

# SUN Movement 2016 Report

## Sierra Leone

April 2015 to April 2016

### Process and Details of the 2016 Joint-Assessment exercise

To help the SUN Movement Secretariat better understand how your inputs for the Joint-Assessment 2016<sup>1</sup> were compiled from stakeholders, and to what extent the process was useful to in-country stakeholders, please provide us with the following details:

#### Participation

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

Group	Yes (provide number) / No (= 0)
Government	11
Civil Society	18
Science and Academia	0
Donors	1
United Nations	5
Business	3
Other (SUN Secretariat)	5

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point?   43  

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the analysed results of this Joint-Assessment exercise will be included in the SUN Movement Annual Progress Report 2016 along with the details of how the exercise was undertaken in- country.

**Process**

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

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

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



Statement from United Nations: Dr Kajali Paintal (UNICEF)



Statement from Donors: Eimear Murphy (Irish Aid)

## Assessment Exercises



United Nations



Business



Government



Civil Society

## Plenary Session

At the Plenary, each group chose a Rapporteur presenting the scores and giving the reasons for each score. Each presentation was followed by questions, observations and answers from participants. The figures show practical plenary sessions of two networks



**Civil Society Organisation Representative**



**Private Sector Representative**

**Usefulness**

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

Yes ✓ / No

Why?

*The workshop is in fulfilment of SUN process one in observance of bringing people together to garner high level consideration to ending hunger and malnutrition and also perceive if any progress has been made in this front by bringing together representatives of stakeholders to give their views and evaluate the work of the networks in general, and the SUN Movement in particular.*

*It is not necessarily a new method, but the way group work was conducted was highly participatory and allowed each of us coming from different domains and sectors, to express our opinion even there were differences. At the end it allowed us to have an agreement, a consensus, on the entire joint assessment with evidence.*



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

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

#### PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space for action

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

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

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordination mechanisms are established at government level and are regularly convened by high-level officials. It indicates if non-state constituencies such as the UN Agencies, donors, civil society organisations and businesses have organised themselves in networks with convening and coordinating functions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structure in place and functioning, such as a high level convening body from government (political endorsement)</li> <li>▪ Official nomination of SUN Government Focal Point as coordinator</li> <li>▪ Convene MSP members on a regular basis</li> <li>▪ Appoint Focal Points/conveners for Key Stakeholder Groups e.g. Donor convener, Civil Society Coordinators, UN Focal Point, Business Liaison Person, Academic representative</li> <li>▪ Institutional analysis conducted of capacity of high-level structure</li> <li>▪ Establish or refine terms of reference, work plans and other types of enabling arrangements [Supporting documents requested]</li> </ul>	4	<p>Exist at district level and need to expand at chiefdom and community level.</p> <p>Expanded membership to UN Women as part of the UN network. Planned to expand to other UN agencies.</p> <p>Private sector expanded membership to other two companies with women as CEOs.</p>

<b>Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which coordinating mechanisms established by the government and by non-state constituencies are able to reach out to relevant members from various sectors, to broaden the collective influence on nutrition-relevant issues. It also analyses the extent to which local levels are involved in the multi-stakeholder-sector approach in nutrition (e.g. decentralisation of platforms).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand MSP to get key members on board</li> <li>▪ Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors</li> <li>▪ Actively engage executive level political leadership</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups working to include new members e.g. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics</li> <li>▪ Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity, WASH etc</li> <li>▪ Establish decentralised structures and/or processes that support planning and action locally, and create a feedback loop between the central and local levels, including community, and vulnerable groups. [Provide examples, if available]</li> </ul>	<p>4</p>	<p>More actors should come in for a broader influence</p>
<b>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the actual functioning of the MSP to facilitate regular interactions among relevant stakeholders. It indicates the capacity within the multi-stakeholder platforms to actively engage all stakeholders, set significant agendas, reach consensus to influence decision making process and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work-plans</li> <li>▪ Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy/legal framework, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews.</li> <li>▪ Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Get platform to agree on agenda / prioritisation of issues</li> <li>▪ Use results to advocate / influence other decision-making bodies</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>There are still gaps in terms of resources, communication, information sharing, reporting. UN partners met and agreed on strategies to support SUN coordination mechanism. Provided guidance to SUN Secretariat on how to strengthen coordination at all levels.</p>

<b>Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the capacity of the multi-stakeholder platform as a whole to be accountable for collective results. It implies that constituencies within the MSP are capable to track and report on own contributions and achievements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis [Supporting documents requested from the latest reporting cycle]</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups tracking commitments and are able to report on an annual basis, at a minimum e.g. financial commitments, Nutrition for Growth commitments, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>DCB report, website, newsletter. Improve technical meeting and coordination</p>
<b>Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at how the multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is institutionalised in national development planning mechanisms and in lasting political commitments, not only by the government executive power but also by the leadership of agencies and organisations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms</li> <li>▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover</li> <li>▪ Institutional commitments from key stakeholder groups</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>Political will is high but still need for engaging and commit district councils and paramount chiefs to have impact at that level. Ongoing support by government and UN to strengthen district coordination UN planned to Continue support to government and the SUN secretariat in the implementation of planned activities</p>

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One</b>
<b>Government</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SUN Secretariat fully operational and represented by Gov.,CS,UN,Donors and the Private Sector based at the office of VP</li> <li>- On-going , there are still gaps in terms of resources, communication, information sharing, reporting</li> <li>- Increase and more effective participating by a broad cross-section of stakeholder</li> <li>- Efficient and effective institutional arrangements should be put in place to facilitate the active participation of district and community levels in all aspects of planning, policy and programmes formulation and implementation processes.</li> </ul>
<b>UN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expanded membership to UN Women as part of the UN network. Planned to expand to other UN agencies Multi stakeholder platform at national level is effective but at district level the implementation process is nearly completed</li> <li>- Held meetings and agreed on strategies to support SUN coordination mechanism.</li> <li>- Provided guidance to SUN Secretariat on how to strengthen coordination at all levels.</li> <li>- Continue to support government and the SUN secretariat in the implementation of planned activities</li> <li>- SUN Sec office placed at VPs office with the involvement of the Vice President in SUN activities high level of political commitment to nutrition</li> </ul>
<b>Donor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SUN Secretariat fully operational and represented by Government, Civil Society, United Nations, Donors and Private Sector based at the office of VP</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Membership has expanded but attendance varies for some groups eg Donors, Academia</li> </ul>
<b>Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exist at district level and need to expanded at chiefdom and community level</li> <li>- More actors should come in for broader influence</li> <li>- There are more stakeholders needed to MSP development</li> </ul>
<b>CSO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financial tracking completed report to be disseminated. M&amp;E officer has just been appointed from the office of the vice President</li> <li>- There are existing structure at national and district level. Extension of activities / interventions and structure at chiefdom level and need for fine tuning functioning</li> <li>- Ebola impacted progress, need for more engagement, improve nutrition coordination meeting</li> <li>- Political impact but still need for engaging with district councils and paramount chiefs (traditional leaders) to impact at that level</li> </ul>

**OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)**

1. **A SUN Secretariat has been established and fully operationalized in the office of the Vice President. Coordination mechanism is spelt out in the food and nutrition security implementation plan**
2. **Coordinating Mechanism (Food and Nutrition Security) embedded in the Food and Nutrition Security Implementation Plan**
3. **Increase numbers of District Nutritionists in MOHS and MAFFS**
4. **Multisector platform meets regularly. Also, district coordinating bodies meet regularly.**
5. **Government and partners input Strengthened capacity of the SUN Secretariat for improved coordination at district and chiefdom levels. This could be better achieved by the provision of logistics and funding and sharing of experience with other SUN countries**
6. **Line Ministries (MOHS and MAFFS) deepened integration of nutrition into their programmes**
7. **Established linkage with additional two food companies: Framix and the Market women local food Industry come on board. Joining the already existing member; Sierra Leone Produce Marketing Company and Bennimix Co.**
8. **Vice President officially Launched the Food and Nutrition Security Implementation Plan and also served as the Keynote Speaker**
9. **There was a multi-stakeholder approach for the right to food to be entrenched in the revised constitution. Worked with Partners to develop a Position Paper that was presented to The Constitutional Review Committee with the intention that the Right to Food should be included in the new Constitution.**
10. **Brought on board both electronic and print media professionals; Press briefing on Scaling Up Nutrition Movement and its relevance to journalists and national development**

+

## Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

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

### Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

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

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

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing nutrition-relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations are analysed using multi-sectoral consultative processes with representation from various stakeholders, especially civil society representatives. It indicates the availability of stock-taking documents and continuous context analysis that can inform and guide policy making.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular multi-sectoral analysis and stock-take of existing policies and regulations</li> <li>Reflect on existing policies and legal framework</li> <li>Existence of review papers</li> <li>Indicate any nutrition relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations identified, analysed during the reporting period and specify the type of consultative process that was applied</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the analysed policies and legislations</b></p>	3	Still requires efficient implementation of policies at all levels

<b>Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, update and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to contribute, influence and advocate for the development of an updated or new policy and legal framework for improved nutrition and its dissemination (i.e. advocacy and communication strategies in place to support the dissemination of relevant policies).It focuses on how countries ascertain policy and legal coherence across different ministries and try to broaden political support by encouraging parliamentary engagement.</p> <p>It also focuses on the efforts of in-country stakeholders to influence decision makers for legislations and evidence-based policies that empower the most vulnerable and disadvantaged (children and women) through equity-based approaches.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy</li> <li>▪ Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality</li> <li>▪ Develop common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy making</li> <li>▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes)</li> <li>▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups promote integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions</li> <li>▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, workshops</li> <li>▪ Dissemination and communication of policy / legal framework by key stakeholders among relevant audiences</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Series of nutrition relevant policies at advance stages of reviews and completion of FNIP, Gender, Land, SME, ICADEP and FBDG</p> <p>Continuous advocacy for alignment of policies and legislation with the NFNSIP. Initiated the process for the Mid -term review of the NFNSIP</p> <p>Meanwhile, There is no strategy in place for common massaging in nutrition and food security. But there is progress in the development of the food based dietary guideline to initiate common messaging and Dissemination.</p>

<b>Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholders efforts</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders - government</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries</li> </ul> <p>E.g. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines / advice /</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Policies are developed, coherent and inclusive.</p> <p>Progress on Right to food to be</p>

<p>(i.e. line ministries) and non-state partners - coordinate their inputs to ensure the development of a coherent policy and legislation framework.</p>	<p>support for mainstreaming nutrition in sector policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key Stakeholder Groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive)</li> <li>▪ Develop/update policies / legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality.</li> <li>▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies relevant (specific and sensitive)</li> <li>▪ Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for BMS, food fortification and maternal leave and policies that empower women</li> <li>▪ Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, other</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts</b></p>		<p>entrenched in the revised constitution. Still at draft level. All government policies and legal framework are on course but challenges in actualizing tracking system to evaluate impact of policy/legislation</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise / enforce the legal frameworks</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the availability of mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislations such as the International Code of Marketing of Breast-Milk Substitutes, Maternity Leave Laws, Food Fortification Legislation, Right to Food, among others.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation</li> <li>▪ Existence of national / sub-national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation [Please share any relevant reports/documents]</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of law enforcement</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Implementation of policy not complete, lack of resources for it and lack of awareness on policy document. On-going, strengthening institutions to enforce policies lacking validated policies engaging small business farmers for quality and value addition</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing policies and legislations have been reviewed and evaluated to document best practices and the extent to which available lessons are shared by</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc.</li> <li>▪ Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>planning stage for Midterm review of National FNSIP On-going tracking system in place but slow to evaluate impact of policy/legislation</p>

different constituencies within the multi-stakeholder platforms.			
--	--	--	--

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two
<b>Government</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Completed; food and nutrition security implementation plan validated eg Education, Health ,Agriculture, Water resources</li> <li>- Completed all government policies and legal framework are on course</li> <li>- Completed for government. There are advocacy at all levels</li> <li>- institutions to enforce policies IS lacking</li> </ul>
<b>UN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Series of nutrition relevant policies at advance stages of reviews and completion FNIP, Gender, Land, SME, ICADEP and FBDG</li> <li>- Policy development, coherent and inclusive</li> <li>- Continuous advocacy for alignment of policies and legislation with the NFNSIP. Initiated the process for the Mid -term review of the NFNSIP</li> </ul>
<b>Donor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advocacy to commence communication unit there but no advocacy strategy should be common, massage for nutrition, dissemination is weak</li> <li>- Right to food not operationalised. Plaining on going</li> </ul>
<b>Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a plan and document and staffing in place. There is planning and review process</li> <li>- There is a FNS Implementation plan that guides the CRF, FBDG</li> </ul>
<b>CSO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Setting of policy benchmark in July 2015, FBG iodate</li> <li>- Still need efficiently implementing the policy at all levels</li> <li>- Implementation of policy not complete, lack of resources for it and lack of awareness on policy document</li> <li>- Work on right to food to include in the constitution but still at draft level no final validate</li> <li>- No tracking system to evaluate impact of policy/legislation</li> </ul>

**OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 2: Coherent policy and legal framework** (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

1. **Post Ebola strategic policy prioritizes women, children and survivors**
2. **Rotation of executive officers and Ministers of government to new posts; Drivers of policy around a common results framework**
3. **Ministry of Agriculture collaborates with SUN stakeholders, Harmonised Framework Workshop for assessing the food vulnerability situation in Sierra Leone in 2015**
4. **Civil Society Platform strengthened for intensification of SUN agenda on the ground through various field based civil society organizations, market women federations and other religious, women and youth groups.**
5. **Revised case management by incorporating Mothers in the MCH Week in line with the no touch policy and provided nutritional support to victims during Ebola epidemic.**
6. **Strengthen linkage between agriculture and nutrition through Women in Agriculture and Nutrition Unit and organised Sierra Leone Women Farmers Forum nationwide. Distributed Ebola Emergency seed rice together with food for work for seed protection.**
7. **Gradual engagement of parliamentary committees on agriculture and food security, health, water resources and education.**
8. **Government focus on national development through agro-based initiatives.**
9. **Office of the President established secretariat for Sierra Leone International Benchmarks (SLIBs) for possible recasting alignment of Benchmarks and indicators with the eight (8) pillars of Agenda for Prosperity (A4P)**



### Process 3: Aligning actions around a Common Results Framework

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

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

The alignment of actions across sectors that significantly contribute to nutrition improvement demonstrates the extent to which multiple sectors and stakeholders are effectively working together and the extent to which the policies and legislations are operationalised to ensure that all people, in particular women and children, benefit from an improved nutrition status. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into actions<sup>2</sup>. The term ‘Common Results Framework’ is used to describe a set of expected results agreed across different sectors of Governments and among key stakeholders through a negotiated process. The existence of agreed common results would enable stakeholders to make their actions more nutrition driven through increased coordination or integration. In practice, a CRF may result in a **set of documents that are recognised as a reference point** for all sectors and stakeholders that work together for scaling up nutrition impact.

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

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholder groups take stock of what exists and align their own plans and programming for nutrition to reflect the national policies and priorities. It focuses on the alignment of actions across sectors and relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition.</p> <p>Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews</li> <li>▪ Analysis of sectoral government programmes and implementation mechanisms</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping</li> <li>▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions</li> <li>▪ Map existing gaps and agree on core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</b></p>	3	<p>Annual action plan available but needs to be mainstreamed to the district and implemented.</p> <p>The UNDAF is aligned to the NFNSIP and A4P with targets clearly defined</p>

<sup>2</sup> ‘Actions’ refers to interventions, programmes, services, campaigns and enacted legislation or specific policy. The 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition provides a set of evidence-based high-impact specific nutrition actions including the uptake of practices such as ‘exclusive breastfeeding for six months’

<p>the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the review of programmes and implementation capacities</p>			
<p><b>Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to agree on a Common Results Framework to effectively align interventions for improved nutrition. The CRF is recognised as the guidance for medium-long term implementation of actions with clearly identified nutrition targets. Ideally, the CRF should have identified the coordination mechanism (and related capacity) and defined the roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder for implementation. It should encompass an implementation matrix, an M&amp;E Framework and costed interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&amp;E.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives</li> <li>▪ Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups<sup>3</sup></li> <li>▪ Agree on CRF for scaling up nutrition. Elements of a CRF would include: Title of the CRF; implementation plans with defined roles of stakeholders in key sectors (e.g. health, agriculture, social protection, education, WASH, gender); cost estimates of included interventions ; cost estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&amp;E; capacity strengthening needs and priorities</li> <li>▪ Assessment of coordination capacity to support CRF</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a robust plan that has been technically and politically endorsed</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Translation of policy into CRF is good</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the national and local capability to sequence and implement the priority actions. This requires, on the one hand, a clear understanding of gaps in terms of delivery capacity and, on the other hand, a willingness from in-country and global stakeholders to mobilise their technical</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources</li> <li>▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements</li> <li>▪ Existence of annual detailed work plans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>Country programme frameworks are in line with UN and government priorities. Joint monitoring is being conducted but there is room for improvement and better coordination</p>

<sup>3</sup> This assumes existence of multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination and engagement under Process1

<p>expertise to timely respond to the identified needs in a coordinated way.</p>	<p>national level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work plans or implementation plan</b></p>		
<p><b>Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition. It looks specifically at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform the adjustment of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Information System (e.g. multi-sectoral platforms and portals) in place to regularly collect, analyse and communicate the agreed indicators focusing on measuring implementation coverage and performance</li> <li>▪ Existence of regular progress reports</li> <li>▪ Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits</li> <li>▪ Adjustments of annual plans, including budgets based on analysis of performance</li> <li>▪ Existence of participatory monitoring by civil society</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of regular/annual joint review of implementation coverage and performance of prioritised actions</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Analysis was showed need for action plan based on lessons learnt</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision making and create evidence for public good.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reports and disseminations from population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research</li> <li>▪ Capture and share lessons learned, best practices, case studies, stories of change and implementation progress</li> <li>▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society</li> <li>▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of evaluation of</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Completed individual annual report from sectors. Media review reports, surveys. Private sector growing at a slow pace.</p>

	<b>implementation at scale that demonstrates nutrition impact and are made available publicly</b>		
--	---	--	--

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
<b>Government</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Completed, line ministries have aligned their action around nutrition policies</li> <li>- Completed policies and their implementation plan aligned with activities clearly spelt out</li> <li>- Nearly completed prioritize due to certain conditions/challenges(Resources and time)</li> <li>- Started no joint monitoring MDA on nutrition.(Education, health, Agriculture, Water resources)</li> <li>- Completed individual annual report from sectors. Media review reports surveys. Leading us on the way funds</li> </ul>
<b>UN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The UNDAF is aligned to the NFNSIP and A4P with targets clearly defined. Actions align to national nutrition targets/policies</li> <li>- Translation of policy into CRF good. CRF is part of the UNDAF document</li> <li>- Country programme frameworks are in line with UNDAF and government priorities</li> <li>- Joint monitoring is being conducted but there is room for improvement and better coordination</li> </ul>
<b>Donor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annual priorities for SUN not yet set (awaiting review of FNSIP)</li> <li>- No evaluation carried out, none planned</li> </ul>
<b>Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All national policies on nutrition are align with SUN sec</li> <li>- Implementation challenges</li> </ul>
<b>CSO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good harmonisation, improved area of message</li> <li>- Annual action plan available but needs to be mainstreamed to the district and implemented</li> <li>- Analysis was showed need for action plan based on lessons learnt</li> </ul>

**OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 3: Common Results Framework for National Nutrition Plan (aligned programming)**  
(i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)

1. National post Ebola strategic plans aligned with SUN principles. Priority to Women and children
2. Completed annual sector reports. Challenges with Ebola Epidemic
3. Clearly spelt out Policies and their implementation plans aligned with activities
4. Completed, all line ministries have aligned their action around nutrition policies
5. Actions align to national nutrition targets/policies
6. All national policies on nutrition are align with SUN though Annual action plans needs to be mainstreamed to the district and implemented
7. SUN Secretariat coordinates and organises MSP meetings soliciting increase support for private sector operations
8. Involvement of planning officers at district council levels captures and aligns sector policies.

### Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

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

#### Process 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

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

#### Progress marker 4.1: Cost and assess financial feasibility

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to provide inputs for costing of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions across relevant sectors (costing exercises can be performed in various ways including conducting a review of current spending or an estimation of unit costs).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of costed estimations of nutrition related actions [please provide the relevant documentation]</li> <li>▪ Existence of costed plans for CRF implementation</li> <li>▪ Stakeholder groups have an overview of their own allocations to nutrition related programmes/actions [please provide the relevant documentation]</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</b></p>	2	Costed plan but needs to be reviewed and updated. financial feasibility and arrangement to support SUN on-going and need to be strengthen

#### Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition

This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to track their allocations and expenditures (if available) for nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions in relevant sectors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Planned spending</li> <li>○ Current allocations</li> <li>○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2	Completed budget tracking exercise. Update on nutrition expenditure tracked at UN agency level.
---	--	---	---



<p>This progress marker also aims to determine whether the financial tracking for nutrition is reported and shared in a transparent manner with other partners of the MSP including the government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of reporting mechanisms including regular financial reports, independent audit reports, cost effectiveness studies, multi-sectoral consolidation of the sectoral nutrition spending (including off-budget), and others. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public.</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending</b></p>		
<p><b>Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at the capability by governments and other in-country stakeholder to identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, setting-up of specific mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps</li> <li>▪ Government and other In-country stakeholders assess additional funding needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions</li> <li>▪ Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</b></p>	1	<p>A truly integrated approach that effectively links resources and opportunities at the national and community level.</p> <p>Budget allocated in country programmes are translated into implementation of programmes to scale up nutrition</p>
<p><b>Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders are able to turn pledges into disbursements. It includes the ability of Donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the fiscal year in which they were scheduled.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments</li> <li>▪ Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through: Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related implementing entities</li> <li>▪ Specific programmes performed by government and/or other in-country stakeholder</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges</b></p>	1	<p>Plans on the way for resource mobilization to sustain implementation</p>

(domestic or external)			
Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how governments and in-country stakeholders collectively engage in long-term predictable funding to ensure results and impact. It looks at important changes such as the continuum between short-term humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of a long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy</li> <li>▪ Coordinated reduction of financial gaps through domestic and external contributions</li> <li>▪ Stable or increasing flexible domestic contributions</li> <li>▪ Existence of long-term/multi-year financial resolutions / projections</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms</b></p>	1	<p>Repositioning and transforming the nutrition sectors will require significant technical and financial resources therefore Government, Donors and UN agencies should play a leadership role in mobilizing resources and facilitating a coordinating approach at national and global levels</p> <p>Clear and precise priority areas and associated actions required to tackle constraints and access opportunities</p> <p>Financial resources are alighted more funding needed for structure</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
<b>Government</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On-going already initiated with few MDAs have budget lines</li> <li>- Completed budget tracking report already published</li> <li>- On-going to scale up more funds to provided. More lobbying to avail more funds</li> <li>- On-going there are challenges in turning pledges into disbursements</li> <li>- On-going still MDAs are face challenges with finances for implementation</li> </ul>
<b>UN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plans on the way for resource mobilization to sustain implementation</li> <li>- Budget allocated in country programmes are translated into implementation of programmes to scale up nutrition</li> <li>- Completed budget tracking exercise. Update on nutrition expenditure tracked at UN agency level.</li> <li>- Adequate resources, whether technical or financial, to support sub programmes</li> </ul>
<b>Donor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not actively having discussions with donors on future funding</li> <li>- Repositioning and transforming the nutrition sectors will require significant technical and financial resources therefore Government, Donors and UN agencies should play a leadership role in mobilizing resources and facilitating a coordinating approach at national and global levels</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear and precise priority areas and associated actions required to tackle constraints and access opportunities</li> <li>-</li> </ul>
<b>Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financial resources are alighted more funding needed for structure</li> <li>- UN, Irish Aids, expressed continue support</li> </ul>
<b>CSO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Costed plan but needs to be reviewed to be updated</li> <li>- Still gaps remaining but slight improvement</li> <li>- Commitment but no disbursements ( not transformed in reality)</li> </ul>

<b>OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation</b> (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvements/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in country)	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Completed draft budget tracking report</li> <li>2. Costed plan but needs to be reviewed to be updated</li> <li>3. Still gaps remaining but slight improvement</li> <li>4. Commitment but no disbursements ( not transformed in reality)</li> </ol>	

## Annex 1: Details of Participants

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.		Agnes I Conteh	Chairperson, DCB Bombali	<a href="mailto:deseretwosil96@gmail.com">deseretwosil96@gmail.com</a>	076948436	✓
2.		Laetitia Battisti	Advocacy Officer, ACF	<a href="mailto:advocacyexpert@sl.missions-acf.org">advocacyexpert@sl.missions-acf.org</a>	076100701	✓
3.		Morrison Gboyor	Ministry of Water and Sanitation	<a href="mailto:gboyor@yahoo.com">gboyor@yahoo.com</a>	076642880	✓
4.		Bernedette Alieu	Technical Officer, SUN Sec.	<a href="mailto:bernadetteallieu@yahoo.com">bernadetteallieu@yahoo.com</a>	078331847	✓
5.		Doris Fatima Webber	Director, WAADO/WESTERN RURAL DLB	<a href="mailto:dorisfatimawebber@gmail.com">dorisfatimawebber@gmail.com</a>	076879300	✓
6.		Abu mortay Kamara	M&E Officer, SUN Sec	<a href="mailto:mortay16@yahoo.com">mortay16@yahoo.com</a>	078295543	✓
7.		Aminata Shammit Koroma	Director DFN/MoHS	<a href="mailto:shamitamin@yahoo.com">shamitamin@yahoo.com</a>	076300770	✓
8.		Mohamed Ajuba Sheriff	Dep Director MAFFS	<a href="mailto:medajuba@yahoo.com">medajuba@yahoo.com</a>	076646442	✓
9.		Sylvester Amara	Chairperson, Pikin-To-Pikin, Tonkolili	<a href="mailto:Sylvester.amara@yahoo.com">Sylvester.amara@yahoo.com</a>	077225687	✓
10.		Muniru S Will	CEO, WHO	<a href="mailto:musatwill@gmail.com">musatwill@gmail.com</a>		✓
11.		Mathew French	Bonth Dist. Human Rt. Org	<a href="mailto:matthewfrench1974@gmail.com">matthewfrench1974@gmail.com</a>	078706737	✓
12.		Momoh M Kpaka	Programme Manager	<a href="mailto:Mkpaka2015@yahoo.com">Mkpaka2015@yahoo.com</a>	076380834	✓
13.		Dr Mohamed Foh	National Coordinator, SUN	<a href="mailto:medbevafoh@gmail.com">medbevafoh@gmail.com</a>	078750822	✓
14.		Dr Magret Wagah	Chief Technical Officer	<a href="mailto:Margaret.wagah@fao.org">Margaret.wagah@fao.org</a>	078293000	✓

15.	Mohamed B Jalloh	CEO, Focus 1000	<a href="mailto:jallohbai@gmail.com">jallohbai@gmail.com</a>	079060592	✓
16.	Samuel A Margai	DCB Chair, Kailahun, Pikin – To – Pikin movement	<a href="mailto:Margai76671849@gmail.com">Margai76671849@gmail.com</a>	076671845 088952129	✓
17.	Ahmid Kabbah	Director of operations, SLPKC	<a href="mailto:akabba@slpmc.sl">akabba@slpmc.sl</a>	076314619	✓
18.	Marie Bob Kandeh	President, MWASL	<a href="mailto:Marketwomen.sl@yahoo.com">Marketwomen.sl@yahoo.com</a>	076803392	✓
19.	Henry A S Allieu	Nutrition Programme Manager, IMC/SNAP	<a href="mailto:hallieu@internationalmedic.alcorps.org">hallieu@internationalmedic.alcorps.org</a>	076645027	✓
20.	Peter F Bangura	DCB chairperson, Pikin – To –Pikin movement	<a href="mailto:peterfo2006@yahoo.com">peterfo2006@yahoo.com</a>	078812645	✓
21.	Mohamed Dabor	Sec Gen, KAAD	<a href="mailto:meddabor@gmail.com">meddabor@gmail.com</a>	078740076	✓
22.	Junta F Moiba	OC West, NaCSA	<a href="mailto:Juntafitimamoiba@nacs.gov.sl">Juntafitimamoiba@nacs.gov.sl</a>	076450210	✓
23.	Marima Bah	Nutrition officer, MAFFS	<a href="mailto:Marima.bah@fao.org">Marima.bah@fao.org</a>	076774742	✓
24.	Mabinty Kamara	Nutrition officer, MAFFS	<a href="mailto:m.b.kamara@hotmail.co.uk">m.b.kamara@hotmail.co.uk</a>	079435346	✓
25.	Cathryn Turay	General Manager	<a href="mailto:cathryn.turay@yahoo.com">cathryn.turay@yahoo.com</a>	079455193	✓
26.	Patric Mansaray	Chairman DCB Kono		076618545	✓
27.	Mariatu H Koroma	Ass. Director MEST	<a href="mailto:koromaallier@gmail.com">koromaallier@gmail.com</a>	076661638	✓
28.	Bridget Lawis	Communication Officer, Focus 1000	<a href="mailto:bblawis@focus1000.org">bblawis@focus1000.org</a>	076414185	✓



29.	Willam Sao Lamin	Coordinator, Accountability Now SL	<a href="mailto:accountabitynowsl@gmail.com">accountabitynowsl@gmail.com</a>	076627655	✓
30.	Kadiatu Dumbuya	Chair Kambia, AMNet	<a href="mailto:amnetkambia2011@gmail.com">amnetkambia2011@gmail.com</a>	030080557	✓
31.	Marbey Sartie	Programme Specilist, UN Women	<a href="mailto:Marbey.Sartie@unwomen.org">Marbey.Sartie@unwomen.org</a>	078822311	✓
32.	Henry Becker	Govt. Officer, MLGRD	<a href="mailto:beckercee@yahoo.com">beckercee@yahoo.com</a>	078149142	✓
33.	Sanusie Fofanah	DCB Chair Moyamba, Pikin To Pinkin	<a href="mailto:sanusiefofanah@yahoo.com">sanusiefofanah@yahoo.com</a>	077200755	✓
34.	Samuel Allieu	Project Officer, SILPA	<a href="mailto:Silpa_4dev@yahoo.com">Silpa_4dev@yahoo.com</a>	076794279	✓
35.	Abdulai D swarray	Director, CAF-SL	<a href="mailto:Cafsl2020@gmail.com">Cafsl2020@gmail.com</a>	076590929	✓
36.	Hassan Ngevaio	Programme officer, MSWGCA	<a href="mailto:saio_marrah@yahoo.com">saio_marrah@yahoo.com</a>	078743135	✓
37.	Feimata Russell	Nutritionist, DFN/MoHS	<a href="mailto:mrsfeimatarussell@gmail.com">mrsfeimatarussell@gmail.com</a>	076623983	✓
38.	Zainab Mansaray	Programme Associate, WFP	<a href="mailto:zainab.mansaray@wfp.org">zainab.mansaray@wfp.org</a>	07617609	✓
39.	Eimear Murphy	Programme Officer	<a href="mailto:eimear.murphy@dfa.ie">eimear.murphy@dfa.ie</a>	076318399	✓
40.	Dr Kajali Paintal	Nut Programme Manager, UNICEF	<a href="mailto:kpaintal@unicef.org">kpaintal@unicef.org</a>	076912422	✓
41.	Emmanuel Aiah Senessie	Communication Officer, SUN Sec	<a href="mailto:emmanuelSenessie@yahoo.co.uk">emmanuelSenessie@yahoo.co.uk</a>	078645365	✓
42.	Mohamed Ajuba Sheriff	Dep. Dir. PEMSD, MAFFS	<a href="mailto:medajuba@yahoo.com">medajuba@yahoo.com</a>	076646442	✓
43.	Aminata Shamit Koroma	Dir. Food and Nutrition	<a href="mailto:shamitamin@gmail.com">shamitamin@gmail.com</a>	076300770	✓

**Annex 2: Focus Questions:**

1.	<p><b>How much time has your MSP and/or its associated organs met</b> since the last Joint-Assessment? Please provide details of the meeting, where applicable, i.e., Technical committee meetings, inter-ministerial meetings, working groups meetings, etc.</p>	<p>SUN secretariat coordinates and conveys national MSP meetings every eight weeks excluding emergencies (Nine (9) times). Despite this, different sectors meet (sectoral coordination meetings) monthly. Similarly, at sub-national levels, MSP food and nutrition coordination meetings happen. Issues discussed, reviewed, follow ups, reports, lessons learnt, suggestions and plans for next meetings form part of the agenda.</p>
2.	<p>Is your <b>MSP replicated at the decentralised levels</b>? Or is there a coordination mechanism for nutrition at the sub-national level? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the coordination mechanism, composition and roles, etc.</p>	<p>Meetings are replicated at sub-national/district levels. Current District Coordination Bodies (DCBs) work in tandem with the district council who are legally mandated to lead coordination. Coordination meetings at district / chiefdom levels consist of DCB chairmen, Council chairman, technical heads of INGOs and CBOs and representatives of Line ministries. Paramount chiefs and other community elders are at most times part of these meetings</p>
3.	<p><b>Have you organised any high level event</b> since the last Joint-Assessment? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event organised, i.e., Forum on Nutrition, Workshop for high-level officials, etc.</p>	<p>YES. High level activities organised include, 1) Official launch of National FNSIP by vice president, 2) Launching of SUN Music video, 3) Organised a three days MSP National Health and Nutrition Fair, 4) Workshop and orientation for media practitioners 5) prepared position paper on the right to food to be entrenched in the revised constitution etc. etc</p>
4.	<p><b>Are you planning to organise any high level event</b> in the coming months (April 2016 – April 2017)? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event to be organised</p>	<p>YES. Planning to 1) organised an inclusive Mid-term review of the National FNSIP, 2) Launch of the Food-based dietary guidelines, 3) undertake periodic joint monitoring exercises 4) Organise another National health and nutrition fair</p>
5.	<p>Do you have identified <b>Nutrition Champions</b> in your Country? (Yes/No)</p>	<p>Yes. 1) Vice president and 2) Wife of the</p>

	If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	President (First Lady) and Deputy Minister of Agriculture The champions promote health and nutrition issues related to women, children, and adolescent girls. Articulate policies related to linking agriculture (women in agriculture) and nutrition and health.
6.	Are <b>Parliamentarians</b> in your country engaged to work for the scale up of nutrition in your country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Parliamentarians for nutrition.	Yes. There are parliamentary sub committees on food security, health, and education and water resources. They oversee the works of the line ministries and non-government actors.
7.	Are <b>journalists and members of the media</b> involved in keeping nutrition on the agenda in your country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the media and journalists for nutrition.	Yes. There is an existing Kombra (Mothers) Media Network comprising journalists from both print and electronic media. They cover events related to food, health and nutrition activities.
8.	Is there any reported <b>Conflict of Interest</b> within or outside your MSP? (Yes/No) If Yes, how was the Conflict of Interest handled?	No.
9.	Do you have a <b>Social mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication policy/plan/strategy</b> ? (Yes/No) If Yes, kindly attach a copy or copies of the documents	No.
10.	Do you use the <b>SUN Website</b> , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	Yes. Support country offices (National SUN secretariat) with sustained internet connectivity
11.	To <b>support learning needs</b> , what are the preferred ways to: – access information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders? – foster country-to-country exchange?	– Access information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders? – Foster country-to-country exchange? (SUN country calls, Learning routes, exchange visits.
12.	Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with <b>humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility</b> ?	YES
13.	<b>What criteria for grouping with other SUN countries with similar challenges and opportunities</b> would be most useful for your country? i.e. federal, emerging economies, maturity in the SUN Movement, with double burden, etc. (for potential tailored exchanges from 2017 onwards)	?

### Annex 3: Common Priorities For 2016-2017:

The table below provides a basic overview of services available to support SUN Countries in achieving their national nutrition priorities in 2016-17. Please review the list below and record your key priorities for the coming year, providing specific details, so the SUN Movement Secretariat can better appreciate how to maximise delivery of relevant support.

The Policy and Budget Cycle Management – from planning to accounting for results	Social Mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication	Coordination of action across sectors, among stakeholders, and between levels of government through improved functional capacities	Strengthening equity drivers of nutrition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Review relevant policy and legislation documents</li> <li>✓ Situation/Contextual analysis</li> <li>✓ Mapping of the available workforce for nutrition</li> <li>✓ Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF)</li> <li>✓ Development of a Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (M&amp;E) framework</li> <li>✓ Support better management of data (e.g. National Information Platforms for Nutrition - NIPN) Estimation of costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level)Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level)</li> <li>✓ Support with the development guidelines to organise and manage Common Results Framework (CRF) at sub-national levels</li> <li>✓ Financing of selected programmes (due diligence)</li> <li>✓ Support with the design and implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Engaging nutrition champions to position nutrition as a priority at all levels</li> <li>✓ Engaging parliamentarians for legislative advocacy, budget oversight and public outreach</li> <li>✓ Engaging the media for influencing decision makers, accountability and awareness</li> <li>✓ Utilising high level events, partnerships and communication channels for leveraging commitments, generating investment and enhancing data</li> <li>✓ Building national investment cases, supported by data and evidence, to drive nutrition advocacy</li> <li>✓ Developing, updating or implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies</li> <li>✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs</li> <li>✓ Strengthening of skills of key actors, such as Multistakeholder Platform member. Skills could include communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination.</li> <li>✓ Support with strengthening capacity of individuals or organization to better engage with: themes (like WASH), sectors (like Education or Business), or groups (like scientists and academics)</li> <li>✓ Analysis/ guidance for institutional frameworks at national and subnational levels, including MSP, Coordination Mechanisms, stakeholder groups, or others</li> <li>✓ Prevention and management of Conflicts of Interest (COI)</li> <li>✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Develop or review mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies.</li> <li>✓ Ensuring participation of representatives from marginalised and vulnerable communities in decision-making processes</li> <li>✓ Adapting, adopting or improving policies that aim to empower among women and girls</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Review relevant policy and legislation documents</li> <li>✓ Situation/Contextual analysis</li> <li>✓ Mapping of the available workforce for nutrition</li> <li>✓ Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF)</li> <li>✓ Support better management of data (e.g. National Information Platforms for Nutrition - NIPN) Estimation of costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level)Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level)</li> <li>✓ Financing of selected programmes (due diligence)</li> <li>✓ Support with the design and implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making</li> <li>✓</li> </ul>	<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Engaging nutrition champions to position nutrition as a priority at all levels</li> <li>✓ Engaging parliamentarians for legislative advocacy, budget oversight and public outreach</li> <li>✓ Engaging the media for influencing decision makers, accountability and awareness</li> <li>✓ Utilising high level events, partnerships and communication channels for leveraging commitments, generating investment and enhancing data</li> <li>✓ Building national investment cases, supported by data and evidence, to drive nutrition advocacy</li> <li>✓ Developing, updating or implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies</li> <li>✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs</li> <li>✓ Strengthening of skills of key actors, such as Multistakeholder Platform member. Skills could include communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination.</li> <li>✓ Support with strengthening capacity of individuals or organization to better engage with: themes (like WASH), sectors (like Education or Business), or groups (like scientists and academics)</li> <li>✓ Analysis/ guidance for institutional frameworks at national and subnational levels, including MSP, Coordination Mechanisms, stakeholder groups, or others</li> <li>✓ Prevention and management of Conflicts of Interest (COI)</li> </ul> <p>Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis</p>	<p><b>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Develop or review mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies.</li> <li>✓ Ensuring participation of representatives from marginalised and vulnerable communities in decision-making processes</li> <li>✓ Adapting, adopting or improving policies that aim to empower among women and girls</li> </ul>

## Annex 4 – Scaling Up Nutrition: Defining a Common Results Framework

---

### The SUN Movement Secretariat has prepared this note to help you take stock of progress with the development of a Common Results Framework

1. Within the SUN Movement the term ‘common results framework’ is used to describe a set of expected results that have been agreed across different sectors of Government and among other stakeholders.
2. The existence of a negotiated and agreed Common Results Framework helps different parts of Government and other Stakeholders (including development partners) to work effectively together.
3. The ideal is that the Common Results Framework is negotiated and agreed under the authority of the highest level of Government, that all relevant sectors are involved and that other stakeholders fully support the results and their implementation.
4. The Common Results Framework enables different stakeholders to work in synergy, with common purpose. It combines (a) a single set of expected results, (b) an plan for implementing actions to realize these results, (c) costs of implementing the plan (or matrix), (d) the contributions (in terms of programmes and budget) to be made by different stakeholders (including those from outside the country), (e) the degree to which these contributions are aligned – when designed and when implemented, (f) a framework for monitoring and evaluation that enables all to assess the achievement of results.
5. When written down, the Common Results Framework will include a table of expected results: it will also consist of a costed implementation plan, perhaps with a roadmap (*feuille de route*) describing the steps needed for implementation. There may also be compacts, or memoranda of understanding, which set out mutual obligations between different stakeholders. In practice the implementation plan is often an amalgam of several plans from different sectors or stakeholders – hence our use of the term “matrix of plans” to describe the situation where there are several implementation plans within the Common Results Framework. The group of documents that make up a country’s Common Results Framework will be the common point of reference for all sectors and stakeholders as they work together for scaling up nutrition.
6. The development of the Common Results Framework is informed by the content of national development policies, strategies of different sectors (eg. health, agriculture, and education), legislation, research findings and the positions taken both by local government and civil society. For it to be used as a point of reference, the Common Results Framework will require the technical endorsement of the part of Government responsible for the implementation of actions for nutrition. The Common Results Framework will be of greatest value when it has received high-level political endorsement – from the National Government and/or Head of State. For effective implementation, endorsements may also be needed from authorities in local government.
7. It is often the case that some sectoral authorities or stakeholders engage in the process of reaching agreement on a Common Results Framework less intensively than others. Full agreement across sectors and stakeholders requires both time and diplomacy. To find ways for moving forward with similar engagement of all sectors and stakeholders, SUN Countries are sharing their experiences with developing the Frameworks.
8. SUN countries usually find it helpful to have their Common Results Frameworks reviewed by others, so that they can be made stronger – or reinforced. If the review uses standard methods, the process of review can also make it easier to secure investment. If requested, the SUN Movement Secretariat can help SUN countries access people to help with this reinforcement.