



Scaling Up Nutrition Movement

Synthesis of Responses

for the Movement wide response to the
Independent Comprehensive Evaluation

March 2015

Synthesis of responses to the SUN Movement's Independent Comprehensive Evaluation

This synthesis report provides an overview of comments received from members of the SUN Movement in response to a request for feedback on the findings of the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation.

A total of **102** comments were received: 29 (or 52%) of SUN country government focal points responded on behalf of their multi-stakeholder platforms; and SUN network facilitators consolidated responses from 36 civil society alliances, 11 donors, 10 businesses and 4 UN system entities. 11 responses were received from individuals, and the SUN Secretariat also provided feedback. 5 out of the 8 countries involved in the country case studies responded. In summary:

- I. There was strong appreciation of the comprehensiveness of the evaluation**, and a recognition of the difficulty in evaluating a young Movement in a constantly evolving nutrition environment. The evaluation has sparked discussion and reflection on the opportunities and the challenges for the Movement after 2015. A lot of useful information is included in the report, however, respondents would have welcomed clearer recommendations to guide its future direction.
- II. The successes of the SUN Movement could be given more recognition for the stage it is at.** The overall tone of the report does not reflect the sheer amount of enthusiasm and energy unleashed by SUN. Many thought that the ICE neglected elements such as achievements by individual countries and networks. A comprehensive analysis of the nutrition landscape is missing from the report and some thought the evaluation failed to answer what the SUN Movement should look like given this context. Perhaps this was beyond the scope of the evaluation, but expectations have certainly been raised.
- III. The recommendations provide little discussion on how to address issues that are raised.** This omission leaves a great deal of work to be done by the Visioning Sub Group to make a recommendations on options for the future strategy of the Movement to the Lead Group. A paper outline visioning recommendations and options has subsequently been developed by independent consultants, to inform decision-making.
- IV. It is perhaps not surprising that the majority of comments focus on how the Movement should address perceived weaknesses in design and implementation** (Recommendation 2 and Conclusions 4 and 5). There is significant repetition between the conclusions and recommendations due, perhaps, to the inter-connected nature of the issues and because the ICE did not disentangle them sufficiently. This is unfortunate. The synthesis of comments on the recommendations is presented first.
- V. The responses received to the evaluation reflect some interesting tensions.** Far from being negative, this points to the strong sense of community that the Movement has nurtured, enabling people with different views to unite behind a common goal. As the Movement is country-led, any application of the renewed strategy will necessarily be context specific allowing such diversity to co-exist.

Recommendation 1: There was **strong agreement** that the SUN Movement should be continued and strengthened, building as far as possible on the existing framework. There was also strong agreement that the mandate of SUN be extended by 5 years.

- 1. The SUN Movement has successfully elevated nutrition on international and national agendas and catalysed momentum for improved coordination.** The increasing number of countries in

the Movement builds confidence amongst others to commit. The approach is refreshing and should be maintained. The next iteration of the strategy needs to better translate political commitment into measurable results at the country level. Continuation of convening and advocacy functions is needed whilst not supplanting the functions of existing organisations.

- 2. All in the Movement need to increase their ambition to transform ways of working, their actions and their commitments.** Whilst transformations take time, progress needs to accelerate if political attention is to be kept. Coordination and alignment are essential, especially in-country by external donors.
- 3. An extended mandate of five years would provide time for SUN countries in the early phases of scaling up to show tangible results.** As activities and programs mature, the measurement of impact should be possible (though maybe not attributable). However, five years will not be enough time to overcome all challenges, especially in crisis-affected countries. An extension beyond this period should be contingent upon results.
- 4. A longer term goal horizon in the updated strategy would reflect the timescale needed to measure sustained impact of nutrition interventions.** Zero stunting would be an ambitious goal, aligning with the 2030 goals of the Sustainable Development Goals and the 2025 World Health Assembly targets in the interim. Objectives for the next 5 years need to be agreed, and whilst we must be clear that it is national goals that SUN governments are working towards, the overarching goals that provide the ambition for the Movement's supporters could be some form of adjusted WHA 2025 targets and Nutrition for Growth commitments.
- 5. If the international governance of nutrition improves such that impact is measurable, the SUN Movement would become irrelevant.** Equally, an extended mandate must not absolve responsibility of the legitimate governing bodies for nutrition to become more efficient and effective.

Recommendation 2: There is **agreement** that the redesign and strengthening of the SUN Movement be reflected in a new strategy document- although there is **no consensus on the priority** elements that should be included. Respondents felt that the new strategy should not be rushed to be completed during the first half of 2015.

- 1. The next phase for the SUN Movement should emphasise the translation of political commitment into actions to increase the coverage of nutrition interventions.** These should reflect the country's prioritisation of critical actions. In summary, the strategy should: be participatory; be underpinned by strengthened accountability; encourage alignment around common results frameworks and national nutrition plans; improve financial tracking; advocate for increased domestic and external resources; strengthen monitoring and evaluation; explore differentiated approaches of support; share experiences between stakeholders; reinforce the capacities of the Movement's networks, secretariat and stewardship arrangements; and develop an approach to coordinate the delivery of support that will have both immediate impact and sustainable transformations. There are differing opinions within each of these elements as to the degree of flexibility, or prescriptiveness, which should be employed. All agree that communication should be improved.

There are numerous suggestions as to how the identified weaknesses in *design* and *implementation* could be addressed.

- 2. The participatory process of developing an updated strategy is important and encourages ownership.** SUN countries must be consulted in its design. Top-line strategic guidance should be

provided by the Lead Group in May 2015; the process of framing the strategy be completed by September; and network work plans to implement the strategy be developed by December 2015. A reflection period, or an independent review of the strategy once completed could be considered. The stewardship arrangement for the Movement needs to be endorsed by the UN Secretary General, soon after the Lead Group meeting in May, so that it assumes responsibility for the updated strategy. The practicalities of national-level implementation should be determined at country level.

- 3. Strengthened accountability systems at global, national and sub-national levels are essential if the delivery of support is to be accelerated, increased and aligned.** The updated strategy should link together network's time-bound work-plans with clear deliverables and timelines, the 'Capacity to Deliver' approach, and impact and implementation markers in ways that enable the Movement's stewardship¹, on behalf of SUN countries, monitor progress. The accountability framework should be re-examined, progress on financial tracking accelerated and modalities of support to the strengthening of national plans agreed. Coverage should be measured and reported by multi-stakeholder platforms annually. Social audits could be encouraged. Advocate for the SUN government focal point to be from the executive part of government, empowered to ensure that nutrition is a cross-ministerial issue.

- 4. The issue of assigning quality standards for costed plans and common results frameworks is contentious.** The *process* of developing costed plans and common results frameworks helps build consensus and should be encouraged. A clearer articulation of the relationship between the costed plans and the common results frameworks would be helpful. Members of the Movement should encourage Inter-governmental bodies with responsibilities for nutrition (i.e. CFS, WHA and ECOSOC) to establish criteria that sets quality standards, and agree upon how to monitor these standards. In the meantime, provide a space for a technical review of documents as requested by SUN countries. Such a peer review should not define standards but showcase a range of options available. External development partners must provide a clear statement of their own criteria required for their financing to be released. Learning routes should be facilitated and mechanisms that encourage all stakeholders to align with national nutrition plans be explored. National capacity for budget tracking and analysis, advocacy, planning and resource mobilisation should be supported.

- 5. Financial resource tracking for improved alignment and impact needs to be improved.** The financial tracking exercise should be extended and the learning shared. Tracking information is particularly useful at the political level and for multi-stakeholder platforms as they develop ways to align with the national Common Results Frameworks. Donors should continue to track external funds and efforts made to track donor and civil society expenditure at the country level. Opportunities for regional partnerships to support tracking of public sector expenditure should be explored. Country specific strategies and approaches will be needed to optimise resources and tracking of progress. Advocate for increasing investment in nutrition at the global and national levels with a focus on ensuring sub-national budget lines and activities have financial support. Support capacity strengthening of technical nutrition capacity at sub-national levels to enable effective implementation of efforts. Increase investment in nutrition at all levels and consider the establishment of a global fund for nutrition

¹ See Recommendation 8 for the Lead Group's role in accountability

- 6. Information gaps in monitoring and evaluation systems are impeding SUN country governments from making decisions on the efficacy of their plans and the efficiency of their stakeholders.** Information is needed on impact, implementation or coverage, implementation of support, and institutional transformations. The Global Nutrition Report could collate information on implementation, and the Secretariat assess the implementation of support through the 'Capacity to Deliver' approach. Attention is also needed on assessing the development of in-country capacity. The tracking of institutional transformations is an asset to the Movement that should be further strengthened especially in reporting process and output indicators. Its intent and purpose should be clearer and better communicated. Some suggested that measurable country specific indicators that shows progress over time would enable the follow up of progress within a country. Others that any external review of progress could take place at a regional level. Result framework indicators should be aligned with SDG framework, which may allow the country follow up.
- 7. The SUN Movement should remain inclusive, open to all countries committed to scale up nutrition and members that align with the principles of engagement.** This may require a differentiation in approach depending upon the commitment of the government to its national nutrition strategy, the capacity of its MSP, and the needs and entitlements of the population. An independent peer review system could provide guidance. A commitment to improving quality of the coordination and implementation of the national plan could be one marker, and resources invested, another. The Secretariat, in its internal organisation, could explore whether their human resources are focused on lower middle income and fragile states, or aligned to countries' different stages of readiness to scale up nutrition.
- 8. Learning and sharing should remain a central tenet of the Movement, building on lessons from a cross-section of initiatives and experiences that have worked.** Other global initiatives provide powerful lessons learned, including from the HIV/AIDS Movement where activities were scaled up with the Global Fund and PEPFAR. Opportunity should be given for regional knowledge sharing among SUN countries—across networks and MSPs. In country, information sharing platform at the community and the district levels for the effective representation of the communities that are affected by malnutrition could be explored by in-country stakeholders. Reflections on the lessons learned from previous rounds of multi-sectorial planning are important and should be disseminated. More guidance is required to develop tools and methodologies which are feasible to apply at country level. Conduct learning routes that will support cross-learning around M&E, CRFs, data collection and national nutrition information systems.
- 9. The strengthening of networks needs to continue:** Work plans for each network, aligned to the strategy, will enable an assessment of progress. Network stewardship should be light touch and catalytic. Strengthened stewardship will only be effective if member organisations are committed to working better together and demonstrate linkages between global, regional and national levels. Implementation should consider long term in-country capacity strengthening (systems and human resources) as well as meeting immediate needs. Member organisations should continue to demonstrate the scale up and alignment of their own resources- and there should be a division of responsibilities based on the comparative advantages of each partner. All networks secretariats should be adequately resourced with multi-year resources– both financial and human- to meet the ambition of the goals of the Movement and the demand from SUN countries. In this respect, the global Civil Society Network should be prioritised, although funding should not come from the MPTF, which is a catalytic fund of last resort. Resources for networks could be results based, or from membership fees. Improvements in inter-network coordination on planning, implementation, challenges and opportunities is needed. The Secretariat must effectively communicate country needs and look at ways to improve coordination and coherence

within the networks. Better engage academics, particularly in contributing to efforts to strengthen capacity and budget analysis.

10. The 'Capacity to Deliver approach' should be simplified, and the support areas clarified. The potential for this approach was recognised in the evaluation, although it was not assessed in depth. A 'demand-based' approach focusing on the requirements for immediate technical assistance should be developed alongside longer-term capacity strengthening. Suggestions were to: consider the establishment of regional technical teams to offer support to SUN countries rather relying solely on support through SUN networks; support the development of guidelines for costed plans, CRFs and tracking tools: make these resources available on the Movement's website; consider how to ensure standardised data for nutrition, generated annually across all countries and that can be disaggregated at sub-national levels; and develop community based approaches and participatory processes.

11. Support from the Secretariat: Views were mixed on the role of the Secretariat, with some suggesting that it should provide technical assistance to SUN countries, and others that it should remain as a catalyst for action. Respondents commented that the SUN Secretariat could more diverse and include staff coming from as many SUN countries, languages and different constituencies as possible to strengthen country knowledge and interaction.

Recommendation 3: There is **agreement** that SUN's primary focus should continue to be on under nutrition and the elimination of stunting, acknowledging that good nutrition plans will need to address all forms of malnutrition, including the double burden.

1. The impact of, and linkages between, all forms of malnutrition must be acknowledged.

However, the Movement must continue to focus on demonstrating measurable progress in addressing undernutrition and eliminating stunting. As an indicator and driver of development, the focus on stunting needs to be reinforced. This needs to be framed in the strategy as a statement of intent, in the Movement's monitoring systems and in networks' work plans. All Member States in the Movement are dealing with the impact of the double burden of malnutrition, and many SUN countries are already referring to this in their national plans.

2. Advocacy should focus on the 1000 days window and encourage reference to double burden in standards and guidelines. Keep messages simple. Linkages with initiatives focusing on the double burden should be explored. Actively support the implementation of the ICN2 commitments and recommendations in countries.

3. Encourage learning routes between countries, particularly those seeking policy coherence with issues such as Non Communicable Diseases, maternal, infant and young child health; develop evidence -based materials that cover all nutrition issues;

4. Generate evidence on how to take effective strategies to scale and increase research on nutritious food systems and nutrition-sensitive approaches. This will require additional resources. Involve national experts including cardiologists/endocrinologists. Ensure technical guidance is available as countries develop their multi - sectoral nutrition plans. Target all the causes of malnutrition and the formulation of programs and interventions including the determinants of malnutrition such as education, diet and agriculture diversification.

5. Dialogue with all nutrition actors needs to be continued. Be mindful of the implications of membership in the Movement, especially for some companies whose business may contribute

to obesity. Work within normative guidance; consult countries that suffer from double burden issues.

Recommendation 4: There is **strong agreement** with the recommendation that the strategy should encompass practical ways to strengthen the focus on gender and equity as they relate to nutrition.

- 1. Women are as active agents in improving their own nutritional status and that of their households,** as farmers, food producers, business leaders and consumers. The new strategy should include a clearly defined range of nutrition sensitive interventions that support women's access to land, credit and education and outcome indicators that measure women's participation.
- 2. Efforts should extend to strengthening the nutritional status, knowledge, and practices of all disempowered and marginalised groups;** as well as ensuring their meaningful participation in design, implementation and monitoring of solutions to achieve positive nutritional outcomes for their communities.
- 3. National plans and common results frameworks could be more explicit about equity makers** and include disaggregation by gender, location, income and ethnicity in their development, costing and monitoring. This would enable stakeholders to address bottlenecks that are impeding results for the most disadvantaged communities;
- 4. Normative agencies should provide examples of criteria to countries wanting to build their national strategies using a nutrition-justice approach.** Where expertise does not exist, it should be sought from specialised UN agencies and NGOs with gender and human rights-based expertise. Their formal engagement in the Movement should be actively encouraged;
- 5. Experience sharing between communities and across generations** could foster a better understanding of gender and equity and could foster home-grown solutions to address these inequalities.

Recommendation 5: There was generally **strong agreement** that the revised strategy must, reflect existing aid effectiveness principles, and focus on strengthening accountability across the Movement.

- 1. Aid effectiveness and accountability are core principles of many national development plans, and on which the Movement has been built.** Continued advocacy is needed to position nutrition within these principles and accountability systems. All stakeholders should make, and be held accountable for, monitorable undertakings in support of country-led plans. Internal accountability and accurate reporting on commitments should be promoted. Common results frameworks are useful participatory processes that encourage joint planning, mutual accountability and support implementation and alignment to avoid duplication and running of parallel programs. Special consideration should be given to countries facing emergency situations.
- 2. The relationship between common results frameworks, national nutrition plans and the sequencing of actions that establish them should be better articulated** to serve as effective accountability mechanisms. Space should be encouraged for SUN members to discuss independent peer reviews, however formal multi-lateral processes must agree on formal mechanisms for setting of norms and standards and any objective mechanism for evaluating costed plans. This should not become a function of the Secretariat or external actors but rather part of the processes that are already in existence, such as existing development partnerships,

e.g. IHP+ and its Joint Assessment of National Strategies tool, or CAADP. Improved data and financial tracking are all elements for increased accountability.

- 3. Accountability for the national plan lies at the country level.** Ensuring that an indicator of stakeholders' alignment behind national plans appears more clearly in the M&E framework may help national governments hold their own stakeholders accountable. Global networks should encourage to alignment of their constituency at country levels. The work plans of global networks should reflect efforts to encourage alignment, clearly outlining roles and responsibilities of various actors and be monitored on quarterly basis. Consideration could be given to the International Framework on CSO Development Effectiveness attached to the 2011 Busan Partnership agreement. The Secretariat will need to strengthen its own accountability, vertically to the SUN countries and any updated stewardship arrangement, and horizontally to the networks.
- 4. Investment in capacity building for accountability will be required in the long term.** Consideration should be given to including accountability into the Terms of Reference for coordination mechanisms. Better understanding of what is meant by mutual accountability, inclusion and transparency of country stakeholders is required. Guidance on what alignment should look like would be useful.
- 5. Transparency should be strengthened at all levels,** including budget and expenditure tracking and support to countries to help them resolve conflicts of interest in their multi-stakeholder platforms. Encourage dialogue in-country between the SUN donor convener and local coordination platforms for improved alignment of projects and programmes.

Recommendation 6: There was **strong agreement** that expecting countries to replicate the same country-level configuration of the support networks is unnecessarily rigid.

- 1. The catalytic spirit of the Movement should be maintained without stifling innovation.** The Movement should grow organically and country-level configurations should develop according to their own needs and abilities, strengthening existing mechanisms where needed. This should be better communicated both in the guidelines to SUN countries and within the global action plans of the support networks. A minimum standard for inclusion could be appropriate.
- 2. Linkages between global and country networks should be better articulated and monitored; this is a significant conduit for catalysing institutional transformations.** The monitoring of country and network progress should be refined. Accountability should also be prioritised by each network and the Secretariat, through work plans aligned to the updated strategy by the end of 2015.

Recommendation 7: There was **strong agreement** that scaling up cannot proceed at the same pace in all countries and that there should be room within the Movement for innovation and experiment.

- 1. Scaling up nutrition will proceed at varying paces throughout SUN countries.** The biggest investors in people's nutrition are families and SUN country governments. Innovations that improve households and governments' ability to invest in good nutrition should be encouraged.
- 2. Transparency is important in funding processes and decisions.** If the Movement is to promulgate best practice then funding decisions need to be accessible and monitored. A clearer picture of financial commitments and disbursements made in country – by external financing mechanisms and domestic funds- supports this approach. Success and failures should be rigorously documented and disseminated to ensure that the learning from country-led nutrition

initiatives are maximised. Countries should feel that the necessary support is available when needed, but also understand the responsibility to report against progress and honour commitments.

- 3. Partners should direct resources strategically, based on development aid effectiveness principles.** Large-scale action in selected countries can be accommodated, so long as the Movement's basic principles, including the principle of country ownership, are observed. Some support the view that financiers are likely to work with few countries that have developed high-quality plans and support them with funding and technical assistance. Others support to countries for immediate action and prioritise resources could be fast-tracked. Flexible use of smaller interventions and exploration of different approaches with government partners should also be considered.
- 4. Whilst progress must be accelerated in mobilising additional resources for nutrition, in a resource-constrained environment, the Movement should seek ways to leverage more nutrition for the money.** This can be catalysed by alignment of existing resources and instruments; well costed multi-sectoral plans with measurable indicators; fostering cross-learning efforts- encouraging shared budget tracking and analysis; implementing research on best practices; capacity building; improving transparency and using innovative funds. Resources are also needed to strengthen the Movement's catalytic and coordination capacities. For some, this dependence upon the same donors represents a tension between what the actors in the Movement can, and are willing to, do.

Recommendation 8: There was general agreement that SUN should strengthen accountability by considerably strengthening its governance arrangements.

- 1. The purpose of strengthening stewardship and accountability arrangements is to ensure nutrition justice for all.** In a complex multi-stakeholder Movement delicate approaches to leadership and stewardship are required. The environment for strengthening accountability has improved considerably as the Movement has matured, and as such it would be appropriate to consider the formation of body that can provide closer supervision of the strategy, and oversight of operational plans. Caution must be exercised in creating additional bureaucracy. Transparency in process and clear rules for procedure are needed for renewed stewardship to be effective.
- 2. The Movement derives its legitimacy from national governments' commitments.** The Lead Group is responsible for organising support around these commitments. In a voluntary Movement, accountability is difficult to enforce. For it to be strengthened, every organisation that counts themselves as Movement members, at country and global level, must agree to be held accountable.
- 3. Organisational commitments should be reinforced at the network level** by the respective steering committees, and bound together by coordinated network-level operational plans-aligned to the overall strategy. Steering committees as they already exist should monitor the implementation of these plans, reporting to an executive body responsible for the oversight of the updated strategy.
- 4. An executive body is seen by many as key to the success of the Movement.** Opinions differed on its composition, but there was a sense that it be realistic and well resourced. Either:
 - a.** The Lead Group should be reconfigured and its mandate revised in order to act as a strategic decision-making body; or
 - b.** The group should be comprised of senior officials nominated by their networks, appointed in a personal capacity by the Lead Group chair, and weighted towards SUN countries; or

- c. The group be formed from network leads, to avoid creating a new bureaucratic layer, with a role of reviewing the work of the Secretariat.
5. **The executive body should be no more than 14 people, in addition to the Chair and the Coordinator**, include two members per network and one country per region. They should meet once a quarter by teleconference to review progress on the operational plans of the networks, and in person with members of the Lead Group to report on progress. The Chair reports to the UN Secretary General.
 6. **Most respondents saw value in the role of the Lead Group as a powerful network of nutrition champions**, whose high profile has contributed to increased global attention to nutrition. This function should be retained and expanded, with more representation and active participation from the global south. Institutional memory will be important so there should not be a complete overhaul. The Group should continue to be appointed by the UN Secretary General and meet once a year – in person- to consider the strategic implication of the progress and challenges that senior body is reporting. The Lead Group should be appropriately resourced – drawing on the advocacy-lead within the Secretariat and information from the country and network teams.
 7. **The Secretariat’s size and function should reflect the ambitions of the Movement in its next phase**. A less flat structure should be implemented, and it should be administered in a way it is able to recruit and retain staff. Where respondents differed were in their views on the technical capacity of the Secretariat: some arguing for improved technical expertise, others for a skill set focusing on catalytic and coordination functions, linking with ongoing initiatives, including the ICN2, the SDGs and ongoing work by the WHA and CFS. It was further suggested that a senior-level deputy - coordinator position be created to enable more regular interaction with key decision-makers.
 8. **Many highlighted that capacity strengthening, technical and financial support will be needed to improve stewardship and accountability, and resources should be invested**. Additional mechanisms that could be used to encourage accountability included advocacy for strengthening international governance, regional bodies and community level committees for nutrition; the establishment of a global pooled fund for nutrition so donor money is better aligned and more easily tracked; and on improved exchange of Movement- related information.

Recommendation 9: There was generally **strong agreement** on the need to increase focus on strengthening monitoring, evaluation and learning. An independent monitoring role of the Global Nutrition Report (GNR) was welcomed.

1. **Strengthened monitoring and evaluation is critical to assessing progress and sharing knowledge**. This should be built into network’s operational work plans. However, there is no consensus on the efficacy of the Movement’s monitoring and evaluation framework. Most appreciated the self-reporting of process and output indicators by country multi-stakeholder platforms; some thought it should be redesigned and made simpler; others argued for more time for the current M&E system to be practiced consistently. Institutional transformations could be linked on the actual monitoring of implementation and spending, using the agreed CRF as an indicator of the translation of plans into actions.
2. **There are also differences in opinion on the precise role of the Global Nutrition Report although it is an initiative that is broadly welcomed**. The GNR is a useful independent complement to SUN Movement accountability and monitoring. It is a quality advocacy tool which can help to compare countries and extract best practices. It may help in gathering consistent data across countries but it may not be equipped to facilitate learning on successes and failures and cross-pollination between countries. Inter and intra network learnings,

communities of practice and official reporting opportunities (at UNGA, the WHA and the CFS) can serve that purpose.

- 3. Nutrition data is needed to plan more effective programs and monitor coverage and trends and assess impact on nutritional status, disaggregated with an equity lens.** Support for more frequent DHS surveys and innovative and participatory means of data collection including disaggregated data at subnational level was expressed.
- 4. Increased human and financial resources are needed to strengthen capacity, knowledge and experience sharing.** The National Information Platforms for Nutrition (NIPN) initiative can contribute to filling the gaps. Capacity building of all stakeholders needs to be a priority. Explore systematic approaches to strengthen inter-country learning and cross-pollination (e.g., South-South cooperation), leveraging existing platforms. This could also be an area for peer country technical reviews of implementation plans. Others suggested that a research function be created to focus on implementation science learning or a robust community of practice around data systems, evaluation and learning.

Recommendation 10: There was **strong agreement** that partners in SUN should pursue further rationalisation of the international architecture for nutrition.

- 1. All stakeholders in the Movement have a responsibility to strengthen coordination efforts and avoid duplication as this will lead to improved accountability and results.** The updated strategy should acknowledge the issue and make clear reference to whom is responsible- and accountable- for ensuring improved governance for nutrition and the delivery of mandates. The lessons learned from the Movement can provide evidence to strengthen sustainable international systems of support. All members should commit to aligning with the international architecture, once clarified.
- 2. The strengthening of coordination and coherence among the UN agencies, and a streamlining of international initiatives on nutrition was seen as important by many.** UN entities must better clarify their roles and responsibilities in contributing to greater convergence, under the leadership of FAO and WHO as normative agencies. These entities need to align with the guidance from both the CFS and the WHA and with countries' common results frameworks. The ICN2 commitments provide a useful framework for this alignment.
- 3. Partners should work to align contributions of all international initiatives on nutrition.** This may entail a mapping of all nutrition-related initiatives, including mandates, activities, financial flows, investments and roles of individual stakeholders. Where redundancy exists, partners should collaborate to streamline initiatives. There should be accountability to Member States. The mapping of existing accountability mechanisms and mandates, by the UN network, would be useful. Other initiatives are welcomed: clarity on the relationships between them and clear and coherent messages is needed. Involving the SUN government focal point in discussions of global initiatives would be useful.
- 4. There is general support for the Global Nutrition Report to play a role in the monitoring of commitments,** as a contribution to improved overall architecture, although this may need further exploration. It has no mandate and, if legitimacy for the report is required, stakeholders involved in nutrition governance will need to provide a mandate. Some question whether there is sufficient expertise and capacity to monitor. If the GNR is to take on the role it should continue to (at least) 2020. A role in monitoring coverage (implementation) would also be welcomed.
- 5. Accountability to Member States is paramount.** It is beyond the mandate of the Movement to address governance issues, and the Movement should not be seen as an attempt or a vehicle to

replace legitimate global governance mechanisms. The Movement should remain focused on supporting national Movements scale up nutrition as catalytic multi stakeholder partnership, light on bureaucracy and without a role in global governance. If the international architecture for nutrition starts to deliver improvements, then the Movement will have served its purpose. Whilst the evaluation notes the architecture is fragmented, it is also not fully understood, and guidance on its mechanisms has been requested.

6. **A long-term, sustainable funding mechanism is a key call from the Civil Society as tool to promote accountability.** Others caution against bringing the current catalytic fund for nutrition under the auspices of the SUN Movement. Resources for an entity for *implementation research* should be explored, and consistent funding for the provision of technical assistance is important. It may be helpful to benchmark against other development initiatives such as the Global Fund for ATBM which has managed to create a number of global activities generating huge awareness and resources.
7. **A simplification of roles and responsibilities of partners at global and country levels through a coordination framework.** Network members could improve collaboration and information sharing, and inter-network discussions be facilitated by the Secretariat. Action by the various SUN networks could include: improved alignment in the donor network - fragmentation undermines commitment and impact; civil society alignment with government plans; the UN system working in coordination; and more collaboration with business.

Conclusion 1: There is **broad agreement** with the assessment that the SUN Movement has been widely successful at the level of advocacy and mobilisation but there is only limited evidence that this is leading further towards scaling up nutrition at country level.

1. **The SUN Movement has been successful in galvanising political attention through advocacy for nutrition.** Much of the challenge remains in transforming this momentum into scaled up actions, strengthened accountability, effective multi-sectoral coordination, resource mobilisation and shared learning. This will take time, especially for newer member countries to demonstrate results.
2. **Country respondents tended to agree that few development partners and CSOs are applying aid effectiveness principles** by aligning behind government plans, and that the self-interest of stakeholders remains a barrier. Members of the networks, on balance, disagreed.
3. **As Multi-stakeholder Platforms (MSPs) are established, development partner assistance can be better monitored and accountability tools can be developed.** In order to promote better alignment, national plans and common results frameworks should clearly articulate the roles and responsibilities of all actors. Global commitments by donors can be better reflected in SUN countries. There have collaborative strides made with donor advocacy with civil society.
4. **More knowledge sharing amongst stakeholders is required.** The frequency of country calls does not provide ample time for cross-country sharing. Evidence can be better developed to help stakeholders identify where they can best support. It will be important to avoid creating an overly elaborate process.
5. **There is Movement-wide agreement that a systematic focus on gender empowerment has yet to be translated into country level actions.** Suggestions for improvement include: a broader definition of women's role in nutrition; sharing of best practices; behaviour change communication; favourable legislation; a focus on adolescent girls; and income generating opportunities for women. The monitoring framework can also be adjusted to encourage gender

considerations. Others felt that the focus should be expanded to include equity and marginalised communities using a human rights based approach to nutrition.

Conclusion 2: There was **general agreement** with the assessment that progress towards SUN's multiple stakeholders aligning their actions with high quality costed plans and common results frameworks (CRF) is limited and progress in mobilising and scaling up resources for nutrition is also very limited.

- 1. There is a need to match available domestic and international resources to national priorities.** Support can be provided to strengthen understanding of public sector funding mechanisms and to match-make with global funding opportunities. In 2015, the Movement will support initiatives for financial tracking due to the gaps in information that exist.
- 2. High quality national plans are needed but obtaining this level of quality and costing of plans is a challenge,** and technical assistance may be restricted to areas of donor interest. The review of 20 countries costed plans enabled valuable steps and criteria for assessing quality and needs to be developed further. Some respondents felt that conforming to a standard formula may undermine country ownership.
- 3. Countries felt that CRFs need to be validated by stakeholders for ownership** and that a better definition and communication of what CRFs are, and how countries define them, would help to improve alignment and accountability. Network respondents offered support to increase understanding of county policies, to review multi-sectoral plans and to ensure multi-stakeholder coordination and alignment of actions.
- 4. Progress towards mobilising and scaling up of resources for nutrition is limited although progress is being made,** particularly for nutrition sensitive interventions and with a prominent focus on the effective use of the funding. Countries felt it is difficult to mobilise domestic resources and that donor programmes are not always aligned with national plans. There was also a suggestion that country plans should be drafted as investment plans.
- 5. There were a number of suggestions on how the mobilisation and scaling up of resources could be improved,** such as:
 - a) Advocacy at all levels and with demonstrable results;
 - b) Hold the highest authorities accountable for resource mobilisation;
 - c) Increase visibility of nutrition in the plans and strategies of all sectors;
 - d) Develop mutually beneficial partnerships among members of SUN networks; and
 - e) Improve the quality of costed plans.

Conclusion 3: There was **strong agreement** across the SUN Movement that strengths should be built upon and numerous suggestions were offered on how this could be done.

- 1. The Movement has proven its relevance and galvanised momentum, however, scaling up needs to continue at an accelerated pace.** Linkages are needed into the broader development narrative by highlighting the importance of good nutrition in the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Governance for nutrition still needs strengthening and members in the Movement, and those outside, have a specific responsibility for this. Work to support actions, policies and programmes for governments and other stakeholders of the related instruments is encouraged. The UN network's Global Nutrition Agenda and clarity on UN Agency mandates will help.

2. **Stakeholders agree that facilitating the strengthening of country level CSO networks** and fostering a willing to address difficult issues, such as conflict of interest (COI) and the role of business, are all strengths of the Movement. Respondents felt the COI workshops were a useful exercise in collaboration, transparency and trust building.
3. **Countries emphasised the ownership of SUN principles, exchanging best practices, capacity building and establishing mechanisms for accountability as important elements going forward.** Other stakeholders felt that new initiatives such as the Communities of Practice should be used to foster effective sharing and learning, communication within and outside the Movement and to uphold the SUN principles of engagement and transparency.
4. **Stakeholders felt the Secretariat has been able to achieve much with limited resources,** and acknowledged the Secretariat's convening power and leadership role, partially due to its positioning in the office of the UN Special Representative for Food Security and Nutrition.
5. **The majority of countries prioritised the Movement's strength:** as 1) efficient resource utilisation; 2) fostering transparency and accountability among stakeholders; and 3) willingness to address difficult issues. The networks highlighted the Movement's flexibility and adaptability but noted the limited understanding of nutrition beyond the health sector in some countries.

Conclusion 4: There is **some disagreement** that SUN's dependence on the quality of the costed plans and common results frameworks as a vehicle for ensuring alignment and mutual accountability is a weaknesses in the SUN Movements design.

1. **Some stakeholders felt that more clarity is needed around common results frameworks (CRF), costed plans and monitoring and evaluation indicators.** Others felt that a weakness is on the quality of costed plans and CRFs to achieve impact at scale. A prescriptive approach will not necessarily improve quality, and there is value in the process of developing the plans. Quality can improve over time and if there is clearer donor financing criteria, governments could take these into account when developing national priorities.
2. **Country respondents felt that more prescriptive guidance is needed to ensure understanding of concepts.** Others felt that the SUN Movement should not be prescriptive, but offer guidelines to encourage quality improvements through broad agreement on best practice criteria for individual countries in lieu of norms and standards. Countries felt that guidelines and strengthened capacity will be important. Others that dialogue aided by guidance documents with minimum standards is important as is SUN's current Monitoring and Evaluation framework. It was noted that the Movement should be a guide, not a quality certifier.
3. **There is little consensus on the evaluation's assessment that the Monitoring and Evaluation framework is insufficiently rigorous,** too subjective, and places too much emphasis on global indicators at the expense of country specific indicators. Countries broadly disagreed, acknowledging their different operating conditions and mentioning that a rigorous system would be unrealistic. Other stakeholders felt that it is important to not be specific when creating country indicators, noting that an overly rigorous framework could be a burden and highlighted the value of retaining the self-assessment model. Remaining stakeholders had mixed opinions that there should be a prescriptive approach, contrasted with views that rigorous measurement goes against the setup and approach of the SUN Movement.
4. **There is agreement that a replication of the global network structure at country level is unnecessarily restrictive.** Country autonomy should be respected, flexibility is paramount and

existing mechanisms should be utilised rather than parallel structures created. Guidance is important and can assist alignment of stakeholder action.

- 5. There has not been sufficient specificity about the criteria that costed plans and CRFs must fulfil if they are to be useful instruments for accountability.** Respondents felt that guidance is required but stakeholders are yet to reach consensus on a process to facilitate this: it is a priority for 2015.
- 6. There is tentative agreement that inclusivity is useful in building political momentum.** However this could stretch and dilute the capacity of the Secretariat and the support networks to provide meaningful assistance to countries, potentially at the risk of tangible results and the credibility of SUN Movement as a whole. Others felt that inclusivity and decisiveness need to be balanced: building political momentum does not need to come at the expense of providing support to countries if external support can further support an inclusive approach.
- 7. Stakeholders broadly agree that differentiated approaches are required in order to be relevant to all member countries.** Each country has different needs, hence a variety of approaches are needed to harness potential to achieve results. Countries have different levels of malnutrition and can have challenging humanitarian conditions. Stakeholders can adapt or employ a context specific approach. Facilitating dialogue between all countries in the Movement – not just those in similar situations – is essential for the sharing of experiences and that the differentiation of approach is already evident within SUN countries. There should be a clear mechanism to help facilitate equitable distribution of nutrition funding.
- 8. Some country respondents believed that country or regional SUN Secretariats could be established** to offer country level financial and technical support and enhance communication with SUN government focal points. Inter-country networking could be strengthened: ensuring strategies and guidelines based on country needs, their level of progress and based on country context. Countries mentioned the lack of strategy and coordination with the UN network has contributed to weaknesses in implementation and that UN networks could be established in-country. There is disagreement from the UN system network on this point.

Conclusion 5: Stakeholders broadly agree that SUN has weaknesses in its implementation.

- 1. Country respondents believed that it is too early in the evolution of the Movement to be demonstrating results.** It makes sense that the relationship between costed plans and CRFs is only now emerging. As agreement amongst stakeholders increases, country analytical capacity for developing plans are strengthened and CRFs are established, it is felt that this can be converted to a strength. Other stakeholders acknowledged the organic growth of the Movement, and noted contexts where leadership has catalysed achievement in a short time.
- 2. Country respondents noted that support amongst a broad constituency should be built at country level, where country specific plans and CRFs are created.** More technical assistance and guidance to countries should support multi-sectoral coordination and be accompanied by mapping and knowledge dissemination.
- 3. Some countries noted the challenge of engaging multiple sectors and multi-stakeholder.** One country noted that guidelines which are set by country governments have been adhered to by relevant networks in country while others highlighted the time taken to establish a working methodology with the SUN Business Network and the difficulties faced by the UN agencies in developing an effective network.

4. **There is agreement that the slow development of practical methodologies for financial tracking are undermining progress in scaling up resources.** Country respondents felt it was important that this be recognised as a new exercise, and that despite scarce resources, this is important for promoting accountability. Others regard financial tracking as an important first step toward understanding implementation and are unclear how this could have been implemented quicker. The Secretariat should work with stakeholders to develop a framework to accelerate support to countries seeking to improve their tracking of financial resources. Flexibility when providing assistance is also important.
5. **There was general agreement that the accountability framework has not been implemented and, as a consequence, follow up with stakeholders was not systematic enough.** Country respondents felt that follow up can be initiated at global and national level with support from the Secretariat and noted their role in holding country calls and sharing experiences. Other stakeholders acknowledged the progress in encouraging countries to report using the progress indicators but mentioned this is not a mechanism for enforcing accountability. Others felt that the Lead Group could have had more of a role. Accountability in a voluntary Movement is difficult to enforce but will work to better communicate the role of the M&E framework, and work with networks to develop SMART operational plans. Others felt that self-reporting should be maintained and the establishment of a working group to develop concrete steps for improvement was suggested. Development of guidelines was also emphasised.
6. **There was broad agreement across the Movement that the Lead Group in its current form is not suited for the task of holding networks, the Secretariat and stakeholders accountable** for making and delivering on actionable commitments. Country respondent felt that the Lead Group can be revised and be smaller, more specific, with a clear Terms of Reference and potentially a mandate to coordinate countries and networks. Other felt that the Lead Group has served its purpose in garnering high level attention, approving the M&E framework and providing guidance but a new structure will be required as the Movement evolves. Its revised mandate should be reviewed for efficiency and a group of nutrition champions should be expanded. Future stewardship arrangements will require predictable and adequate resources to ensure tangible results.
7. **Country respondents felt that country expectations should be reviewed** and that measuring the quality of plans should not become a function of the Secretariat. There has yet to be agreement on who holds this responsibility. Support will be needed to both plans that are deemed high quality and those that are not, but the overall responsibility of quality remains with national governments.

Conclusion 6: Stakeholders **strongly agree** that serious weaknesses in the international architecture for nutrition persist.

1. **Country respondents agreed that there were overlapping nutrition initiatives and poor coordination and recommended a comprehensive mapping.** There is agreement that there has been slow progress in ‘addressing issues of coherence and coordination among UN bodies concerned with nutrition’. Country respondents felt that coordination and articulation amongst UN bodies is a problem, as is the top down approach of international initiatives. Other respondents felt that ICN2 was a good example of the UN working together, as is REACH at country level. Others mentioned that the development of the UN Global Nutrition Agenda and the SDG Summit will support greater aligned actions at all levels, as will improved leadership from the UN to define clear roles and responsibilities. SUN was not presented as a solution but members with a governance mandate should be encouraged to address this fragmentation.

2. **Stakeholders highlighted SUN's role as a 'big tent' has helped promote discussion and improve coherence.** Country respondents felt that adherence to SUN's mandate can help facilitate country level MSPs and ownership, and UN supportive partnerships without competition. If expected to play a role in terms of the global architecture, SUN should be given the mandate from the UNSG and supported by the UN system.
3. **It was noted that the programmes and investments of donors and civil society can more actively aligned.** Commitment fatigue was mentioned due to the high degree of overlap.

Conclusion 7: Respondents **broadly agree** with the conclusion that SUN will ultimately be a failure unless its weaknesses are seriously and urgently addressed.

1. **Weaknesses must be tackled but the wording of the conclusion is too strong and ignores the progress made, which is counterproductive.** Stakeholders highlighted the Movement's strength in convening and advocacy and the political attention this has galvanised; noting that the weaknesses identified are age-appropriate for the Movement. Other respondents remarked that it is difficult to assess progress due to the limited lifespan of the SUN Movement, the various stages across countries, and the lack of robust M&E systems.
2. **The changes that the SUN Movement is advocating for in nutrition policy are feasible and can have lasting benefits for affected populations.** Country respondents remarked that the Movement has served as a catalyst for policy and institutional arrangements and that transformation at community level should be the focus.
3. **Country respondents emphasised the importance of advocacy and communication** and cautioned that a lack of adequate understanding amongst senior management about nutrition would result in vertical projects with weak inter-sectoral collaboration.
4. **Stakeholders lauded the Movement for undertaking the ICE now** but that governance and support at country level needs to be strengthened going forward.

SUN Movement Secretariat: March
2015

