

SUN Movement Secretariat Response to Guiding Questions

03 March 2020

1. Which recommendations do you think are the highest priority and should receive top attention in the next phase of the movement? List 3-5 key priorities. (Recommendations 11, 16, 17, 33-35)

i. Developing a country-driven, country-led and country-centred SUN Movement Strategy

Recommendation (11) Develop a country-driven, country-led and country-centred SUN Movement strategy. The strategy should be focused on and respectful of the perspectives and priorities of member countries; such a strategy should be significantly more effective in contributing to substantive improvements in nutrition outcomes in these countries....

The priorities reported by SUN Countries through their Joint Annual Assessments, https://scalingupnutrition.sharepoint.com/:w:/s/allsms/EQ66dEnBqIFirdgz3zZbeAoB_tPP6sp6rroxolrt3L7XDg?e=ka57l their feedback at the 2019 Global Gathering and continuous interactions with the SUN Coordinator, Secretariat and networks need to remain the centrepiece for the strategy of phase three.

The **process** for developing the recommendations for phase three of the SUN Movement, and the strategy development that follows, must ensure that **SUN Countries** are given **adequate time and support** to have their voices heard.

ii. Strengthening the opportunities for SUN Countries to share and learn from each other

Recommendation (16) Strengthen the role of the SMS in facilitating cross-country learning and exchange of experience. The SUN Movement should expand opportunities for knowledge exchange amongst member countries and networks and

*Recommendation (17) Strengthen the role of the SMS in collaborating with countries to generate data for action. The SMS should build on the added value of the SUN Movement's links to countries and its extensive networks to **facilitate documenting and sharing country activities, knowledge and experience, new ideas and innovative approaches.***

The SMS is strongly committed to establishing a knowledge management **strategy** firmly grounded in cross-country learning and sharing that will help accelerate progress towards the **'SUN Academy'**. We are currently in discussions with partners to obtain the expert support needed to advance. The Secretariat would like to see the whole of the global support system and partners get behind an agreed approach to knowledge management as a priority for the next phase of the Movement. The potential to optimise the resources of the **SUN Movement Pooled Fund** for this purpose need to be explored, while keeping its catalytic and last-resort nature as overall principles.

iii. Improving access to and quality of Technical Assistance

Recommendation (33) Enhance the role of the SMS as a source of information about TA. This should include maintaining an up-to-date roster of providers and types of TA available and information on how to access it and communicating this regularly to country stakeholders via the networks and the SUN Movement website. The roster and information should include sources that are internal and external to SUN.

Recommendation (34) Proactively identify country TA needs through the SUN networks. The SMS should proactively identify country demand for TA through regular consultation with Country Focal Points and CSAs and communicate this to TA providers to inform the scope of their activities. Revamped JAA processes can also be used as an opportunity for the SMS to jointly identify gaps

and needs with country stakeholders and for countries to determine whether to access UN or TAN support.

Recommendation (35) Strengthen coordination between SUN TA providers and between SUN and UN TA providers. There is scope to improve coordination between the SUN TA mechanisms and ensure that, together, these mechanisms provide a comprehensive and complementary range of TA that meets country needs. The UNSCN (UNN) has an important role to play in establishing a stronger relationship with SUN Movement TA providers at a global level. Consideration could also be given by current TA providers and any future one-stop shop (see below) to making better use of UN agencies to provide TA in areas where they have a comparative advantage.

Recommendations **33 to 35** provide several helpful proposals for strengthening technical assistance including better documentation and communication regarding what countries have asked for and what is available; improved collaboration with networks and SUN Government Focal Points to ensure better alignment and prioritisation of in-country sources of support. However, **more analysis of the important lessons** can be drawn from the way technical assistance is currently managed within SUN Countries, with a particular focus on the performance of in-country SUN networks.

The ambitions of the SUN approach warrant innovation in terms of the way technical assistance is defined, developed, delivered and funded. The SUN Movement Secretariat, and the four SUN Networks, need to work more proactively together to set **the parameters for establishing an outcome-focused technical assistance model**. This model must build on what exists to comprehensively and coherently respond to country needs in a way that strengthens **in-country capabilities** in real time whilst working towards the longer-term **institutional change** that is required.

This system of mapping and capability strengthening must be demand-driven and respectful of local language, culture and legitimacy. Where possible, it should draw on the experience and leadership of SUN Countries rather than top-down approaches or guidance (the establishment of a SUN Academy would be key). The priorities that countries share in the Joint Annual Assessments offer the opportunity for the global support system and partners to plan and shape their response.

2. Are there recommendations with which you disagree strongly, and if so, list up to 5 key recommendations that you disagree with, and why. (Recommendations 31, 23 and 19)

i. Establishment of a SUN Country Focal Point Network.....

Recommendation (31) Build a network of SUN Country Focal Points and strengthen the communication between the Focal Points and the four SUN global networks. There is no formal network for Government Focal Points, although the SMS refers to this as a 'network' and liaises with Focal Points through the SMS Country Liaison Team. There is scope for a more structured approach, particularly to ensure that country perspectives inform strategy and decision making and to strengthen sharing of knowledge and experience between countries (see section 3.2.3). For example, the Guatemala country case study highlighted a desire to learn from the experience of other countries in engaging non-health sectors in the nutrition response.

The SUN Movement Secretariat would emphasise that the SUN Country Network **does not only exist, but it is at the heart of the entire Movement**. Indeed, the Secretariat's primary purpose is to serve this SUN Country Network by facilitating, coordinating and improving support and communication with and across the rest of the global support system and players.

The 'SUN Country Network' meets virtually as agreed to discuss thematic areas of importance through webinars organised by the SUN Movement Secretariat as well as through regional discussions led by SUN Government Focal Points on the Executive Committee. The 'Government Engagement Hub', recently established to ensure that the 2020 Nutrition for Growth Summit is country-driven, is another example of the important ways that SUN Countries are working together.

ii. Focus, purpose and positioning of the ASG/Coordinator

Page 23 of the Strategic Review states that **'The coordinator's role, as currently defined, lacks focus and clarity of purpose, which raises questions about conflicts of interest and transparency'**. This is in **direct contradiction** to the findings of the **2018 Mid-term review** which states:

"Observations on current effectiveness The SUN Movement Coordinator scored highest of any element of the GSS, both in terms of focus of effort and effectiveness of performance." (page 18, SUN Movement 2018 Mid-term Review)

This is followed by:

Recommendation (23) Clarify and revise the respective roles of the coordinator and the SMS director. There is a need for a clearer delineation of responsibilities between the Coordinator and the SMS director. The coordinator should primarily have an external focus, on SUN external relations and advocacy, as well as provide inputs into the development of the SUN strategy. The SR review recommends the coordinator have a small, dedicated team to support the coordinator's activities; the team should include a senior nutrition adviser. **The coordinator's role should not include oversight of day-to-day implementation of the SUN strategy, leadership of the SMS and line management of the SMS director or coordination of the Country Focal Points.....**

The draft strategic review appears to dismiss the significant value in having an United Nations Assistant Secretary-General Coordinator who can convene the highest-level actors of government, UN, civil society, donors and business. By remaining well-connected to the Secretariat and SUN Countries, the Coordinator is well placed to ensure that SUN Countries' needs and priorities are given a high-level platform. Feedback received from SUN Countries suggest that the relationship between the Coordinator and SUN Country Focal Points has been productive and her visits have been viewed as extremely useful in enhancing commitments for improving nutrition.

Phase three will require the **Coordinator's authority and convening power** to bring the global support system and players together behind national agendas. In particular, the Coordinator's role in developing and implementing a joint workplan that unifies the entire global support system behind the priorities and needs of SUN Countries will be essential.

iii. Merger with Global Nutrition Report (GNR)

Recommendation (19) Explore the potential for a merger with the GNR. Rather than duplicate the work of the GNR, a reinvigorated, country-centred SUN Movement with a strong commitment to generating and sharing data for action could merge with the GNR. There are already many overlaps between the two, including multiple members of the GNR Stakeholder Group who have a formal or close relationship with the SUN Movement. Bringing these two initiatives together could be an effective way to combine the well-respected data platform of the GNR with an action- and results-oriented SUN Movement. If a merger is not feasible, SUN should explore ways to collaborate more closely with the GNR in ways that are mutually beneficial.

The SUN Movement Secretariat has discussed this recommendation with colleagues from the GNR and would like to highlight several reasons why this proposal is unfeasible:

- the GNR is global in nature while the SUN Movement MEAL system is limited to SUN countries. It should be noted that the SUN Movement provides the GNR (as other partners do) with information that is included in their annual report
- the GNR is a stand-alone report, whilst the 'MEAL' is a system that includes elements of monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning
- the GNR's objective are different from the SUN MEAL system: the GNR was born to track N4G commitments and provide a snapshot of the global nutrition situation; the SUN MEAL system provides the SMS, the global support system and the Executive Committee with information on the status of SUN countries against the 4 Strategic Objectives and the SUN Theory of Change
- the GNR wishes to remain independent (hosted outside of any UN or SUN Movement)

3. Are there important aspects that you feel have been missed by the Strategic Review, and if so, list up to 5 key areas?

i. Continuous focus on **actions that SUN Countries have identified as priorities**

In order for the strategy of phase three of the SUN Movement to be 'country-driven, country-led and country-centered' as proposed in Recommendation 11, the set of recommendations developed by the Executive Committee for Lead Group endorsement must propose concrete actions that would respond directly to the needs and priority areas of support expressed by SUN Countries. **As stated earlier, the process for developing these recommendations, and the strategy development that follows, must ensure that SUN Countries are given adequate time and support to have their voices heard.**

Based on what SUN Countries reported in their 2019 Joint Annual Assessments as well as their consistent feedback to the SUN Movement Secretariat and Coordinator, we would recommend that the next phase of the Movement focuses on how best to support SUN Countries to address their expressed **needs and priorities**:

- Support for in-country high-level **advocacy efforts to build and sustain policies, legislation, financing and action on nutrition that can withstand shifts in leadership and political agendas allied to coherent involvement in shaping and delivering the international agenda**
- **Strong, accessible and coordinated presence of the SUN networks** which are able and willing to align behind the implementation of national nutrition plans along with partners and network
- Support countries in **developing and costing** their multi-sectoral national nutrition plans
- Making more domestic and external **resources available for national nutrition plans – both domestic** through collaboration with Ministries of Finance, building the business case, budget tracking and analysis (including both allocation and disbursement) and aligned support from partners
- Build the mandates, resources, leadership, knowledge and expertise to **implement multisector nutrition plans at the sub-national level.**
- Increasing **community engagement and ownership**, particularly amongst **young people**, for the most appropriate and sustainable actions to ensure that all citizens can claim their right to good nutrition.

- Support countries to **build and strengthen the ability to monitor and evaluate implementation** of national nutrition plans and to use this data most effectively
- Better **access to and connections** with other SUN Countries who can share their progress and experience in addressing the double burden of malnutrition as well as other emerging challenges (sustainable food systems).

ii. Analysis and recommendations regarding the **four networks and the global support system**

The SUN Movement Secretariat would appreciate **a deeper analysis of our four Networks**. This includes - a more granular understanding of the kind of support requested by and provided to their country constituencies as well as their potential added value, beyond strengthening capacity, in **promoting and facilitating coherent support to SUN Country networks in alignment with national nutrition plans and priorities**.

We would also benefit from a more concrete analysis and set of recommendations related to **how best to structure, incentivise, monitor and hold to account a global support structure that is putting SUN Countries needs and priorities at the core of its work. More specifically, it would be helpful to see analysis as proposed in the terms of reference of the strategic review (Scope of Work 4)**

- **Working arrangements** of the Global Support System including the newly developed convergence plan, collaboration between the SUN Secretariat and the networks and how different teams are interacting to achieve common objectives (e.g. on policy, finance and M&E, on advocacy and communication, on TA provision, etc. Current and future hosting facilities, terms and conditions of the different components of the GSS (e.g. Secretariats and TA mechanisms);
- **Funding of the GSS** looking at best ways to broaden and optimize resources from all stakeholders and limit transaction costs for example by harmonizing reporting requirements;

iii. Ensuring **systemic change and mutual accountability** across the Movement

There is an **undeniable need to address the powerful drivers of the ‘broken international nutrition system’ the SUN Movement creators set out to repair nearly 10 years ago**. Action and commitment at the highest levels of the organisations and institutions who govern the international nutrition system is required in order to ensure that this **systemic change** and greater collaborative spirit can cascade down to the practical actions that drive implementation and systemic nutrition impact at country level.

However, the **deficit in mutual accountability across the SUN Movement has become ever sharper with time**. As pointed out in the Mid-Term Review but overlooked in the draft Strategic Review, *‘SUN members who are significantly dependent on international assistance are more rigorously assessed than are the funding providers.’* If the SUN Movement is to be truly, country-led and country driven, **the Executive Committee must ensure that the recommendations proposed for phase 3 place the same importance on assessing the performance of those supporting SUN Countries as is placed on assessing the performance of SUN Countries**.

The next phase of the SUN Movement is well-paved with credible milestones to capture SMART commitments to improve mutual accountability for SUN Countries and those supporting the SUN Movement. These include the **2020 Nutrition for Growth Summit and the 2021 Food Systems Summit as well as monitoring of progress against the 2025 World Health Assembly Nutrition Targets and Goal 2 of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda** (along with the several other SDGs which can also be heavily influenced by our progress on nutrition).

These **SMART commitments** must speak directly to the power dynamics and **incentives that drive each player** and that can unlock better alignment and coordination. They must also be translated into **concrete indicators of accountability** for all actors and levels of the SUN Movement that are **independently and regularly monitored**.

iv. Countries' request for better regional presence and interaction

Localising support for SUN Countries requires the global support system to assist SUN Countries to strengthen interactions with regional social economic organisations (including ECOWAS, SADEC and ASEAN) to cultivate their support and involvement in national nutrition planning, resourcing and action cycles. Who is best placed to do this and how requires more discussion and analysis to ensure that regionalisation does not add layers of bureaucracy or make coordination across the Movement more difficult.

4. Are the parts of the report, particularly recommendations, that need clarification? If so, list up to 5 key areas for further clarification.

- i. Several instances of what appears to be **contradictory observations and advice**
 - a. **Focus v expansion** to including nutrition-related issues, including equity at large, but also gender equality
 - 2.1 Findings and insights related to SUN's focus and niche: As a global movement, SUN has been slow to infuse considerations such as climate change, urbanisation, conflict, insecurity and human mobility—phenomena that are observed in several SUN countries with political instability, protracted population displacement, recurring hazards (e.g. drought, flooding), human rights violations (including but not limited to issues of gender equality) and food crises.
 - Rec (5.) **Expand the scope of SUN to include important nutrition-related issues** such as climate change, food systems and NCDs. This should be done in close consultation with member countries to ensure the expanded scope reflects country priorities vis-à-vis those issues. It will also be important to demonstrate how the Movement's nutrition priorities are linked to other issues. A good example of this approach is the 2019 report on the global syndemic of obesity, undernutrition and climate change, published by the *Lancet* Commission.
 - (1.2.1 Country-led, country-driven) overview 'The **proliferation of goals**—including the six WHA Global Nutrition Targets for 2025; the diabetes and obesity target for 2025 in WHO's Global Monitoring Framework for NCDs; and multiple and wide-ranging goals related

to the underlying causes of undernutrition in agriculture and food systems' clean water and sanitation, education, employment and social protection, health care, support for resilience, women's empowerment and community-led development—is a **fundamental weakness of the strategy.**

- Rec (12.) Ensure the SUN strategy is **concise and focused** and prioritises actions that will support countries to scale up nutrition programmes, improve effectiveness and achieve results.

b. Less bureaucracy vs more structures and layers

Page 22 of the draft Strategic Review states '*There is consensus that processes need to be less bureaucratic and that SUN could potentially be a model for other global partnerships. This is followed by **Recommendation 20** which proposes to set up a **formal board** which is likely to create more layers and less flexibility.*

*Further recommendations to set **up another network for SUN Countries (Recommendation 31)** as well as **another structure to support the Coordinator separate to the SUN Movement Secretariat (recommendation 23)** do not illustrate how this would streamline efforts or recognise the potential of duplication of existing mandates. As presented in the above, **a SUN Country Network does not only exist but it is at the heart of the entire Movement.** Indeed, the Secretariat's primary purpose is to serve this Country Network by facilitating, coordinating and improving support and communication with and across the rest of the global support system and players.*

- ii. Several **references to a 'standardisation', 'prescriptive' and 'one-size-fits-all'** approach as well as and a 'list of expected country actions' are in direct conflict with the origins of the SUN approach and misrepresent the purpose and intent behind the SUN Movement. The report does not identify from where this constraining structure and guidance emanates, making it very difficult to further reflect and address. More evidence and clarification are desired

5. Are there areas where you feel there needs to be more analysis in order to make an informed decision or recommendation? If so, list up to 5 key areas for further analysis. (Recommendations 18, 20, 22, 25 and 26)

i. The MEAL System and the Joint Annual Assessments

- *Recommendation (18) Review the value and VfM of SUN investment in the MEAL system and in the JAA process. The ongoing investment in the MEAL system should be reconsidered in light of concerns amongst stakeholders and the SR team about its value and its VfM.*

The 2015 Independent Comprehensive Evaluation helped to kick-start a Movement-wide effort to further articulate the value of the 'SUN Approach' through the SUN Movement Theory of Change. This Theory of Change aims to capture how the change of behaviour of actors leads to systemic change across organisations and institutions which leads to improved nutrition outcomes in SUN Countries. The SUN Theory of Change is the foundation of the 2016-2020 Strategy and Roadmap and continues to guide the Movement.

The SUN Movement Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) system was created to mirror the Theory of Change. Its purpose is to help all actors across the SUN Movement to gather, analyse, test and communicate data, information and experiences related to the eight elements of the Theory of Change.

The MEAL System was intended to be so much more than a database. It was designed to be a system that contains numerous elements including:

- Monitoring - SUN Countries' Joint Annual Assessment
- Networks' Annual Assessments
- National Budget Analysis
- Stakeholder & Action Mapping
- National plan reviews
- SUN Global Gatherings
- In-depth country reviews (Deep Dives)
- Regional/global workshops
- Country calls/webinars
- Learning Routes between SUN Countries
- Tracking of external Technical Assistance
- Various Evaluation Exercises – 2018 Mid-Term Review (MTR), the 2019 Strategic Review and Networks' evaluations

Used together, these elements were envisioned to **Monitor** actions, **Evaluate** progress, establish **Accountability** across all actors and allow the whole of the Movement to **Learn** what was working, what needed improving, what could be useful to others and what needed to change. It was planned that a variety of concrete products could be produced by drawing on the various elements of the system to provide tailored, practical advice for policy-makers, practitioners, funders, political leaders – supporting people throughout the Movement to make the right decisions and take the right actions. To date these include the results framework, 2016 baseline, country dashboards and thematic briefs (covering issues such as gender, multiple forms of malnutrition, and humanitarian contexts).

The SUN Movement Secretariat would argue that **investment – in terms of improving understanding, effectively communicating and enhancing accessibility** - in the MEAL system should be scaled up. The system itself has much to offer all actors across the Movement. The biggest challenge to date has been building ownership and uptake of the various elements in order to take advantage of the lessons it has to offer.

The Mid Term Review made several recommendations for the ways in which the data in the MEAL database could be better utilised and presented but overall referred to it as 'a **useful tool for consolidated, comparative data on a defined set of global indicators** and in particular identified the **country dashboards as 'an excellent, quick reference'**. Action has been taken on several of the Mid-Term Review proposals. For example, in order to enhance the effective of the Joint Annual Assessments, members of the SUN Movement Secretariat participated in *several 2019 Joint Annual Assessments; updated the guidance and developed an online JAA reporting system for better management of information. Several webinars, workshops and virtual discussions have been held to better explain the potential uses of the SUN MEAL system to SUN Countries and members of the global support system. But much more can and should be done in Phase 3 to realise the true potential of the SUN MEAL System.*

The SUN MEAL system needs to improve and evolve alongside the unprecedented journey of the SUN Movement and its approach to scaling up nutrition. It offers a **potential home to the**

accountability mechanisms needed for systemic change as well as a firm root from which country-driven learning can flourish. We need to draw on the expertise available across the Movement to develop concrete proposals to make better use of what it has to offer to SUN Countries and to the Movement's governance. But we also must own our commitment and confidence in the value of the SUN approach and our Theory of Change in order to agree on the best way to measure it.

ii. **Transformation of the Executive Committee into a 'functional governing board'**

***Recommendation (20)** Transform the ExCom into a functional governing board. The ExCom should assume the responsibilities that are standard practice for boards or management committees and should be renamed the SUN Movement Board to reflect this.²⁷ For example, the Board should be responsible for establishment of broad policies and priorities, oversight of SUN's strategy development implementation, approval of plans and budgets and review of financing and audited financial reports. Identifying and managing potential conflict of interest is a critical governance issue, and this should also be included in the remit of the Board. A permanent finance subcommittee should be in place to ensure the many financial issues facing SUN receive the requisite attention. Ad hoc committees or time-limited task forces could be established as required to deliver specific Board inputs or outputs. The Board should meet formally at least twice a year, with a clear agenda, including decision points. The SMS should be responsible for servicing the Board and liaising with the SUN networks to ensure that they have an opportunity to contribute to the agenda and to prepare papers for Board meetings. More effective communication of Board decisions and of how these are or will be followed up is also required. This overarching recommendation to reform the ExCom is consistent with the MTR recommendations that SUN needs a board. Light-touch oversight is not sufficient given the need for effective accountability and transparency and the financial resources invested in SUN. The ExCom should assume responsibility as the primary governance mechanism of the Movement and should become the key forum for holding the Secretariat and networks to account.*

It is not clear from what is presented in the draft strategic review report how 'transforming' the Executive Committee into a formal board will provide sufficient oversight 'given the need for effective accountability and transparency and the financial resources invested in SUN'.

Further details are needed that would address the following:

The recommendation suggests that the Executive Committee should 'assume responsibility as the primary governance mechanism of the Movement and should become the key forum for holding the Secretariat and networks to account' However, there are no concrete activities, indicators or mechanisms proposed that suggest a role that looks significantly different than what the Executive Committee plays at the moment.

In its current configuration, the Executive Committee meets twice a year and holds several teleconferences to discuss agenda items proposed by its membership. In addition, there are smaller task teams who take on issues that have been identified of particular importance (for example, the Strategic Review, the Global Gathering and the establishment of a SUN Academy). In terms of oversight of implementation of the SUN Movement Strategy, the SUN Movement Secretariat shares its annual workplan and budget for its review/endorsement as well as significant updates to planning, recruitment and progress throughout the year. No other network secretariat or actors, organisations or institutions who are involved in or support the Movement are subject to this type of oversight by the Executive Committee. It is unclear if or how this would change in what is currently proposed.

It would be very helpful to receive **further guidance and concrete examples of other similar governance models that are able to hold to account the diversity of actors involved in the SUN Movement including governments, donor agencies, United**

Nations agencies and organisations, civil society actors and businesses. In particular, we would welcome a review of existing governance models that have been able to innovate themselves and operate under the principles and spirit of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The systemic change and mutual accountability required across the Movement is of the utmost priority and it requires action and commitment at the highest levels of all organisations and institutions across the Movement to better coordinate and align the work, resources, funding and ways of measuring success behind SUN Countries. This cannot be addressed by narrowly focusing on the budget and workplan of the SUN Movement Secretariat or network secretariats. This critical task requires bold proposals that match its ambition.

iii. Revision of the Lead Group's role and title

Recommendation (22) Revise the Lead Group's role and title. The Lead Group should become a Council of Ambassadors²⁸ which includes the SUN coordinator and focuses on ambassadorial and advocacy activities.

Lead Group members, including the Chair, are not mere ambassadors but very powerful figures of influence and authority in the nutrition and broader development landscape. If we remove their role in decision-making and direction-setting, we also risk decreasing any leverage to affect change from within their organisations and institutions.

The SUN Movement Secretariat would like to see an emboldened Lead Group – positioned at the highest levels of influence – guided by a strong and concrete accountability mechanism to create change from within. Whilst the appointment of Lead Group members must remain with the United Nations Secretariat General, more can be done to enhance the involvement of SUN Countries and Networks in a transparent nomination process.

iv. Hosting arrangements and contract modalities of the SUN Movement Secretariat

Recommendation (25) Maintain the current hosting arrangement with UNOPS. SUN is not maximising the range of services that UNOPS can offer and should explore the potential for UNOPS to provide additional services within the current hosting arrangement. The human resource team within UNOPS should work with existing and former staff members to better understand and address the challenges they face or faced in the workplace.

The SUN Movement Secretariat is already taking steps to maximise the use of services offered by UNOPS. However, the draft strategic review report appears to miss out on a few issues that require further discussion and consideration:

1. Did the strategic review process uncover any particular services available from UNOPS that the Secretariat is currently underutilizing? Are there priority actions that should be further explored in order to improve the working relationship?
2. The draft strategic review suggests that a 'potential new contract modality...will enable UN entities to attract skilled and experienced staff but without the offer of a long-term career in the UN.' Much more information on the 'new contract modality' is necessary before it can be considered a viable option. In line with what is suggested in the draft strategic report, UNOPS has confirmed that this new contract modality is very unlikely to be available anytime soon.
3. The report suggests that the Secretariat should be able to 'attract and retain high-calibre staff' without offering fixed term contracts. It then acknowledges that 'contractual issues have been a factor in the high staff turnover in the SMS.' This is not only contradictory but an entirely separate

issue to the comparative benefits of the current hosting arrangement between the Secretariat and UNOPS and other entities.

The current UNOPS hosting agreement offers the Secretariat the options to provide three different contract modalities: International Contractor Agreements, Fixed Term and Temporary Appointments. Each modality comes with a unique set of conditions and benefits which have significant impact on personnel including remuneration, benefits (including insurance and pension), tax liability and contract stability. Most UN agencies offer these contract modalities.

Independent of a decision by the leadership of the Movement for the Secretariat to remain hosted by UNOPS, further analysis of how these different contract modalities affect the recruitment and retention of high-quality staff as well as the delivery of the workplan should be completed. Further, the cost implications and liabilities of each contract modality needs to be acknowledged and considered in future decisions regarding the administration of the SUN Movement Secretariat.

v. SUN funding and VfM

Page 27 of the draft Strategic Review states, '*Be cost-effective*' is one of the SUN Principles of Engagement, but there is little evidence that SUN systematically considers cost containment or VfM in strategy, decision making or operations'. This is then followed by Recommendations 26 and 27 which focus on the budget and spending of the SUN Movement Secretariat and the value for money of the Global Gathering.

Recommendation (26.) Review opportunities to achieve cost savings. The priority should be to **reduce staff count** by rationalising and prioritising the activities of the SMS and the coordinator support team (see above); reducing the travel budget; sharing resources or activity costs with partners; making better use of technology; and outsourcing key functions and activities, including to SUN Movement partners. The functions and costs of supporting the activities of the coordinator and the SMS should be clearly delineated.

The SUN Movement Secretariat is extremely conscious of the importance of offering value for money. In order to further explore this area, the Secretariat would need to understand which criteria that have been used to assess its cost-effectiveness and to which, if any, similar secretariat models it is being compared. It would also be helpful to know if any assessment was undertaken of the four networks both in terms of the administration and budgets of their secretariats and the broader alignment of the projects and programmes of its membership.

Recommendation (27.) Review the value and VfM of the Global Gathering and consider more effective and cost-effective alternatives. Many organisations have shifted away from large-scale events in favour of more cost-effective alternatives. As a Movement, SUN should consider other ways to bring its many stakeholders together. Smaller, regional or thematic action-oriented meetings could provide better opportunities for face-to-face discussions at a lower cost, especially if they used member- or partner- operated venues such as conference facilities run by governments, donors and the UN. Similarly, regular online seminars, which are not currently used by SUN, have proven to be a cost-effective way to bring audiences together for learning and dialogue.

The SUN Movement Secretariat takes the cost-effectiveness of the SUN Global Gatherings extremely seriously. Smaller regional events are being considered but it is unlikely to reduce the overall cost of this hallmark face-to-face gathering element of the SUN Movement. Costed options and evidence for the smaller meetings 'at lower cost' would be very welcome for further assessment and discussion.