SUN Movement Reporting, 2017

Name of Zambia

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes (provide number)/No (= 0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and academia</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? How many were women and how many were men? ________________________________
Process

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review, validation</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Utility

5. If a collection or validation meeting did take place, would you say that the meeting was useful to participants, beyond the usual work of the MSP?
   Yes/No
   Why?

   Participants that attended the face to face validation meeting recommended that this self-reflection output be presented at the next MSP where there would be larger gathering so that they appreciate MEAL and be concerned of the four SUN processes. This will also help them to continuously take stock on development of the in country SUN movement process so they will be enabled to constructively and actively participate in the 2018 Self-Assessment.

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.
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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SIGNS</th>
<th>FINAL PLATFORM SCORE</th>
<th>PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td>▪ 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 convenor, 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</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I. Special committee of Permanent Secretaries on Nutrition meeting took place in 3rd August 2016. As an agenda item the meeting attended to the recommendations from the Multistakeholder Platform including expanding the food balance sheet; need to develop framework for nutrition sensitive interventions for the line ministries; and the work force provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>the UN Agencies, donors, civil society organisations and businesses have organised themselves in networks with convening and coordinating functions.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Establish or refine the terms of reference, workplans and other types of enabling arrangements <em>(Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Terms of Reference, workplan or Supporting documents requested)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Expand MSP to get key members on board, i.e. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Actively engage executive-level political leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity and non-discrimination, WASH etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Ensure that the MSP membership is expanded to – or better able to – support women’s leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ 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. <em>(Provide examples, if available)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/contribute to the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed workplans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy and legal documents, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ 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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The last MSP meeting resolved the following Key issues: prioritise review Legislation on BMS; expand the food balance sheet; need for mainstreaming agriculture sensitive interventions; bringing on board the department of forestry into food security discussions; and nutrition workforce improvement.*
stakeholders, set
significant agendas, reach consensus to
influence decision-making processes and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use results to advocate/influence other decision-making bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Networks convene other meetings that bring together a range of stakeholders that feed into the MSP on a wide range of issues that contribute to in-country SUN Movement progress.

Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of newsletters, activity and monitoring reports of the MSP or the nutrition coordination system <strong>(please share, if available)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stakeholder groups tracking commitments and are able to report on an annual basis, at a minimum, such as financial commitments, Nutrition for Growth commitments, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Joint Annual Review conducted in five (5) SUN Funded districts focusing mainly on M and E, and Behavior Change Communication.

II. Regular review processes by other programmes and networks are undertaken on annual basis MDGi, GIZ

III. Quarterly newsletters and update calls for the SBN

V. The NFNC and stakeholders participated in all the SUN country teleconferences organised by the SUN Secretariat.

VI. SUN quarterly progress report for the SUN Pool Fund activities generated and disseminated to stakeholders.
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.

leadership irrespective of turnover
- Institutional commitment, also toward gender equality, from key stakeholder groups


CSO SUN has engaged various political parties to include nutrition in their party manifestos

II. CSO SUN has engaged various political parties to include nutrition in their party manifestos

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Please can you explain if you are engaging with the humanitarian partners? How? Do you face any challenges?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zambia has not had an emergency but efforts to invest in preparedness include the revival of nutrition in emergency committee and development of nutrition emergency plan and guidelines. Further training of nutrition staff on nutrition in emergency was conducted in October/November 2016 with support from UNICEF. Some of the Humanitarian partners are engaged in the nutrition cooperating partners network

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS you have in place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance of partners with the SUN Movement Principles of Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nutrition Networks have been committed with their involvement in the MSP notably NCPS, CSO-SUN and SUN Business Network. There has been challenge with the Academia and Research Network because of non-availability of a research agenda.

Government line ministries commitment has been lukewarm especially at Director level that have been
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?)

inconsistent in attending the MS Platform. Because of high staff turnover and infrequent orientation there has generally been inadequate understanding of the SUN Principles of Engagement under the line ministries

iii. Our Communication and Advocacy have been narrowed to the 14 SUN Pool funded districts rather than national

iv. SBN at point of engagement members sign up principles of Engagement but however, there is no mechanism for assessing the adherence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>- Government through the NFNC has continued to coordinate the line ministries and other nutrition players through the various platforms on nutrition and nutrition related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>- The UN has continuously supported Government in its efforts to strengthen its convening role and bring together both individuals and inputs from across the various sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- Donors/UN produced a working brief to elevate nutrition on the agenda for the new government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>- Collaborates with National Food and Nutrition Commission, Ministry of Health and Ministry of Commerce departments to complete several initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

Special Committee of Permanent Secretaries has been meeting consistently as well as the National Multistakeholder Platform. Other SUN networks have expanded bringing more players especially the Donor Network, SBN and CSO. DNCCs have been formed in a number of districts other than the SUN Funded districts and of note are those in the Southern Province since this is one of the provinces not covered under the SUN Pool Fund. While the continued functioning of the MSP and its SUN units or networks, majority of stakeholders have not fully internalised the four SUN processes thus experience challenges in participation in self-assessment. Therefore, the SUN Focal point should include on MSP meeting agenda on progress or updates around the four SUN processes.

The delay in agreeing on the research agenda for the country on nutrition has made the Academia and Research Network to lag behind all other networks. This aspect should be prioritised in 2017 so that the network can be generating evidence for policy, advocacy and programming.
**Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework**

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

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SIGNS</th>
<th>FINAL PLATFORM SCORE</th>
<th>PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. | • 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 | 2 | • Two consultative meetings have been held to review the NFNC Act. A draft Bill is still undergoing discussions.  
• Draft Food Safety and Quality Bill is still under discussion  
• Processes for the review of the National Food and Nutrition Strategic Plan 2011 – 2015/6 commenced and drafting the NFNSP 2017 to 2021 aligned to 7th National Development Plan.  
• Consultative meetings on the review of the 2006 Statutory Instrument on BMS  
• Portions of the Public Health Act have been proposed for amendment  
• SBN launched an initiative to undertake an economic analysis of the current policies and regulatory framework to find entry points for nutrition |

**Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4:** Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislation analysed.
### Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, updating and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existence of a national gender equality and women’s empowerment strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop a common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy-making that is pro-female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Key stakeholder groups promote the gender-responsive integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, social media outreach, workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dissemination and communication of policy/legal framework by key stakeholders among relevant audiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2

- The 2014 to 2016 Advocacy strategy was reviewed with support from FANTA and the draft Advocacy Plan in has been developed. Further the Zambian Nutrition Profiles was updated which will be used as tool for advocacy.
- Orientation of the new members of parliament from parliamentary committees (health, social, agriculture) of the 12th Session of the National Assembly
- An advocacy toolkit was developed for use by various nutrition champions including Parliamentarians who were oriented.
- The CSO SUN Alliance engaged with the members of parliament regularly from different political party backgrounds through the All Party Parliamentary Caucus on Nutrition APPCON. Multiple Trainings were held, that included joint efforts with National Food and Nutrition Commission as well as Save the Children.
### Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholder efforts

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.

- 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.

**Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4:** Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts

| 2 | Stakeholders engaged in the review of the Agriculture Policy and the development of the Social Protection Strategy |
|   | The NFNC with support from UN network (Unicef) facilitated the development and dissemination of the Nutrition Sensitive Framework in readiness for Medium Term Expenditure Framework Planning for the period 2018-2020. |
|   | A number of stakeholders provided inputs in the Health nutrition related legislation through consultative workshops and meetings. |
|   | Legislation on BMS is being reviewed to address identified gaps with respect to enforcement |
|   | A roadmap to revive food fortification agenda for Zambia was developed by the National Food Fortification Alliance’s Technical Working Group. |

### Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise/enforce the legal frameworks

This progress marker looks at the availability of

| Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation | 2 |

I. The enforcement manuals for Statutory Instrument on the Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes
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.

**Existence of national/sub-national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation**

**Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence (relevant reports/documents) of law enforcement**

and Food Fortification are in place but are due for review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports**

| 1 |

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

If the country or part of the country faces certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) recently or at present, elaborate about the integration of mitigation measures into policies and legal frameworks

1) Are mitigation measures clearly integrated in nutrition relevant policies and legal frameworks?

Nutrition in Emergency plan in place to be considered yet how it fits in the relevant policies and legislation
### ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your view on HOW WE CAN MEASURE ADVOCACY EFFORTS AND SUCCESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobilisation of high-level advocates (including champions, parliamentarians, media)</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Have you organised a high-level event on nutrition? If yes, please provide details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Do you assess the existing 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).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**CSO-SUN engaged Members of Parliament and particularly specific MPs were vocal in advocacy efforts related to nutrition, including the Chairperson of The All Party Parliamentary Caucus on Nutrition.**

**CSO-SUN Secretariat also had input in Zambia’s First Lady’s speech on nutrition at the UN Decade of Action.**

**CSO-SUN and NFNC have been tracking budget allocation on nutrition but expenditure is not being tracked**

**CSO-SUN and stakeholders have been assessing the progress made so far by the Government of Zambia in Nutrition. CSO-SUN being an NVF grantee commenced efforts towards having the Zambian government make SMART commitments that lead to sustainable food and nutrition security and eliminate all forms of malnutrition which were intended for the second Nutrition for Growth Summit.**

**SBN members make voluntary commitments to nutrition but these are not tracked or followed up as the mechanism to do so has not been developed**

**A proposal on how to strengthen the tracking has been developed**

**Nutrition for Growth being reported annually, revised all the old NG recommendations updated and validated them and have included new ones**
### Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>The Government partners continued to provide leadership in the review of nutrition related legislation and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN provides policy level support and engages in strategic advocacy to increase prioritization of nutrition agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Support NFNC and line ministries on review of food and nutrition related policies and legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Support to NFNC and line ministries on the Refinement of Nutrition Workforce Planning Recommendations - Support NFNC and line ministries on advocacy for review of food and nutrition policies and legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017) FOR PROCESS 2: Coherent policy and legal framework

Zambia has performed poorly on this process as most of the pieces of legislation whose review processes commenced in the last 2-3 years still remain unfinished including the Food and Nutrition Bill, the Food Safety Bill, and SI on marketing of BMS. Completion of these tasks depends on the workload at MoJ. Notable progress was on completion of the agriculture policy and the commencement of the development of the Social Protection guidelines. The Communication and Advocacy Technical Working Group has made progress in building nutrition champions from Parliamentarians. This should also be extended to the Church leaders who were oriented in 2016.
**Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework**

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

**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 actions. 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SIGNS</th>
<th>FINAL PLATFORM SCORE</th>
<th>PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 | ▪ Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews  
▪ Analysis of sectoral Government programmes and implementation mechanisms  
▪ Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping | 3 | Mapping and gap analysis data was collected in 88 out of 103 districts of the 10 provinces on distribution of nutrition specific and sensitive interventions, geographical coverage, and beneficiaries covered  
The NFNC commission a Study undertaken on the |

---

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’.
policies and priorities. It focuses on the alignment of actions across sectors and relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition. Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the review of programmes and implementation capacities

- Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions
- Map existing gaps and agree on gender-sensitive core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:**
Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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&amp;E Framework and costed interventions, including costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives
- Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups
- 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 |
| Minimum Package to ascertain the evidence and the cost to guide development of a scale up plan for the 1st 1000 MCDP and provide cost estimates for the scale up plan. |
| Development of the 1st 1000 MCDP 2017-2021 commenced with a revised Results Framework and the programme will still be anchored in the NFNSP 2017 to 2021 as Strategic Objective 1. |
| Two consultants have been contracted to facilitate the development of the National Food and Nutrition Strategic Plan 2017-2021. |
| With support from Nutrition International some work was undertaken to assess capacity of the NFNC to coordinate nutrition. This will inform development of the institutional (NFNC) strategic plan |

---

2This assumes existence of multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination and engagement under Process 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Existence of annual detailed work plans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. The NFNC with partners refined the Workforce Report recommendations and have been submitted to government for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Under the 1st 1000 MCDP annual costed work plans have been reviewed and revised by the key line ministries and NFNC as well as other SUN Fund grant recipients at national and district levels. The Memorandum of Understanding between CARE and grant recipients will run until December 2017 when MCDP 1 winds up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. The District level plans were revised with new targets up to December 2017 based on the revised log frame of the 1st 1000 MCDP Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This progress marker looks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Information systems(e.g. multi-sectoral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The M&amp;E plan which has common results framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
specifically at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition. It looks specifically at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform the adjustment of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.

Platforms and portals in place to regularly collect, analyse and communicate agreed upon indicators focusing on measuring implementation coverage and performance
- Existence of regular progress reports
- Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits
- Adjustments of annual plans, including budgets based on analysis of performance
- Existence of participatory monitoring by civil society

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** Countries are required to provide evidence of regular/annual joint review of implementation coverage and performance of prioritised actions

**Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate the implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact**

This progress marker looks specifically at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision making and create evidence for public good.

- 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

3

A process evaluation of the 1st 1000 MCDP was conducted in selected SUN Funded districts and information disseminated at MSP and other meetings.

Open research day held and various researches shared

Stakeholders have advocated for increased coverage of nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive interventions
▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society
▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes

Minimum requirements for scoring 4:
Countries are required to provide evidence of evaluation of implementation at scale that demonstrates nutrition impact and are made available publicly

in order to achieve significant impact on reduction of stunting.

A national consultant was engaged to develop a framework and guidelines for incorporating nutrition in the sector plans.

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

If the country or part of country face certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) in the recent past or at present, please elaborate on the alignment of mitigation/emergency measures

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?

Stakeholders | Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
--- | ---
Government | - Spearheading M&E implementation plan as well as capacity enhancement for the DNCCs and line ministries
UN | - UN provides all support to national policies and programmes to/through Government; all activities aligned to government priorities
Donor | - Undertook a redesign exercise for SUN support towards the national programme beyond 2016
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)

The joint annual reviews undertaken generated valuable information which was used in the development of MCDP2. Further there has been good quality data since the reorientation of the DNCC and a number of districts (from the 14 SUN Pool Funded) were able to pass the data quality assessments (DQA) which were conducted after every quarter reporting.

While there has been evidence of good practices in the 14 SUN funded districts around some nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive interventions, there was inadequate documentation to enhance wider sharing. As the country braces for rolling out lessons from the MCDP phase 1 should be well documented and disseminated to inform phase 2.
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.

**Process marker 4.1: Cost and assess financial feasibility of the CRF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SIGNS</th>
<th>FINAL PLATFORM SCORE</th>
<th>PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR FINAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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). | ▪ 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)* | 4 | Six Line ministries (Health, Agriculture, Local Government, Community Development, Education, Agriculture and Livestock) developed, costed and operationalized individual work plans at national level. Similarly, multisectoral plans were developed and costed for various nutrition interventions at provincial and district level in the 14 and 7 SUN 1000 MCDP implementing districts and provinces respectively  
The MCDP 2 was costed over 5 year period 2017 to 2021 and Nutrition Cooperating Partners provided indicative figures to support the government over the five year period. |

### Progress Marker 4.1: Cost and assess financial feasibility of the CRF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress Marker not applicable to current context</th>
<th>Nothing in place</th>
<th>Planning begun</th>
<th>Planning completed and implementation initiated</th>
<th>Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational</th>
<th>Fully operational/Targets are achieved/On-going with continued monitoring/Validated/Evidence provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Progress Marker 4.1: Cost and assess financial feasibility of the CRF

**DEFINITION**

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).

**POSSIBLE SIGNS**

- 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)*

**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.

- Six Line ministries (Health, Agriculture, Local Government, Community Development, Education, Agriculture and Livestock) developed, costed and operationalized individual work plans at national level. Similarly, multisectoral plans were developed and costed for various nutrition interventions at provincial and district level in the 14 and 7 SUN 1000 MCDP implementing districts and provinces respectively
- The MCDP 2 was costed over 5 year period 2017 to 2021 and Nutrition Cooperating Partners provided indicative figures to support the government over the five year period.
### Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition

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.

- Reporting of nutrition-sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector and sex, where relevant, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including:
  - 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.
  - Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information
  - Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public.

#### Minimum requirements for scoring 4:
Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Government line ministries and NFNC funding allocation are reflected in the Annual Expenditure Book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A team comprising NFNC, IAPRI, CSO SUN, Care International, and Concern developed a budget tracking framework and monitored financial commitments from 2013-2017 towards nutrition and appeared before the Parliamentary Expanded committee on Estimates and Expenditure and highlighted key issues on nutrition. The committee further pledged to continuously consult NFNC and other stakeholder’s partners on how to make Social Cash Transfer, Farmer Input Support Programme (FISP) and other government programmes nutrition sensitive.

Documentation available on planned spending and current allocation, however recent expenditure not being tracked

For pool funded there is a quarterly financial reporting mechanism and the audit systems

The other stakeholders use the existing Government financial system for reporting

The NFNC engaged consultant who undertook a Fiscal space analysis but experienced challenges with internal and external expenditure data on nutrition.

### Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Government and other in-country stakeholders assess additional funding needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through: Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related implementing entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Specific programmes performed by government and/or another in-country stakeholder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to increase advocacy efforts around nutrition investments, a Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III (FANTA) organised a PROFILES workshop and Advocacy Planning in April 2017. Representatives were drawn from an array of stakeholders that included: -Government Ministries and Departments (Health, Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, Local Government, Education, National Development and Planning), NFNC, Central Statistics Office, FANTA III, Zambia Institute for Policy and Research (ZIPAR), Nutrition Cooperating Partners and Academia.

A consolidated 2017-2027 PROFILES Model for Zambia was developed and will be the basis for advocacy and this Model for Zambia was developed in line with the national, regional and global nutrition targets respectively.

In country stakeholders have disbursed according to the timeframes agreed upon. Donors and other nutrition Cooperating Partners financed nutrition the fiscal year mainly through the SUN FUND which is a pool fund comprising DFID, Swedish Aid and Irish Aid and other none pool funding mechanism.

Specific programmes supported by donors/partners in the period under review included: - Management of Malnutrition, Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission, Scaling up Nutrition, Social Cash Transfers, Strengthening women’s livelihood, Nutrition surveillance, control and technical support and PHC RMNCAH & Nutritional Services.
### Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact

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 predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.

- 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

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:**
Countries are required to provide evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms

---

**In order to ensure sustainability of nutrition programme, nutrition budget lines were introduced in the SUN 1000 MCDP implementing Government Ministries. However, the allocation to these key nutrition sensitive and specific budget lines remained significantly low and Cooperating partners continued to carry the major funding gaps and supplemented government funding.**

The SUN Business Log frame is a multi-year programme which clearly sets out priority interventions and expected costs for each quarter or period under review.

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

If the country or part of country face certain types of emergency (i.e. natural, humanitarian, conflict situations) in the recent past or ongoing, elaborate about the finance of mitigation measures

| 1) | Is there clearly identifiable funding for emergency situations? |
| 2) | Do emergency funds complement mainstream funding for nutrition? If so, how? |

---

### Stakeholders | Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four

| Government | - Coordinate development of costed annual plans on MCDP  
- Facilitate gathering data on budget tracking from line ministries and NFNC |
| UN | - UN works to cost own activities in line with priorities of government and UN in Zambia |
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)

While many investments are being made across Zambia to tackle under nutrition, the government budget allocation, outside of human resources, remains stagnant and in some cases, decline. In the meantime, the National budget overall has doubled in 2017 since 2012. Eliminating under nutrition in children can increase productivity for an entire country and boost GDP by as much as 12%; given the critical role that good nutrition will play in the future economic development of Zambia, the opportunity for continued and meaningful investment should not be missed, in particular when evidence is in place for many interventions which are known to have a high impact. The Nutrition Matters report published last year also noted that an annual public investment of $47.8 million would reduce stunting, save lives, free up people from disability and chronic ill health and contribute $123 million to the GDP of Zambia. Current planned investment for 2017 stands at only $3.1 million, with a further $25 million from cooperating partners which is far short of this

Recommendations

- Continue to fund the ‘whole of government’ approach which is already employed under programmes like the Most Critical 1000 Days Programme and recognizes that the responsibility for tackling under nutrition rests across different sectors and Ministries.
- Increase the budgetary expenditure on nutrition-sensitive interventions in line with the NFNC’s recommendation of ZMW 40 million per year and nutrition-specific interventions to meet the WHO target of 300ZMW/child under 5 per year.
- Leverage the substantial investment in the Social Cash Transfer to increase impact on nutrition by targeting pregnant and lactating women and integrating nutrition messages into the programme.
- Continue advocating for increase funding to the NFNC and line ministries to have the greatest impact on reduction of all forms of malnutrition. This funding must be sufficient enough to fund - Scale up high impact nutrition interventions in Zambia to reach 80% of the target population by 2021, coordination, monitoring and evaluation, creating and sharing of information, resource mobilization, communications and advocacy.
Donors continued to support regular joint annual reviews to track programme progress.

Annex 1: Common priorities for 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015-2016 priorities</th>
<th>Please reflect on the completion of the work vis-a-vis your priorities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Progress on Stated Priorities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the Multi-Stakeholder Platform coordinate the response of the actors to the identified annual priority action areas?</td>
<td>Not much progress was made on the CRF since a decision was made to have it incorporated into the next National Food and Nutrition Strategic Plan (2017 to 2021), whose work commenced early 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, were you able to access external technical assistance as</td>
<td>While the nutrition advocacy had lagged behind, a number of important activities where undertaken including orientation of members of Parliaments and the Church leaders. Nutrition Champions were not yet identified and it was decided to build champions from on-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Required? What went well? What went wrong?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement with parliamentarians and faith based leaders. In addition successful Nutrition campaigns for the MCDP were held in the 14 districts using a mix of communication channels and tools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While the MSP and other SUN Networks continued to meet according to schedule strengthening of skills of key actors, in communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination was generally inadequately done for all levels. However efforts were made to incorporate capacity enhancement aspects in the revised MCDP plans at district and national levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis. Not much progress because our advocacy was generally below par.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerning strengthening equity drivers of nutrition, nothing much was accomplished and the country needed support in this area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Challenges:

- Slow progress on updating of the NFNC Bill
- Continued capacity gaps within Government resulted in challenges in effective coordination and implementation.
- Nutrition sector activities include more than what is done under SUN fund, but often not reported so full picture of nutrition activities is not fully reflected (mapping exercise protracted)
- Common Results Framework will not be finalized until new National Food and Nutrition Strategic Plan is approved (currently under development)
- Low levels of investment by Government in nutrition service delivery (outside of staffing costs and infrastructure).

---

**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. Strengthen mechanisms for tracking nutrition for growth SMART commitments as well as expenditure. This may require input from the SUN Movement Secretariat or the Executive Committee especially in getting high level political commitment.

2. Roll out the MCDP beyond the 14 phase I districts at least to reach 25 districts in 2018 with funding from SUN Pool and other Non-pool funding sources.

3. Strengthen national and provincial technical capacity to support DNCCs and WNCCs to enable them effectively coordinate and implement nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive interventions that converge on beneficiaries.

4. Strengthen monitoring, evaluation and learning agenda for nutrition to also cover all districts implementing the 1000 MCD regardless of funding sources and invest in wider information dissemination on best practices. External support will be required from relevant Global networks.

5. Strengthen advocacy especially to get unfinished draft pieces of legislation including the Food and Nutrition Bill, the Food Safety Bill and the SI on marketing of BMS.

6. Once the research agenda is agreed upon will proceed to strengthen the Academia and Research Network by establishing secretariat at one of the research institutions to coordinate this effort.

7. Finalize the national food and nutrition strategic plan, the 1000 Most Critical Days Programme Phase II and the National Food and Nutrition Strategic Plan. All these documents that cover a five-year period (2017-2021) are expected to improve the environment for nutrition.

8. Improved donor coordination for nutrition programming and financing through the operationalization of the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Fund Phase II.

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

The National Food and Nutrition Commission is celebrating its 50th Anniversary. As part of the celebrations, a 2-day Nutrition Conference has been planned (10-11 August, 2017), which will bring together nutrition experts, influencers and policy makers to discuss why it is important to invest in nutrition. This conference is expected to raise the profile of nutrition in the country and beyond.
### Annex 2: Details of Joint-Assessment of National Multi-Stakeholder Platform Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Specific SUN Role (if applicable)</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Should contact be included in the SUN mailing list?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>Jane Chistembo</td>
<td>NAZ / CSO SUN</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:janekalimina@gmail.com">janekalimina@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>+2609777207344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Officer</td>
<td>Erwin Miyoba Mbaale</td>
<td>PAM</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:erwinmiyoba@gmail.com">erwinmiyoba@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>+260 953969729/976011936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Programme Assistant</td>
<td>Tambudzai Matenga</td>
<td>SBN</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tambudzai.matenga@wfp.org">Tambudzai.matenga@wfp.org</a></td>
<td>+260971020344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Principal Food and Nutrition Officer</td>
<td>Rose Silyato</td>
<td>MoA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rosashangala@gmail.com">rosashangala@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>+260977926620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Nutrition Specialist</td>
<td>Ruth Siyandi</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rsiyandi@unicef.org">rsiyandi@unicef.org</a></td>
<td>+260 977719129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>Ethel Yandila</td>
<td>DFID</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:E-Yandila@dfid.gov.uk">E-Yandila@dfid.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>+260 211251164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Gender Coordinator</td>
<td>Faides Nsofu</td>
<td>CARE/SUN FUND / CSO SUN</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:nsofuf@carezam.org">nsofuf@carezam.org</a></td>
<td>+260 977324500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Dorothy Namuchimba</td>
<td>CARE / SUN FUND / CSO SUN</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:namuchimbad@carezam.org">namuchimbad@carezam.org</a></td>
<td>+260 977795223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Robinah Mulenga Kwofie</td>
<td>NFNC</td>
<td>Govt. SUN Focal point</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmulenga2011@yahoo.com">rmulenga2011@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Nutrition Advisor</td>
<td>Emily Heneghan</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:emily.heneghan@wfp.org">emily.heneghan@wfp.org</a> +260 971238426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>H/PHCNU</td>
<td>Freddie Mubanga</td>
<td>NFNC</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:fdmubanga@gmail.com">fdmubanga@gmail.com</a> +260 977805413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Food Scientist</td>
<td>Gladys Chirwa Kabaghe</td>
<td>NFNC</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:gladysckabaghe@yahoo.com">gladysckabaghe@yahoo.com</a> +260 966761583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Head-NECU</td>
<td>Eustina M. Besa</td>
<td>NFNC</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Embestine.besa@gmail.com">Embestine.besa@gmail.com</a> +260 955883952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>SBN Manager</td>
<td>Raphael Siwiti</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
<td><a href="mailto:raphael.siwiti@wfp.org">raphael.siwiti@wfp.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Nutrition Specialist</td>
<td>Hermann Ouedraogo</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:houedraogo@unicef.org">houedraogo@unicef.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Social Protection Advisor</td>
<td>Dolika Nkhoma</td>
<td>DFID</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:d-nkhoma@dfid.gov.uk">d-nkhoma@dfid.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>CSO-SUN Acting Country Coordinator</td>
<td>Mwandwe Chileshe</td>
<td>CSO-SUN</td>
<td></td>
<td>mwandwedee@          +260 976620359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>