

## SUN Movement Report, 2017

### ZIMBABWE

#### 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 writing and verbally
Civil society	Yes writing
Science and academia	Yes verbally
Donors	Yes in writing
United Nations	Yes verbally and in writing
Business	no
Other (please specify)	

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? How many were women and how many were men? 23 with 13 Women and 10 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Review, validation	Meeting <input type="checkbox"/>		Email	<input checked="" 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/No

Why?

Networks interacted and reflected on progress to date. It allowed for new members to participate in the process and trigger further engagements, particularly for the research group.

**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,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structures in place and functioning, such as a high-level convening body from the Government (political endorsement)</li> <li>Official nomination of a SUN Government Focal Point</li> <li>Appoint Focal Points/conveners for key stakeholder groups,i.e. a donor convener, civil society coordinators, UN focal points, business liaison persons, academic representative</li> <li>Convene MSP members on a regular basis: please provide the number of meetings for each identified coordination structures</li> </ul>	3	During the reporting year donors met in informal settings to discuss/address issues related for example to crisis responses, food security/nutrition, agriculture and policy. Informal donor FS/Agriculture donor coordination group (to be chaired by DFID) on hold since early 2017. The institutional structures from national to ward level were capacitated on the multi-stakeholder Food and Nutrition Security Committees has managed to capacitate 15 District Food and Nutrition Security Committees (DFNSCs) . The DFNSCs in turn trained 75 ward

<p>donors, civil society organisations and businesses have organised themselves in networks with convening and coordinating functions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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</li> <li>▪ Establish or refine the terms of reference, workplans and other types of enabling arrangements</li> </ul> <p><b>(Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Terms of Reference, work-plan or Supporting documents requested)</b></p>		<p>food and nutrition committees(WFNSC) on the Community Based Multisectoral (MCBM) approach to food and nutrition security for stunting reduction.</p> <p>The UN Network has developed a 2017 plan for coordinating support to the government towards community based stunting reduction focusing on 4 priority districts that are modelling / piloting the MCBM approach.</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence</b></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"> <li>▪ Expand MSP to get key members on board,i.e. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics</li> <li>▪ Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors</li> <li>▪ Actively engage executive-level political leadership</li> <li>▪ Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity and non-discrimination, WASH etc.</li> <li>▪ Ensure that the MSP membership is expanded to – or better able to – support women’s leadership</li> <li>▪ 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)</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>(Provide examples, if available)</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The nation has engaged in various Partners and even capacitated them in some districts; 5 districts were trained to integrate nutrition programmes particularly in Women Affairs Gender and Community Department. The integration of nutrition programming includes gender related issues, WASH, food security, resilience and social protection. 14 Districts have fully scaled up, 10 supported by ENSURE and 4 by AMALIMA which are consortia of NGOs. Engagement of nutrition sensitive sector has been initiated in various programmes which include the MCBM in 19 districts, DFID emergency in 10 districts. The decentralised structures were guided by the MCBM manual. The UN Network is supporting integration of nutrition in the agriculture sector to enable them to actively play their sectoral role in nutrition better. Ministry of Agriculture Mechanisation and Irrigation Development (MOAMID) has improved on nutrition sensitive programming to include</p>

			<p>in their pre-service training curriculum of agriculture extension officers on human nutrition related matters.</p> <p>WASH in some parts of the country used the ZimAhead Community Health clubs Approach.</p>
<b>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/contribute to the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)</b>			
<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"> <li>▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work-plans</li> <li>▪ Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy and legal documents, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews.</li> <li>▪ Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders</li> <li>▪ 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</li> <li>▪ Use results to advocate/influence other decision-making bodies</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement</li> </ul>	<p>4</p>	<p>The multisectoral platform convened by the Office of the President and Cabinet The plans are also embedded within high political document, the ZimASSET, quarterly plans and Reports.</p> <p>Donor convenor attended MSP meeting and forums (these have been mainly the regular conference calls organise by the SUN Secretariat). Cross network engagement continues within the MSP as partners are supporting Government efforts in all sectors from Agriculture, Nutrition and Health, Social Protection, Gender and WASH. Engagement of media both print and electronic. The meeting was held on the principle that journalists should be nutrition champions in reporting nutrition related issues in the country. This forum raised and increased awareness among journalists on the current nutrition situation in the country, effects of malnutrition on the country’s economic growth and development as well as interventions in place to eradicate malnutrition with a special focus on the first 1000 days of life.</p>

			<p>The UN Network convened a meeting with senior managers (including the permanent secretary, principal directors and directors) from the ministry of agriculture (MAMID) to discuss strengthening nutrition integration in the sector’s policies, strategies, programmes and activities. In service training of agriculture extension officers in nutrition is ongoing and one province has been trained so far. Three more trainings are scheduled for 2017.</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments</b></p>			
<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 report on own contributions and achievements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis)</li> <li>▪ Existence of newsletters, activity and monitoring reports of the MSP or the nutrition coordination system(<b>please share, if available</b>)</li> <li>▪ 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.</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>The Newsletter and bulletins for Food and Nutrition Security already in place. The Near Real Time monitoring under the MCBM helps in monitoring the community level indicators and dashboards are used as planning platform. The Ministry of Health and Child Care does report for the government e.g. the news of the Food Fortification Act shared on Twitter. The Government is in the process of developing an online Food and Nutrition Security Information System (FNSIS). The Nutrition for Growth Report was produced and shared. Quarterly district reports are shared and are consolidated at national level to produce a national report. In addition, various platforms have been used to engage with multiple stakeholders to track on contributions and accomplishments. The Nutrition Technical Working Group (NTWG) meets on a monthly basis and the National</p>

			<p>Food and Nutrition Committee meets quarterly. Among other functions, the platforms are coordinated by Government and members include government sectors and partners implementing nutrition interventions. It is an opportunity for stakeholders to engage in issues and their contribution towards scaling up nutrition in the country and networking for individuals. With the support from the UN Network the country is engaging a M&amp;E consultant to assist the government in improving the food and nutrition information system and help track progress with multisectoral actions for addressing nutrition as guided by the National Nutrition Strategy, the country's SUN document.</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform</b></p>			
<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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms</li> <li>▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover</li> <li>▪ Institutional commitment, also toward gender equality, from key stakeholder groups</li> </ul>	<p>4</p>	<p>Issues of Food and Nutrition Security have been placed on high level political agenda ,for instance the adoption in the Food and Nutrition Security cluster of ZimASSET. Structures within all the networks have sections responsible for nutrition</p> <p>Scaling up of the Multisectoral Community Based Approach to Food and Nutrition Security for Stunting Reduction(MSCBM) to 15 more districts in the reporting period also ensures that communities are engaged and that impact of programmes and policies is at</p>

<p>of agencies and organisations.</p>		<p>the household level. The model strengthens accountability at localised level for actions to address stunting, as well as community ownership of food and nutrition programs in their communities</p> <p>Need to advocate for increased donor commitments to the nutritional agenda as well as information sharing.</p> <p>The minister of Health is spearheading the national food fortification agenda, with mandatory industrial fortification of 4 selected food vehicles set to start on July 1<sup>st</sup> 2017. The MAMID is also spearheading promotion of production and consumption of biofortified crops.</p>
---------------------------------------	--	---

<b>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS</b>		
<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>2)</p>	<p>In accordance with the Civil Protection Act of 1989, the President of Zimbabwe, His Excellency R.G Mugabe declared a State of Drought Disaster following the impact of El Nino induced erratic rainfall. With regards to El Niño and Floods, response was intersectoral and the committee was set up from the government civil protection unit and drought responses committee, emergency technical response team (technical WG). The Drought Response and Early Recovery Plan focused on the mobilisation of emergency relief, both domestically and internationally.</p> <p>The UN Network coordinates the Central Emergency Response Fund which benefited support to drought mitigation efforts in response to the El Niño drought in 2016 with most of the emergency programmes ending in 2017. These were coordinated with the government and included support to screening and management of acute malnutrition, preserving</p>



		<p>and preventing livestock assets and support towards crop production.</p> <p>Inter-sectoral responses to the emergency , CPU, and weekly, Drought responses committees, PRDC meets weekly</p> <p>Humanitarian partners’ fully engaged within their key results areas.</p> <p>Most donors engage as well with humanitarian partners. Nutrition concerns are mainstreamed across relief programming and include support to severe and moderately malnourished children and PLW.</p> <p>Main challenges: coordination of assistance initiatives at local level, occasional issues related to access to humanitarian space.</p>
<b>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS you have in place:</b>		
<p>Compliance of partners with the SUN Movement Principles of Engagement</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> <li>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?</li> </ol>	<p>Yes, partners funded by USAID conduct the gender analysis before implementation, e.g. PADARE and male initiatives has now been adopted by UNICEF, messaging also genders initiative.</p> <p>Government is committed to the achievement of gender equality and women’s empowerment and the Constitution provides a robust legal framework. Several policies and institutions have been put in place to actualise these provisions, for instance: The National Gender Policy (NGP), the goal of which is ‘to eradicate gender discrimination and inequalities in all spheres of life and development’. The Zimbabwe Gender Commission (ZGC) which seeks to ensure gender equality as provided for in the Constitution.</p> <p>The UN Network upholds the rights of women and children in all the support to the government. Gender is a cross-cutting issue mainstreamed in all programmes. Targeting children in the first</p>

	<p>3) Do you promote compliance of stakeholders – and sectors with which you engage– with the SUN Principles of Engagement?</p> <p>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>	<p>1000 days is central to all nutrition programmes given the fact that stunting is the main nutrition problem in Zimbabwe.</p> <p>Yes, sharing of TORS and review.</p>
--	---	---

Stakeholders	Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
<b>Government</b>	- Coordinate and convene the meetings, provide the favourable environment in terms of policy and structures for MSP
<b>UN</b>	-UN network supported the establishment of the cascade capacitation of the 15 district level committees and support implementation of the Community Based model to food and nutrition security for stunting reduction( MSCBM). The UN network also supported the engagement of a REACH facilitator, the hiring of a M&E consultant as well as a advocacy consultant. The UN has also continued to support the fortification agenda for Zimbabwe and resource mobilisation for scaling up nutrition programmes. It has also developed a plan for joint collaboration focusing on 4 priority districts stragthening the MSBM programme.
<b>Donor</b>	-EU contribution: financial support of a 3M Euro project to address chronic malnutrition in Zimbabwe through joint UNICEF-FAO program.
<b>Business</b>	- Part of the fortification taskforce
<b>CSO</b>	-ZCSOSUNA organised a media engagement forum for journalists from both the print and electronic media on the 15th of March 2017. This platform was also used to enlighten participants on the role media plays in the fight against malnutrition in all its forms in the country. -Guided by the alliance’s strategic document, the alliance developed a two year advocacy and communication strategy as well as indicators to measure success of all advocacy and communication activities. The overall strategic goal of the strategy is to Accelerate progress in eliminating malnutrition in all its forms by raising awareness, strengthening support and action, increasing citizen engagement and political commitment and creating enabling environments that support scaling up of nutrition interventions.
<b>Others</b>	-

<p><b>OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2016 to April 2017)</b></p>
<p><b>FOR PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space</b>(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)</p>
<p>Improve on joint monitoring and assessment</p> <p>Tracking of various contributions (nutrition specific/sensitive funding initiatives) need to be pursued. A system of accountability (whereby all members of the MSP report on own contributions an achievements) remain outstanding.</p>

In order to better address the above issues, the newly EU funded program also foresees a secretariat support to the SUN Donor network to ensure some of the key tasks are timely performed.

Due to limited capacity, a dedicated SUN donor forum or other related working modality is still be established. Improved outreach is needed for an improved participation and commitment to the nutrition agenda, which will ensure as well the participation of key sector experts (such as wash, health, food security) and all other concerned stakeholders.

Limited capacity and other competing priorities have limited the ability to engage interested donors in an active dialogue for reaching consensus on topical matters and influencing decision making processes

## 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 acoherent 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"> <li>▪ Regular multi-sectoral analysis and stock-take of existing policies and regulations</li> <li>▪ Reflect on existing policies and legal framework</li> <li>▪ Existence of review papers</li> <li>▪ 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</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislation analysed</b></p>	4	<p>The Government developed the National Health Strategy for Zimbabwe 2016-2020 which seeks to achieve ‘Equity and Quality in Health: Leaving no one behind.’ The Strategy is anchored on four priority areas, namely: communicable diseases; non-communicable diseases (NCDs); reproductive, maternal, new-born, child and adolescents; and public health surveillance and disaster preparedness and response.</p> <p>Food and Nutrition Security is reflected in the country’s development policies. There was a launch of an Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (IPRSP) in September 2016 as part of Government’s international re-engagement efforts, and to eradicate poverty and ensure inclusive growth. The issues include in the paper include child and maternal nutrition and school feeding initiatives.</p> <p>In December 2016 the National Social Protection Policy Framework (NSPPF) which seeks to strengthen mechanisms</p>

			<p>for reducing poverty and vulnerability by improving the coverage and effectiveness of the various social protection programmes in place, was launched.</p> <p>Donors continue to support the government to facilitate implementation of the Food and Nutrition Security Policy and National Nutrition Strategy; which includes pertinent advisory and capacity building initiatives.</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, updating and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks</b></p>			
<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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy</li> <li>▪ Existence of a national gender equality and women’s empowerment strategy</li> <li>▪ 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</li> <li>▪ Develop a common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy-making that is pro-female</li> <li>▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes)</li> <li>▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups promote the gender-responsive integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions</li> <li>▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, social media outreach, workshops</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>One of the key champions in the parliament of Zimbabwe is Honourable Thokozile Khumalo worked on tabling the presentation of nutrition in Cabinet and the Parliamentary Portfolio committees. The aim was to influence the policies that affected the nutrition outcomes and broader developmental issues around food and nutrition security. The influential “gate-keepers” when it comes to nutrition have been side-lined for many programmes but currently there has been a deliberate move to involve Male Champions at sub-levels to influence developmental issues. Civil Society organisations developed gender sensitive training document on male engagement. The Ministry of Health and Child Care carried out dissemination and communication of legal framework for Food Fortification including the Act among Food and Nutrition Security Committees at Provincial, District and Ward levels(PFNSC,DFNSC,WFNSC). Also there has been dissemination of the Food Fortification Guidelines in all provinces through PFNSC.</p> <p>A policy brief was presented to members who attended the budget analysis dissemination meeting, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development as well as members of the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on SDGs</p>

<p>evidence-based policies that empower women and girls through equity-based approaches.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dissemination and communication of policy/legal framework by key stakeholders among relevant audiences</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</b></p>		<p>Through support to the REACH national facilitator, plans are underway to conduct develop materials toward national nutrition advocacy and a consultant will be engaged to support the government in the endeavour.</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholder efforts</b></p>			
<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"> <li>Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries I.e. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines/ advice/support for mainstreaming nutrition into sectoral policies.</li> <li>Key stakeholder groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition-related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive)</li> <li>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</li> <li>Existence of updated policies and strategies that are nutrition relevant (specific and sensitive)</li> <li>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</li> <li>Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>4</p>	<p>The Food Fortification Act was developed and passed through a consultative in-country approach with external technical support.</p> <p>Trade Policy and the Food and Food Standards Act Health (EHT) were reviewed to iron out the conflict that existed between the two legal documents.</p> <p>The legal policy framework (and related strategies) rae already in place and the need for new inputs on policy work is rather limited for the time being; however, donors remain interested in the future to actively contribute to any relevant policy dialogue/debates.</p> <p>The priority for the time being remain the effective implementation/operationalization of the existing policy/strategy documents.</p> <p>With support from the EU, the UN Network, through FAO is disseminating guidelines for helping the agriculture sector integrate nutrition in the policy, strategies and programmes. The FAO recommendations for making agriculture work for nutrition have been shared with the ministry and a departmental plan for each MAMID department was developed to help ensure this. In addition, the curriculum for agriculture extension training colleges is being revised to</p>

	<b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts</b>		integrate nutrition. A consultant has been engaged to spearhead this work.
<b>Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise/enforcethe legal frameworks</b>			
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation</li> <li>▪ Existence of national/sub-national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence (relevant reports/documents)of law enforcement</b></p>	3	The implementation of the Food and Nutrition Security Policy is being supported and enforcement initiatives initiated in over 8 Provinces across a range of donor programs. Advocacy work continue for the support of other sub-sector policies (i.e. Food Fortification). The resuscitation of subnational level structures on food and nutrition security and scaling up of the MSCBM in 15 more districts aims to monitor and drive the implementation of policies and strategies at community level. The multi-sectoral CBM has further disseminated the Policy to 15 districts and 75 wards.
<b>Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact</b>			
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc.</li> <li>▪ Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports</b></p>		<p>Various multistakeholder Learning Summits were held in particular under the livelihood and food security programme, a marketplace for sharing good practices was hosted centrally.</p> <p>During some of the Multistakeholder Platforms that are held quarterly, a Midterm review of AMALIMA AND ENSURE shared. This allowed for improvement of the projects and buying in of other stakeholders in the processes</p> <p>The dissemination and discussion of the SHINE study under ZVITAMBO was shared shred through brown bag and this include the discussion during o of the multistakeholder platforms on Aflatoxin exposure in Maternal and Child Health(MCH).</p> <p>FAO through a Technical Cooperation Programme to the Ministry of Health and Child Care is strengthening the</p>

		<p>National Food Control System. This follows an assessment of the system conducted in September to December 2016 using the FAO/WHO new tool on assessing national food control systems. The support will include development of a National Food Control Strategy in line with commitment 4 of the national Food and Nutrition Security Policy, revision of food safety legislation, training in various aspects risk based assessment, training of street food vendors and development and dissemination of food safety awareness messages to the general population in collaboration with the Consumer Council of Zimbabwe.</p> <p>Donor network held a learning summit to support on Integration of nutrition, resilience, agriculture, WASH and communications. By continued support to the SHINE (Sanitation Hygiene Infant Nutrition Education) initiative, DFID and EU are contributing to building the evidence base knowledge to inform future intervention in the sector. As part of a continuous process, tracking and reporting of results for the FNSP is done through the FNSCs which report on a quarterly basis on a set of indicators identified as contributing to food and nutrition security. The indicators are being integrated into a broader Food and Nutrition Security Information System.</p>
--	--	--

<b>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your view on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS</b>		
<p>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</p>	<p>1) Are mitigation measures clearly integrated in nutrition relevant policies and legal frameworks?</p>	<p>Yes, social protection framework has been put in place to facilitate to a greater level of predictability, providing scope for impacting on chronic hunger and vulnerabilities and increase on government ownership. The Food and Nutrition Security Policy encompasses the social protection objectives as well as early warning systems.</p>



<p>integration of mitigation measures into policies and legal frameworks</p>		
<p><b>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your view on HOW WE CAN MEASURE ADVOCACY EFFORTS AND SUCCESSES</b></p>		
<p>Mobilisation of high-level advocates (including champions, parliamentarians, media)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>2) Have you organised a high-level event on nutrition? If yes, please provide details</p>	<p>Yes, the following engagements happened in order to increase visibility on nutrition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ZCSOSUNA issued a press statement( see Annex)</li> <li>• Discussion by government on Value Added Tax(VAT) on basic commodities and how it could impact on nutrition outcomes in parliament.</li> <li>• Collaboration of MAMID and MoHCC ministers on Biofortification event, Food fortification Press statement with industry and partners</li> </ul>
<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>	<p>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?</p> <p>2) Do you assess the <i>existing</i> commitments and analyse whether (a) they are still valid (e.g.</p>	<p>Zimbabwe Civil Society Organisations Scaling Up Nutrition Alliance hosted an engagement meeting with 14 members of the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on Sustainable Development Goals. The meeting was also attended by representatives from the Ministry of Health and Child Care and the media. Following the 2017 budget analysis which was conducted by the civil society alliance the meeting was aimed at disseminating budget analysis findings, lobby for increased financial resource allocations in future and present a budget analysis policy brief. The same platform was also used to discuss with members of the August house how the country is working towards achieving the sustainable development goals targets and better nutrition for women of child bearing age and children below the age of two years.</p>

	<p>aligned with an up-to-date action plan); (b) they are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Bound (SMART).</p> <p><b>Please share any available evidence of commitments made since the beginning of 2016.</b> Kindly note that the evidence could be looking at new commitments made or changes to existing commitments, to make them more SMART.</p>	<p>Commitment based disbursement of funds. RBF and HTF also has commitment-linked disbursement. As set of indicators are available for the disbursement linked indicators for MCBM.</p>
--	--	---

Stakeholders	Description/Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Two
<b>Government</b>	<p>Led the processes of developing and reviewing policies and strategies like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Health Strategy for Zimbabwe 2016-2020</li> <li>• Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper</li> <li>• National Social Protection Policy Framework</li> </ul> <p>Presented a paper to Parliament through the advocacy of Honourable Thokozile Khumalo who is the nutrition champion</p>
<b>UN</b>	The UN SUN Network provided technical and financial support towards the development of the above mentioned key documents
<b>Donor</b>	A pool of donor funds like the HDF set to improve on the delivery and review of policies and other strategic documents
<b>Business</b>	
<b>CSO</b>	<p>- Hosted an engagement meeting with 14 members of the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on Sustainable Development Goals. The meeting was also attended by representatives from the Ministry of Health and Child Care and the media. Following the 2017 budget analysis which was conducted by the civil society alliance the meeting was aimed at disseminating budget analysis findings, lobby for increased financial resource allocations in future and present a budget analysis policy brief. The same platform was also used to discuss with members of the August house how the country is working towards achieving the sustainable development goals targets and better nutrition for women of child bearing age and children below the age of two years. Based on the 2017 National budget analysis report, CSA formulated a policy brief which is intended to explain why the Zimbabwean government need to leverage additional domestic resources if it wants to end malnutrition in all its forms. The purpose of this policy brief is to increase attention to, investment in both nutrition specific and sensitive interventions. The alliance published a press release in the Sunday Mail which one of the widely read newspapers in the country. In the release, the alliance gave a standing ovation to the government and its partners in their success in reducing stunting levels from around 33% in 2010 to around 26% in 2016. The alliance also applauded the National Nutrition Department for its efforts in fighting malnutrition in all its forms. On the other hand the alliance called the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development to increase its investment in nutrition and set aside specific budget lines for nutrition in future national budgets.</p>

	-
<b>Others</b>	-

**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)**

As above stated, the current policy framework on nutrition is considered at present sufficiently developed. The contribution/commitments to the food and nutrition policy by various line ministries varied; some gaps are being already identified and should be addressed in the future planning/programming exercise. For example the UNICEF-FAO program has initiated a number of actions to strengthening the nutrition agenda by the Ministry of Agriculture.

Increased attention may be needed to advocate for improved integration of nutrition outcome across other line Ministries.

Dissemination and communication of policy need also to be strengthened.

There is still a need to better capitalize on lesson learned and good practices (also taken from other international experiences).

Continuous review and evaluation of policies ought to be carried out in line with emerging needs.

### 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 actions<sup>1</sup>. 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews</li> <li>▪ Analysis of sectoral Government programmes and implementation mechanisms</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping</li> </ul>	3	Nationally, multisectoral nutrition situation analysis was done through the Annual Rural Livelihoods Assessment as well as an Urban Livelihood Assessment. Partners assisted through providing technical, financial and human resources. The Ministry of Health and Child Care carried out a SMART survey. Where relevant,

<sup>1</sup> ‘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>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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions</li> <li>▪ Map existing gaps and agree on gender-sensitive core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</b></p>		<p>donors programming on nutrition is aligned with national policies and priorities. However, proper mapping analysis and consultation to align actions and plans should be further developed.</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition</b></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&amp;E Framework and costed interventions, including costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives</li> <li>▪ Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups<sup>2</sup></li> <li>▪ 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&amp;E, capacity strengthening needs and priorities</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>Individual sectors do have yearly work plans. However a Consolidated short-term Performance monitoring plan does not exist. Short term priorities only exists for ZIMASSET. Accelerated Action Plan(AAP) at sub-national level has allowed for yearly plan by sectors. The Zimbabwe National Nutrition Strategy already defined a CRF (5 key results areas) to which various stakeholder should be aligned.</p>

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

<p>estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&amp;E.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment of coordination capacity to support CRF</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a robust plan that has been technically and politically endorsed.</b></p> <p>Please let us know if you have used <a href="#">the checklist for quality national nutrition plans</a> in a bid to review your plans</p>		
<p><b>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</b></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"> <li>▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources</li> <li>▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements</li> <li>▪ Existence of annual detailed workplans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national levels</li> <li>▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism</li> </ul> <p><b>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</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>A comprehensive donor based result framework is still to be elaborated. The work plans of the FNCS are aligned to the seven commitments of the National Food and Nutrition Security Policy (NFNSP), the ZIMASSET food security and nutrition cluster implementation plan and the six thematic areas of the NNS. The subnational and national multisectoral platforms have been given room for dialogue across sectors on various issues around food and nutrition security. The MSCBM microplans developed by districts are based on information system dashboards. The committees develop and implement the stunting reduction interventions in a way to operationalize the NFNSP, the ZimASSET and the NNS. This process involves community engagements.</p>

Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework			
<p>This progress marker looks 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Information systems (e.g. multi-sectoral platforms and portals) in place to regularly collect, analyse and communicate agreed upon indicators focusing on measuring implementation coverage and performance</li> <li>▪ Existence of regular progress reports</li> <li>▪ Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits</li> <li>▪ Adjustments of annual plans, including budgets based on analysis of performance</li> <li>▪ Existence of participatory monitoring by civil society</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of regular/annual joint review of implementation coverage and performance of prioritised actions</b></p>	3	<p>The MSCBM’s Near Real Time Data component is centred on the functionality of Food and Nutrition Security Committees from village right up to national level with all levels responsible for the collection, compilation, analysis and synthesis of data. This component also takes into consideration the data utilisation and citizen accountability as key to improving food and nutrition security challenges. The central food and nutrition security information system (FNSIS) hardware set-up is a step towards a consolidated data portal.</p> <p>National and district reviews were done for the MSCBM programme. These meetings went a long way in redirecting the implementation of the programme in the four learning districts. Review workshop was held with the overall objective of reviewing the first pilot phase of implementation of the MSCBM and reviewing the performance of the Near Real Time Data Monitoring System. A report for the review workshop was compiled and was critical in informing the planned scaling up of the MSCBM approach to more districts in the country.</p> <p>A consolidated information system to monitor implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition is yet to be established.</p>
Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate the implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact			
<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"> <li>▪ Reports and dissemination of findings of population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research</li> <li>▪ Capture and share lessons learned, good practices, case studies, stories of change –</li> </ul>	3	<p>Livelihoods assessments were done for both urban and rural households. The results are used to create a base for evidence and programming for government and its partners. For instance from the results it was recommended that There is need for further investigation into why boys are more affected by Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM), Severe Acute Malnutrition</p>

	<p>especially those that empower women and girls – and implementation progress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society</li> <li>▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes</li> </ul> <p><b>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</b></p>	<p>(SAM) and stunting than girls. In addition, in light of the worsening food security situation, stakeholders called for increased coordination by stakeholders in the food and nutrition sectors. It was also noted that food insecurity levels of urban households were rising. This negatively impacts on the livelihoods of a significant proportion of rural households who depend on remittances (both cash and in-kind) from relatives within urban areas. There is need to consider social protection measures that help to improve the lives of these vulnerable households. Social Behaviours – Gender Based Violence: GBV continues to be a national problem that according to this study not only affects women but also affects men. People from all socio-economic and cultural backgrounds were subject to violence although the study showed that those that were divorced/separated were affected more by physical violence and women that experienced most sexual violence were married living apart with a diploma/certificate after primary. A supplementary report on GBV was produced to this effect. A detailed report highlighting the issues and recommendations from the provinces and districts was compiled.</p> <p>In addition to the Vulnerability Assessments, the country undertook and published the ZDHS and SMART surveys, Lessons learnt from Review meetings by DFNSCs</p> <p>Learning Summit organised by UN Network and Donor. Various donors agencies carried out regular evaluation exercises to ensure high standards level of accountability across various funded actions (including initiatives with nutrition outcomes); in some instances these also contribute to build lesson learned and best</p>
--	--	--



			practices for wider dissemination and future planning (i.e. LFSP program).
--	--	--	--

**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?</p>	<p>Yes, government established a Special Committee on Emergency Responses to Drought/Flood-induced Disasters to oversee the production and implementation of the Drought Response and Early Recovery Plan and set-up the related mechanism for resource mobilisation. A Working Party of officials supports the Special Cabinet Committee by coordinating the implementation of set eight thematic areas which include food security and social protection, emergency safe water supply, micronutrient/under five feeding programme, school feeding programmes among others.</p>
	<p>2) Is there a minimum multi-sectoral package for emergency that is being implemented? If so, can you elaborate?</p>	<p>Emergency Response Plan was development through a multisectoral and situation report every two weeks was done. In addition there is an IMAM emergency strategy that is standard and anyone responding is within the strategy.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
<b>Government</b>	- Government coordinates the MSP that carries out the Vulnerability Assessments through a consultative approach. Information systems are put in place in order to track for implementation of the FNSP as well as the CRF. The tracking of the implementation of the CRFs is ongoing through FNSCs.
<b>UN</b>	- Support the SMART survey and the emergency responses based on evidence. Coordinated a learning summit to track and share on implementation. Recruiting a Consultant to support streamlining, monitoring and reporting indicators tracking multisector response to nutrition.
<b>Donor</b>	- Supported the SHINE study by ZVITAMBO in a bid to provide evidence for programming
<b>Business</b>	-
<b>CSO</b>	- Civil Society Organisations working towards scaling up nutrition in Zimbabwe are complementing government efforts in the fight against malnutrition in all its forms. Their actions are guided by national documents and plans, such as the National Food and Nutrition Security Policy and the National Nutrition Strategy. The alliance developed a four year strategic document in line with national policies and strategies as a way of ensuring national plans are translated into action.
<b>Others</b>	- N/A

**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)

A consolidated information system to monitor implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition is yet to be fully functional established. Minimum set of indicators are to be identified and tracked through the online system. A costed consolidated yearly plans ought to be developed with short-term priorities. Donors feel they should develop through a streamlined approach their own Result Framework that capture key nutrition sensitive sectors. MSP needs to conduct a joint mapping exercise and develop a database of who is doing what and where which is continuously updated.

## 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

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 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"> <li>▪ Existence of costed estimations of nutrition related actions(<b>please provide relevant documentation</b>)</li> <li>▪ Existence of costed plans for CRF implementation</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder groups have an overview of their own allocations to nutrition related programmes/actions (<b>please provide relevant documentation</b>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4:</b> Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</p>	2	<p>The country developed a Humanitarian Emergency Response Plan and was costed.</p> <p>The Zimbabwean National Nutrition Strategy has already estimated the financial resources needed to address 4 key result areas during the period 2014-2018. Mapping of current spending still need substantial analysis by the larger donor community, to identify both nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive intervention, which does contribute to specific key result area and/or national nutrition commitment (with an increase challenge to track nutrition sensitive interventions).</p>

<b>Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition</b>			
<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"> <li>▪ 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"> <li>○ Planned spending</li> <li>○ Current allocations</li> <li>○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ 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"> <li>○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public.</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending.</b></p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Mapping of spending on nutrition need still substantial analysis and consolidation. A detailed financial tracking system is to be further elaborated. It will be also important to identify and share best practices/lesson from donors engaged in the SUN initiatives in other countries.</p>
<b>Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls</b>			
<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"> <li>▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps</li> <li>▪ Government and other in-country stakeholders assess additional funding needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>SUN CSA used the 3 step approach to conduct the 2017 national budget analysis. Findings of the analysis revealed that the slowdown in economic growth has had an adverse effect on revenue performance. Having reached a peak of 3.93 billion in 2014, budget revenues declined to 3.54 billion in 2015 and 3.85 billion in 2016. In 2017, the government anticipates to collect revenue of 3.7</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</b></p>		<p>billion against an expected expenditure of 4.1 billion, thus a financing gap of 400 million.</p> <p>Detailed gap analysis to be further developed while mobilization of resources to address key intervention areas has been in the meantime further strengthened. To note for example EU funded UNICEF-FAO initiative to address issues in the areas of nutrition information system, nutrition governance, integration of nutrition agenda in the agriculture sector, and promote national communication campaign on nutrition).</p>
<b>Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements</b>			
<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"> <li>Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments</li> <li>Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through:Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related implementing entities</li> <li>Specific programmes performed by government and/or another in-country stakeholder</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</b></p>	3	<p>Disaster response plan received an increased funding from various Donors as pledged during the call. Commitments from donors have been progressively translated into disbursement (i.e. LFSP, ENSURE, AMALIMA, ZVITAMBO, FAO-UNICEF joint programming to address stunting etc.). Scaling up of proven high impact interventions have been a success through commitment from the donor network.</p>
<b>Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how governments and in-country stakeholders collectively engage in long-term predictable funding to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of a long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy</li> <li>Coordinated reduction of financial gaps through domestic and external contributions</li> </ul>	2	<p>Donors are committed to support both nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive programming. Additional funding resources are sought to</p>

<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stable or increasing flexible domestic contributions</li> <li>▪ Existence of long-term/multi-year financial resolutions/projections</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms</b></p>		<p>complement current Government funding commitments.</p>
---	---	--	---

<b>ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS linked to the MEAL system. Please give us your views on partnerships in EMERGENCY SETTINGS</b>		
<p>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</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Is there clearly identifiable funding for emergency situations?</li> <li>2) Do emergency funds complement mainstream funding for nutrition? If so, how?</li> </ol>	<p>In part there is identifiable funding through the coordinated approach to emergency. The set structures fundraise for the set requirements a stipulated in various government and partners emergency response plans.</p> <p>Nutrition is one of the thematic areas in emergency particularly for the vulnerable. A subcommittee on Nutrition Emergency led by the Nutrition Technical Working Group, advocates for funds and allocation for nutrition. Emergency requirements, like IMAM commodities and food relief and water for affected communities remains a short-term priority.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
<p><b>Government</b></p>	<p>- Government budgetary allocation for sectors like health, agriculture ,education, social welfare etc. Coordinated a Cost of Hunger Study to build and advocacy tool for nutrition investment case.</p>
<p><b>UN</b></p>	<p>- A joint proposal was done by UNICEF and FAO on accelerated community stunting reduction programme - WFP technically and financially supported the COHA study</p>
<p><b>Donor</b></p>	<p>- Various donor committed to the 2016-17 Drought Disaster domestic and international appeal for assistance</p>

<b>Business</b>	-
<b>CSO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Budget allocations for the past 3 years on health, are far less than 15% of the total budgets as recommended by the Abuja Declaration to which Zimbabwe is a signatory. It was observed that there has been inconsistency in the allocations going to MoHCC over the past 3 years. Analysis reveals that 6.57%, 8.3% and 6.9% of the nation’s budget has been allocated to the ministry in 2015, 2016 and 2017 respectively. 2017 budget allocation was reduced by 1.4 percentage points from the 2016 estimates. In 2017 approximately 80%of the allocation to MoHCC will be for staff salaries and only 20% will be for non wage expenditure including nutrition investment</li> <li>- It was also noted that the 2017 National budget prioritises the agriculture sector with a total allocation of 291.6 million proposed, covering key activities related to the following strategic grain reserve- 112.5 million, input schemes-102 million, supportive personnel/employment costs-47.3 operations 8million among others. The above allocation together with other agriculture related expenditures incurred during 2016 amounting to 148.8 translates into total agriculture support towards the 2016/17 season of 440.4 million (10.7%of national budget). The level of support is in line with the 2003 Maputo declaration by African heads and governments on committing at least 10% of national budgetary resources to the sector</li> <li>- The 2017 budget allocated 803.8 million towards primary and secondary education, this allocation has been reduced by approximately 86.34 million from last year’s allocation. An amount of 0.58 million is earmarked for the construction of appropriate infrastructure to facilitate increased enrolment at the early childhood development level. In order to mitigate against learners dropping out of school on account of hunger, 0.12 million has been allocated in support of the school feeding programme. The minister complemented efforts in place by parents and school authorities through the establishment of nutrition gardens.</li> <li>- 4.7 % (193.8 million) was allocated to the Ministry of Public Service Labour and Social Welfare. 21.4 million of the total allocation to the ministry was allocated to social protection programmes.</li> <li>- The alliance held an engagement meeting which was attended by representatives from various ministries to disseminate findings of the budget analysis exercise. In addition the alliance published a press release calling the ministry of Finance and Economic development to increase its investment in nutrition and set aside specific budget lines for nutrition in future national budgets. ZCSOSUNA has also had an engagement meeting with 14 members of the parliamentary portfolio committee on SDGs lobbying for support in calling for improved investment in nutrition.</li> </ul>
<b>Others</b>	-

**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)

More funding is required in research to disseminate the findings and sharing lessons learnt.

**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>Financing of selected programmes (due diligence) was realised to some extent with partners and government in the wake of the Humanitarian response plan. Support with the design and implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making. Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence currently on going  <b>The need for</b> support better management of data (e.g. Estimation of costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level) Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level) is still required. External expertise is needed.</p> <p>Yes, the MSP was able to coordinate on the communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination. The platforms also helped in the guidance for institutional frameworks at national and subnational level, Coordination Mechanisms, stakeholder groups, or others thereby preventing and managing Conflicts of Interest. More work required to 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).                      The country undertook a cost of hunger (COHA) study through a multisectoral approach in bid to build a national investment case, supported by data and evidence, to drive nutrition advocacy.</p> <p>External support came in under REACH and a national coordinator has just begun work. Some of the deliverables include the consolidated costed plans and priorities that were set in 2015-16. Short term consultancies TORS for advocacy and communications and Monitoring and evaluation and ICT has been developed to date.</p>
<p><b>Please list your key priorities for 2017-2018, providing details, as required</b></p>	



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

- Research-Financial support to disseminate and respond to government research gaps
- Capacity building on financial tracking of resources going into nutrition and the benefits thereof[**expert needed**]
- Tracking of progress with multisector actions for addressing malnutrition through the CRF (e.g. Estimation of costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level)Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level) [**Support from the secretariat is needed**]
- Guidelines and support to improve on documentation of lessons learnt
- Funding for scaling up and improvement of a multisectoral plan[external support needed]
- Support for CSO funding to improve on advocacy and engagement of Parliamentarians [**external support needed**]
- Review of National policies and guidelines
- Develop multisectoral plans and improve on the Joint Monitoring exercises
- Advocate for intra and intersectoral nutrition-sensitive programming
- Update and review our guidelines/ documents to include merging issues like climate change, gender, resilience
- Exchange visits to improve innovation on programming like the ICT, behaviour change, communications
  
- Advocacy and communication priority areas
  - To secure and maintain high level political commitment that translates into tangible action.
  - To create awareness of and maintain national interest in and commitment to improving and supporting nutrition programmes in the country.
  - To track all commitments made to nutrition and hold respective sectors accountable as a way of effectively supporting scaling up of nutrition interventions in Zimbabwe.

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)	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in the SUN mailing list?
1.	Mr	Dexter Chagwena	Ministry of Health and Child Care (MOHCC)	Government Secretariat	<a href="mailto:tungadex@gmail.com">tungadex@gmail.com</a>		
2.	Ms	Annastancia Chineka	UNICEF		<a href="mailto:achineka@unicef.org">achineka@unicef.org</a>		
3.	MRS	Thokozile Ncube	UNICEF		<a href="mailto:tncube@unicef.org">tncube@unicef.org</a>		
4.	MRS	Kudzai Mukudoka-Mudukuti	MSCBM Consultant		<a href="mailto:kmukudoka@unicef.org">kmukudoka@unicef.org</a>		
5.	Ms	Chigova Siboniso	FNC	Government	<a href="mailto:chigova.sibo@gmail.com">chigova.sibo@gmail.com</a>		yes
6.	MRS	Naume Tangwena	ZVITAMBO	Research			
7.	MRS	Tecla Musizvigozva	Care International	CSO Member	<a href="mailto:TeclaMus@carezimbabwe.org">TeclaMus@carezimbabwe.org</a>		yes
8.	MR	Michele Schivos	EU	Donor Convener	<a href="mailto:Michele.SCHIVO@ees.europa.eu">Michele.SCHIVO@ees.europa.eu</a>		yes
9.	MR	Manyika Ngoni	Ministry of Public Service Labour and Social Welfare		<a href="mailto:ngonnymanyika@gmail.com">ngonnymanyika@gmail.com</a>		
10.	MR	Lameck Betera	Ministry of Local Government, Public		<a href="mailto:lbetera@eprzim.org">lbetera@eprzim.org</a>		

			Works and National Housing				
11.	MR	Kudakwashe Zombe	Save the Children	Civil society Organisation Coordinator	nutritionist.zombe@gmail.com		yes
12.	MRS	Julia Tagwireyi		National REACH coordinator	julia.tagwireyi@gmail.com		yes
13.	Ms	Delilah Takawira	FAO		Delilah.Takawira@fao.org	+2634252655 – 8 exte 253 / +2637727298 17	
14.	Ms	Tafara Ndumiyana	WFP		tafara.ndumiyana@gmail.com		
15.	Mr	George Kembo	Food and Nutrition Council	SUN GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINT	georgekembo@gmail.com		yes
16.	Mr	Ismael Ingeta	UNICEF	UNNETWORK Chair			yes