

**Independent Evaluation of the Multi Partner
Trust Fund of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement**

Inception Report

Chris Leather

Nick Norvell

30th September 2015

Independent Evaluation of the Multi Partner Trust Fund of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement: Inception Report

The evaluation team comprises Chris Leather & Nick Norvell. The evaluation team were supported by research assistants: Thais Gomes Nogueira Espíndola and Patricia Luyza de Malafaia Giordano.

The Independent Evaluation was commissioned by the Management Committee of the SUN Movement's Multi Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) and is overseen by its evaluation Steering Group (SG). Funding for the Evaluation is provided through Window III of the MPTF. The evaluation manager for this Inception Phase was Kwame Akoto-Danso from the Sun Movement Secretariat (SMS).

This report should be cited as:

Leather, C. & Norvell, N. 2015. *Independent Evaluation of the Multi Partner Trust Fund of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement: Inception Report*. Rio de Janeiro: 18 September 2015.

The evaluation team would like to thank all those who have assisted its work so far. These include the MPTF Evaluation Steering Group and the SUN Movement Secretariat in particular Florence Lasbennes, Kwame Akoto-Danso and Elena Gaino. The evaluation team has sole responsibility for the opinions expressed in this report and for any errors that remain.

Contents

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Origins of the Evaluation	5
1.2	Inception Phase	5
1.3	Structure of the Report	5
2	Subject of the Evaluation	6
2.1	Context: The Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement	6
2.2	The SUN Movement Multi Partner Trust Fund (MPTF)	7
3	Evaluation Focus	11
3.1	Evaluation Objectives	11
3.2	Evaluation scope and depth	11
3.3	Evaluation Stakeholders	12
4	Evaluation Criteria and Questions	13
4.1	Evaluation Criteria	13
4.2	Evaluation Questions	13
5	Evaluation Approach and Instruments	14
5.1	Project reviews	14
5.2	In-depth CSA Case Studies (country visits)	15
5.3	Governance and Administrative analysis	16
5.4	Analysis of the future need for catalytic, last resort fund	16
5.5	Evaluation instruments	16
5.6	Information analysis	17
5.7	Evaluability challenges, theories of change and counterfactual analysis	17
5.8	Quality Assurance	18
6	Evaluation Organisation and Timing	18
6.1	Deliverables	18
6.2	Work Plan	18
6.3	Division of responsibilities between team members	19
6.4	Ensuring the timely submission of high quality deliverables	20
6.5	Dissemination of Findings	20

Annexes

Annex A	Terms of Reference for the Independent Evaluation of the SUN Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF)	21
Annex B	Inception Phase questions and interviewees	38
Annex C	SUN MPTF chronology	40
Annex D	MPTF Financial Tables	44
Annex E	Stakeholder Analysis	47
Annex F	Evaluation Questions	48
Annex G	Bibliography	52
Annex H	Selection of Country Cases	59
Annex I	Evaluation Timetable	61

Boxes

Box 1	Priority evaluation questions	14
Box 2	Evaluation products	18

Tables

Table 1	Overview of the Report Structure	5
Table 2	Current status of MPTF funds received and allocated	9
Table 3	SUN MPTF projects budget and expenditure	10
Table 4	SUN MPTF budget by PUNO	11

1 Introduction

1.1 Origins of the Evaluation

1.1 The SUN Multi Movement Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) (Annex A) states:

The Management Committee of the SUN Movement MPTF agreed to use funds available against Window III to commission an evaluation of the MPTF to take place in the second half of 2015. The evaluation will provide the Management Committee of the SUN Movement MPTF and the Transition Stewardship Team of the SUN Movement with findings, recommendations and fund design options that are expected to assist in identifying the best course of action for the future.

1.2 The evaluation follows on from the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation (ICE) of the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement published in May 2015, which included a brief review of the MPTF (see Annex K in Mokoro 2015).

1.2 Inception Phase

1.3 During the Inception Phase the team conducted a review of the most important literature, held Skype interviews with members of the Evaluation Steering Group and undertook a brief stakeholder analysis. These activities informed the prioritisation of evaluation questions and the finalisation of the methodology, including stakeholder mapping, in-depth case studies and the potential survey. The list of interview questions and people interviewed is presented in Annex B.

1.3 Structure of the Report¹

1.4 The aim of this Inception Report (IR) is to set out a clear methodology and work plan for conducting the evaluation. The main text has been kept as concise as possible, but the IR has to provide thorough justifications for some elements of the methodology, and it will also serve as a handbook for the team conducting the evaluation. It therefore includes a number of annexes, as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Overview of the Report Structure

Chapter/coverage	Linked annexes
1. Introduction	Annex A Evaluation Terms of Reference Annex B Inception Questions & Interviewees
2. Subject of the Evaluation	Annex C SUN MPTF Chronology Annex D SUN MPTF Financial Data
3. Evaluation Focus	Annex E Stakeholder Mapping

¹ The report structure is adapted from the SUN ICE Inception Report (Mokoro 2014a) which itself was adapted from the CGIAR Standards for Independent External Evaluation (CGIAR 2013)

Chapter/coverage	Linked annexes
4. Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Annex F Evaluation Questions
5. Evaluation Approach and Instruments	Annex G Bibliography Annex H Selection of In-depth Case Studies
6. Organisation and Timing	Annex I Work Plan

2 Subject of the Evaluation

2.1 Context: The Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement

2.1 The MPTF Management Committee ToR (ref) states:

In recent decades it has become evident that better nutrition – especially in pregnancy and early childhood - is the cornerstone of equitable development. Several nations have demonstrated impressive results through prioritizing nutrition in national development strategies and harnessing the energy of multiple stakeholders behind community-based programmes. Despite these successes at least one third of today’s children are disadvantaged by chronic under-nutrition.

2.2 The MPTF Evaluation ToR describes the establishment, institutional structure and evolution of the SUN Movement as follows:

The Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement, established in September 2010, is a collaboration of stakeholders in governments, civil society, business, research groups and international organisations to encourage increased political commitment and programmatic alignment to accelerate reductions in under-nutrition. The emphasis is on women and children under two years of age.

The current institutional structure of the SUN Movement was established in early 2012 under the aegis of United Nations Secretary-General, Ban Ki Moon. At the heart of the Movement are the countries that have opted to join: so far there are 55. They have created an inclusive multi-stakeholder political movement for nutrition.

The stakeholders who support the SUN Countries have organized themselves into four networks (United Nations, Donors, Business and Civil Society) so that they better align their support for country priorities and programmes. These networks respond to the needs and specific gaps identified by national governments.

The Movement is steered by a Lead Group that includes 27 high level leaders from SUN Countries, civil society, business, donor agencies, foundations, alliances and international organizations convened by the UN Secretary General. It seeks to ensure the coherence and impact of the Movement, and is accountable for the way it responds to national needs.

Since 2012, the SUN Movement Secretariat has developed as a small coordinating mechanism operating 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 in countries to intensify actions and achieve nutrition objectives, is received in a coordinated and coherent way. It also ensures that the Movement’s progress is tracked efficiently and communicated clearly.

2.3 The forthcoming SUN Movement Strategy 2016 – 2020, describes the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation which took place in 2015 and the subsequent development of the next 5 year strategy:

The SUN Movement Lead Group commissioned an Independent Comprehensive Evaluation (ICE) of the Movement in May 2014 with the purpose of assessing its relevance, efficiency and effectiveness and enabling an updated strategy to be developed. The ICE ran from June 2014 to January 2015. In April 2015, a response to the findings of the evaluation was issued: over half of SUN Government Focal Points contributed on behalf of their multi stakeholder platforms; SUN Networks’ facilitators consolidated responses from their members and the SUN Movement Secretariat, whilst providing its own feedback, synthesised these responses.

In April 2015, President Kikwete of Tanzania, a SUN Movement Lead Group member, hosted a multi-stakeholder meeting in Dar es Salaam to enable the deliberation of options for the future of the Movement. The SUN Movement Lead Group accepted the recommendations from the meeting and provided a steer to a Transitional Stewardship Team (TST) tasked to guide the development of the strategy. The Secretariat and a consultant have worked with the TST and Network facilitators to capture the strategic elements for the strategy. Forty-one SUN Government Focal Points and nearly 200 participants in their multi-stakeholder platforms provided input into shaping the strategy.

The process is not finished, and the next step will be to develop a Roadmap and network work-plans to bring the strategy to life. This will require significant consultation with the Movement’s stakeholders, including SUN Government Focal Points and the Movement’s networks, to ensure realistic targets and outcomes that can be monitored. The process will be overseen by the SUN Movement Lead Group’s Executive Committee.

2.2 The SUN Movement Multi Partner Trust Fund (MPTF)

2.4 The Evaluation ToR provides an introduction to the SUN MPTF:

In March 2012 the SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) was established by Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs) and contributing partners. It was formulated in response to a perceived gap in funding for country-level platforms, particularly those pertaining to the civil society alliances.

2.5 As also noted on the SUN website:

Resources for Scaling Up Nutrition in SUN countries are usually mobilized at country level from national budgets or through agreements with development partners. Funds for some in-country activities – particularly catalytic actions by national authorities and participation of in-country civil society groups within national SUN platforms – have not proved easy to mobilize in-country.

2.6 The Evaluation ToR explains the purpose of the MPTF as

A catalytic tool to stimulate actions by members of the SUN Movement for scaling up nutrition, especially to catalyse support for SUN governments’ plans to enhance and expand nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions. The SUN Movement MPTF has not been designed to be a vertical nutrition fund for large scale investments in food and nutrition security, nor to replace existing funding pathways at country level (both from national budget and from bilateral and multilateral resources). The SUN Movement MPTF has been meant to be used as a small fund of last resort (when other funding is not available) for stakeholders to access small grants through which their engagement in the SUN Movement at country level can be initiated and/or enhanced. As a last resort funding mechanisms any potential recipient is supposed to explore all other funding opportunities before being able to access the SUN Movement MPTF funds. It has also to be proved that a recipient receive additional funding from other sources to be able to sustain the next phase of the project after the catalytic start up being funded by the MPTF comes to an end.

2.7 A chronology of key events in the history of the MPTF is presented in Annex C. This chronology will be further developed during the course of this evaluation.

2.8 The MPTF supports three primary areas for work, with three corresponding funding windows:

Window I: Support for initial SUN actions at country level to galvanize their commitments to the principles of the Movement;

Window II: Support for mobilizing of Civil Society to contribute to the goals of the SUN Movement; and

Window III: Support for global SUN strategic efforts.

2.9 Annex 2 of the 2013 MPTF Annual Report (SUN MPTF 2013) presents the MPTF Log Frame and Window II Theory of Change. The key areas of change identified in the Window II Theory of Change are:-

1. Coordinated Civil Society Alliances (CSAs) in SUN countries;
2. CSAs advocate effectively;
3. CSAs participate in national platforms for scaling up nutrition;
4. CSAs contribute to better accountability in SUN countries; and
5. The collective of CSAs are a functioning learning network (i.e. The global SUN Civil Society Network).

2.10 Annex K of the ICE Final Report (Mokoro 2015) provides a comprehensive description of the MPTF covering the issues below:

- Origins and evolution of the Sun MPTF
- Purpose of the MPTF
- Governance arrangements
- Fund allocation process
- History of fund allocations
- Disbursement timeframes
- Current status of MPTF funds (income, allocations, balance)
- Use of funds
- Accountability mechanisms

2.11 The information presented in the ICE Annex will be complemented and updated during the course of this in-depth MPTF evaluation. Up to date financial data is presented in Annex D of the current report. A summary of key, updated information is presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Current status of MPTF funds received and allocated

Total source of funds		10,119,316.71
DFID		5,860,090.60
Irish Aid		429,485.00
Swiss Agency for Development & Cooperation		3,798,082.60
Interest & investment income		31,658.51
Total use of funds		9,765,370.62
<i>Projects</i>		
Window I:	Learning Routes	642,000.00
	Budget tracking	320,000.00
Window II:	24 Civil Society Alliances	7,606,115.00
	CSN Secretariat (3 allocations)	1,036,055.00
Window III:	SUN Movement M&E baseline report	60,000.00
<i>Sub-total projects</i>		<i>9,664,170.00</i>
<i>Administration</i>		
Refunds from PUNOs		-99.90
MPTF admin fee		100,876.58
Bank fees		423.94
<i>Sub-total admin</i>		<i>101,200.62</i>
Balance remaining in MPTF		353,946.04

As of 10 September 2015, values in USD. Source: UNDP MPTF Office

2.12 Overall income is \$10.1 million. The three donors have been the UK DfID (\$5.9mn), Swiss Development Corporation (\$3.8mn), followed by Irish Aid (US\$0.4mn).

2.13 A list of all the funded projects is presented in Table 3.

2.14 Window I (USD 962,000) has been utilised to support a pilot project (USD 642,000) led by PROCASUR to improve sharing and learning initiatives between national SUN multi-stakeholder platforms and for a project (USD 320,000) in support to the SUN Movement Community of Practice on Planning, Costing, Implementing and Financing Multi-sectoral Actions for Improved Nutrition.

2.15 Window II (USD 7,606,115) is providing financial support to civil society actors in 24 countries [4] across Africa, Asia and Latin America. Support has also been granted to the SUN Civil Society Network Secretariat through Window II (USD 1,036,055) 10.24% of the total SUN MPTF funding has been allocated under this window for civil society support, either on network or country specific projects. Donors fund the Civil Society Alliances in five countries bilaterally.

Table 3 SUN MPTF projects budget and expenditure

SUN Movement Fund - Projects by Country			
Data as of 9 Sep 2015 10:00 AM GMT			
All amounts in US\$			
Covering from Jan 2012 to Dec 2015			
	Approved budget	Expenditure	% spend
WINDOW I			
Learning Routes	642,000	580,436.55	90%
Budget tracking	320,000	0.00	0%
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>962,000</i>	<i>580,436.55</i>	
WINDOW II			
Bangladesh	535,000	384,105.45	72%
Burundi	209,059	106,849.76	51%
El Salvador	299,600	113,858.46	38%
Ghana	374,500	312,200.00	83%
Guatemala	428,000	148,216.79	35%
Guinea	289,000	134,541.98	47%
Kenya	299,600	72,556.58	24%
Kyrgyzstan	235,400	92,968.44	39%
Lao PDR	267,500	179,240.71	67%
Madagascar	299,600	141,100.00	47%
Malawi	428,000	330,617.00	77%
Mali	374,500	373,422.16	100%
Mozambique	428,000	389,277.12	91%
Myanmar	224,700	224,700.00	100%
Nepal	428,000	292,921.00	68%
Niger	428,000	299,102.00	70%
Nigeria	212,943	0.00	0%
Peru	278,200	154,099.00	55%
Rwanda	240,750	109,216.00	45%
Senegal	212,963	128,002.16	60%
Sierra Leone	299,600	107,331.68	36%
Sri Lanka	235,400	133,640.00	57%
Uganda	321,000	141,200.26	44%
Zimbabwe	256,800	151,358.00	59%
CSN Secretariat	1,036,054	759,687.38	73%
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>8,642,169</i>	<i>5,280,211.93</i>	
WINDOW III			
M&E Baseline	60,000.00	59,900.10	100%
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>60,000</i>	<i>59,900.10</i>	
TOTAL	9,664,170	5,920,548.58	61%

Source: UNDP MPTF Office

2.16 Window III (USD 60,000) has been used to support the development of the SUN Movement Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework. It is also being used to fund this evaluation of the SUN Movement MPTF.

Table 4 SUN MPTF budget by PUNO

MPTF Projects by PUNO		
Data as of 9 Sep 2015		
All amounts in US\$		
Organization	Approved budget	% of total
WHO	1,048,600.00	10.85%
UNICEF	1,656,543.40	17.14%
UNOPS	2,230,254.65	23.08%
WFP	4,728,772.00	48.93%
TOTAL	9,664,170.05	

Source: UNDP MPTF Office

2.17 As can be seen from Table 4, the funding share by PUNO varies significantly. During the evaluation it will be necessary to examine the implications of this workload in terms of the workload required by each PUNO to channel and oversee the use of funds.

2.18 In November 2014 the Management Committee approved the extension of the SUN Movement MPTF until 31 December 2016. Currently the SUN Movement Secretariat is working with Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs) on those projects that may need to be extended.

3 Evaluation Focus

3.1 Evaluation Objectives

3.1 The purpose and objectives of the evaluation are set out in detail in the ToR (Annex A). They can be summarised as follows:-

To assess the performance of the MPTF in contributing to the four Strategic Objectives of the SUN Movement².

To assess the need for, and propose options for, any future catalytic, last resort fund at global level.

3.2 The more detailed elements of the purpose and objectives spelled out in the ToR are reflected in the evaluation questions presented in Section 4 and Annex F.

3.2 Evaluation scope and depth

² **Strategic Objective 1:** Creating an enabling political environment, with strong in-country leadership, and a shared space where stakeholders align their activities and take joint responsibility for scaling up nutrition; **Strategic Objective 2:** Establishing best practices for scaling up proven interventions, including the adoption of effective laws and policies; **Strategic Objective 3:** Aligning actions around high quality and well-costed country plans, with an agreed results framework and mutual accountability; and **Strategic Objective 4:** Increasing resources towards coherent aligned approaches. (please see the SUN Movement Strategy -2012-2015)

3.3 The evaluation covers the whole period of implementation since the establishment of the MPTF in March 2012 until the start of the evaluation. It will also assess the need for, and design of, any future catalytic, resort global fund, taking into account the strengths and weaknesses of other existing funding mechanisms.

3.4 The evaluation aims to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of all 28 projects funded by the SUN MPTF across the three funding windows. As described in Section 5 below, four of the Civil Society Alliance projects will be evaluated in depth through country field visits.

3.5 The evaluation will also assess the role and work of the MPTF governance structures, i.e. the Management Committee and the SUN Secretariat (specifically in its role as MPTF technical secretariat) as well as its fund administration structures (i.e. the MPTF Office specifically in its role as administrative agent³; the Participating UN Organisations; and the Implementing Partners). The role and work of the CSN Secretariat, including its contribution to the management of the MPTF, will be evaluated as one of the 28 funded projects.

3.6 The issues to be evaluated are reflected in the evaluation criteria and questions presented in Section 5 below. As requested in the ToR, the evaluation will consider all aspects of the current SUN MPTF and of any alternative funding mechanisms. However, due to the limited timeframe and capacity for the evaluation, the evaluation questions have been prioritised based upon the feedback received from stakeholders during the Inception Phase. The evaluation team will ensure that the high priority questions are addressed in depth.

3.3 Evaluation Stakeholders

3.7 The stakeholders of this evaluation are the SUN Movement Secretariat, the MPTF Office, the donors, the PUNOs, the SUN Networks, the Implementing Partners (IPs), Civil Society Alliances and the Lead Group (see Annex E). The wider SUN Movement has a stake in this evaluation because the effectiveness or not of the MPTF has an important bearing on strategic direction which MPTF might take - to continue its mandate, to reform or to terminate the Fund. The donors of course have a high interest in the evaluation, to establish what lessons can be learned from the design and implementation of the MPTF in order to make funding decisions, and decisions on structure for the future and the assumptions which were made in the design phase. This was echoed in interviews with all donors.

³ The Evaluation will assess the role and work of the MPTF Office in the administration of the SUN MPTF but not the overall UNDP MPTF architecture.

4 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

4.1 Evaluation Criteria

4.1 The ToR state that: “the evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability** of the current SUN Movement MPTF... and when looking at the future (if any) of the MPTF and of alternative pooled financing models”. The standard OECD DAC criterion of impact is not included.

4.2 The SUN MPTF Logframe 2012-2015 states the desired impact of the MPTF as: “Sustained public, political and financial commitment and action to effectively tackle under nutrition in SUN countries”. The impact criterion is not included because it is recognised that there has been too short a timeframe for the MPTF to achieve such an impact.

4.3 In addition to the criteria referred to in the evaluation ToR, the Evaluation team will also assess: the **coverage** of catalytic funding needs in the SUN Movement by the MPTF and the **coherence** of MPTF funded projects with each other (internal coherence) and with national nutrition strategies and plans and/or the SUN Movement global strategy and road map (external coherence).

4.4 To ensure consistency we will use the definitions of evaluation criteria and other terminology presented in Annex F (glossary) of the ICE Inception Report (Mokoro, 2014a).

4.2 Evaluation Questions

4.5 The evaluation ToR states that the evaluation team will propose a revised set of questions to the Steering Group and through a consultative process with the SG the set of questions will be agreed. This process was followed during the Inception Phase and the Evaluation Questions that will form the basis of the evaluation are presented in Annex F. The Evaluation Questions are also informed by the MPTF Logframe and the Window II Theory of Change and are categorized according to the evaluation criteria referred to above.

4.6 The questions presented in Annex F are a comprehensive basis to guide the evaluation. They will be used to guide literature reviews, interviews and group discussions and a possible survey during the course of the evaluation.

4.7 During the Inception Phase members of the evaluation Steering Group were asked to identify the most important questions that the evaluation should answer. Their responses are summarised in Box 1 below.

Box 1 Priority evaluation questions

Current MPTF

- To what extent has the MPTF contributed to progress in relation to the four SUN Movement Strategic Objectives?
- What factors have influenced the performance of the MPTF?

Future

- Is there a future need for a catalytic, last resort fund at global level?
- If yes, what are the options?

4.8 These priority questions are consistent with the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and the evaluation questions outlined in the ToR. The evaluation team will provide comprehensive answers to these priority questions in the final report, as well as addressing, as much as possible, the more detailed list of questions presented in Annex F.

5 Evaluation Approach and Instruments

5.1 In order to answer the evaluation questions, the team members will undertake the following activities:

- Desk based evaluation the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of all 28 funded projects (project reviews) and in-country/project determinants of success
- In depth case studies (including country visits) of 4 out of the 24 Civil Society Alliances
- Desk based analysis of the MPTF governance and administrative mechanisms (including the Management Committee, SMS, MPTF Office, PUNOs) and the role of other global level structures (e.g. SUN Networks)
- Desk based analysis of the future need for a catalytic, last resort fund

5.1 Project reviews

5.2 The project reviews will focus on evaluation questions 1.1.1. – 1.1.7 and 1.2.1. – 1.2.4. The 28 projects have been divided between the team members. We will review the relevant literature (see preliminary Bibliography in Annex G) and interview key informants (see stakeholder analysis in Annex E) who can assist in answering the relevant evaluation questions. Summary analyses, particularly of the 24 CSA projects, will be produced to be included as an Annex to the final evaluation report. In line with the request in the ToR, these analyses will include:

- Intended changes and summary of the project plan for making them happen
- Key achievements relating to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency & sustainability
- Factors influencing results (ingredients for success, obstacles and challenges, including the role played by the MPTF)
- Lessons learnt (including how obstacles were overcome)
- Recommendations and linkages (where relevant and possible) with SUN 2.0 strategic objectives & priorities
- Future funding needs and opportunities 2016-2020

5.2 In-depth CSA Case Studies (country visits)

5.3 During the evaluation, there will be a total of four in-depth Case Studies, including countries visits. This is the maximum number that budget and time will permit.

5.4 During each country visit, the team member will spend up to 5 working days in the country, having undertaken the desk based project review in advance. The desk-based review will include a stakeholder mapping and identify key issues to be explored. The case studies will provide a key opportunity to explore the validity of the Window II Theory of Change. Each country visit will start with a briefing with key stakeholders and an in country debriefing on emerging findings will be held at the end.

5.5 Building upon the proposals presented in the evaluation ToR and in consultation with members of the evaluation Steering Group, the criteria identified for CSA case study selection are as follows:

- Geographical distribution
- At least one country with a fragile political environment
- CSAs from both Phase 1 and 2 funding allocations
- A range of PUNOs
- At least one country with REACH presence
- A range of Implementing Partners (at least one local NGO)
- At least one project with a high size of grant (>\$400k)
- Exclude CSAs about which the evaluation team have good analysis from the ICE and the CSN alignment study

5.6 The application of these criteria, suggest the following case study countries:-

- *Guatemala*
- *Lao People's Democratic Republic*
- *Mali*
- *Zimbabwe*

5.7 See Annex H for an analysis of all 24 CSAs against the selection criteria.

5.8 Confirmation of the selection and timetable requires liaison with the countries concerned and will take place as soon as possible. Discussions have already started with key contacts in Lao PDR given that this is scheduled for the week of the 28th September.

5.3 Governance and Administrative analysis

5.9 The purpose of the governance and administrative analysis (evaluation questions 1.2.5 – 1.2.12) is to evaluate the extent to which the SUN MPTF decision-making and resource distribution mechanisms enabled high quality projects and outcomes and were effective and efficient in their functioning. Literature will be reviewed, including Terms of Reference, Management Committee minutes, SMS documents, and interviews will be held with key informants (see stakeholder analysis in Annex E). The analysis will also examine the influence that other global mechanisms have played (or not played) in facilitating the desired outcomes of MPTF funding.

5.4 Analysis of the future need for catalytic, last resort fund

5.10 This analysis will seek answers to evaluation questions 2.1 – 2.6. Literature will be reviewed and key informants interviewed regarding catalytic funding needs in relation to the SUN Movement 2.0 strategy; funding opportunities at country, regional and global levels; and the relative pros and cons of different global funding mechanisms. See stakeholder analysis in Annex E for stakeholder groups to be interviewed.

5.5 Evaluation instruments

5.11 In undertaking the four activities above, the evaluation will use the following information collection instruments:

Literature reviews: The evaluation team will make maximum use of existing information and analysis. A preliminary bibliography is in Annex G. The literature in the Bibliography is categorised as follows: 1) SUN general; 2) MPTF general; 3) Project specific (by Window).

Interviews and group discussions: Interviews and group discussions will be the main form of primary data collection. For each interview, relevant questions will be selected from the list of Evaluation Questions in Annex F to form an interview specific checklist. Interview notes will be systematically written up. To respect the confidentiality of interviewees, the notes will only be accessible to team members. A consolidated file of interview notes will facilitate searches on key thematic issues, countries etc. Identification of interviewees will draw on the stakeholder analysis (Annex E). Most interviews will be via skype to keep costs low.

A brief **online survey** is likely to be carried out during the second phase of data collection in order to test emerging findings, particularly in relation to project results, key determinants of effectiveness and future options. It will enable the team to reach a wider set of stakeholders than will be possible through interviews. Survey participants will be requested to validate (or otherwise) key findings. A survey at this stage in the evaluation has the added advantage of providing an indication of likely stakeholder reaction to the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The number of questions will be strictly limited (e.g. 10 – 15 questions). The survey will be available in English, French and Spanish and will be anonymous. The sample frame will cover all MPTF stakeholders.

5.6 Information analysis

5.12 The literature and interview notes will be analysed by categorising the information according to the evaluation questions. Sources of information will be referenced whilst respecting the confidentiality of interviewees. This categorised information will form the basis of our evaluation findings. Frequently recurring and divergent information will be noted and analysed. We will be careful to differentiate findings (information provided by others) from the evaluation team's conclusions (our summative interpretation of the evidence based findings in response to the main evaluation questions).

5.7 Evaluability challenges, theories of change and counterfactual analysis

5.13 The major challenge will be one of attribution, i.e. in the case of CSA projects, the extent to which conclusions can be made with confidence regarding the causal chain between funding, CSO actions, increased political commitment and better actions to address malnutrition. There are numerous factors that could potentially result in changes along this chain in addition to funding.

5.14 The use of a theory based approach and counterfactual analysis will be critical for drawing valid conclusions regarding the contribution of the MPTF to the achievement of the SUN Movements for Strategic Objectives.

5.15 The Window II Theory of Change will be a key evaluation tool to identify and investigate the key links in the logic that it depicts, in terms both of the internal causal links and of key assumptions. It will be necessary to gain an understanding of the theory of change of each CSA project and how coherent it is with the overall Theory of Change. It will also be necessary to develop an understanding of the implicit theories of change for the projects funded through Windows I and III.

5.16 During project reviews and in-depth case studies, a counterfactual analysis will be undertaken to determine what might or might not have happened in the absence of MPTF funded activities.

5.8 Quality Assurance

5.17 The Evaluation will be subject to extensive consultation with stakeholders. The Inception Report will first of all need approval by the SUN MPTF evaluation Steering Group. The Team Leader will also provide Quality Assurance of all outputs. Each of the deliverables will be carefully reviewed in draft form before final submission.

5.18 As requested in the ToR, the evaluation team will provide an “audit trail” detailing how comments received have or have not been addressed in the final evaluation report, including issues agreed for analysis in the Inception Report which could not be adequately addressed and a justification for this.

6 Evaluation Organisation and Timing

6.1 Deliverables

6.1 It is proposed to submit the products identified in the ToR according to the timetable in Box 2 below. A short description of the content of main products is also provided.

6.2 In addition to these main deliverables, a one page analysis of each of the MPTF funded projects will be provided as an Annex in the Final Report, in line with the request in the ToR in relation to the 24 CSAs.

Box 2 Evaluation products

Deliverable	Deadline
<i>Inception Report</i>	18 th September
<i>Interim Briefing</i> (3 pages max): will provide background on the evaluation, outline key issues to stimulate discussion and present any preliminary findings.	12 th October
<i>Interim Report</i> (10 pages max): will present principal preliminary findings and provisional options for the future provision of catalytic, last resort funding	6 th November
<i>Draft Final Report</i> (v1)	8 th January
<i>Final Report</i> (30 pages max, including Executive Summary + annexes): Introduction to the evaluation; Description of the MPTF; Evaluation findings (in relation to evaluation questions); Conclusions; Recommendations; Annexes (including one pager analysis of achievements & added value of each project)	31 st January
<i>Evaluation Brief and PPT</i>	31 st January
<i>Findings presentation</i>	Last 2 weeks of January

6.2 Work Plan

6.3 A work plan is presented in Annex I showing the main activities to be carried out and days to be worked by the Team Leader and the Support Expert per week. In total,

both team members will work 70 days during the 5³/₄-month evaluation period. The evaluation commenced on 4th September 2015.

Data collection phase 1: 21st September – 8th November

6.4 The first phase of data collection will culminate in the production of the Interim Report. This phase includes: the further review of literature including desk-based project reviews of MPTF funded projects; Skype interviews with key informants; 2 Country Case Study visits; drafting of Interim Briefing; and consultations during the SUN Global Gathering.

6.5 The Global Gathering provides a critical opportunity to brief the full range of SUN stakeholders on emerging issues as well as to conduct face-to-face interviews and group discussions with key informants. The possibility of discussions on the MPTF as an agenda item on relevant side meetings, e.g. the CSN, Donor Network etc., are being explored with the SMS and Network Coordinators.

Data collection phase 2 and data analysis: 2nd November – 29th November

6.6 During this second phase of data collection final Skype interviews will be conducted with key informants, primarily to cross check and verify findings that have emerged during the first phase. There will also be 2 further Country Case Study visits.

6.7 Data analysis will be undertaken on an on-going basis throughout the evaluation in order to build upon and verify information and emerging findings. The analysis of information will be intensified and finalised during this phase.

Final Report writing & findings presentation

6.8 As much as possible, elements of the report will be drafted during the course of the evaluation, e.g. literature review, Country Case Studies etc. but will, of course, be open for revision if necessary. This iterative approach should help to ensure the timely finalisation of the draft report. The one page analysis of achievements and added value of each of the 28 projects will be provided as an annex to the Final Report.

6.9 It is proposed that the evaluation team submits the draft Final Report for comment to the Steering Committee by 8th January and comments are received by 15th January. The final version of the report will be submitted by 31st January, together with the Evaluation Brief and PowerPoint presentation.

6.3 Division of responsibilities between team members

6.10 The broad division of responsibilities between the Team Leader and Support Expert is outlined in the work plan in Annex I.

6.11 The Team Leader will lead on evaluation planning, data analysis and production of deliverables, whilst also undertaking desk reviews, interviews and one Country Case Study. The Team Leader will lead the evaluation of the use and impact of funds.

6.12 The Support Expert will lead the evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the MPTF as a mechanism and its pros and cons vis-à-vis other possible mechanisms.

6.13 It is proposed that both team members attend the Global Gathering given that this provides a good opportunity to interview a large number of SUN stakeholders, in more depth than is possible by Skype/phone.

6.4 Ensuring the timely submission of high quality deliverables

6.14 Difficulties scheduling Skype interviews and Country Case Study visits could affect the team's ability to carry out the activities on time and to the required standard. We will be seeking many interviews at a time when MPTF stakeholders will be busy in the development of the SUN 2.0 strategy in addition to their day-to-day responsibilities. Country visits will perforce be short. The support of the Steering Group, the EM and the SMS will be critical in securing the timely and active participation and availability of stakeholders. The Evaluation Team will use an intern to assist organise interviews, country visits etc. If there are such difficulties, beyond the control of the evaluation team, it may be necessary to extend the deadline for the submission of the final report. However, every effort will be made to submit the report on time.

6.5 Dissemination of Findings

6.15 Responsibility for translation and dissemination of the evaluation's reports will rest with the Evaluation Manager, the Evaluation Steering Group and the SMS. The deliverables will feed directly into MPTF Management Committees decision making regarding the future of the MPTF, as well as inform discussions in the SUN Donor Network regarding the future financing of scaling up nutrition processes at country level, as well as global support capacities. The SUN movement has a strong ethos of transparency and interim and final evaluation reports will be published on its web-site (and this will be an important part of the consultative strategy during the evaluation). We will support and facilitate dissemination by observing the TOR requests for concise, accessible and publication-ready final documents, and by providing French and Spanish translations of the final report.

Annex A Terms of Reference for the Independent Evaluation of the SUN Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF)

1. Background and Context:

Scaling Up Nutrition Movement

1. The Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement, established in September 2010, is a collaboration of stakeholders in governments, civil society, business, research groups and international organisations to encourage increased political commitment and programmatic alignment to accelerate reductions in under-nutrition. The emphasis is on women and children under two years of age.

2. The current institutional structure of the SUN Movement was established in early 2012 under the aegis of United Nations Secretary-General, Ban Ki Moon. At the heart of the Movement are the countries that have opted to join: so far there are 55. They have created an inclusive multi-stakeholder political movement for nutrition.

3. The stakeholders who support the SUN Countries have organized themselves into four networks (United Nations, Donors, Business and Civil Society) so that they better align their support for country priorities and programmes. These networks respond to the needs and specific gaps identified by national governments.

4. The Movement is steered by a Lead Group that includes 27 high level leaders from SUN Countries, civil society, business, donor agencies, foundations, alliances and international organizations convened by the UN Secretary General. It seeks to ensure the coherence and impact of the Movement, and is accountable for the way it responds to national needs.

5. Since 2012, the SUN Movement Secretariat has developed as a small coordinating mechanism operating 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 in countries to intensify actions and achieve nutrition objectives, is received in a coordinated and coherent way. It also ensures that the Movement's progress is tracked efficiently and communicated clearly.

6. To ensure that the Movement is fit for purpose to contribute to achieving the goal of ending malnutrition, the Lead Group commissioned, in September 2013, an Independent Comprehensive Evaluation which took place in 2014. The evaluation represents an opportunity for the Lead Group to assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the Movement and adjust the priorities, operating modalities and stewardship arrangements accordingly. The findings of the evaluation are now informing a visioning process that seeks to ensure that the Movement is fit for purpose after 2015.

SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund

7. In March 2012 the SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund (SUN Movement MPTF) was established by Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs) [1] and Donors [2]. It was formulated in response to a perceived gap in funding or difficulty in mobilizing funds for country-level platforms for scaling up nutrition, particularly those pertaining civil society alliances.

8. Since its establishment the SUN Movement MPTF has worked along established principles. It has been conceived as catalytic tool to stimulate actions by members of the SUN Movement for scaling up nutrition, especially to catalyse support for SUN governments' plans to enhance and expand nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions. The SUN Movement MPTF has not been designed to be a vertical nutrition fund for large scale investments in food and nutrition security, nor to replace existing funding pathways at country level (both from national budget and from bilateral and multilateral resources). The SUN Movement MPTF has been meant to be used as a small fund of last resort (when other funding is not available) for stakeholders to access small grants through which their engagement in the SUN Movement at country level can be initiated and/or enhanced. As a last resort funding mechanisms any potential recipient is supposed to explore all other funding opportunities before being able to access the SUN Movement MPTF funds. It has also to be proved that a recipient receive additional funding from other sources to be able to sustain the next phase of the project after the catalytic start up being funded by the MPTF comes to an end.

9. The SUN Movement MPTF Logframe with planned results (impact, goal, outcomes and outputs) was established as the central mechanism for assessing the quality and contribution of projects to the overall aims of the SUN Movement. In particular, the theory of change set forth for Window II articulates a virtuous circle of change and synergy that should enhance and align civil society contributions to national level efforts to scale up nutrition. A revised Logframe was later agreed to clarify roles and responsibilities more clearly and to ensure collating data aligned MPTF and donors reporting to minimise duplication.

10. The SUN Movement MPTF has **three funding Windows**:

- a. **Support for initial SUN actions at country level (Window I)**: Facilitate initial actions with SUN Countries for which financial support is not available – including support for the strengthening of multi-stakeholder platforms, stock-taking of nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive activities, or SUN launches that provide opportunities for sharing of experiences amongst key stakeholders in national regional and global SUN meetings.
- b. **Catalytic programmes for countries (Window II)**: Fund SUN Movement partners' participation in SUN country plans.
- c. **Support for global SUN strategic efforts (Window III)**: Fund other initiatives, including the development and outsourcing of strategic pieces of work, such as on resource mobilization and transfer strategies, communications work, triangulation and validation of progress indicators.

11. While the fund is open to governments, UN agencies, civil society groups, other SUN partners and support organization, the vast majority of funds has been allocated since 2012 to support civil society participation and actions for scaling up nutrition (Window II). Since 2012 donors have contributed to the SUN Movement MPTF with a total of USD 10,119,317 [3]. As of May 2015 the SUN Movement MPTF has disbursed USD 9,664,170 for 28 approved projects. This corresponds to approximately 95.50% of the total funds deposited.

- a. **Window I** (USD 962,000) has been utilised to support a pilot project (USD 642,000) led by PROCASUR to improve sharing and learning initiatives between national SUN multi-stakeholder platforms and for a project (USD 320,000) in support to the SUN Movement Community of Practice on Planning, Costing, Implementing and Financing Multi-sectoral Actions for Improved Nutrition.
- b. **Window II** (USD 7,606,115) is providing financial support to civil society actors in 24 countries [4] across Africa, Asia and Latin America. Support has also been granted to the SUN Civil Society Network Secretariat through Window II (USD 1,036,055) 10.24% of the total SUN MPTF funding has been allocated under this window for civil society support, either on network or country specific projects. The Civil Society Alliances in five countries [5] are funded bilaterally by Donors.
- c. **Window III** (USD 60,000) has been used to support the development of the SUN Movement Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework. It will be used to fund the evaluation of the SUN Movement MPTF.

12. In November 2014 the Management Committee approved the extension of the SUN Movement MPTF until 31 December 2016. Currently the SUN Movement Secretariat is working with Participating UN Organizations on those projects who may need to extend the time frames of their projects' implementation after 2015.

Governance arrangements of the SUN Movement MPTF

13. The governance of the SUN Movement MPTF is based on the SUN Lead Group, which provides overall strategic direction to the SUN Movement and hence the priorities of the fund.

14. The Management Committee of the SUN Movement MPTF is the body that takes decisions on fund allocations, based on funding availability, criteria determined by the overall strategic direction set by the SUN Lead Group and the technical evaluation of the SUN Movement Secretariat. Members of the Management Committee include: Coordinator of the SUN Movement (Chair), Participating UN Organizations [6], Donors [7], Administrative Agent as ex officio member (UNDP MPTF Office), and the SUN Movement Secretariat as an ex-officio member. Other organizations and entities involved in the SUN Movement may be invited by the Management Committee to join the meetings as observers such as the SUN Network Facilitators (i.e. UN, Business, Civil Society, Donors and Country Network) and delegated officials from the SUN Lead Group.

15. The SUN Movement Secretariat supports the Management Committee as its Technical Secretariat in developing guidelines for the preparation and submission of proposals for approval by the Management Committee; in reviewing proposals submitted by requesting entities for consistency with agreed SUN Movement principles and SUN Movement MPTF criteria and Logframe; in transmitting proposals to the Management Committee for their review and potential approval; and in assessing and compiling lessons-learned from the programme and initiatives supported. The SUN Movement Secretariat is also responsible for developing and implementing an effective knowledge management system and facilitating independent evaluations, as needed. It is also its responsibility to ensure that policies and strategies decided by the SUN Lead Group are implemented and adhered to.

16. The UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) serves as the Administrative Agent of the SUN Movement MPTF and is responsible for a range of fund management services, including: receipt, administration and management of contributions; transfer of funds approved by the Management Committee to Participating UN Organizations; reporting on the source and use of contributions received; synthesis and consolidation of the individual financial progress reports submitted by each Participating UN Organization for submission to contributors through the Management Committee; and ensuring transparency and accountability of SUN Movement MPTF operations.

17. Participating UN Organizations (UNOPS, WFP, WHO, UNICEF) that have signed the Fund's Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the MPTF Office assume full programmatic and financial accountability for funds transferred to them. Their responsibilities include: preparing and submitting proposals; supervising and overseeing projects financed by the SUN Movement MPTF and providing periodic narrative and financial reporting, in accordance with provisions of the MoU and decisions of the Management Committee.

18. At the global level, the SUN Civil Society Network (CSN) was established to support the formation and evolution of Civil Society Alliances (CSAs) in SUN countries, as well as facilitate communication and coordination across CSAs, and with the broader SUN Movement. Through SUN Movement MPTF Window II's support, the SUN CSN Secretariat has recruited two full time staff **[8]**. The primary purpose of the SUN CSN Secretariat is to encourage the alignment of civil society organizations' strategies, programmes and resources with country plans for scaling-up nutrition. The SUN CSN Secretariat aims to achieve this through strengthening the support available for and capacity of national Civil Society Alliances. To date, the SUN CSN Secretariat has worked very closely with the SUN Movement Secretariat to share information and answer queries by the Management Committee regarding the progress of SUN Movement MPTF Window II projects as well as to share lessons from civil society alliances funded by the SUN Movement MPTF.

2. Purpose and Objectives of The Evaluation

19. The Management Committee of the SUN Movement MPTF agreed to use funds available against Window III to commission an evaluation of the MPTF to take place in the second half of 2015. The evaluation will provide the Management Committee of the SUN Movement MPTF and the Transition Stewardship Team of the SUN Movement with findings, recommendations and fund design options that are expected to assist in identifying the best course of action for the future.

The **purpose** of the evaluation will cover two distinct dimensions:

- a. **Assessing the current SUN Movement MPTF:** Assess whether the current SUN Movement MPTF has met its objective in supporting any of the four strategic objectives [9] of the SUN Movement. It will consider the value added by the SUN Movement MPTF and will capture its major achievements, challenges, institutional knowledge, experiences, and lessons learned by the various stakeholders involved in the operation of the SUN Movement MPTF since its inception.
- b. **Forward looking at the need for catalytic last resort fund:** By focusing on the areas requiring financial support to contribute to the objectives of the SUN Movement (2016-2020), consider future needs for a catalytic last resort fund to support national multi-stakeholder platforms during the next phase of the SUN Movement. These areas for support shall be identified in the revised Strategy of the SUN Movement and Roadmap that will be developed during the same period of the evaluation. The evaluation will as well determine whether a pooled financing mechanisms like the MPTF would be the most appropriate mechanism or whether alternative financing models could be better fit for the purpose and consider the comparative advantage and/or complementarity vis-a-vis newly established financing facilities (e.g. Power of Nutrition, UNITLIFE).

20. The **objectives** of the evaluation are:

Assessing the current SUN Movement MPTF

- a. To determine the extent to which the SUN Movement MPTF funds are proving catalytic for actions to scale up nutrition in-country, with specific attention on the contribution of the SUN Civil Society Alliances.
- b. To assess the validity of the SUN Movement MPTF Theory of Change and Logframe and the extent to which the SUN Movement MPTF has contributed to the changes identified in its Theory of Change and Logframe and to improved alignment of projects funded under the three Windows.
- c. To ascertain what extent the SUN Movement MPTF was (or has been) the most appropriate financing architecture in providing catalytic and last resort grants to SUN Movement.

- d. To ascertain the opportunities and limitations that the current MPTF legal arrangement and governance mechanism has had in supporting the development and implementation of actions for scaling up nutrition and to understand how it compares to alternative sources of financing.

Forward looking of the need for catalytic last resort fund

- a. Based on elements coming from the revised SUN Movement Strategy consider future needs for a catalytic last resort fund during the next phase of the SUN Movement and propose possible support measures (Windows) in line with the revised strategy.
- b. If a similar fund will be considered needed, present several different funding design options based on the analysis of existing systems.
- c. Look at alternative monitoring systems that can capture and evaluate more broadly the different functions, roles and effects and assess the different needs of all stakeholders involved. Consider the need for a strengthened monitoring and evaluation framework for any future pooled funding mechanism.

3. Scope of the Evaluation

21. The evaluation will cover the SUN Movement MPTF duration from March 2012 until the start date of the evaluation (September 2015) having in mind that the new end for the mandate is 31 December 2016.

22. The evaluation will provide both an assessment of the current SUN Movement MPTF as well as a set of clear forward-looking recommendations to inform management decisions in designing the forthcoming (if any) fund mechanism for the SUN Movement and to strengthen the role this mechanism could have in contributing to the new strategy of the SUN Movement (2016-2020). The evaluation will particularly take into consideration and reflect on the position and value of a potential future MPTF in regards to other (existing) funding mechanisms. It will have to reflect the aspirations and concerns of all stakeholders involved including Donors, Participating UN Organization, Implementing Partners, SUN Networks, Civil Society Alliances, SUN Movement Secretariat and the MPTF Office.

23. The evaluation is expected to consider all aspects of the current SUN Movement MPTF and of any alternative fund mechanism(s): architecture and governance structure; objectives and results achieved; working models; decision, fund transfer, indirect cost recovery, implementation and reporting processes; role of the fund within the broader SUN Movement; its efficiency as a catalytic and last resort funding mechanism; its appropriateness in terms of size and the additional benefits/shortfalls if the fund were to be expanded in size.

24. The evaluation will at minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of the current SUN Movement MPTF. The evaluation should

look at the extent to which projects funded through the SUN Movement MPTF have been **relevant** or not to the achievement of any of the four strategic objectives of the SUN Movement Strategy (2012-2015). It should consider the extent to which the SUN Movement MPTF has been an **effective** funding channel to in-country civil society stakeholders and how this can be considered having contributed to the objectives outlined in the SUN Movement MPTF Logframe and to the broader objectives of the SUN Movement. When evaluating the potential impact of CSAs efforts the evaluation team should take into consideration the diversity of funding timeframe (most of CSAs projects lasted for 1 to 2 years, while few others for 3 years). The **efficiency** of the fund architecture should be explored. The evaluation should focus as well on the **sustainability** of the fund in the outcomes that it is trying to achieve. For doing this the evaluation will need to look at the broader picture of funding for national CSAs including the role of International Non-Governmental Organizations in their nurturing and support to them.

25. The evaluation will as well cover the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability when looking at the future (if any) of the SUN Movement MPTF and of alternative pooled financing models that could potentially support the new strategy of the SUN Movement (2016-2020). This analysis should be framed within the current global architecture for development, in particular the context of the Second International Conference for Nutrition and the discussion on the Post 2015 development agenda.

26. The evaluation will not assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of the overall UNDP MPTF as a pooled financing mechanism for development but will rather focus on the SUN Movement MPTF and its role in contributing to the objectives of the SUN Movement. However the evaluation will inevitably have to analyse the fund overall architecture to assess if this pooled financing model will be well placed (or not) to support the next phase of the SUN Movement – should the need for a catalytic last resort fund be identified in the second phase of the SUN Movement.

4. Evaluation Questions

27. Within the broader parameters indicated by this terms of reference it is expected that the evaluation team will propose a revised set of questions to the SUN Movement MPTF Steering Group [10] within the first 2 weeks of the evaluation. Through a consultative process with the Steering Group the set of questions will be agreed and will form the basis for the evaluation. They should cover both dimensions of the evaluation: assessing the current fund and looking at alternative future models.

28. The evaluation criteria that will be used include: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the current SUN Movement MPTF and of any alternative pooled financing model. It will have to encompass the following elements:

- a. The architecture and governance of the fund, including its monitoring and evaluation framework

- b. The role and work of the Management Committee
- c. The role and work of Participating UN Organizations
- d. The role and work of Implementing Partners
- e. The role and work of the SUN CSN Secretariat
- f. The role and work of the SUN Movement Secretariat as MPTF Technical Secretariat
- g. Progress, achievements and challenges by the MPTF funded projects against the three Windows.

29. While Window II will inevitably receive a stronger focus due to the number of projects and share of funding allocated to it, all three Windows should be addressed by the evaluation and gain similar attention in order to reflect well on their respective relevance and their interrelation for impact.

30. The role and work of the MPTF Office while not part of this specific evaluation should be considered within the broader assessment of the architecture and governance of the SUN Movement MPTF.

31. The evaluation, while encompassing the elements above, will consider the following questions when assessing the current SUN Movement MPTF. Similar questions will have to be considered when looking at the future (if any) of the SUN Movement MPTF and of alternative pooled financing models.

Questions of Relevance

- a. To what extent were the SUN Movement MPTF objectives and strategies in the assessment period (2012 – 2015) consistent with the needs of beneficiaries and partners? And to what extent are they still relevant or have they changed with new needs identified?
- b. To what extent has the SUN Movement MPTF and its expected results contributed towards the achievement of any of the four strategic objectives of the SUN Movement?
- c. How has the role and strategic focus of the SUN Movement MPTF been relevant to national actions, strategies, policies towards scaling up nutrition?

Questions on Effectiveness

- a. To what extent has a three Windows fund contributed to the achievement of the SUN Movement MPTF objectives? How have these three Windows been interconnected for impact? To what extent were the objectives achieved/are

likely to be achieved? What have been the effects (positive or negative) of achieved results?

- b. How did the SUN Movement MPTF as a last resort catalytic fund influence national actions for scaling up nutrition and add value to the overall SUN Movement?
- c. How adequate is the SUN Movement MPTF design including its results framework, monitoring and reporting system and theory of change for decision-making and for measuring progress?
- d. What role have the civil society alliances played at country level (e.g. holding other actors accountable, campaigning for policies)? What level of engagement in the policy processes and in the delivery of services have the established alliances had?
- e. Has there been unexpected results of the SUN Movement MPTF funded activities? If so, what have been their key effects on the mechanism and achievement of the four strategic objectives of the SUN Movement?
- f. What factors influenced: a) the motivation for specific interventions supported by the SUN Movement MPTF; b) the role and level of engagement of partners; c) the appropriateness of different implementation modalities chosen; d) the value added and the results achieved?

Questions on Efficiency

- a. How efficient was the organization and management systems of the SUN Movement MPTF especially with relation to the planning of activities, disbursement of funds, implementation, monitoring and reporting of activities, and division of labor? Were activities cost-efficient? Were objectives achieved on time? Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
- b. What is the overall level of satisfaction (with respect to each user's interest) among key stakeholders (particularly including beneficiaries) involved in the SUN Movement MPTF?
- c. What effect did the management and institutional arrangements of the SUN Movement MPTF have in terms of programming, delivery and monitoring of implementation of MPTF funded projects?
- d. What monitoring and reporting procedures were applied (and to what extent were they effective) by SUN Movement MPTF stakeholders to ensure greater accountability?
- e. How effective has been the role of the CSN Secretariat in tracking and supporting progress by civil society alliances funded by the SUN Movement

MPTF? Which are the key factors that underpin the usefulness, strengths and weaknesses of the role of the CSN Secretariat within the SUN Movement MPTF? Which (different if any) role should the CSN Secretariat play in a future pooled financing mechanism supporting the new strategy of the SUN Movement? What should be the accountability lines between the SUN CSN secretariat and the SUN CSAs within any future pool-funding facilities?

Questions on Sustainability

- a. To what extent have the programs and partners considered sustainability of outcomes as part of their decisions and during implementation? How was this concern reflected in the design of the projects, the implementation of activities, the delivery of outputs and the achievements of outcomes? Did the activities promote sustainable changes in attitudes, behaviours or strengthen existing systems aimed at scaling up nutrition beyond the MPTF lifespan?
- b. Have there been program results and activities with a likelihood of continued long-term benefits after MPTF funding ceased? Have the SUN Movement MPTF finances contributed to build capacities? (e.g. to engage with other actors)
- c. To what extent do stakeholders have confidence that they will be able to build on the changes promoted by the SUN Movement MPTF activities?
- d. What has been the commitment of key partners' towards making results and activities sustainable over time?

5. Evaluation Methodology

32. The evaluation team will have the independence and degree of flexibility, within the scope and objectives of this TORs, to define and concentrate on those areas where there is more strengths to be built on and weaknesses to be addressed and to explore in greater depth those issues which are identified as being of critical importance. A Steering Group [11] composed by key representatives of the broader community of stakeholders involved in the SUN Movement MPTF will ensure the quality and independency of the evaluation.

33. The evaluation will be transparent and will be asked to provide information which is considered evidence-based, reliable and useful. The evaluation team is expected to work following a consultative approach ensuring the engagement of all stakeholders through the Steering Group of the SUN Movement MPTF. The SUN Movement Secretariat will provide support to this consultative process by ensuring that regular meetings/calls are organized.

34. The evaluation will seek to obtain data from a range of sources, including desk review and document analyses, interviews, surveys and questionnaires as well as stakeholders consultations both at the level of the governance structure of the SUN

Movement MPTF as well as at the level of in-country recipient projects. It is recommended that different sources of data are accessed and that different stakeholder groups are consulted so as to help the interpretation of a set of data which due to their nature linked mostly to institutional and behavioural change will be critically dependent on the evaluation team judgment. While appreciating the challenge of providing evidence to behavioural changes by in-country actors towards scaling up nutrition the evaluation team will try to provide wherever possible counterfactual evidence of what may or may not have occurred in the absence of the SUN Movement MPTF (through a triangulation of different sources of evidence).

35. Governance analysis. At the inception of the evaluation it will be important to conduct an analysis of the governance architecture and the different partners involved in order to identify, inter alia, the different actors and steps involved in the management of the fund.

36. Documentation desk review. The evaluation team shall maximise the use of existing information and will review all relevant source of information including governance foundation documents, annual progress reports of the MPTF, individual project reports, financial statements, minutes of the Management Committee meetings, and any other documentation deemed relevant for the evaluation. This phase can be supported by interviews with different stakeholders of the SUN Movement MPTF including the SUN Movement Secretariat, PUNOs and the MPTF Office. The evaluation team is asked to consult Annex 1 with a list of relevant documents.

37. Interviews. The evaluation team will collect most of the information from having interviews and consultations with relevant partners. These should be Identified in the inception phase of the assignment and documented. Wherever possible interviews should take place on the phone to reduce travel costs.

38. Surveys. It is recommended that the evaluation team will consider the added value of conducting a survey for the collection of specific additional information and data. Surveys could also be used to validating some findings.

39. Country case studies and country visits. All projects in the three Windows funded by the SUN Movement MPTF should be included in the desk review. The review should consider the implication on funds disbursement, project approval process and timeliness imputable to projects belonging to either the first or the second call for proposals.

40. A **one pager analysis on key achievements and added value of each of the 24 CSAs** funded through the SUN Movement MPTF is to be developed. Key areas to look for these one pagers are: a) five key achievements by the CSAs; b) five ingredients for success in political cultural and social context with link to the SUN Movement processes; c) five obstacles and challenges; d) what has not worked and why?; e) main lessons learnt and recommendations moving forward; f) five key areas the CSAs will focus on and how this connects to strategic priorities of SUN Movement 2.0; g) how useful has the SUN Movement MPTF been to the CSAs and what have been some of the challenges? How have these challenges been overcome? h) have the CSAs explored and / or secured funding to support sustainability of the alliance after the MPTF funding?

41. The scope of the evaluation will not permit the selection of the totality of the MPTF funded projects for an **in-depth analysis** which should be rather conducted on a selected number of case studies where site visits will be done. In addition to the above key areas that should frame the analysis of the 24 CSAs, for the case studies receiving a site visit the evaluation team should pay particular attention at stakeholder dynamics in country and how these have impacted on CSA efforts.

42. It is expected that the evaluation team will suggest which case studies would benefit from a country visit (up to a maximum of 5). When selecting the range of case studies to be looked at more in to depth and to be visited, they should be considered sufficiently representative of the overall fund. The findings from these selected cases will have to be generalized to the totality of the projects therefore the evaluation team will have to be sensible in selecting the cases. It is expected that individual case studies (from Window II [12]) will have to be selected using the following parameters:

- a. Projects representing the geographic distribution of SUN Countries and context diversity (including fragile context and situation and others).
- b. Countries with presence of REACH.
- c. Projects that by the time of the evaluation have established CSA and projects with CSAs in the process of being set up.

43. While selecting the countries to visit the evaluation team is invited to look at the countries selected by the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation (ICE) of the SUN Movement and used for the ICE analysis of the SUN Movement MPTF. [13] To the extent possible the selected CSAs should complement those visited for the ICE (if appropriate). However, other countries should also be selected.

44. It is expected that the methodology as well as the country case studies and country visits will be clearly presented and detailed in the Inception Report. The evaluation team will be solely responsible for the evaluation findings and recommendations. But it is expected that they will consult widely in deriving them, in order to ensure both their evidence base and the potential for follow up. It would be expected that the evaluation would provide more than a fund design option, including its advantages and disadvantages, for the future (if any) of a pooled fund supporting the SUN Movement in its next phase.

45. The evaluation will use a combination of evaluation methods but in any case it will have to build upon the findings of the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the SUN Movement (conducted in 2014) and the vision being developed by the Lead Group for the strategic direction, operational modalities and stewardship arrangements for the Movement after 2015.

46. While this is not an evaluation of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of the UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund as a pooled financial mechanism but rather of the SUN Movement MPTF itself, it will be essential that the evaluation assesses the SUN Movement MPTF within the broader architecture of the MPTF. For this

the evaluation team will have to access any existing evaluations and analysis of the broader MPTF as pooled financial mechanism or of other MPTFs such as the evaluation of the Central Fund for Influenza Action. [14]

6. Evaluation Products and Timetable

40. The evaluation is expected to present findings, conclusions and targeted recommendations that will allow the Transition Stewardship Team (TST) of the SUN Movement and Donors to consider options for catalytic financing mechanisms that could support the updated strategy of the SUN Movement (2016-2020).

41. The key steps for the evaluation exercise include – while not limited to – the following stages:

- Preparatory and inception phase;
- Data and information collection (including country visits);
- Report writing;
- Findings presentation.

42. During the preparatory and inception phase the evaluation team will hold consultations with the Steering Group of the SUN Movement MPTF to define the evaluation purpose and scope. The evaluation team will prepare an **inception report**, within 2 weeks of evaluation start-up, for review by the Steering Group. In preparing the inception report the evaluation team will take into account the considerations listed in the section “methodology” and well as the outcomes of the preparatory phase. The evaluation team is however encouraged to suggest different approaches as considered more appropriate for the scope of this exercise. The inception report will provide a comprehensive road map for the evaluation, the methodology proposed for the evaluation and an outline of:

- a. Exhaustive list of issues and questions to be examined by the evaluation;
- b. Stakeholders to be interviewed;
- c. Countries to visit for case study analysis.

43. During the data and information collection phase the evaluation team will carry out detailed consultation, analysis, interviews, country visits in accordance with the process set forth and agreed in the inception report.

44. An **interim briefing** of key findings to be presented to the SUN Movement Global Gathering (20-21-22 October 2015) where the last Movement-wide consultation on the updated SUN Movement Strategy (2016-2020) will be held. It will have to be delivered in time for translation in French and Spanish. It is expected that the interim briefing will be maximum 3 pages.

45. An **interim report** is expected to be submitted to the Steering Group by the end of October 2015.

46. The interim report will outline the principal preliminary findings, including hypothesis and several options for broad recommendations on the future need for a catalytic last resort fund and on how such a fund (MPTF or an alternative model) may be relevant to the next phase of the SUN Movement. It is expected that the interim report will be maximum 10 pages including a short executive summary (2 pages). The interim report is expected to be shared for quality check in advance with the Steering Group and in time for translation.

47. The report writing phase will be based on the analysis conducted, the country visits and the feedback received by the Steering Group. It will have as well to be recalibrated by taking into account the outcomes of the consultations held at the SUN Movement Global Gathering. **[15]** The evaluation team will prepare a draft (zero) of the **final report** to be reviewed for quality check by the Steering Group. The evaluation team will revise it if there are any comments. A final draft will be made available to the Management Committee by the first week of January 2016. While a draft will be offered to the Steering Group for comments the final report of the evaluation will remain under the entire responsibility of the evaluation team. It is expected that the final report will be maximum 20 to 30 (plus annexes) and will include an executive summary of 2 to 3 pages summarizing key findings, conclusions and recommendations.

48. The evaluation team will be asked to present the findings of the evaluation to stakeholders of the Movement in several occasions including – but not limited to: SUN Movement Global Gathering – TBC (20-21-22 October 2015), calls of the SUN Movement Government Focal Points (January 2016 TBC) and a call of the Management Committee (January 2016). It will be also asked to present the findings to the Transition Stewardship Team if requested. The evaluation team will be asked to prepare an evaluation brief summarizing the main conclusions and findings for use in stakeholder presentations together with a PowerPoint presentation. It will be asked that the evaluation team makes itself available to reply to any queries or request for clarification during the month of January 2016.

49. All deliverables will be as concise as possible. The reports will be submitted in Standard English **[16]**. 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. When submitting the final report, the evaluation team is required to provide an “audit trail”, detailing how all received comments on the draft findings have (or have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report. This audit trail should also include those issues agreed for analysis in the inception report which could not be addressed satisfactorily in the course of the evaluation – the evaluation team should provide a satisfactory justification for this. The consultant will be flexible in undertaking a series of revisions on the text (for all materials that are listed above) that will lead to sound final drafts. If, in the estimation of the Steering Group, any of the materials do not meet these required standards, then the consultant will, at their own expense, undertake the editing that is necessary to bring them to the required standards.

50. The total duration of the evaluation is estimated over approximately 4.5/5 months for a total of roughly 60 to 70 working days each consultant. The evaluation is

expected to start the first week of September to be able to submit the final report by the first week of January 2016. Payment modality will be linked to the submission of key deliverables (Inception Report, Interim Report, Final Report and Finding Presentations). A more detailed timeframe is expected to be presented in the Inception Report including a contingency plan should delays be encountered during the evaluation period.

Activity / Completion Date

- **Inception Report to the Steering Group:** Two weeks from start-up of evaluation
- **Interim Briefing of key findings for the SUN Movement Global Gathering (20-21-22 October 2015):** 9 October 2015
- **Interim Report to the Steering Group:** 30 October 2015
- **Draft Final Report to the Steering Group:** 14 December 2015
- **Final Report to SUN Movement MPTF Management Committee:** 4 January 2016
- **Findings presentations (ad hoc) – including evaluation brief and PPP:** October 2015 and January 2016

7. Evaluation Ethics

51. The evaluation will be undertaken by an independent evaluation team in accordance with the parameters defined in this TOR and within the framework of the UNDP Evaluation Policy [17] and the United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards [18].

8. Implementation Arrangements

52. The principal responsibility of the evaluation stays with the Management Committee of the SUN Movement MPTF.

53. A **Steering Group** will be appointed by the Management Committee. It will be chaired by the Coordinator of the SUN Movement and will consist of representatives from the SUN Movement MPTF donors, PUNOs, the SUN Donor Network and the Steering Group of the Civil Society Network.

54. Steering Group members will support the evaluation team in assuring the independence, adequacy, methodological soundness and overall quality of the evaluation. The Steering Group will play an important role in providing strategic, methodological and substantive inputs to the evaluation process, as well as peer review for the key outputs, including the inception, interim and final report. The Steering Group will ensure that the final report bases its claims on evidence, that the findings, conclusions and recommendations are grounded in solid analysis, that the key messages are communicated effectively, and that the report has a clear strategic focus with

materials to inform decision-making at various level. This Group will also overview the finalization of this TOR and the consultants' recruitment process. The Steering Group will report to the Management Committee periodically.

55. The **SUN Movement Secretariat** will facilitate communication with stakeholders, gather documents, and provide day to day support to the evaluation team and Steering Group.

56. One staff of the SUN Movement Secretariat will act as the **Evaluation Manager** serving as the liaison between the Steering Group and the Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Manager will report directly to the Chair of the Steering Group. The Evaluation Manager will facilitate and guarantee a smooth and timely implementation of the evaluation and help to manage and address any differences of opinion that may arise between the evaluation team and the stakeholders, while protecting the agreed independence of the evaluators and the Steering Group.

57. It will be essential that throughout the evaluation the work of members of the Steering Group, of the SUN Movement Secretariat and of other stakeholders reached out by the evaluation team is not disrupted by the evaluation. This will have to be carefully considered and taken into account by the evaluation team.

Annex 1

List of all relevant documents:

- Governance Documents: Memorandum of Understanding between Participating UN Organizations and the United Nations Development Programme regarding the Operational Aspects of a Scaling Up Nutrition Movement (SUN Movement) Multi-Partner Trust Fund [http://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/SUN-MOU-signed_WFP_WHO_UNICEF_UNOPS.pdf]
- Management Committee Terms of Reference and Rules for Procedures [http://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/SUN_MPTF_Management_Committee_TOR_and_RoPs-REV_May2013.pdf]
- Supplementary Guidance Note on Roles and Responsibilities [http://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/150528_SUN-MPTF-Supplementary-Guidance-Note_FINAL.pdf]
- GATEWAY [<http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/SUN00>]
- SUN Movement website [<http://scalingupnutrition.org/resources-archive/sun-mptf>]
- 2012, 2013 and 2014 Annual Reports of the SUN Movement MPTF [<http://scalingupnutrition.org/resources-archive/sun-mptf>]
- Minutes of the Management Committee Meetings [<http://scalingupnutrition.org/resources-archive/sun-mptf>]
- Individual projects [<http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/SUN00>]
- Transfer of funds tracking document (available upon request to the SUN Movement Secretariat)
- Final Report (with Annexes) of the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the SUN Movement [[http://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/SUN_ICE_FullReport-All\(1-5-15\).pdf](http://scalingupnutrition.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/SUN_ICE_FullReport-All(1-5-15).pdf)]
- Visioning exercise of the SUN Movement [Update available upon request to the SUN Movement Secretariat. Information available also at <http://scalingupnutrition.org/>]
- 2012-2015 Strategy of the SUN Movement and its Road Map [<http://scalingupnutrition.org/resources-archive>]
- SUN Movement Annual Progress Reports [available at <http://scalingupnutrition.org/resources-archive>]
- SUN Civil Society Network blog [<http://suncivilsociety.net/wix.com/suncsnblog>]

- SUN Civil Society Network web page of the SUN website [<http://scalingupnutrition.org/the-sun-network/civil-society-network>]
- A business case on funding to CSAs developed by SUN SCN Secretariat (currently as a draft - available upon request to the SCN Secretariat)

End Notes

- [1] WFP, UNOPS, WHO. UNICEF joint later.
- [2] Department for International Development (DFID), IrishAid, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
- [3] This includes Interest and Investment Income from Fund
- [4] Bangladesh, Burundi, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Kenya, Kyrgyz Rep., Lao PDR, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Zimbabwe.
- [5] Ethiopia, Pakistan, Tanzania, Togo, Zambia.
- [6] UNOPS, WFP, WHO, UNICEF
- [7] Department for International Development (DFID), IrishAid, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
- [8] The CSN Secretariat is referred to as the 'Global CSO network' in MPTF documents
- [9] **Strategic Objective 1:** Creating an enabling political environment, with strong in-country leadership, and a shared space where stakeholders align their activities and take joint responsibility for scaling up nutrition; **Strategic Objective 2:** Establishing best practices for scaling up proven interventions, including the adoption of effective laws and policies; **Strategic Objective 3:** Aligning actions around high quality and well-costed country plans, with an agreed results framework and mutual accountability; and **Strategic Objective 4:** Increasing resources towards coherent aligned approaches. (Please see the SUN Movement Strategy -2012-2015)
- [10] See section "Implementation Arrangements" for more information about the Steering Group
- [11] See section "Implementation Arrangements" for more information about the Steering Group
- [12] Bangladesh, Burundi, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Kenya, Kyrgyz Rep., Lao PDR, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Zimbabwe
- [13] Guatemala, Mozambique, Senegal, Tanzania, Bangladesh
- [14] This level of information will have to be accessed to through the MPTF Office
- [15] It is expected that the consultants will join the SUN Movement Global Gathering in Milano (20-21-22 October 2015) – especially the sessions dedicated to the new Strategy.
- [16] http://www.un.org/depts/OHRM/sds/lcp/English/resources_un.html The translation of the evaluation deliverables in English, Spanish, Russian, Arabic and Portuguese will be handled by the SUN Movement Secretariat but this will have to be taken into account in the evaluation timeframe.
- [17] <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml>
- [18] <http://www.uneval.org/document/foundation-documents>

Annex B Inception Phase questions and interviewees

Inception interview questions

- What are the 2 or 3 most important questions which you think the evaluation should answer?
- Are there particular SUN MPTF funded projects which you would be most interested to have evaluated in depth? Are there any of lower priority? If so, why?
- Do you have any suggestions on the evaluation methodology and work plan?
- Do you have any views on the achievements, strengths and weaknesses of any of the SUN MPTF funded projects?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of how the SUN MPTF has operated?
- What future do you envisage for the SUN MPTF?
- Other issues you would like to raise.

Inception Interviewees

Surname	Names	Gender	Organisation	Job title	Role in SUN Movement	Interviewer	Date of interview
Lasbennes	Florence	F	SUN Movement Secretariat	Chief of Staff	SMS	Chris & Nick	4 & 8/9/15
Gaino	Elena	F	SUN Movement Secretariat	Administrator	SMS Administrator	Chris & Nick	04/09/2015
Akoto-Danso	Kwame	M	SUN Movement Secretariat	Policy Adviser	SMS	Chris & Nick	04/09/2015
Siddle	Ben	M	Irish Aid	Policy Lead - Nutrition	MPTF MC & Evaluation SG	Chris	10/09/2015
Heeb	Marlene	F	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	Programme Officer	MPTF MC & Evaluation SG	Nick	10/09/2015
Lieberum	Maren	F	GIZ	Nutrition	Donor Network Facilitator	Chris	14/09/2015
Nabarro	David	M	UNDP	UNSG SR on Food Security and Nutrition	SUN Movement Coordinator (out going)	Chris & Nick	15/09/2015
Aleshina	Olga	F	UNDP	MPTF - Project Manager	MPTF MC & Evaluation SG	Nick	15/09/2015
Green	Tanya	F	DfID	Project Manager	MPTF MC & Evaluation SG	Nick	15/09/2015
Arnold	Tom	M	SUN Movement Secretariat	SUN Coordinator ad interim	SUN Movement Coordinator ad interim	Chris	16/09/2015
Blanchard	Claire	F	Civil Society Network	CSN Network Facilitator	CSN Network Facilitator	Nick	16/09/2015
Geniez	Perrine	F	World Food Programme	Nutrition Programme and Policy Officer	WFP MPTF focal person (support to Martin Bloem)	Chris	18/09/2015

Annex C SUN MPTF chronology

It is expected that this chronology will be further refined as the evaluation proceeds.

Year	Month	Event
2012	February	Standard Administrative Arrangement for Multi-Partner Trust Fund Using Pass-Through Fund Management: Memorandum of Understanding between Participating UN Organizations and the United Nations Development Programme regarding the Operational Aspects of a Scaling Up Nutrition Movement (SUN Movement) Multi-Partner Trust Fund.
2012	March	Start Date: The SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) was officially established by Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs, namely UNOPs, WHO and WFP) and contributing partners. It works as a subsidiary means to provide catalytic support for priority actions by SUN Movement stakeholders.
2012	July	Management Committee (MC) Meeting: Key decisions on MPTF Terms Of Reference and Rules of Procedure.
2012	August	Management Committee Meeting: Funding allocations were agreed as follows: Window II: USD 3,745,000 for 9 Civil Society Alliances. Proposals from Zambia and Tanzania were funded in-country by bilateral donors. USD 535,000 was allocated to the CSN Secretariat. Window III: USD 60,000 to MDF Consultancy for the development of the SUN Movement M&E Baseline Report.
2012	September	The Terms of Reference of the MPTF state the purpose of the Fund as follows: The SUN Movement MPTF is designed to ensure that catalytic grants reach governments, UN agencies, civil society groups, other SUN partners and support organizations. The SUN MPTF will enable partners to contribute finances that will facilitate the development and implementation of government or stakeholder actions for scaling up nutrition within the parameters of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement's Strategy as approved in September 2012 and its Road Map.
2012	December	Management Committee Meeting: The MC agrees on the following funding allocations: USD 350,000 to OMAES in Mali; USD 350,000 to Ghana Alliance against Hunger and Malnutrition in Ghana; USD 500.000 to Save the Children UK for Global SUN CS proposal. The total allocation of funding equivalent to USD \$1,200,000 under Window 2 of the SUN MPTF with additional 7% to be charged by Participating Organizations for their oversight function.

Year	Month	Event
2013	April	Bangladesh: (through the CSA via WFP) has received one of the biggest grants to date from the MPTF. This funding, available from April 2013 to December 2015, has strengthened the dynamism and networking of the CSA. From the secretariat at BRAC the CSA has been active in advocacy and networking, for example on breastfeeding. The CSA is also taking part in the development of a national advocacy and communication strategy on nutrition.
2013	May	Management Committee Meeting: The MPTF Office and the SMS Secretariat incorporates suggestions by members of the Management Committee into the final SUN MPTF progress report for fiscal year 2012. The report was circulated to members of the Committee by the chair in its final version and published on all relevant websites. It was clarified that REACH could not be a PUNO.
2013	May	The 2012 Annual Report: states that during the reporting period covered by this report, the SUN Movement MPTF received a total of US\$ 4.71 million in total contributions from three contributors. In December 2012 the MPTF Office, as Administrative Agent, transferred a total of US\$ 2.14 million to Participating UN Organizations for approved projects. These funds enabled civil society alliances to start their work in 5 countries.
2013	May	Mozambique: MPTF funding was provided to Mozambique to the tune of USD 424.000. The funding is channelled through a local nutrition NGO, ANSA. The objectives of the project are to: create a CS network which has active participation of its members; advocate for nutrition – for the theme as well as for resources; monitoring the Government and also for aligning CSO priorities with those of the Government; and sensitization – listening to the beneficiaries and doing the feedback into national processes.
2013	July	Guatemala: SUN approved a fund of USD 428,000 through MPTF to strengthen Scaling Up Nutrition through civil society in Guatemala. The funding is targeted at: strengthening monitoring of the nutrition response by CS; developing a strategy for the civil society response; putting in place a mobilization and information campaign about the 1000 day window. The MPTF funding is channelled to Save the Children Guatemala to manage on behalf of CS. Stakeholders stressed the importance of a stronger and more unified CS engagement. From the engagement with CS the evaluation team was left with strong impression however, that the approach to the use of the MPTF funding is to deal with it as another project. The communication component was being used, among other things, for the production of glossy materials on SUN and the CS involvement.

Year	Month	Event
2013	October	Call for Proposals: Eighty-three applications were received by the SMS. Sixteen were taken to the Management Committee, twelve were approved, some were asked to provide more information.
2013	November	Management Committee Meeting: The MC decided to allocate: Window I: USD 642,000 to PROCASUR Corporation for two “Learning Routes”. Window II: USD 2,985,407 to 11 CSAs and an additional USD 321,000 to the CSN Secretariat.
2013	December	UNICEF joined became a PUNO and a revised SUN MPTF MoU signed.
2014	March	Management Committee Meeting: The MC approved: Window II: US662, 772 to 3 CSAs.
2014	May	The 2013 Annual Report: presents the MPTF Log Frame and Window II Theory of Change. ⁴ The key areas of change identified in the Window II Theory of Change are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinated Civil Society Alliances (CSAs) in SUN countries; 2. CSAs advocate effectively; 3. CSAs participate in national platforms for scaling up nutrition; 4. CSAs contribute to better accountability in SUN countries; and 5. The collective of CSAs are a functioning learning network (i.e. the global SUN Civil Society Network).
2014	July	Management Committee Meeting: Updates on the funding balance of SUN Movement MPTF. Mapping of the internal due diligence for the funds disbursements took place around that time (exact date to be checked)
2014	November	Supplementary Guidance Note on Rules and Procedures was drafted and subsequently approved in early 2015.
2014	November	Management Committee Meeting: This was the first face to face meeting of the MC. It was decided that a comprehensive, independent evaluation of the SUN MPTF would be carried out in 2015.

⁴ As the majority of projects are funded through Window II, only a brief summary of developments in Windows I and III is presented (with no theories of change) in the annual report.

Year	Month	Event
2015	January	<p>Management Committee Meeting: It was agreed to:</p> <p>Window I: allocate US\$ 320,000 of MPTF resources to support SUN countries with the project “Addressing gaps on multisectoral costing and financial tracking for nutrition” through the Community of Practice 1 on Planning, Costing, Implementing and Financing Multi-Sectoral Actions for Improved Nutrition.</p> <p>Window II: the proposal “Mobilizing Civil Societies to Scale Up Nutrition in Nigeria” with the condition that the additional information requested in the Assessment Fiche is provided and that all Management Committee’s considerations are addressed.</p>
2015	May	<p>Management Committee Meeting: The MC approves the Terms of Reference of the evaluation of the SUN Movement MPTF with the requested changes and with a contingency budget of USD 25,000 on top of the initial provision of USD 200,000. The Management Committee appoints a Steering Group chaired by the Coordinator of the SUN Movement and consisting of representatives from the current SUN Movement MPTF donors, the facilitator of the SUN Donor Network, one representative from the Steering Group of the SUN Civil Society Network and one representative from the Participating UN Organizations (WFP). The SUN Movement Secretariat is requested by the Management Committee to work with its administering agency (UNOPS) on the recruitment of the evaluation team</p>
2015	May	<p>The 2014 Annual Report: states that, as of December 2014, the Management Committee of the SUN Movement MPTF allocated a total of USD 8,951,172 (approximately 89% of the total deposits) to the three Windows which compose the MPTF:</p> <p>Window I - Support for initial SUN actions at country level: USD 642,000 for a project to develop a learning and sharing programme across stakeholders of the SUN Movement.</p> <p>Window II - Catalytic programmes for countries: USD 7,393,172 for 23 projects to support in-country civil society participation and actions for scaling up nutrition and USD 856,000 to support the costs of the Secretariat of the SUN Civil Society Network.</p> <p>Window III - Support for global SUN strategic efforts: USD 60,000 for one project to develop the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework of the SUN Movement.</p>
2015	December	Original end date of the MPTF
2016	December	<p>End Date: is based on the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and constitutes the last date for contributions and project approvals. If the Steering Committee decides to extend the end date, then it will be defined as such. Consequent to the grant extension decision, most CSA/CSO projects between mid-2015 and current period are under the process of submitting requests for no cost extensions.</p>

Annex D MPTF Financial Tables

Funding Status - SUN Movement Fund

Data refreshed 10 Sep 2015 7:00 AM GMT

Funding Status as of 2015, values in US\$

Funds with Administrative Agent

Deposits	10,087,658.20
Interest and Investment Income (from Fund)	31,658.51
Interest (from Participating Organizations)	0.00
Total source of funds	10,119,316.71
Transferred to Participating Organizations	9,664,170.05
Refunds from Participating Organizations	-99.90
Administrative Agent Fee	100,876.58
Direct Cost	0.00
Bank Charges	423.94
Total use of funds	9,765,370.67
Balance with Administrative Agent	353,946.04
As a percentage of contributions	3.5%

Funds with Participating Organizations

Transferred to Participating Organizations	9,664,170.05
Total resources	9,664,170.05
Participating Organizations' Expenditure	5,920,548.58
Refunds from Participating Organizations	99.90
Total expenses	5,920,648.48
Balance with Participating Organizations	3,743,521.57
As a percentage of transfers	38.7%
Total Balance of Funds	4,097,467.61
As a percentage of contributions	40.6%

MPTF Projects

Data as of 10 Sep 2015 10:00 AM GMT

All amounts in US\$

Fund: SUN Movement Fund

Organization	Approved budget	Net Funded Amount	Transfers	Refunds	Expenditure	Delivery rate
WHO	1,048,600	1,048,600	1,048,600	0	403,276	38.5%
UNICEF	1,656,543	1,656,543	1,656,543	0	407,399	24.6%
UNOPS	2,230,255	2,230,155	2,230,255	-100	1,803,965	80.9%
WFP	4,728,772	4,728,772	4,728,772	0	3,305,910	69.9%

Contributors/Partners Contributions

Data as of 10 Sep 2015 10:00 AM GMT

Covering from 2012 to 2015

Fund: SUN Movement Fund

Start date: 2012

End date: 2015

Contributor/Partner	Commitments	Deposits	Deposit rate
DEPARTMENT FOR INT'L DEVELOPMENT (DFID)	5,860,090.6	5,860,090.6	100.0%
IRISH AID	429,485.0	429,485.0	100.0%
SWISS AGY FOR DEVELOPMENT & COOPERATION	3,798,082.6	3,798,082.6	100.0%

SUN Movement Fund - Projects by Country

Data as of 10 Sep 2015 10:00 AM GMT

All amounts in US\$

Covering from Jan 2012 to Dec 2015

	Approved budget	Net Funded Amount	Expenditure
SUN Movement Fund	9,664,170	9,664,070	5,920,549
Countries			
Bangladesh	535,000	535,000	384,105
Projects			
00084692 SUN 02/BGD/001 "Civil Society"	535,000	535,000	384,105
Burundi	209,059	209,059	106,850
Projects			
00090070 SUN 02/BDI/027 Strengthen CS r	209,059	209,059	106,850
El Salvador	299,600	299,600	113,858
Projects			
00088541 SUN 02/SAL/013 CSO mobilizatio	299,600	299,600	113,858
Ghana	374,500	374,500	312,200
Projects			
00085325 SUN 02/GHA/002 "Civil Society"	374,500	374,500	312,200
Guatemala	428,000	428,000	148,217
Projects			
00085723 SUN 02/GUA/003 "Civil Society"	428,000	428,000	148,217
Guinea	289,000	289,000	134,542
Projects			
00089417 SUN 02/GIN/019 Civil Society M	289,000	289,000	134,542
Kenya	299,600	299,600	72,557
Projects			
00089284 SUN 02/KEN/018 Mobilizing Civi	299,600	299,600	72,557
Kyrgyzstan	235,400	235,400	92,968
Projects			
00089285 SUN 02/KGZ/020 Structural Supp	235,400	235,400	92,968
Lao People's Democratic Rep	267,500	267,500	179,241
Projects			
00089650 SUN 02/LAO/015 CSO Alliance	267,500	267,500	179,241
Madagascar	299,600	299,600	141,100
Projects			
00089561 SUN 02/MDG/023 Civil Society P	299,600	299,600	141,100
Malawi	428,000	428,000	330,617
Projects			
00084721 SUN 02/MWI/004 "Civil Society"	428,000	428,000	330,617

Mali		374,500	374,500	373,422
Projects				
00085562	SUN 02/MLI/005 Civil Society	374,500	374,500	373,422
Mozambique		428,000	428,000	389,277
Projects				
00084693	SUN 02/MOZ/006 "Advocacy"	428,000	428,000	389,277
Myanmar		224,700	224,700	224,700
Projects				
00089099	SUN 02/MNM/016 Civil Society A	224,700	224,700	224,700
Nepal		428,000	428,000	292,921
Projects				
00087074	SUN 02/NPL/007 "Civil Society"	428,000	428,000	292,921
Niger		428,000	428,000	299,102
Projects				
00084722	SUN 02/NER/008 Sensibilisation	428,000	428,000	299,102
Nigeria		212,943	212,943	0
Projects				
00094057	SUN 02/NGA/026 Mobilizing&Str	212,943	212,943	0
Peru		278,200	278,200	154,099
Projects				
00088585	SUN 02/PER/014 Childhood Nutri	278,200	278,200	154,099
Rwanda		240,750	240,750	109,216
Projects				
00090332	SUN 02/RWA/024 Coordinated CSO	240,750	240,750	109,216
Senegal		212,963	212,963	128,002
Projects				
00090021	SUN 02/SEN/025 Gouvernance	212,963	212,963	128,002
Sierra Leone		299,600	299,600	107,332
Projects				
00089470	SUN 02/SLE/022 Mobilised Civil	299,600	299,600	107,332
Sri Lanka		235,400	235,400	133,640
Projects				
00089100	SUN 02/LKA/017 Civil Society A	235,400	235,400	133,640
Uganda		321,000	321,000	141,200
Projects				
00084723	SUN 02/UGA/010 CivSoc Cap Stre	321,000	321,000	141,200
United Nations		2,058,055	2,057,955	1,400,024
Projects				
00089227	SUN 01/GLO/001 PROCASUR	642,000	642,000	580,437
00094562	SUN 01/GLO/002	320,000	320,000	0
00086995	SUN 02/GLO/012 "Civil Society"	1,036,055	1,036,055	759,687
00088016	SUN 03/Monitoring & Evaluation	60,000	59,900	59,900
Zimbabwe		256,800	256,800	151,358
Projects				
00089316	SUN 02/ZWE/021 Supporting Civi	256,800	256,800	151,358

Annex E Stakeholder Analysis

The stakeholder matrix presented in this annex is intended to ensure that all relevant parties are kept in view throughout the process of the evaluation, as well as to guide the selection of interviewees and survey recipients. The matrix is not intended as an exhaustive list of stakeholders nor as a comprehensive interviewee list. The names of interviewees will be completed early during the 1st phase of data collection.

Subject of evaluation		Stakeholder groups	Individuals
Projects	CSA projects	CSA member organisations CSA Executive Committees CSA Secretariats MPTF Implementing Partner PUNO (global and country levels) SUN government focal point Other SUN Networks CSN Secretariat CSN Steering Group SMS	
	CSN Secretariat	CSN Secretariat Implementing Partner (Save the Children UK) PUNO (UNOPS) CSN Steering Group CSN members, especially CSAs SMS Lead Group MPTF MC Other SUN Networks (UN, Donor, Business)	
	Learning routes	PROCASUR Learning Route Participants SMS MPTF MC PUNO (UNOPS)	
	Costing & financial tracking workshops	Members of COP 1 SMS MPTF MC Participants in workshops PUNO (Unicef)	
	M&E Baseline report	Authors PUNO (UNOPS) SMS MPTF MC SUN government focal points	
Global SUN MPTF governance	MPTF Management Committee	MPTF MC SMS	
	SMS	MPTF Office PUNOs	
	MPTF Office	Implementing Partners	
Future catalytic, last resort mechanisms	Other global funding mechanisms	Power of Nutrition UNITLIFE FAO WHO Donors	

Annex F Evaluation Questions

1. Evaluation of current SUN MPTF
1.1. What have been the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of MPTF funded projects?
RELEVANCE
1.1.1. To what extent were / are the MPTF role, objectives and strategies relevant to the needs of beneficiaries, partners, national policies, plans etc.? To what extent were the intended MPTF objectives, outcomes etc. appropriate?
1.1.2. Did the MPTF fund the projects most relevant to the SUN Strategic Objectives (SOs) and to national policies, plans and frameworks? Were the funded projects the best use of funds?
EFFECTIVENESS
1.1.3. To what extent have funded projects been successful in achieving the objectives of their TORs? (E.g. Did CSA projects increase CSO engagement in nutrition? Did CSOs influence the way nutrition was being addressed by decision makers at national and sub national levels? Did increased engagement of decision makers lead to better actions for nutrition?)
1.1.4. Were there any unexpected results of MPTF funded projects? If so, what have been their key effects in relation to the four strategic objectives of the SUN Movement?
1.1.5. To what extent have overall objectives of the MPTF been achieved?
1.1.6. To what extent have MPTF funded projects contributed towards the achievement of any of the four strategic objectives of the SUN Movement? What has been the added value of the MPTF to the SUN Movement? Would any of the results have been achieved without MPTF funding?
EFFICIENCY
1.1.7. To what extent were project activities implemented on time? Were funds spent on time? If not, why not?
1.1.8. Would other methods of project implementation have been more efficient?
1.1.9. What is the quality of project monitoring, evaluation and reporting?
1.1.10. Were project activities cost-efficient?
SUSTAINABILITY
1.1.11. To what extent have MPTF funds been catalytic and last resort?

1.1.12. Have there been project results and activities with a likelihood of continued long-term benefits after MPTF funding ceases?
1.1.13. Have the SUN Movement MPTF finances contributed to build capacities? (e.g. to engage with other actors)
COVERAGE
1.1.14. What was the coverage of catalytic funding needs within the SUN Movement? I.e. was the size of the fund adequate in relation to the catalytic, last resort funding needs of SUN stakeholders?
COHERENCE
1.1.15. How coherent were MPTF funded projects with each other? Were there any synergies, e.g. through cross learning?
1.1.16. How coherent were the projects with national nutrition strategies and plans and/or the SUN Movement global strategy and road map
1.2. What factors have determined the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of MPTF funded projects?
COUNTRY / PROJECT LEVEL
1.2.1. The role and work of Implementing Partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Did the IP make funds available efficiently? ● Did they play their role effectively? ● Were there alternative options? ● Which were the main challenges faced? How were they addressed?
1.2.2. The role of other project stakeholders at national level (e.g. CSA Executive Committees, CSA Secretariats, CSA members etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Were fund governance arrangements clear amongst project stakeholders? ● Did other project stakeholders have the commitment and capacity to implement the project effectively, efficiently etc.? ● What % of the overall project budget was covered by MPTF funds?
1.2.3. The role and work of Participating UN Organisations at country level (taking into account the roles and responsibilities agreed in the MoU) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Did they make funds available efficiently? ● Did they play an appropriate and effective role? What added value did they provide? Did they help resolve any problems quickly within their remit and resource availability? ● Were there alternative options to channelling funds through PUNOs? (E.g. direct to IPs). If yes, was the use of PUNOs a good decision? ● Which were the factors affecting their ability to play their role well? (e.g. the indirect support costs, internal systems and procedures) How were challenges addressed?
1.2.4. The role of other (non-project) stakeholders at national level (e.g. SUN government focal points, REACH facilitators, other members of national multi-stakeholder platforms) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What opportunities for engagement in policy processes and in the delivery of services have CSAs been provided?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What impact did other stakeholders have on the project?
<p>GLOBAL LEVEL – MPTF GOVERNANCE AND ADMINSTRATIVE STRUCTURES</p>
<p>1.2.5. The role and work of PUNOs at global level (taking into account the roles and responsibilities agreed in the MoU)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did HQ disburse funds to country offices efficiently? • Did they play an appropriate and effective role? What added value did they provide? Did they help resolve any problems quickly within their remit and resource availability? • Were there alternative options to channelling funds through PUNOs? (E.g. direct to IPs). If yes, was the use of PUNOs a good decision? • Which were the factors affecting their ability to play their role well? (e.g. the indirect support costs, internal systems and procedures) How were challenges addressed?
<p>1.2.6. The role and work of the MPTF Office in the administration of SUN MPTF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did they make funds available efficiently? • Did the MPTF Office ensure adequate accounting of funds?
<p>1.2.7. The role and work of the SMS as MPTF Technical Secretariat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the MPTF Technical Secretariat play its role effectively and efficiently?
<p>1.2.8. The role and work of the SUN MPTF Management Committee (MC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were funding decisions appropriate to the needs of SUN Movement stakeholders? • What factors influenced funding decisions? • Were MC decisions timely?
<p>1.2.9. The overall design, architecture and governance of the MPTF, including its M&E framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How adequate is the SUN Movement MPTF design and implementation? (including its working models; decisions, fund transfers, indirect cost recovery, implementation processes, results framework, monitoring and reporting system, logframe and theory of change for decision-making and for measuring progress? How valid is the Window II theory of change?) • Was the communication system and flow adequate between structures at different levels? • How efficient were the organization and management systems of the SUN Movement MPTF especially with relation to the planning of activities, disbursement of funds, implementation, monitoring and reporting of activities, and division of labour? • What effect did the management and institutional arrangements of the SUN Movement MPTF have in terms of programming, delivery and monitoring of implementation of MPTF funded projects? Was it necessary / appropriate to have separate governance arrangements (i.e. MC) to SUN Movement? • To what extent was the SUN MPTF the most appropriate financing mechanism to provide catalytic, last resort grants? What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the current MPTF legal arrangement and governance mechanism in comparison to other sources of funding?
<p>OTHER GLOBAL LEVEL STRUCTURES</p>
<p>1.2.10. The role and work of the global SUN Civil Society Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effective has the CSN Secretariat been in tracking and supporting progress by civil

<p>society alliances funded by the SUN Movement MPTF? Which are the key factors that underpin the usefulness, strengths and weaknesses of the role of the CSN Secretariat within the SUN Movement MPTF? Which (different if any) role should the CSN Secretariat play in a future pooled financing mechanism supporting the new strategy of the SUN Movement? What should be the accountability lines between the SUN CSN secretariat and the SUN CSAs within any future pooled funding facilities?</p>
<p>1.2.11. The role and work of MPTF donors, other donors and the SUN Donor Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were adequate funds made available to meet catalytic, last resort funding needs within the SUN Movement?
<p>1.2.12. Did other global SUN networks (UN and Business) contribute to the achievements of MPTF funded projects?</p>
<p>1.2.13. The role and work of the SUN Lead Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What role, if any, was played by the SUN Lead Group? Was it effective?
<p>2. What is the future need for a catalytic last resort fund?</p>
<p>2.1. Based on the SUN Movement 2.0 strategy and road map, what are the future needs and gaps for catalytic, last resort funding (2016-2020)? Should a pooled fund support innovation and respond to current gaps (such as advocacy, sustain CSAs efforts) as opposed to being purely catalytic?</p>
<p>2.2. What are the opportunities and constraints for accessing funds at country level? (E.g. from national governments, private foundations, international donors, INGOs etc.)</p>
<p>2.3. What is the likelihood, desirability and sustainability of funds being made available for SUN activities through alternative regional or global funding mechanisms (e.g. Power of Nutrition, UNITLIFE)?</p>
<p>2.4. What are the comparative relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of different pooled financing options, including the MPTF?</p>
<p>2.5. What are the design options for any future fund? (Including governance arrangements, support measures (windows), options for minimising the number of layers through which funds must filter between donor and end user.)</p>
<p>2.6. How could the monitoring and evaluation framework of any future pooled fund be improved?</p>

Annex G Bibliography

SUN general

Mokoro Limited 2015	Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the Scaling Up Nutrition Movement: Final Report. Main Report and Annexes. Mokoro Limited. 1 May 2015.
SMS	Visioning Exercise of the SUN Movement [update available upon request to the SUN Movement Secretariat. Information available also at http://scalingupnutrition.org]
SMS 2012a	Sun Movement: Revised Road Map. SUN Movement Secretariat. September 2012.
SMS 2012b	Scaling Up Nutrition: SUN Movement Progress Report (2011-2012). SUN Movement Secretariat. September 2012.
SMS 2014	SUN Movement Annual Progress Report. SUN Movement Secretariat. September 2014.
SUN 2011	Progress Report from countries and their partners in the Movement Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN). Compiled for the United Nations High Level Meeting on Nutrition, September 20 th 2011, by the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General for Food Security and Nutrition. Scaling Up Nutrition. September 2011.
SUN 2012	Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement Strategy [2012-2015]. SUN Movement. September 2012.
SUN 2013	State of the SUN Movement Progress Report. Scaling Up Nutrition. September 2013.

MPTF general

SMS	SUN Movement Secretariat (SMS). Transfer of funds tracking document (available upon request to the SUN Movement Secretariat)
SUN MPTF 2012	Memorandum of Understanding between Participating UN Organizations and the United Nations Development Programme regarding the Operational Aspects of a Scaling Up Nutrition Movement (SUN Movement) Multi-Partner Trust Fund. February 2012.
SUN MPTF 2013a	2012 Annual Report of the SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund. SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund. 31 May 2013.
SUN MPTF 2013b	2013 Annual Report of the SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund. SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund. 2013.
SUN MPTF 2014	2014 Annual Report of the SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund. SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund. 2014.
SUN MPTF 2015	Minutes of the Management Committee Meetings. SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund. 9 July 2012 – 28 May 2015.
SUN MPTF 2013	Management Committee Terms of Reference and Rules for Procedures. Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF). Revised 17 May 2013.
SUN MPTF Management Committee 2014	Supplementary Guidance Note on Roles and Responsibilities. SUN MPTF Management Committee. 20 Nov 2014.
SUN CSN Secretariat	A business case on funding to CSAs. SUN CSN Secretariat (currently as a draft – available upon request to the CSN Secretariat)

Project specific

Window I

Learning routes:

PROCASUR 2013	Strengthening the Capacity of SUN Countries to Scale Up Nutrition through 'Learning Routes'. PROCASUR. Oct 2013
PROCASUR 2014a	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Report. PROCASUR. 31 Mar 2014
PROCASUR 2014b	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. PROCASUR. 31 Jun 2014
PROCASUR 2014c	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. PROCASUR. 30 Sep 2014
PROCASUR 2014d	Financial Report SUN. PROCASUR. Feb - Jun 2014.
PROCASUR 2014e	Financial Report SUN. PROCASUR. Jul- Sep 2014.
PROCASUR 2015a	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. PROCASUR. 28 Feb 2015
PROCASUR 2015b	Submission Form for Extension of Programme Duration to the SUN Movement MPTF Technical Secretariat. PROCASUR. 2 Jan 2015.
PROCASUR 2015c	Financial Report Jan - Feb 2015. PROCASUR. 2015.

Budget tracking;

UNICEF n.d.	Adressing gaps on multi-sectoral costing and financial tracking for nutrition. UNICEF.
UNICEF n.d.2	Annexes 2 – 6. UNICEF.

Window II

Civil Society Network

UNOPS 2014a	SUN MPTF Annual Narrative Progress Report. UNOPS. Jul 2013 – Mar 2014.
UNOPS 2014b	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Updates (2 parts). UNOPS. 31 Mar – 30 Jun 2014.
UNOPS 2014c	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. UNOPS. 30 Sep 2014.

UNOPS 2014d	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. UNOPS. 31 Dec 2014.
UNOPS 2014e	Budget Monitoring MPTF and SUN CSN Grant (2 parts). UNOPS. 1 Dec 2014.
UNOPS 2015	SUN MPTF Annual Narrative Progress Report. UNOPS. Jul 2013 – Mar 2015.

Civil Society Alliances

short ref	full ref
Bangladesh n.d.	Civil Society Alliance for SUN – Appendix 1 – 7. Bangladesh.
Bangladesh 2014	MPTF Office Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Bangladesh. Jan - Dec 2014.
Bangladesh 2015	1st Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Year 2015. Bangladesh. Jan - Mar 2015.
Burundi n.d.	SUN MPTF Strengthening Civil Society’s Role in Scaling Up Nutrition in Burundi. Burundi.
Burundi 2014a	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Burundi. 1 Oct 2014.
Burundi 2014b	Rapport Descriptif Annuel Sur L’Etat D’Avancement Du Programme – Annee 2014. Burundi. May – Dec 2014.
El Salvador n.d.	SUN MPTF CSO mobilization to eradicate hunger and malnutrition through comprehensive, multi-sectoral gender-based approach. El Salvador.
El Salvador 2014a	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. El Salvador. Jun 2014.
El Salvador 2014b	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. El Salvador. Sep 2014.
El Salvador 2014c	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. El Salvador. Dec 2014.
El Salvador 2015a	SUN MPTF Annual Narrative Progress Report. El Salvador. Mai 2014 - Mar 2015.
El Salvador 2015b	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. El Salvador. Jan 2014 – Mar 2015.
Ghana n.d.	A Status Report on the Ghana Civil Society Coalition for Scaling-Up Nutrition in the context of SUN Movement. Ghana.
Ghana n.d.2	Ghana Coalition of Civil Society Organisation for Scaling Up Nutrition Terms of Reference. Ghana.
Ghana n.d.3	Supporting the 1,000 Days of the child camp in Ghana with a song titled “save a child” composed by Noble Nketia, a Ghanaian Gospel Artiste and the Celebrity Ambassador of the Ghana Coalition of Civil Society Organizations for Scaling Up Nutrition. Ghana.
Ghana 2013a	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Ghana. Oct 2013.
Ghana 2013b	Guidelines for Good Governance of Ghana Coalition of Civil Society Organizations for Scaling Up Nutrition (GHACCSSUN). Ghana. 20 Jul 2013.
Ghana 2013c	MPTF Office Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Ghana. Jan - Dec 2013.
Ghana 2014a	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Ghana. 1 Jul 2014.
Ghana 2014b	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Ghana. 1 Oct 2014.
Ghana 2014c	MPTF Office Generic Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Ghana. Jan - Dec 2014.
Ghana 2015	1st Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Year 2015. Ghana. Jan - Mar 2015.

short ref	full ref
Guatemala 2012	Proposal of the Civil Society in Guatemala for the Implementation of the SUN Strategy/1000 Days. Guatemala. 11 Jun 2012.
Guatemala 2013	SUN MPTF Progress Table. Guatemala. 13 Dec 2013.
Guatemala 2014a	SUN MPTF Annual Narrative Progress Report. Guatemala. Sep 2013 - Feb 2014.
Guatemala 2014b	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Guatemala. 31 Mar 2014
Guatemala 2014c	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Guatemala. 30 Jun 2014
Guatemala 2014d	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Guatemala. 30 Sep 2014
Guatemala 2014e	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Guatemala. 30 Dec 2014
Guatemala 2014f	MPTF Office Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Guatemala. Jan - Dec 2014
Guinea n.d.	Support the mobilization of civil society for scaling up nutrition in Guinea. Submitted by UNICEF. Guinea.
Guinea 2015	Annual Narrative Progress Report. Guinea. May 2014 – Mar 2015.
Kenya n.d.	Mobilizing Civil Society in Kenya to champion Scaling Up Nutrition. Kenya.
Kenya n.d.2	Funds Utilization Report – UNICEF. Kenya.
Kenya 2014	SUN MPTF Annual Narrative Progress Report. Kenya. Jan - Dec 2014
Kenya 2015	Final SUN CSA Work Plan. Kenya. Dec 2014 – Dec 2015.
Kyrgyzstan 2013	Creating of enabling environment/structural support to improve nutrition for the sake of justice and future generations in the Kyrgyz Republic. Kyrgyzstan. 2013.
Kyrgyzstan n.d.	List of members of the Civil Alliance and Detailed Report on the implementation of the First Tranche. Kyrgyzstan.
Kyrgyzstan n.d.2	Results and logframe. Kyrgyzstan.
Kyrgyzstan 2015	SUN MPTF Annual Narrative Progress Report. Kyrgyzstan. Jan - Mar 2015.
Lao PDR n.d.	Stakeholders review, Interview questions review and Data collection and preparation (3 parts). Lao People’s Democratic Rep.
Lao PDR 2014a	SUN Narrative Progress Report. Lao People’s Democratic Rep. Jan – Jun 2014.
Lao PDR 2014b	SUN Narrative Progress Report. Lao People’s Democratic Rep. Jul – Sep 2014.
Lao PDR 2014c	SUN Narrative Progress Report. Lao People’s Democratic Rep. Oct – Dec 2014.
Lao PDR 2015a	SUN Narrative Progress Report. Lao People’s Democratic Rep. Jan – Mar 2015.
Lao PDR 2015b	SUN Narrative Progress Report. Lao People’s Democratic Rep. Apr – Jun 2015.
Madagascar 2014	Rapport Descriptif Annuel Sur L’Etat D’Avancement Du Programme – Annee 2014. Madagascar. Mar – Dec 2014.
Madagascar 2015	1st Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Year 2015. Madagascar. Jan - Mar 2015.
Malawi n.d.	Terms of Reference for Malawi CSONA. Malawi.
Malawi 2013a	CSONA Update Volume 1 Issue 1. Malawi. Dec 2013
Malawi 2013b	SUN MPTF Progress Table. Malawi. 13 Dec 2013.

short ref	full ref
Malawi 2013c	MPTF Office Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Malawi. Jan - Dec 2013
Malawi 2014a	MPTF Office Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Malawi. Jan - Dec 2014
Malawi 2014b	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Malawi. 1 May 2014
Malawi 2014c	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Malawi. 1 Jul 2014
Malawi 2014d	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Malawi. 1 Oct 2014
Malawi 2015	1st Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Year 2015. Malawi. Jan - Mar 2015.
Mali 2014	Rapport Descriptif Annuel Sur L’Etat D’Avancement Du Programme – Annee 2014. Mali. Jan – Dec 2014.
Mali 2015	Rapport bilan des activités de la société civile au Mali en contribution au mouvement SUN 2011 – 2015. Mali. Mar 2015.
Mozambique n.d.	Submission Form for Programme/Budget Revision to the SUN Movement MPTF Management Committee. Mozambique.
Mozambique n.d.2	Termos de Referência da Plataforma da Sociedade Civil no âmbito da Iniciativa SUN. Mozambique.
Mozambique 2013	MPTF Office Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Mozambique. Jan - Dec 2013
Mozambique 2014a	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Updates (3 parts). Mozambique. 1 May – Oct 2014.
Mozambique 2014b	Cartaz Debate Nutrição (Nutrition Debate Poster). Mozambique. 2014.
Mozambique 2014c	MPTF Office Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Mozambique. Jan - Dec 2014
Mozambique 2015	1st Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Year 2015. Mozambique. Jan - Mar 2015.
Myanmar n.d.	Establishing a Civil Society Alliance to Scale Up Nutrition in Myanmar. Myanmar.
Myanmar 2014a	Scaling Up Nutrition – Brief on SUN Civil Society Alliance in Myanmar. Myanmar. 2014.
Myanmar 2014b	Financial Report SUN CSA. Myanmar. 2014.
Myanmar 2014c	SUN MPTF Annual Narrative Progress Report. Myanmar. Feb - Dec 2014.
Nepal 2014	Annual Report Annexes 5-11, 17-37 (9 parts). Nepal. 2014.
Nepal 2015	1st Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Year 2015. Nepal. Jan - Mar 2015.
Niger 2013	Rapport sur le financement de la nutrition au Niger and Rapport Analyse Financement Nutrition. Niger. 2013.
Niger 2014	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Updates (2 parts). Niger. 1 May – 1 Jul 2014.
Niger 2015	1st Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Year 2015. Bangladesh. Jan - Mar 2015.
Nigeria n.d.	Mobilizing and strengthening Civil Societies to Scale Up Nutrition in Nigeria. Submitted by UNICEF. Nigeria.

short ref	full ref
Peru n.d.	Peru/Latin America and the Caribbean – Harmonized action for childhood nutrition. Submitted by UN WFP. Peru.
Peru 2014	MPTF Office Generic Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Peru. Jan - Dec 2014.
Peru 2015	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Updates (3 parts). Peru. 1 Jul 2014 – Mar 2015.
Rwanda 2014	MPTF Office Generic Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Rwanda. Jun - Dec 2014.
Rwanda 2015	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Updates (2 parts). Rwanda. Oct 2014 – Apr 2015.
Senegal n.d.	Projet D'Appui a La Bonne Gouvernance des Secteurs de La Nutrition et de Securite Alimentaire au Senegal et Suivi des Engagements SUN. Senegal.
Senegal 2014	Rapport Descriptif Annuel Sur L'Etat D'Avancement Du Programme – Anne 2014. Senegal. 7 Apr – 31 Dec 2014.
Sierra Leone n.d.	A Coordinated and Mobilised Civil Society Platform in Sierra Leone in Support of Scaling Up Nutrition Movement. Submitted by UNICEF. Sierra Leone.
Sierra Leone 2015	SUN MPTF Progress Report - A Coordinated and Mobilised Civil Society Platform in Sierra Leone in Support of Scaling Up Nutrition Movement. Sierra Leone. 1 Mar 2014 – 30 Mar 2015.
Sri Lanka n.d.	Formation of Civil Society Alliance (CSA) that supports to make Sri Lanka a nourished nation. Submitted by WFP. Sri Lanka.
Sri Lanka 2014a	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Year 2014. Sri Lanka. 1 Jul 2014.
Sri Lanka 2014b	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Year 2014. Sri Lanka. 1 Oct 2014.
Sri Lanka 2014c	MPTF Office Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Sri Lanka. Jan - Dec 2014.
Sri Lanka 2015	1st Programme Quarterly Progress Update – Year 2015. Sri Lanka. Jan - Mar 2015.
Uganda 2013	SUN MPTF Progress Table. Uganda. 13 Dec 2013.
Uganda 2014a	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Uganda. Jun 2014.
Uganda 2014b	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Uganda. Sep 2014.
Uganda 2014c	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Uganda. Dec 2014.
Uganda 2015	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Update. Uganda. Mar 2015.
Zimbabwe n.d.	Supporting Civil Society in Realising SUN Objectives and Commitments. Submitted by UN WFP. Zimbabwe.
Zimbabwe 2014	MPTF Office Generic Annual Programme Narrative Progress Report. Zimbabwe. Jan - Dec 2014.
Zimbabwe 2015	SUN MPTF Programme Quarterly Progress Updates (2 parts). Zimbabwe. Oct 2014 – May 2015.

Window III

M&E Baseline Report:

UNOPS 2012	Baseline Report. SUN Secretariat. UNOPS. Sep 2012.
------------	--

Annex H Selection of Country Cases

	Region	Fragility ⁵		Start date	Duration (months)	PUNO	REACH	Implementing Partner	Size of grant	Amount of existing info ⁶
		Category	Score							
Bangladesh	South Asia	Alert	91.8	07/12/2012	36	REACH	Yes	BRAC	\$535,000	H
Burundi	Central Africa	Alert	98.1	10/04/2014	18	WFP	Yes	World Vision	\$209,059	L
El Salvador	LAC	Warning	71.4	17/12/2013	24	WHO	No	Calma	\$299,600	L
Ghana	West Africa	Warning	71.9	25/01/2013	36	WFP	Yes	HAG	\$374,500	L
Guatemala	LAC	High Warning	80.4	20/02/2013	36	WHO	No	Save the Children	\$428,000	L
Guinea	West Africa	High Alert	104.9	18/02/2014	24	UNICEF	No	Fondation Terre des Hommes	\$289,000	L
Kenya	East Africa	Alert	97.4	07/02/2014	23	UNICEF	No	World Vision	\$299,600	H
Kyrgyzstan	Central Asia	High Warning	82.2	07/02/2014	23	UNICEF	No	Innovative Solutions	\$235,400	L

⁵ Source: The Fund for Peace Fragile States Index 2015. <http://fsi.fundforpeace.org>

⁶ This refers to the amount of data already available to the SUN MPTF Evaluation Team from the ICE and the research study on civil society alignment with SUN efforts carried out by the Team Leader (report forthcoming).

Lao PDR	SE Asia	High Warning	84.5	07/03/2014	22	UNOPS	No	Plan International	\$267,500	L
Madagascar	Sthn Africa	High Warning	83.6	03/03/2014	22	WFP	No	Action Contre la Faim	\$299,600	L
Malawi	Sthn Africa	High Warning	86.9	11/12/2012	36	WFP	No	Concern Worldwide	\$428,000	L
Mali	West Africa	Alert	93.1	12/02/2013	24	WFP	Yes	OMAES	\$374,500	L
Mozambique	Sthn Africa	High Warning	86.9	07/12/2012	32	REACH	Yes	ANSA	\$428,000	H
Myanmar	SE Asia	Alert	94.7	23/01/2014	24	UNOPS	No	Save the Children	\$224,700	L
Nepal	South Asia	Alert	90.5	02/07/2013	30	WFP	Yes	Save the Children Nepal	\$428,000	H
Niger	West Africa	Alert	97.8	11/12/2012	36	REACH	Yes	FORSANI	\$428,000	L
Nigeria	West Africa	High Alert	102.4	10/02/2015	23	UNICEF	No	Association of Public Health Physicians	\$212,943	L
Peru	LAC	Warning	71.9	18/12/2013	24	WFP	No	Care	\$278,200	H
Rwanda	Central Africa	Alert	90.2	01/05/2014	20	WFP	Yes	Catholic Relief Services	\$240,750	L
Senegal	West Africa	High Warning	83	07/04/2014	18	WFP	No	Eau Vie Environment	\$212,963	H
Sierra Leone	West Africa	Alert	91.9	21/02/2014	23	UNICEF	Yes	FOCUS 1000	\$299,600	H
Sri Lanka	South Asia	Alert	90.6	23/01/2014	24	WFP	No	Save the Children	\$235,400	L
Uganda	East Africa	Alert	97	11/12/2012	36	WHO	Yes	World Vision	\$321,000	L
Zimbabwe	Sthn Africa	High Alert	100	11/02/2014	23	WFP	No	Progressio	\$256,800	L

Annex I Evaluation Timetable

Week	Date	Activities		Days	Days
		Team Leader	Support Expert		
Inception phase				10	10
1	4/9 - 13/9	Literature review, Skype interviews, report writing	Literature review, Skype interviews, report writing	5	5
2	14/9 - 20/9	Literature review, Skype interviews, report writing	Literature review, Skype interviews, report writing	5	5
Data collection phase 1				21	25
3	21/9 - 27/9	On leave	Project reviews, Skype interviews	0	5
4	28/9 - 4/10	On leave	Country case study	0	5
5	5/10 - 11/10	On leave, drafting Interim Briefing,	On leave	2	0
6	12/10 - 18/10	Drafting Interim Briefing, Project reviews, Skype interviews	On leave	5	0
7	19/10 - 25/10	SUN GG: face to face interviews,	SUN GG: face to face interviews	5	5
9	26/10 - 1/11	Drafting Interim Report, Project Reviews, preparing survey	Country case study	5	5
10	2/11 - 8/11	Addressing SG comments & Finalising Interim Report, Survey dissemination	CCS analysis, Skype interviews, Project reviews	4	5
Data collection phase 2 + data analysis				20	23
11	9/11 - 15/11	Project reviews, Skype interviews, Survey follow up	Project reviews, Skype interviews, survey follow up	3	5
12	16/11 - 22/11	Country Case Study	Country Case Study	5	5
13	23/11 - 29/11	CCS analysis, Project reviews, Survey follow up	CCS analysis, Project reviews, Survey follow up	4	4
14	30/11 - 6/12	Skype interviews, Data analysis	Skype Interviews, Data analysis	4	4
15	7/12 - 13/12	Data analysis	Data analysis, Drafting inputs to Final Report	4	5

Final Report writing & findings presentation			19		12
16	14/12 – 20/12	Drafting Final Report v1	4	Drafting inputs to Final Report	4
17	21/12 - 27/12	Drafting Final Report v1	2	Supporting preparation of Final Report	4
18	28/12 – 3/1	On leave	0	On leave	0
19	4/1 – 10/1	Drafting Final Report v1	4		2
20	11/1 – 17/1	Awaiting comments, Evaluation Brief & PowerPoint	3		1
21	18/1 – 24/1	Awaiting comments, Revising Final Report, Presentations	2		1
22	25/1 – 31/1	Revising Final Report, Presentations	4		
			70		70