

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2017

Name of Country

2017 Reporting template: Joint-Assessment by National Multi-Stakeholder Platforms in line with the SUN Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) System

April 2016 to April 2017

Process and details of the 2017 Joint-Assessment Exercise

To help the SUN Movement Secretariat better understand how your inputs for the Joint-Assessment 2017 were compiled by stakeholders, and to what extent the process was useful to in-country stakeholders, please provide us with the following details:

Participation

1. Did the following stakeholder groups provide specific inputs, whether in writing or verbally, to the Joint-Assessment?

Group	Yes (provide number)/No (= 0)
Government	yes
Civil society	no
Science and academia	yes
Donors	no
United Nations	yes
Business	no
Other (please specify)	No

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? How many were women and how many were men? 12 (3 women and 9 men)

Process

3. Was the Joint-Assessment data gathered and/or reviewed during a face-to-face meeting, or via email?

Step	Format			
Collection	Meeting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Email	<input type="checkbox"/>
Review, validation	Meeting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Email	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. If a collection or validation meeting did take place, please attach a photo, if possible.

Utility

5. If a collection or validation meeting did take place, would you say that the meeting was useful to participants, beyond the usual work of the MSP?

Yes

Why?

The meeting brought new members of the platform together

Utilisation by the SUN Movement

Please note that the filled-in reporting template will be put on the SUN Movement website, unless notified otherwise. Analysed results of this Joint-Assessment Exercise will also be included in the 2017 SUN Movement Annual Progress Report.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	On-going	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational/Targets are achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/Validated/Evidence provided

Process 1: Bringing people together in the same space for action

PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space for action
 Strengthened coordinating mechanisms at national and sub-national level enable in-country stakeholders to better work for improved nutrition outcomes. Functioning multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral platforms enable the delivery of joint results, through facilitated interactions on nutrition related issues, among sector relevant stakeholders. Functioning multi-stakeholder platforms (MSP) enable the mobilisation and engagement of relevant stakeholders, assist relevant national bodies in their decision making, enable consensus around joint interests and recommendations and foster dialogue at the local level.

Progress marker 1.1: Select/develop coordinating mechanisms at country level

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE Please give one score per progress marker	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordination mechanisms are established at government level and are regularly convened by high-level officials. It indicates if non-state constituencies such as the UN Agencies, donors, civil society organisations and businesses have organised themselves in networks with convening and coordinating functions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structures in place and functioning, such as a high-level convening body from the Government (political endorsement) ▪ Official nomination of a SUN Government Focal Point ▪ Appoint Focal Points/conveners for key stakeholder groups, i.e. a donor convener, civil society coordinators, UN focal points, business liaison persons, academic representative ▪ Convene MSP members on a regular basis: please provide the number of meetings for each identified coordination structures ▪ Institutional analysis conducted of the design and/or performance of the high-level MSP, or relevant structures, also in terms of ensuring gender equality, at all levels ▪ Establish or refine the terms of reference, work plans and other types of enabling arrangements 	4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existence of a functional National Nutrition Council (NNC) chaired by the vice president 2. Existence of a functional National Nutrition Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC), chaired by the SUN focal person 3. Quarterly meetings of the NTAC, NNC, Integrated Management of Acute Malnutrition (IMAM) technical working group, 2-monthly SUN Movement teleconferences etc. 4. Donor convener yet to be identified

	<p>(Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Terms of Reference, work-plan or Supporting documents requested)</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The REACH country assessment and the Nutrition Bottleneck analysis 6. Existence of the ToR for the NTAC and the IMAM taskforce. 7. The work of the NNC is guided by the Food Act 2005
<p>Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordinating mechanisms established by the government and by non-state constituencies are able to reach out to relevant members from various sectors, to broaden the collective influence on nutrition-relevant issues. It also analyses the extent to which local levels are involved in the multi-stakeholder-sector approach in nutrition (e.g. decentralisation of platforms).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expand MSP to get key members on board, i.e. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics ▪ Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors ▪ Actively engage executive-level political leadership ▪ Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity and non-discrimination, WASH etc. ▪ Ensure that the MSP membership is expanded to – or better able to – support women’s leadership ▪ Establish decentralised structures and/or processes that support planning and action locally (please provide number of existing decentralised structures if applicable, and Terms of Reference if they exist) ▪ Involve representatives from local levels in the national mechanism or create feedback mechanisms between the central and local levels, including the community and vulnerable groups. (Provide examples, if available) 	<p>3</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not fully achieved due to the inadequate participation of civil society, Academia, private sector and other relevant ministries/ Agencies. 2. Political leadership actively engaged through the National Nutrition Council (NNC). 3. The UN Nutrition Technical Working Group has been expanding its membership 4. At the government level relevant technical working groups are being established as the need arises 5. Inclusion of the Women’s Bureau and Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Unit in the NTAC Limited engagement of regional structures such as the Regional Technical Advisory Committees (TAC).

Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/contribute to the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)			
<p>This progress marker looks at the actual functioning of the MSP to facilitate regular interactions among relevant stakeholders. It indicates the capacity within the multi-stakeholder platforms to actively engage all stakeholders, set significant agendas, reach consensus to influence decision-making processes and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work plans ▪ Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy and legal documents, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews. ▪ Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders ▪ Get platform to agree on agenda/prioritisation of issues, such as deciding which nutrition problems to emphasise, choosing between possible nutrition actions, or prioritising target regions or groups for actions, among others ▪ Use results to advocate/influence other decision-making bodies ▪ Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement 	3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although individual member institutions achieve their goals, but there is no common results framework for the MSP 2. Contribution of relevant stakeholders in the development of the policy, strategy and business plan as well as the financial tracking reporting 3. The Use of the NTAC as an interaction forum 4. The development of the policy and the strategy 5. The results are used for advocacy, resource mobilisation and the development of policies 6. The SUN focal person links with the SMS and other local and international institutions for support 7. The UN Nutrition Technical Working Group links with the REACH and the global UN nutrition network
Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments			
<p>This progress marker looks at the capacity of the Multi-Stakeholder Platform, as a whole, to be accountable for collective results. It implies that constituencies within the MSP are capable to track and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis) ▪ Existence of newsletters, activity and monitoring reports of the MSP or the nutrition coordination system (please share, if available) ▪ Key stakeholder groups tracking commitments and are able to report on an annual basis, at a minimum, such as financial 	2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is limitation on this point 2. NaNA reports on its financial commitments and Nutrition for Growth commitments 3. Other individual stakeholders report on their contributions to scaling up nutrition.

<p>report on own contributions and achievements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ commitments, Nutrition for Growth commitments, etc. 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The financial tracking has started and still ongoing to cover all relevant institutions 5. Nutrition technical briefs published in local newspapers, activity and monitoring reports are available
--	---	--	--

Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform

<p>This progress marker looks at how the multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is institutionalised in national development planning mechanisms and in lasting political commitments, not only by the Government executive power but also by the leadership of agencies and organisations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms ▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover ▪ Institutional commitment, also toward gender equality, from key stakeholder groups 	<p>4</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MSP involved in the development of the National Development Plan and United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2. Existence of the NNC and chaired by the Vice President 3. UN Country Team has a Nutrition Focal Agency 4. Nutrition integrated within sector policies and programmes e.g, Health, Education and Agriculture
--	--	----------	---

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS

<p>If the country or part of country face certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) in the recent past or currently, elaborate about the types of partnerships you have in place.</p>	<p>1) Please can you explain if you are engaging with the humanitarian partners? How? Do you face any challenges?</p>	<p>Yes, we do joint assessments with WFP, National Disaster Management Agency, Red Cross, Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, FAO, UNICEF, Ministry of Agriculture.</p>
--	---	--

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS you have in place:		
Compliance of partners with the SUN Movement Principles of Engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Do you assess or analyse how your MSP and/or its members abide by the SUN Principles of Engagement? If so, can you share the results of these assessments? 2) Specifically, do you, within the MSP and with partners, act in accordance with a commitment to uphold the equity and rights of all women, men and children? 3) Do you promote compliance of stakeholders – and sectors with which you engage – with the SUN Principles of Engagement? 4) Are there cases of incompliance? How do you deal with them (please describe any specific feedback or complain mechanism that are in place or envisaged by the MSP?) 	<p>1.No</p> <p>2. Yes we do</p> <p>3.Yes we do as we ask them to meetings</p> <p>4. Yes, we as a country still have difficulty in bringing the civil society on-board. There has been a nutrition stakeholder mapping that was used to identify stakeholder, what they do and where they are. This will help in bringing stakeholder from the civil society into MSP.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
Government	- Provision of human resource for the coordination and creating an enabling environment for stakeholder engagement
UN	- Provision of financial and technical support as well as advocating for the functioning of the coordination mechanisms. Also strengthening internal UN coordination
Donor	- Provision of funding
Business	-
CSO	- Advocacy
Others (Academia)	- Technical support

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017)

FOR PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

Functioning of the National Multi-stakeholder Platforms (NTAC, NNC, IMAM TWG, UN Nutrition Network).

Started working on financial tracking of nutrition interventions.

Participated in regular SUN teleconference.

Integration of nutrition into the UNDAF and other UN agency specific country programme document.

Integration of nutrition into sectorial policies and programmes

Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	On-going	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational/Targets are achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/Validated/Evidence provided

Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

The existence of a coherent policy and legal framework should inform and guide how in-country stakeholders work together for improved nutrition outcomes. Updated policies, strategies and legislations are fundamental to prevent conflict of interest among the wide range of actors involved in a complex societal topic such as nutrition. This process focuses on the enabling policy and legal environment.

Progress marker 2.1: Continuously analyse existing nutrition-relevant policies and legislations

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE Please give one score per progress marker	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing nutrition-relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations are analysed using multi-sectoral consultative processes with representation from various stakeholders, especially civil society representatives. It indicates the availability of stock-taking documents and continuous context analysis that can inform and guide policy-making.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regular multi-sectoral analysis and stock-take of existing policies and regulations ▪ Reflect on existing policies and legal framework ▪ Existence of review papers ▪ Indicate any nutrition-relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations identified, analysed during the reporting period and specify the type of consultative process that was applied <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislation analysed</p>	3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Periodic reviews of policies 2. Assessment of policies and regulations to see how relevant they were in promoting Optimal Infant and Young Child Feeding practices in the country (World Breastfeeding Trends Initiatives) 3. Conducting a nutrition bottle neck analysis to inform the nutrition policy review and programme and strategy development. 4. The development of a new Education Policy and a School Feeding Policy

Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, updating and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to contribute, influence and advocate for the development of updated or new policy and legal frameworks for improved nutrition and its dissemination (i.e. advocacy and communication strategies in place to support the dissemination of relevant policies).It focuses on how countries ascertain policy and legal coherence across different ministries and try to broaden political support by encouraging parliamentarian engagement. It also focuses on the efforts of in-country stakeholders to influence decision makers for legislations and evidence-based policies that empower women and girls through equity-based approaches.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy ▪ Existence of a national gender equality and women’s empowerment strategy ▪ Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and legal frameworks with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality and whether they are fit-for-purpose to ensure gender-sensitive nutrition actions ▪ Develop a common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy-making that is pro-female ▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes) ▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies ▪ Key stakeholder groups promote the gender-responsive integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions ▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, social media outreach, workshops ▪ Dissemination and communication of policy/legal framework by key stakeholders among relevant audiences <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>PROFILES, social and behavioural change communication, nutrition communication strategy and health promotion and education developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Revision of the nutrition policy in progress that will lead to the development of the nutrition strategic plan. This was preceded by the nutrition bottleneck analysis. . Platform members participated in the development of the school feeding and ECD policies . The existence of National Assembly Select Committees on Health, Agriculture, Women Youth and Children . The Vice President acts as Champion for Nutrition and promotes pro-nutrition policies as chair of the National Nutrition Council . The MSP participates in the development of the National Development Plan and UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) . Engagement of the press and media through interviews and workshops . The Nutrition policy 2010-2020 has been disseminated to partners and stakeholders . The Regional Technical Advisory Committees have been trained on legislation e.g Food Fortification and Salt Iodisation Regulation . The Law Enforcement Agents sensitised on existing regulations

Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholder efforts			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders – the Government (i.e. line ministries) and non-state partners – coordinate their inputs to ensure the development of a coherent policy and legislation framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries I.e. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines/ advice/support for mainstreaming nutrition into sectoral policies. ▪ Key stakeholder groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition-related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive) ▪ Develop/update policies/legal frameworks, with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality, especially those that can be seen as harmful or in conflict with the rights of women and girls ▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies that are nutrition relevant (specific and sensitive) ▪ Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes, food fortification and maternal leave and policies that empower women ▪ Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, etc. <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The composition of NNC itself reflects the involvement of various relevant ministries • The Nutrition Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC) and Technical Working Groups coordinate and harmonise inputs for the review of nutrition policies and legislations • MSP members supported the development and review of the National Nutrition Policy and Strategic Plan • National Health Policy (2012-2020), National Nutrition Policy (2010-2020), Agriculture and Natural Resource Policy (2009-2015), School Feeding Policy, ECD Policy (), Social Protection Policy (), Education Policy (2015-2025), Health Education and Promotion Policy (), Food Safety and Quality Act (2011), Fisheries Policy, Women’s Empowerment Policy (2010-2020), Population Policy (), National Youths Policy (), Water Sanitation Policy (), The Breastfeeding Promotion Regulation 2006, Food Fortification and Salt Iodisation Regulation 2006 and Women’s Act 2010

Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise/enforce the legal frameworks			
<p>This progress marker looks at the availability of mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislations such as the International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes, maternity and parental leave laws, food fortification legislation, they right to food, among others.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation ▪ Existence of national/sub-national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence (relevant reports/documents) of law enforcement</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Breastfeeding Promotion Regulation, Food Fortification and Salt Iodisation Regulation to operationalised the Food Act • Strategies for the Control of Micronutrient Deficiencies as well as Costed Business Plan for Nutrition • Existence of trained Law Enforcement Agencies at the Regional Level to enforce the regulations such as the Police, Customs and exercise, Public Health
Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing policies and legislations have been reviewed and evaluated to document good practices and the extent to which available lessons are shared by different constituencies within the Multi-Stakeholder Platforms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc. ▪ Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A national nutrition survey was conducted using the SMART methodology, Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), the WHO Stepwise Survey for Non-Communicable Diseases (NCD). Integrated Household Survey (HIS) and 2013 Census report. • The results of these studies have been used to inform policies and programmes

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us you view on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS		
<p>If the country or part of the country faces certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) recently or at</p>	<p>1) Are mitigation measures clearly integrated in nutrition relevant policies and legal frameworks?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>present, elaborate about the integration of mitigation measures into policies and legal frameworks</p>		
<p>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your view on HOW WE CAN MEASURE ADVOCACY EFFORTS AND SUCCESSES</p>		
<p>Mobilisation of high-level advocates (including champions, parliamentarians, media)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Have you tracked “success” moments with the engagement of high-level advocates? Please consider their public statements, attendance at high-level events, mentions in Parliament of nutrition, etc. and share sources demonstrating their advocacy impact. 2) Have you organised a high-level event on nutrition? If yes, please provide details 	<p>There was a recent launching of the NeoINAAT research study dealing with new borns at Serekunda General Hospital inviting several stakeholders including parliamentarians. The Study is being carried out by MRC</p>
<p>SMART-ness of nutrition commitments by high-level representatives of Governments and networks/alliances (CSOs, business, the UN system, donors) made since the beginning of 2016</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Do you have experience with tracking nutrition commitments made by high-level representatives of Governments and networks/alliances? If so, can you explain how you collect these commitments and how you report on them? 2) Do you assess the <i>existing</i> commitments and analyse whether (a) they are still valid (e.g. aligned with an up-to-date action plan); (b) they are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Bound (SMART). <p>Please share any available evidence of commitments made since the beginning of 2016. Kindly note that the evidence could be looking at new commitments made or changes to existing commitments, to make them more SMART.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

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

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017) FOR PROCESS 2: Coherent policy and legal framework (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	On-going	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational/Targets are achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/Validated/Evidence provided

Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework (CRF – please see ANNEX 4 for the definition)

The alignment of actions across sectors that significantly contribute to improvements in nutrition demonstrates the extent to which multiple sectors and stakeholders are effectively working together, and the extent to which the policies and legislations are operationalised to ensure that all people, women and children in particular, benefit from improved nutrition. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into actions¹. The term ‘Common Results Framework’ is used to describe a set of expected results agreed across different sectors of Governments and among key stakeholders through a negotiated process. The existence of agreed common results would enable stakeholders to make their actions more nutrition driven through increased coordination or integration. In practice, a CRF may result in a **set of documents that are recognised as a reference point** for all sectors and stakeholders that work together for scaling up nutrition impact.

Progress marker 3.1: Align existing actions around national nutrition targets/policies

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE Please give one score per progress marker	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholder groups take stock of what exists and align their own plans and programming for nutrition to reflect the national policies and priorities. It focuses on the alignment of actions across	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews ▪ Analysis of sectoral Government programmes and implementation mechanisms ▪ Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping ▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nutrition stakeholders mapping exercise conducted • The NTAC meetings conducted • The National Nutrition Policy is being reviewed • The National Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy was developed and National Agricultural Investment Plan is being developed

¹ ‘Actions’ refer to interventions, programmes, services, campaigns and enacted legislation or specific policy. The 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition provides a set of evidence-based high-impact specific nutrition actions including the uptake of practices such as ‘exclusive breastfeeding for six months’.

<p>sectors and relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition. Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the review of programmes and implementation capacities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Map existing gaps and agree on gender-sensitive core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</p>		
<p>Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to agree on a Common Results Framework to effectively align interventions for improved nutrition. The CRF is recognised as the guidance for medium-long term implementation of actions with clearly identified nutrition targets. Ideally, the CRF should have identified the coordination mechanism (and related capacity) and defined the roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder for implementation. It should encompass an implementation matrix, an M&E Framework and costed interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives ▪ Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups² ▪ Agree on CRF for scaling up nutrition. Elements of a CRF would include: Title of the CRF; implementation plans with defined roles of stakeholders in key sectors (e.g. health, agriculture, social protection, education, WASH, gender), cost estimates of included interventions, cost estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E, capacity strengthening needs and priorities ▪ Assessment of coordination capacity to support CRF <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence</p>	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no Common Results Framework (CRF) but the MSP is proposing to develop one after the revision of the nutrition policy and development of a nutrition strategic plan is completed

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

	<p>of a robust plan that has been technically and politically endorsed.</p> <p>Please let us know if you have used the checklist for quality national nutrition plans in a bid to review your plans</p>		
<p>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the national and local capability to sequence and implement priority actions. This requires, on the one hand, a clear understanding of gaps in terms of delivery capacity and, on the other hand, a willingness from in-country and global stakeholders to mobilise technical expertise to timely respond to the identified needs in a coordinated way.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources ▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements ▪ Existence of annual detailed workplans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national levels ▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work-plans or implementation plan</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>No CRF available as yet</p>
<p>Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information systems (e.g. multi-sectoral platforms and portals) in place to regularly collect, analyse and communicate agreed upon indicators focusing on measuring 		<p>No CRF available as yet</p>

<p>for improved nutrition. It looks specifically at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform the adjustment of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.</p>	<p>implementation coverage and performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of regular progress reports ▪ Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits ▪ Adjustments of annual plans, including budgets based on analysis of performance ▪ Existence of participatory monitoring by civil society <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of regular/annual joint review of implementation coverage and performance of prioritised actions</p>	<p>0</p>	
<p>Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate the implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision making and create evidence for public good.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reports and dissemination of findings of population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research ▪ Capture and share lessons learned, good practices, case studies, stories of change – especially those that empower women and girls – and implementation progress ▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society ▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of evaluation of implementation at scale</p>	<p>4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Integrated Household Survey was conducted and the results disseminated. • The final census report was disseminated • The midline survey for the Maternal and Child Nutrition and Health Results Project was conducted and the results are being finalised. • The results of these studies have been used to inform policies and programmes • Implementation progress discussed during meeting • Advocacy for the implementation of nutrition programmes ongoing

	that demonstrates nutrition impact and are made available publicly		
--	---	--	--

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

<p>If the country or part of country face certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) in the recent past or at present, please elaborate on the alignment of mitigation/emergency measures</p>	<p>1) Are mitigation/emergency measures implemented in a coordinated way? 2) Is there a minimum multi-sectoral package for emergency that is being implemented? If so, can you elaborate?</p>	<p>There is a multi sectoral disaster risk reduction working group that coordinate and implement mitigating measures for any emergencies. There is a national and regional emergency contingency plans that are being implemented</p>
---	---	--

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

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017) FOR PROCESS 3: Common Results Framework for National Nutrition Plan (aligned programming)
(i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

Empty space for summary content

Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
Not applicable	Not started	Started	On-going	Nearly completed	Completed
Progress Marker not applicable to current context	Nothing in place	Planning begun	Planning completed and implementation initiated	Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational	Fully operational/Targets are achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/Validated/Evidence provided

Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

Assessing the financial feasibility of national plans to implement actions for improved nutrition is essential to determine funding requirements. The latter is based on the capability to track planned and actual spending on nutrition across relevant government ministries and from external partners. The existence of plans with clearly costed actions helps government authorities and key stakeholders (e.g. UN, donors, business, civil society) to align and contribute resources to national priorities, estimate the required budget for implementation and identify financial gaps.

Progress marker 4.1: Cost and assess financial feasibility of the CRF		FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE
DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	Please give one score per progress marker	Refer to specific signs or provide your own examples. Please share relevant documentation as evidence
This progress marker looks at the extent to which the Government and all other in-country stakeholders are able to provide inputs for costing of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions across relevant sectors (costing exercises can be performed in various ways including conducting a review of current spending or an estimation of unit costs).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of costed estimations of nutrition related actions (please provide relevant documentation) Existence of costed plans for CRF implementation Stakeholder groups have an overview of their own allocations to nutrition related programmes/actions (please provide relevant documentation) <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Budget Estimates, UNICEF/Gambia Government Rolling Work Plan, National Health Strategic Plan
Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition			

<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to track their allocations and expenditures (if available) for nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions in relevant sectors. This progress marker also aims to determine whether the financial tracking for nutrition is reported and shared in a transparent manner with other partners of the MSP including the Government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reporting of nutrition-sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector and sex, where relevant, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planned spending ○ Current allocations ○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period) ▪ Existence of reporting mechanisms including regular financial reports, independent audit reports, cost effectiveness studies, multi-sectoral consolidation of the sectoral nutrition spending (including off-budget), and others. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information ▪ Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<p>National budget (Fiscal estimates) are normally printed and distributed among stakeholders. There each sector can know how much resources are available for nutrition interventions. Each sector can track the amount of resources expended over a period, however this is not normally done.</p> <p>The IFMIS can provided budget execution rate over each period, but there is no specific platform where this information is collated to track investment into Nutrition interventions.</p>
<p>Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the capability by governments and other in-country stakeholder to identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, setting-up of specific mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps ▪ Government and other in-country stakeholders assess additional funding needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions 	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<p>Other than the Costed National Nutrition Strategy which expired in 2015, there is no national document that is developed to identify resource Gap for Nutrition. Government have been steadily increasing allocation for Nutrition over the period but those allocations are mainly for Personal Emoluments. The World Bank is putting lots of support into Nutrition but nationally the country cannot clearly</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</p>		<p>identify the extent of resource coverage in terms of programmes nor can we identify the gaps due.</p>
Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements			
<p>This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders are able to turn pledges into disbursements. It includes the ability of donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the fiscal year in which they were scheduled.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through: Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related implementing entities Specific programmes performed by government and/or another in-country stakeholder <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</p>	3	<p>Most donors who pledged to support nutrition interventions are disbursing funds regularly and the Government even though it's commitment is minimal is honouring commitment to certain extent.</p>
Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how governments and in-country stakeholders collectively engage in long-term predictable funding to ensure results and impact. It looks at important changes such as the continuum between short-term humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of a long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy Coordinated reduction of financial gaps through domestic and external contributions Stable or increasing flexible domestic contributions Existence of long-term/multi-year financial resolutions/projections 	1	<p>The Costed National Nutrition Strategy has been used by donor and partners to certain extent in determining support to nutrition interventions but Government is not using this document for national resources allocation for nutrition.</p>

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

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS

If the country or part of country face certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) in the recent past or ongoing, elaborate about the finance of mitigation measures	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Is there clearly identifiable funding for emergency situations? 2) Do emergency funds complement mainstream funding for nutrition? If so, how? 	There is a national budget earmarked for emergencies that is always available
---	--	---

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

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017) FOR PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvement/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

Annex 1: Common priorities for 2017-2018

2015-2016 priorities	Please reflect on the completion of the work vis-a-vis your priorities:
<p>Were you able to respond to and address the identified priorities for the year ahead, as per your 2016 Joint-Assessment? Which ones were realised and which ones were not? What went well? What went wrong?</p> <p>Could the Multi-Stakeholder Platform coordinate the response of the actors to the identified annual priority action areas?</p> <p>If not, were you able to access external technical assistance as required? What went well? What went wrong?</p>	<p>The Policy and Budget Cycle Management – from planning to accounting for results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Review relevant policy and legislation documents is ongoing. The review of the Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy was completed, the review of the National Nutrition Policy is ongoing ✓ Mapping of the available workforce for nutrition. A nutrition stakeholder mapping was conducted and results validated ✓ Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF). This awaits the finalisation of the revised nutrition policy ✓ Development of a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework.). This awaits the finalisation of the revised nutrition policy ✓ Financing of selected programmes (due diligence) is ongoing specifically on VAS, IMAM, IDD, IYCF ✓ Support with the design and implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making. This is ongoing e.g the NeolNAAT study that was recently launched by The Gambia Government and MRC ✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence. This is ongoing e.g the NeolNAAT study that was recently launched by The Gambia Government and MRC <p>Social Mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Engaging parliamentarians for legislative advocacy, budget oversight and public outreach. Sensitization of the Select Committee on health, women and children and the presentation of the Annual Activity and Financial Statements to the Public Accounts Committee of the National Assembly ✓ Engaging the media for influencing decision makers, accountability and awareness. Ongoing radio and television programmes. ✓ Utilising high level events, partnerships and communication channels for leveraging commitments, generating investment and enhancing data – e.g. Presentations on the nutrition situation in the country at the UN Development Fora and quarterly reporting to the Vice President. ✓ Developing, updating or implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies e.g. Development of the National SBCC Strategy and Action Plan and Community Mobilization Strategy and tool kits ✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation. Flipcharts, Discussion Cards, Posters <p>Coordination of action across sectors, among stakeholders, and between levels of government through improved functional capacities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with strengthening capacity of individuals or organization to better engage with: themes (like WASH), sectors (like Education or Business), or groups (like scientists and academics). E.g. training

	<p>Teachers on Nutrition Education and training of members of the Multidisciplinary Facilitation Teams on Basic Nutrition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis e.g. Nutrition Stakeholder Mapping Exercise conducted. <p>Strengthening equity drivers of nutrition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Adapting, adopting or improving policies that aim to empower among women and girls. This was done for the Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy and the National Development Plan
--	---

Please list your key priorities for 2017-2018, providing details, as required

Please list your key priorities for the coming year, providing specific details, including if support from the SUN Movement support system (SUN Movement Secretariat, Executive Committee, Lead Group, Coordinator, Global Networks, experts) is foreseen to achieve the latter

1. Development of a Common Results Framework. This will require support from the SUN Movement Secretariat.
2. Improving the tracking of investment in nutrition with support from the SUN Movement Secretariat.
3. Encourage the involvement and active participation of the Civil Society and Business community in the MSP
4. Strengthen Coordination and partnership through more frequent meetings and sharing of information.
5. Assessment of the capacities of members of the MSP with SUN Movement Secretariat support

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

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

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Specific SUN Role (if applicable)
1.	Dr.	Momodou K. Darboe	MRC Gambia	Academia
2.	Mr.	Alieu Kujabi	NaNA	Government
3.	Ms.	Lalia Jawara	Food Safety and Quality Authority	Government
4.	Mr.	Alhaji Jabbi	University of The Gambia	Academia
5.	Mr.	Yahya Kandeh	MOHSW	Government
6.	Mrs.	Sarjo Camara	Dept. of Community Development	Government
7.	Mrs.	Sarah Yehouenou	WFP	UN Agency
8.	Mr.	Abdou Aziz Ceesay	NaNA	Government
9.	Mr.	Malang N. Fofana	NaNA	Government
10.	Mr.	Bakary Jallow	NaNA	Government
11.	Mr.	Modou Cheyassin Phall	NaNA	Government
12.	Mr.	Lamin Njie	NaNA	Government