for the most part from structured and semi-structured questionnaires and interviews with a wide range of stakeholders. The consultants will need to triangulate in order to assess the quality of the information and data collected by these means. There may also be instances where it is desirable or necessary to back this up with some primary data (perhaps through separately commissioned country rapid appraisal studies aimed at determining whether there is evidence of SUN contribution to plausible outcomes within a line of causality). The inception report would be expected to include proposals for such assessment studies.
25. Consultation with a large and representative number of different stakeholders will be key, in order to ensure confidence and ownership in the evaluation process. This should include individuals and groups that have expressed scepticism or raised questions and concerns regarding SUN. During the inception phase such consultation will be important in determining issues, areas for concentration, etc. It will also be essential for information gathering; to verify findings and to examine the potential implementability of recommendations. In the countries visited, consultations and interviews with government representatives, civil society, the private sector, NGOs, development agencies, in-country coordination and advocacy groups, policy research

bodies, and beneficiaries, will all be important. In the interests of time and cost, this may be accomplished through stakeholder workshops or focus group discussions. Structured and semi-structured questionnaires and possibly electronic bulletin boards and/or using of social network techniques via technologies such as facebook or linkedin will also be important in seeking inputs from all stakeholders, as well as helping to ensure transparency and ownership.

26. Major intermediate evaluation deliverables, such as the inception report will be made available on the SUN public website.

### *Sampling for in-depth evaluation and analysis*

27. There are several hundred, if not thousands, of stakeholders that are now directly involved with SUN in one way or another. This means that the number of in-depth interviews will need to be highly selective. Acceptable sampling techniques will need, therefore, to be applied. The extent of sampling required will be informed by the review and consultation process in the inception phase, which may also usefully include a preliminary analysis of SUN strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT).

### *Country visits and country case studies*

28. It is essential for all aspects of the evaluation that the evaluation team visit SUN countries, in addition to working through other forms of enquiry such as questionnaires and telephone interviews. It is through country-level assessments that the most important findings, lessons, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation will be derived. The countries to be visited should be selected by the core team on the basis of a set of clearly defined, transparent criteria which should be detailed in the inception report.
29. It will not be possible, however, to arrive at a truly representative sample of SUN countries. The countries are at different stages of economic development and at very different stages of preparedness to scale up nutrition. Some countries when they joined SUN already had relatively strong national plans and programs in nutrition, while others were entirely without either. Also, some countries joined almost as soon as the SUN Movement was launched while others joined only very recently. The evaluation should include SUN countries that reflect this diversity, as well as those with potential for changes in intermediate outcomes such as those that have been classified as being 'ready to scale up rapidly'.
30. The countries to be visited, therefore, should be determined on a purposive rather than random basis. Its aim should not be to achieve representativeness but rather to be able to assemble with methodological rigor an informed and 'fair' perspective of the value-added arising from SUN, of positive and negative lessons learned and of requirements and pathways for the future. These assessments could include one or more SUN countries from each of the following groups: East and Central Asia; South Asia; South and East Africa; Francophone West Africa; Latin America and the Caribbean. Up to ten assessments could be expected, although not all need to be at same level of intensity on the ground. Within these considerations, selection criteria will be randomized (stratified random sampling). Logistical and budgetary considerations may also be factors.
31. Country visits would not be expected to need to involve all members of the core evaluation team. In some cases, someone with appropriate evaluation experience and country knowledge could be subcontracted to carry out the work. Evaluators from the relevant country or region would have a comparative advantage from the point of view of depth of country knowledge. The country visits will be expected to address all major issues indicated in these TORs and a common template should be applied to ensure as that this is the case and that results are as comparable as possible.

The basic plan and approach for country visits should be formulated by the core team in line with the criteria defined above, and included as part of the inception report.

32. Given the difficulties of drawing broader conclusions from visits to a limited number of the 50 SUN countries, the evaluation team should consider whether an Internet-based survey on key issues that covers a wider range of countries would be cost-effective in testing the generalizability of major issues to be covered in the country case studies.

#### *Consideration of other organizations and benchmarking*

33. An important evaluation question raised by SUN stakeholders is the extent to which SUN is gaining a similar importance, priority and political will for nutrition as was achieved in earlier global health initiatives (e.g. vaccines and immunization, HIV/AIDS, malaria). This cannot be done in depth, as that would require a great deal of primary research, and rigorous and credible benchmarking of the progress of SUN relative to such other initiatives. In addition, benchmarking against other organizations would be exceedingly difficult, given non-comparability of data and the fact that SUN is still a very young initiative. Nevertheless, the evaluation core team should examine whether a literature review of materials readily available in the public domain, coupled with highly selective interviews, might yield some useful proxy indicators of possible trends and/or magnitudes of difference. The purpose would be to draw lessons from other relevant initiatives for increasing SUN's impact.

#### *Recommendations of the ICE*

34. The core team will be solely responsible for the evaluation findings and recommendations. But it is expected to consult widely in deriving them, in order to ensure both their evidence base and the potential for practical follow-up. It would be expected that there would be more than one option proposed, each with its advantages and disadvantages, for the future evolution of the SUN Movement.

#### *Oversight and Quality Assurance*

35. The Visioning Sub-Group (VSG), a sub-group of the SUN Lead Group has been formed provide governance oversight of the evaluation. Its role is to ensure that the terms of reference are adhered to and that the evaluation is conducted in a timely manner, with quality, independence and within budget. Three Quality Assurance Advisors (QAA) will be contracted to advise on the independence, adequacy, methodological soundness and overall quality of the evaluation. They will be accountable to the VSG. Their principal role will be to aid the VSG in assuring that both the process and the product of the evaluation are credible and independent. The QAA will develop a scorecard and apply it to review, assess and grade responses submitted by evaluation consultants in response to the request for proposals. They will submit the results of their review to the VSG for its consideration. The QAA will also review the inception report, the interim report and the final report with regard to their adequacy, methodological rigor, application of good practice in comprehensive evaluations, soundness of evidence and independence. (See Annex A for detailed terms of reference for the QAA and Annex C for an illustrative scorecard).

### **IV. Deliverables and Timetable**

36. **Deliverables:** Deliverables can be expected to include, among possibly others to be identified during the course of the evaluation work:

- a) An **inception report**: The first task of the evaluation team will be to prepare an inception report, within six weeks of evaluation start-up, for review by the VSG. In preparing its inception report, the core team will take account of the considerations outlined above, including coverage, issues to be addressed and methodology. The core team is, however, encouraged to suggest different approaches and considerations where it considers these appropriate. The inception report will specify the key deliverables of the ICE core team. The inception report will provide a comprehensive road map for the evaluation, an outline of issues to be addressed by the evaluation and how it intends to address them, the methodology proposed for the evaluation and an outline of:
    - Countries for visits and for case studies and the plan of visits and studies based on the criteria presented above;
    - Specific issues and main questions the evaluation will examine; and
    - Other germane matters that may configure expectations for and outcomes from the evaluation.
  - b) An **interim progress report** to be submitted to the VSG at the beginning of September, so that they may inform the Lead Group of the evaluation's status and any major issues for their meeting mid-September. The interim report would outline the principal findings to date, hypotheses and options for broad recommendations being explored for the evolution of the SUN Movement. The section of the Interim Report assessing the work of the Secretariat will include material, complemented by a separate covering note to the relevant donors, sufficient to meet the Secretariat's contractual obligations to those donors. It is understood that any recommendations or options in the Interim Report on future changes to the Secretariat may be subject to further analysis and the conclusions of the final report. The VSG would at that time also recommend to the Lead Group the process for planning the visioning review for which the evaluation results and recommendations will comprise a principal component.
  - c) **The Final Report** is to be delivered to the Chair of the Lead Group, who is also the Chair of the Visioning Sub-Group, as well as to the Coordinator of the SUN Movement by the end of December, 2014. A draft should be made available for comment by the Visioning Sub-Group, as well as the Secretariat, by the end of first week of December. However, the final report of the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation remains the responsibility of the evaluation team. An extraordinary meeting of the Lead Group (date to be scheduled) will be held to formally receive the final report.
37. All deliverables will be as concise as possible. The inception and interim reports will be submitted in English and the final report in English, French and Spanish. The language used should be direct, free of jargon, avoid euphemisms in describing problems and weaknesses, and be reader-friendly. Annexes and appendices should be included only if there is a clear rationale for doing so. Executive summaries should be included and address findings and recommendations. If certain issues agreed for analysis in the inception report could not be addressed satisfactorily in the course of the evaluation, the final report should explain why this was the case.

## V. The Evaluation Team and Role

38. **The core team**: The number of persons comprising the core team will be indicated in the proposals submitted by companies in response to these terms of reference and in recognition of

the competencies stipulated in Annex B. One of the core team members will have the role of team leader. The core team will have the sole responsibility for the direction, supervision and conduct of all substantive work of the ICE, including full involvement in the execution of the evaluation work.

39. The core team will report to the Visioning Sub-Group (VSG) of the SUN Lead Group, which is acting on behalf of the SUN Lead Group as a whole. The VSG will provide oversight of the execution of the evaluation, including adherence to standards of quality and independence with the assistance and independent advice of the 3 Quality Assurance Advisors. Day to day support to the core team will be provided by the SUN Movement Secretariat. It will, however, be essential throughout the evaluation that the work of the SUN Movement not be disrupted by the evaluation. Both the Secretariat and the evaluators will need to take that into careful and full account.

## **Annex A: Terms of Reference for Quality Assurance Advisors**

### ***Background***

- 1) The Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement has come a long way since its launch in September 2010. Borne out of a frustration from countries with high-burdens of malnutrition that a fragmented global nutrition community was not giving sufficient support to their efforts to improve nutrition, the SUN Movement has catalysed the better functioning of systems that support actions designed to improve nutritional status.
- 2) Nutrition has since risen dramatically up political and development agendas. The recognition that nutrition is a key determinant of an individual's wellbeing and nation's future prosperity is accepted by national leaders in 50 countries - home to over half of the world's stunted children. Today, these countries have committed to scale up nutrition with a twin-track strategy of investing in specific nutrition interventions and nutrition-enhancing approaches. They are recognising that women's empowerment is a priority.
- 3) They are joined by tens of thousands of stakeholders with expertise in a wide range of sectors who are working together and aligning behind national plans to scale up nutrition. Billions of dollars have been committed for action on nutrition - both from domestic resources and externally. Investment in nutrition is increasing because the evidence is growing of the importance of investing in nutrition and the pathways considered most likely to achieve success.
- 4) There remains much to be done: millions of children are not achieving their full potential, and in far too many cases, dying as a result of malnutrition. As countries look ahead they are asking whether the SUN Movement, as it is currently functioning, is fit-for-purpose and able to provide appropriate and timely support to so that sustainable results are more rapidly achieved.

### ***Independent Comprehensive Evaluation***

- 5) The SUN Movement's Lead Group - 27 leaders appointed by the UN Secretary General to provide strategic oversight for the Movement - has requested that an independent comprehensive evaluation of the Movement's progress be carried out to enable a longer-term vision to be developed for the Movement's future. This evaluation will focus on the Movement's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability in delivering results.
- 6) An independent comprehensive evaluation of the SUN Movement will be undertaken by expert evaluators. Its Terms of Reference (currently being developed) will stipulate the scope and process that should be followed in order to ensure its credibility amongst all stakeholder groups of the SUN Movement.
- 7) The evaluation will be overseen by the Visioning Sub Group (VSG) of the SUN Movement's Lead Group. Administrative and back-up support will be offered by the SUN Movement Secretariat (SMS).
- 8) A small group of three independent experts are required as 'Quality Assurance Advisers' (QAA), to assist the VSG to assure the independence, adequacy, methodological soundness and overall quality of the evaluation.

### ***Role and Responsibilities of the Quality Assurance Advisers (QAA)***

- 9) The QAA's will be accountable to the VSG, as are the independent evaluators. The principal role of the QAA is to aid the VSG in assuring that both the process and the product of the evaluation are credible and independent.

- 10) As part of the recruitment process for the team of independent evaluators, the QAAs will develop a scorecard<sup>5</sup> and apply it to review, assess and grade all the proposals submitted<sup>6</sup>. The QAAs will initially conduct a 'blind' review and then compare the scores they assigned to each category. These will become a part of the record transmitted to the VSG. A second stage will entail discussion between the advisors to arrive at a consensus on the rankings and agree a consensus note, describing the process followed and, taking into account all factors, making a recommendation (or recommendations) for the consideration of the VSG.
- 11) The QAA will review the inception report, the interim report and the final report with regard to their adequacy, methodological rigor, application of good practice in comprehensive evaluations, soundness of evidence and independence. At each of these stages, they will provide brief advisory notes to the VSG. These will need to be made available on a timely basis.

### ***Requirements***

- 12) The successful applicant (s) will have at least 15 years of experience in a combination of evaluation work and work on or with multilateral organizations or global partnerships, aid effectiveness, and development.
- 13) They should preferably have participated in two or more comprehensive evaluations of multilateral organizations or global partnerships and be seen as experts in such evaluations. They will have in depth experience at both country and global or regional levels.
- 14) The reporting requirements will require a very high standard of English: the successful applicant will be fluent in written and spoken English.

### ***Timeframe and Location***

- 15) The QAA would agree to undertake the tasks above in a timely manner and consistent with the final timetable to be called for in the contract with independent evaluation team.
- 16) The QAA would work on the basis of drawdown contracts with an estimated maximum total time for each advisor of 15 days. Any extension of contract will be subject to the agreement of both parties, the availability of funds and satisfactory performance.
- 17) The main periods of work are likely to be April/May 2014 (review of proposals/inception report); August/September 2014 (interim report) and December 2014 (final report).
- 18) The QAA will be home-based and communication with the VSG, the evaluators and the SUN Movement Secretariat will be conducted by e-mails and phone calls.

---

<sup>5</sup> An example of such a scorecard is appended for consideration by the QAAs.

<sup>6</sup> Eighty-five percent of total score will be based on technical merit and fifteen percent to price. The technical weightings in the scorecard will be expected to be assigned against standard best practices factors, such as the extent to which it responds to the functional requirements and specifications in the TOR, reputation and relevant experience.

## **Annex B: Evaluation Core Team: Qualifications**

The core team, under the direct authority of the team leader, will have sole responsibility for the direction, supervision and conduct of all substantive work of the IEE, including full involvement in the execution of the evaluation work. Core team members will work for extended periods from May 2014 to December 2014.

### ***Qualifications and experience of the core team:***

- Extensive prior experience in designing and conducting large scale, complex evaluations, preferably including one or more comprehensive evaluations and multi-stakeholder organizations.
- Experience in working in or with the public sector, with experience in the private and NGO sectors being an advantage.
- Significant exposure to the multilateral system and to issues and challenges in international development;
- Experience in evaluation of multi-stakeholder and, preferably, multi-sectoral global partnerships;
- Experience in evaluations that take account of the agreed principles of aid effectiveness of the Paris-Accra-Busan process.
- Experience in working in or with the public sector, with experience in the private and NGO sectors being an advantage.
- Significant exposure to the multilateral system and to issues and challenges in international development;
- Demonstrated ability in:
  - a) communication (written and oral);
  - b) conceptual and empirical analysis; and
  - c) synthesis reporting, including synthesis of findings and recommendations;
- At least one member of the core team will require a knowledge of quantitative and qualitative methods of social and economic research, including participatory survey techniques and cost-benefit analysis as applied to complex situations (including substantial non-quantifiable variables).
- Knowledge of international health and nutrition issues will be an advantage.
- Ability to work in French and Spanish as well as English will be an advantage.

Evaluation core team leader: He/she will provide overall leadership of the evaluation team and have a coordinating role. Qualifications, in addition to those above, will include:

- Experience in organizing-directing-managing complex evaluations, preferably in the multilateral system;
- Experience of systems analysis and/or strategic planning
- Extensive knowledge of the international development system and its institutional framework.
- Experience in institutional analysis, including analysis of governance.

**ANNEX C: Example of Scorecard to Assess SUN Comprehensive Evaluation Proposals<sup>7</sup>**

Criteria	Possible Points	Points Awarded QAA #1	Points Awarded QAA #2	Points Awarded QAA #3	Total Points
<b>1. Qualifications and Experience</b>					
1.1. Sufficient resources and staff to conduct the study	0-10				
1.2. Qualifications of evaluation team members.	0-10				
1.3. Qualifications and experience of team leader responsibilities with respect to other studies	0-10				
1.4. Company experience in conducting comprehensive evaluations and/or international institutions	0-10				
1.5. Specialist knowledge of Nutrition/Public Health	0-5				
<b>2. Methodology and Data Collection</b>					
2.1. Outline/Description of methodology and mechanisms to collect data.	0-10				
2.2. Methodology proposed reflects accepted good practices in comprehensive evaluations.	0-10				
2.3. Steps and Methods to validate data.	0-5				
<b>3. Data Analysis</b>					
3.1. Methods to analyze data and categories proposed to be analyzed.	0-10				
3.2. Demonstration of statistical validity of methods proposed.	0-5				
<b>TOTAL TECHNICAL POINTS</b>	0-85				
<b>Cost</b>	0-15				
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	0-100				

<sup>7</sup> For illustrative purposes only; the scorecard is to be determined by the selected Quality Assurance Advisors.

## ANNEX D: Requirements for a Mid-Term Evaluation of SMS Within the ICE

The agreements (Memoranda of Understanding) between several donors which have provided financial support to the work of the SUN Secretariat (SMS) require a mid-term evaluation of the SMS. That evaluation, which has been integrated into the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation (ICE), however, requires a report in September in order to fulfill the Secretariat's contractual obligations to its donors. Thus, the Interim Progress Report of the ICE (to be submitted in early September) must include material sufficient to respond to the mid-term evaluation obligations of the SMS to its donors. Those obligations, as set out in (exact title of document), require an evaluation of SMS performance and progress on 12 SMS activity indicators in three results areas. These are summarized in the following table:

Result Area	SMS Activity Indicator
<b>Result Area 1</b> 1. The SUN Movement Lead Group is able to exercise stewardship over the Movement, sustain the political attention to under-nutrition and increase investments in direct nutrition interventions and nutrition sensitive development.	1.1- Provide assistance to Lead Group so that it can exercise accountable stewardship over the Movement in line with its Strategy and Roadmap
	1.2- Provide assistance to Lead Group Members and the Movement as a whole to undertake effective resource mobilization for addressing undernutrition
	1.3- Provide assistance to Lead Group Members to oversee the accountability of the overall SUN Movement
	1.4- Enable Lead Group members to undertake effective High Level Advocacy
	1.5- Foster greater understanding of the SUN Movement and its progress
<b>Result Area 2</b> 2. Provide assistance to Lead Group Members – and the Movement as a whole - to undertake effective resource mobilization for addressing under- nutrition.	2.1. Support SUN Countries to ensure they have timely access to the technical expertise they need
	2.2. Track progress in SUN Countries
	2.3. Empower stakeholder advocacy and communication
<b>Result Area 3</b> 3. Stakeholders from self-governing and mutually accountable SUN Networks respond to needs of SUN Countries in a timely and effective way and contribute to responsive and aligned assistance to SUN Countries.	3.1. Ensure that the four SUN stakeholder networks provide an optimal service when receiving and responding to requests identified by governments and other stakeholders within SUN Countries
	3.2. Ensure that strategies and actions of SUN Networks are in synergy with the overall SUN Movement strategy, and that they are monitored, reviewed and updated regularly
	3.3. Provide support to the functioning of the SUN Multi-Partner Trust Fund
	3.4. Facilitate communication, learning and engagement across the Movement

## **Annex E: Indicative Listing of Issues/Questions to be Addressed in the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the SUN Movement**

The issues raised and questions posed in this annex are presented as guidance for the evaluation, not as a definitive listing, and many of them are very closely interrelated. They derive from written comments received and 25 semi-structured interviews (some group interviews) with SUN stakeholders. The interviews started with: ‘What do you see as the principal issues and questions that the evaluation should give priority to and that should be clearly indicated in the Terms of Reference?’ Stakeholder responses to this pointed to five overarching questions for the evaluation.

### ***THE OVERARCHING ISSUES***

- To what extent is there evidence of a real and shared understanding of and commitment to the idea of SUN as a "movement", rather than as a single entity, which is not operational itself but whose multiple components all support and encourage the country efforts to scale up nutrition that are at its core? Does it provide significant differences and added value (e.g. in mobilization and in action) from other multi-stakeholder global partnerships? Has this been/is it proving to be a helpful concept in establishing multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral approaches to nutrition?
- If the SUN Movement is to continue after 2015, does it have an appropriate structure as an informal partnership under the aegis of the UN Secretary General?
- How effective has the overall SUN Movement model and its governance been? This question applies to the Movement as a whole and to its key components --the Lead Group, Secretariat and five networks -- carrying out their respective roles? Should that structure or the roles of those components be changed?
- Has there been sufficient transparency and accountability within the Movement and among its components?
- To what extent have the necessary foundations been laid for sustainability of the objectives and progress of the SUN Movement? What structural changes are indicated to increase its sustainability as well as effectiveness?

Deriving from and bearing on these overarching questions, SUN stakeholders suggested a range of key questions that they would like the evaluation to address. The questions deal with intermediate outcomes, needs and priorities, comparative advantage (including gaps in the international architecture), and efficiency. Taken together, answers to them are crucial to overall assessment of the effectiveness of the SUN Movement and its work. These include:

### ***GENERAL***

#### **Priorities**

- How effectively has SUN made progress on each of its ‘strategic priorities’ -- mobilization of political support, supportive policies and laws and spread of good practice, alignment around well-costed and high quality country plans, and increased domestic and external financing?
- Are the four strategic priorities the right ones to help countries achieve the overall objective of SUN of accelerating reduction in undernutrition in order to meet their national targets as well as the global targets established by the 2012 World Health Assembly? If they are not sufficient, what changes in areas of emphasis should be considered?

### **Country focus**

- To what extent has SUN succeeded in putting countries front and centre in all aspects of its efforts? What do countries view as the benefits they have gained (or the absence of expected benefits) from participating in SUN?
- To what extent has SUN contributed to moving from mobilization to action and concrete changes at country level -- both by government and other country stakeholders and by donors? How can it do so better, and, in so doing, also keep nutrition high on the country and global political agenda?

### **Quality**

- To what extent has SUN contributed to helping countries improve the quality of their plans and programs in terms of, e.g., focus on proven direct nutrition interventions and the first 1000 days, balance of direct and nutrition-sensitive activities, prioritization of activities, resource allocations, addressing capacity and implementation issues, and a sharper focus on achievement of results? Regarding resource allocations, are the governments of SUN countries assigning increases from their own fiscal resources to nutrition?
- What should be done to increase the focus on quality? Would good practice principles, such as those found in the case of IHP+, be merited?

### **The right balance:**

- Has SUN struck the right balance between being inclusive (number of countries involved) and being effective in providing in depth support to countries? Is there a need to place greater emphasis on showing success stories ('proof of concept') in several countries of what difference SUN has made?
- Has SUN focussed adequately on the need to strike a reasonable balance between direct nutrition interventions and nutrition-sensitive interventions? How has SUN contributed to the evolution of thinking on the latter and how effectively is it contributing to multi-sectoral coordination at country level?
- Has SUN given sufficient attention to issues of gender equity and women's empowerment?

### **Mandate and role:**

- Are SUN's mandate and role appropriate, in relation to the numerous international organizations and global partnerships involved in closely related areas (e.g. food security and maternal and child health)? To what extent have the Movement and its Secretariat been effective in creating a 'magnetic field' to collaborative, complementary and common effort at country and global levels to reduce undernutrition?
- To what extent has SUN contributed to increasing coordination and complementarity, and reducing fragmentation of externally-funded programs at country level?
- Should SUN broaden its overall objective of accelerating reduction in undernutrition to include reduction in overnutrition, with its consequences for Non-Communicable Diseases, as well?

### **Achieving and measuring concrete outcomes**

- To what extent has SUN moved (and/or is moving) beyond its initial focus on structures, capacities and processes that can feed into results to a focus on achievement of outcomes

and intermediate outcomes? To what extent is program coverage in nutrition actually increasing at country level?

- To what extent are the tracking and monitoring systems reporting on evidence of actions and investments as well as on statements and pledges? Is there reliable evidence of increased financial flows?

#### **Advocacy**

- How strategic and effective has the SUN role in advocacy been?
- To what extent has SUN succeeded in making the shift to multi-stakeholder advocacy at country and global levels (vs. seeing advocacy as essentially the responsibility only of civil society)?

#### **Trust Fund**

- Should the Multi-Partner Trust Fund -- for catalytic financing at country level when other financing is not available -- be continued? If so, what is the evidence and justification and should its volume or scope be expanded?

### ***INDIVIDUAL COMPONENTS OF SUN***

#### **Lead Group**

- What role has the SUN Lead Group exercised in providing strategic direction and oversight to the SUN Movement and in mobilizing support at country and global level?
- Has the Lead Group been able to get commitment and active participation from its members?
- Is its very senior membership able to provide the time and leadership needed to scaling up nutrition?
- Is the Lead Group the most appropriate governance arrangement for SUN? Might its role and modus operandi be made more effective through, for example, some form of small Executive Committee with agreed TOR?
- Are Lead Group members kept adequately informed of what is going on in all parts of SUN? Have they been adequately equipped to provide oversight and effective strategic direction?

#### **SUN Networks**

- How well is the SUN Network structure functioning – overall and by network? To what extent does it have an impact on actions by its members? Is this structure appropriate for moving ahead?
- How should the mandates, roles and modalities of the different SUN networks evolve?

#### **Country Network and Country-Level Governance:**

- How effective is governance of SUN at country level (recognizing the country specificity of that governance)? What impact has the SUN Movement had on that governance? What more could be done by the different components of the SUN Movement to increase that impact, for example in getting stronger commitment from heads of government and finance ministers?
- To what extent are the country platforms inclusive and multi-stakeholder based? Do they include balanced participation of different actors, including from civil society and business?
- Have ‘best practices’ been identified in country networks? Is there evidence that these are helpful in sharing experiences and learning? Is there evidence that they are being successfully transferred? What changes in role and modality would increase the

effectiveness of the Country Network? For example, do country focal points have the seniority and ‘convening power’ required for country networks to function effectively? Would it be useful to give more emphasis to the regional level, or is learning from good practice across regions more important?

### **Civil Society Network**

- To what extent has the CSO network been a factor in embedding nutrition within the priorities of CSOs working at the local level as well as in getting nutrition a more prominent place on the political agenda at country and global levels?

### **Business Network**

- To what extent has the Business Network specifically been able to move from mobilization to action, including responding to the demand from SUN countries for stimulating public-private partnerships?
- To what extent have the SUN Movement as a whole and the Business Network been able to address and resolve highly contentious issues relating to the role of business and public-private partnerships within SUN (e.g. concerns over conflicts of interest, on the one hand, and understanding/acceptance of the ‘double value proposition’ (i.e. the social value and the financial value) as prerequisite to the effective mobilization of partnerships with business?

### **Donor Network**

- To what extent has there been a scaling up of current and credibly-projected funding by donors and other external funders?
- To what extent have donors emphasized effective use of their assistance by following agreed principles of aid effectiveness and given adequate attention to capacity strengthening? And to what extent have they emphasized and helped countries to strengthen the quality of country programs?

### **UN Network**

- To what extent has the UN Network been able to achieve better coordination and alignment of activities of UN agencies at country level?

### **Secretariat**

- See Annex D for other important questions for the Secretariat from the log frame agreed with donors to the Secretariat
- Is the size and financing of the Secretariat commensurate with its appropriate role at global and country levels?
- What are the implications of the changing needs of countries, as SUN moves its emphasis from mobilization to action, for the role, size, and structure of the Secretariat? Regarding structure, would the Secretariat be more, or less, effective if it were to become formalized as a UN structure?
- Is the system of monitoring and evaluation coordinated by the Secretariat adequate? How should it be improved, taking account of ongoing work by consultants to be completed in June? (See the question above on intermediate indicators.)

## Annex F: Definitions of Terms used in the Terms of Reference

Benchmark	Reference point or standard against which performance or achievements can be assessed. A benchmark often refers to the performance that has been achieved in the recent past by other comparable organizations or what can be reasonably inferred to have been achieved in the circumstances.
Comprehensive Evaluation	See below.
Effectiveness	The extent to which the intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance and the volume of resources deployed.
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, etc.) are converted to results.
Impacts	Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by an intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.
Indicator	Quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to verify achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of an actor.
Outcomes	The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs.
Outputs	The products, goods and services which result from an intervention.
Performance	The degree to which an intervention or a partner operates according to specific criteria/standards/guidelines or achieves results in accordance with stated goals or plans.
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of an intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.
Results	The output, outcome or impact of an intervention.
Stakeholders	Agencies, organizations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the intervention or its evaluation.
Sustainability	The continuation of benefits from an intervention after major assistance has been completed. The probability of long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.
Triangulation	The use of three or more sources or types of information, or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment, in order to overcome the bias that comes from single informants, single-methods, single observer or single theory studies.
Comprehensive Evaluation	<p>CEs draw on the accepted principles and methods for evaluation in international development, but CEs have a number of distinguishing features that differentiate them from evaluations of interventions, projects, or programs.</p> <p>First, the scope of CEs is much broader. Evaluating an organization as a whole requires that CEs address a much larger set of issues, apply and integrate a larger range of evaluation tools and techniques (e.g. randomized impact evaluations, data from existing monitoring and evaluation systems, benchmarking, operations research, participatory or</p>

	<p>action research, and peer review) – depending on what is already available and on the time and resources available for the CE.</p> <p>Second, CEs require far greater outreach and inclusion of stakeholder views than do other types of evaluations. They draw on all available quantitative and qualitative evidence but also typically give more weight than in other evaluations to obtaining and analyzing the views and assessments of a broad variety of stakeholders – and some non-stakeholders. This is done, drawing on accepted rigorous methodologies, through interviews, surveys, and case studies. This process of broad consultation is usually vital not only as a source of evidence but to assure credibility and impact. The process entails extensive data collection and analyses as one of the initial steps and then continues, through cross verification and validation (“triangulation”) as conclusions and recommendations emerge from the analysis.</p> <p>Third, the need for broad consultation, as well as for considering a broad range of issues and for drawing on a variety of evaluation methods, means that CEs inevitably take a longer time than narrower evaluations. Ensuring sufficient time is also essential to the credibility and transparency of the entire CE process – from TORs and choice of the independent evaluation team through consideration of the findings of the CE by the governance structure.</p> <p>Fourth, because of their scope and complexity, CEs generally require more time than most other types of evaluation. Establishment of realistic timelines for comprehensive evaluations has been shown to correlate highly with the quality and utility of the final product.</p> <p>Fifth, to a far greater extent than other forms of evaluation, CEs involve both looking backward (what evaluators often call “summative evaluation”) and forward (or “formative evaluation”) and on synthesizing the two with recommendations for future actions. Looking back is essentially for purposes of accountability and to some extent for learning. Looking forward puts a heavier emphasis on learning and equipping the organization for the future. It examines the larger landscape, including the relative position of the organization vis-à-vis other organizations, changing conditions and new challenges. This leads to recommendations for future improvements. These may range from minor adjustments to major changes in organizational and governance structure, accountability and incentive mechanisms, policies and priorities, and even whether the organization should continue or be phased out.</p>
--	---

## Annex G: Bibliography

This short bibliography mentions only a sample of the wide variety of material relevant to the comprehensive evaluation that is available on the SUN website ([www.scalingupnutrition.org](http://www.scalingupnutrition.org)) and elsewhere.

1000 Days, “Essential Documents” (<http://www.thousanddays.org/resources/essential-documents/>)

Haddad, Lawrence, “Ending Undernutrition: Our Legacy to the Post 2015 Generation”, Institute of Development Studies and Children’s Investment Fund Foundation, May 2013  
(<http://nutrition4growth.org/Ending%20Undernutrition%20-%20Background%20framing%20paper%20-%20Final%20May%202013.pdf>)

IFPRI, Global Food Policy Report, March 2014  
[http://www.unicef.org/publications/index\\_68661.html](http://www.unicef.org/publications/index_68661.html)

Lancet, Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition, January 2008  
(<http://www.thelancet.com/series/maternal-and-child-undernutrition>).

Lancet, Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition, June 2013  
(<http://www.thelancet.com/series/maternal-and-child-nutrition>)

“Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement Strategy [2012-2015], September 2012.  
(<http://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/SUN-MOVEMENT-STRATEGY-ENG.pdf>)

SUN Movement Revised Road Map, September 2012. ([http://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/SUN-Movement-Road-Map-Septemeber-2012\\_en.pdf](http://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/SUN-Movement-Road-Map-Septemeber-2012_en.pdf))

“SUN Network and Lead Group Resources” (<http://scalingupnutrition.org/resources-archive/network-resources-2>)

“SUN Movement Draft Progress Report” and “Draft Compendium of SUN Country Fiches”  
(<http://scalingupnutrition.org/news/now-available-draft-state-of-the-sun-movement-progress-report-september-2013#.UzbvxsftZ1Q>)

UNICEF, “Improving Child Nutrition: The achievable imperative for global progress”, April 2013 ([http://www.unicef.org/publications/index\\_68661.html](http://www.unicef.org/publications/index_68661.html))