

# SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

Name Yemen Country

## 2016 Reporting Template: Joint-Assessment by National Multi-Stakeholder Platform

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	15
Civil Society	2
Science and Academia	0
Donors	0
United Nations	5
Business	1 (From Commerce Chamber representing private sectors)
Other (please specify)	3 (INGOs)

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? \_\_26\_\_

<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Email	<input type="checkbox"/>
Review, validation	Meeting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Email	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

**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?

Yes. It was very useful. Participants learned and practiced somehow a new method for doing review that also can help them in their workplace. Participant were actively reacting and giving inputs during the exercise.

---



---



---

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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is steering committee and technical committee established before April 2015.</li> <li>▪ There was no regular meetings held for the steering committee during the Reporting Period due to active conflict, however the SUN National Secretariat has organised adhoc meetings if and when necessary with relevant members. SUN secretariat has been active and continued to monitor the implementation of different sectors.</li> <li>▪ No update has been made for the TOR and work plans during the Reporting Period.</li> <li>▪ The reason behind this is the shift to support and implement the humanitarian response activities</li> </ul>

<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>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Two key members have been added to the MSP (Ministry of Social Affairs and Social Welfare Fund) but that was before the Reporting Period.</li> <li>▪ Political leaders are engaged within each sector in the implementation process but this engagement is not made at the desired level. The current political unrest is the main obstacle behind.</li> <li>▪ There was no stakeholder groups formed during the Reporting Period.</li> <li>▪ The National SUN Secretariat is part of many clusters and they are actively participated in all coordination meeting of Nutrition, WASH and Agriculture and Food Security Clusters. Secretariat was member of the technical committee of Emergency Food Security and Nutrition Assessment (EFSNA) that for some obstacles could not be implemented yet. They are also part of the technical committee of IPC.</li> <li>▪ During the Reporting period, there was establishment of decentralized structures, or assignment of focal points at local levels (governorate levels).</li> </ul>
<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</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-</li> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is one part of the programme was implemented during the Reporting Period. It is the part of the humanitarian response.</li> <li>▪ During the Reporting Period, there has been no discussion taken place in regard to polices and plans. However, before the Reporting Period, there was some preparation for the financial matters. The Secretariat joint some international meetings on the financial tracking.</li> <li>▪ The platform has been used by players for setting priorities and targeting. The example is the new GIZ</li> </ul>

<p>process and take mutual ownership and accountability of the results.</p>	<p>making bodies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement</li> </ul>		<p>supported projected who referred to the Secretariat for the targeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There were no well-planned advocacy activities done during the Reporting Period.</li> <li>▪ The Secretariat and active members such as Health, Planning, and UN agencies are in regular link with the global support system. Yemen is joining most of the regular teleconferences of the Global Secretariat.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the capacity of the multi-stakeholder platform as a whole to be accountable for collective results. It implies that constituencies within the MSP are capable to track and report on own contributions and achievements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monitor and report on proceedings and results of MSP (including on relevant websites, other communication materials) on a regular basis [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>2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There was no systematic tracking in regard to the monitoring and report of different sectors. The follow up is made through focal points in those sectors or through exploring the materials of different sectors on the Web.</li> <li>▪ Stockholders particularly governmental, UN agencies and NGOs continued implementation of the activities which are part of the plan, but there was no initiative for preparing compiled reports.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at how the multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is institutionalised in national development planning mechanisms and in lasting political commitments, not only by the government executive power but also by the leadership 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>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There was no recent Higher National Development Plan to integrate the nutrition plan to.</li> <li>▪ There is continuous participation of the political leadership but without obvious outcomes.</li> <li>▪ There is a weakness in the commitment of the government side to the implementation of the plan.</li> <li>▪ Different sectors including SUN stakeholders have been fully engaged in the IPC exercise conducted in June 2015.</li> </ul>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
Government	- Leading the steering and the technical committees as well as the coordination and the advocacy
UN	- Continue the technical and financial support as well as the advocacy
Donor	- They are part of it, giving the majority of funds to support the humanitarian interventions which is part of the plan

<b>Business</b>	- Not yet actively involved
<b>CSO</b>	- Focus on supporting the humanitarian response plan
<b>Others</b>	-

**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)

**Positive changes:**

- At each sector, there is a kind of engagement of political leaders in the implementation process although it is not at desired level.
- The most implemented part of the programme is the response to the humanitarian emergency situation. However, the platform is used by development partners for setting priorities and targeting. Stockholders particularly governmental, UN agencies and NGOs continued implementation of the activities that are part of the plan.
- The National SUN Secretariat is actively participating in many clusters, and they are part of IPC technical committee. Secretariat continues joining the SUN relevant international events. The Secretariat and active members such as Health, Planning, and UN agencies are in regular link with the global support system through joining most of the regular teleconferences of the Global Secretariat. Different sectors including SUN stakeholders have been fully engaged in the IPC exercise conducted in June 2015.
- The national SUN secretariat continued monitor the plans of different sectors through secretariat focal points

**Key challenges:**

- There were no regular meetings held for the steering committee during the Reporting Period due to the escalation of the conflict in Yemen. In link to this the TOR of the steering committee has not been reviewed and there was no stakeholder groups formed during the Reporting Period. The structure still central based which has not been reflected to the decentralised level. The secretariat has not been tracking systematically in regards to monitoring and reporting.
- Unfortunately, there was no recent a higher National Development Plan to integrate the nutrition plan to. On the other hand, there was no related advocacy strategy or plan to support the implementation of the nutrition multi-sectoral plan
- The main reason behind this is the current conflict situation that pushed all sectors to change priorities from the development side to the humanitarian and lifesaving side. On the other hand the current political situation and the fragility is behind hindering many activities especially that are related to revision and update of policies and legal documents.

**Suggestion for improvement:**

- Secretariat should put a calendar for regular meetings of the steering committee.
- Support should be given to the secretariat to maintain the coordination tasks as well tracking the progress in different sectors.

## 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 acoherent policy and legal framework**  
 The existence of a coherent policy and legal framework should inform and guide how in-country stakeholders work together for improved nutrition outcomes. Updated policies, strategies and legislations are fundamental to prevent 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>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the Reporting Period, there was multi-sectoral analysis or evaluation for policies has been made. The current political situation is not allowing in doing such analysis.</li> </ul>

**Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, update and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks**

This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was no strategy or plan has been established for advocacy and communication. However, during the Reporting Period, there</li> </ul>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>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>▪ 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, pressengagement 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>were sporadic activities for advocacy by stockholders to implement the multi-sectoral plan. The best example is the coordination made for the Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan that has got a consensus and also got supported.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholders efforts			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders - government (i.e. line ministries) and non-state partners - coordinate their inputs to ensure the development of a coherent policy and legislation framework.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries E.g. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines / advice / support for mainstreaming nutrition in sector policies.</li> <li>▪ Key Stakeholder Groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive)</li> <li>▪ Develop/update policies / legal 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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ During the Reporting Period, there was no update has been made for policies because there was no any analysis or evaluation has been made for the current existed polices. All efforts were to the direction of humanitarian response as an emergency priority.</li> <li>▪ Nutrition legislation such as the decree of breastfeeding promotion and protection, the salt iodisation law, and the flour and oil fortification are existed. However, during the Reporting Period, they have not been reviewed or updated. The current political crisis does not allow doing such update.</li> </ul>
Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise / enforce the legal frameworks			
<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,</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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ During the Reporting Period, guideline has been prepared for the implementation of the decree of breastfeeding promotion and protection which is translating the International Code of Marketing of BMS. However, the national mechanisms for operationalisation are still under planning.</li> </ul>

among others.			
<b>Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact</b>			
This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing policies and legislations have been reviewed and evaluated to document best practices and the extent to which available lessons are shared by different constituencies within the multi-stakeholder platforms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc.</li> <li>▪ Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports</b></p>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ During the Reporting Period, there was no review has been made for policies and legal documents, therefore, no lessons learned have been sorted out.</li> </ul>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two
<b>Government</b>	- Leading the steering and technical committees
<b>UN</b>	- Provide with the technical assistance and doing the advocacy
<b>Donor</b>	- Their support is essential in future
<b>Business</b>	- Still are not actively involved
<b>CSO</b>	- They have to be involved in future
<b>Others</b>	-

**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)

**Positive changes:**

- During the Reporting Period, the majority of efforts were given to the humanitarian response as an emergency priority. In regard to advocacy, there were sporadic activities by stockholders to implement the multi-sectoral plan.
- Yemen has some of nutritional legislation mainly those are related to breastfeeding protecting and food fortification with micronutrients. Government has prepared guideline for the implementation of the decree of breastfeeding promotion and protection which is translating the International Code of Marketing of BMS, but in regard to the national mechanisms for operationalisation this decree, is still under planning.

**Key challenges:**

- During the Reporting Period, there was no multi-sectoral analysis, evaluation or update of policies or legislation matters have been made. As a result of this, no lessons learned have been gleaned. In regards to the advocacy, social mobilization communication, there is no strategy or plan has been established.

- The current political situation and the fragility is behind hindering many activities especially that are related to revision and update of policies and legal documents.

**Suggestions for improvement**

- MQSUN should be contacted to finalize the update of situation analysis. The national SUN secretariat need to invite the technical committee for a meeting mainly to prepare a list of documents and datasets those can help MQSUN to update the analysis with consideration to the crisis period.

### 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 the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the</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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active coordination mechanism by the Clusters, with presentation of MOPIC and different related sectors</li> <li>Assessments &amp; Surveys planned, part of them implemented</li> <li>Analysis of the implemented surveys data</li> <li>4Wsmappings updated regularly by the concerned sector/cluster</li> <li>MOH is in advance stage in comparison with the governmental authorities</li> </ul>

<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’

review of programmes and implementation capacities	<b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</b>		
<b>Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition</b>			
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&E Framework and costed interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.	<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>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SUN plan already submitted, it has the objectives and clear division of the roles &amp; responsibilities</li> <li>▪ Current conflict affect the prioritization for governmental policy &amp; clusters objectives to be more emergency oriented</li> <li>▪ Coordination capacity is included within the cluster mechanism which is emergency oriented</li> <li>▪ SUN work plan need to be adopted by each sector specific plans, this objective was delayed due to the current crisis</li> </ul>
<b>Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework</b>			
This progress marker looks specifically at the national and local capability to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce</li> </ul>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capacity assessment was not done systematically although it was included in the</li> </ul>

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

<p>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 expertise to timely respond to the identified needs in a coordinated way.</p>	<p>and other resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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-national level</li> <li>▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work plans or implementation plan</b></p>		<p>SUN plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Institutional reforms to increase the capacity of the coordination are not part of the SUN plan</li> <li>▪ SUN priorities should be reflected in the action plan for each sector/cluster</li> </ul>
<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:</b></p>	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Information management for SUN secretariat was not establish, but they are benefited from sector based information management system as IPC data &amp; related clusters data</li> <li>▪ SUN secretariat to be complemented with food security secretariat to address the common areas as data management system as a priority, taking into consideration of the specific programmatic areas for each party</li> <li>▪ Reviews of the plan along with related recommendation were done</li> <li>▪ Sun monitoring role was not activated for civil society.</li> </ul>

	<b>Countries are required to provide evidence of regular/annual joint review of implementation coverage and performance of prioritised actions</b>		
<b>Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact</b>			
<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 implementation at scale that demonstrates nutrition impact and are made available publicly</b></p>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Part of the planned Surveys &amp; operational research implemented &amp; data disseminated</li> <li>▪ Advocacy work done for the nutrition specific interventions as CMAM scale up plan but very limited for Nutrition sensitive interventions</li> <li>▪ There was no evaluation for the impact or social auditing for the results</li> </ul>

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three</b>
<b>Government</b>	Strong presence in the clusters, ready SUN working plan, information flow
<b>UN</b>	Leading active coordination mechanism by cluster approach , advocate for resources mobilization , information system exist
<b>Donor</b>	Focusing on Humanitarian aspects more than development
<b>Business</b>	Weak role till now , but there is potential for the future
<b>CSO</b>	Members of the clusters, implementing agencies have active role in information flow
<b>Others</b>	Members of the clusters, implementing agencies have active role in information flow

**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)

**Positive changes:**

- Active coordination mechanism exist via the Clusters & updated 4Ws mappings available
- MOPIC and governmental authorities have strong presence at different clusters
- Implemented assessment survey followed by analysis of its data & data disseminated
- MOH is taking the lead in many aspects
- SUN plan with objectives and clear division of the roles and responsibilities already exist & its review process already done

**key challenges:**

- Current conflict affect the prioritization for governmental policy to be more emergency oriented
- Information management for SUN secretariat was not established, but they are benefited from sector based information management system as IPC data & related clusters data
- SUN monitoring role was not activated for civil society.
- There was no evaluation for the impact or social auditing for the results

**Suggestions for Improvement:**

- SUN work plan and its priorities need to be adopted by each sector specific action plan for each sector/cluster
- More advocacy work for development activities & not only emergency interventions
- SUN secretariat activities to be complemented with the food security secretariat to address the common areas as data management system
- Systematic capacity assent to be conducted & Institutional reforms in order to increase the capacity of the coordination to be focused on



### 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SUN plan includes the cost estimation for each sector</li> <li>▪ Each sector have their own cost estimation for their programs activities which are not necessarily to cover all the aspects of SUN plan due to the current emergency situation</li> <li>▪ All stakeholders have viewed their own contribution in the SUN plan</li> <li>▪ Under YHRP major areas as Nutrition, Health &amp; Wash were addressed as key components (specific more than sensitive nutrition interventions)</li> </ul>
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-	<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> </ul> </li> </ul>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial reports per sector submitted to MOPIC regularly</li> <li>• Still there is no transparent and publicly available financial related information</li> </ul>

<p>sensitive actions in relevant sectors. This progress marker also aims to determine whether the financial tracking for nutrition is reported and shared in a transparent manner with other partners of the MSP including the government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period)</li> <li>▪ Existence of reporting mechanisms including regular financial reports, independent audit reports, cost effectiveness studies, multi-sectoral consolidation of the sectoral nutrition spending (including off-budget), and others.</li> <li>○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information</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>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ For humanitarian response, there is good mechanism to advocate for resource mobilization</li> <li>▪ Mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps exist within the clusters mechanism ( more for humanitarian than development)</li> <li>▪ No strategic increase in government and domestic budget due to melt down of financial situation dire to the current crisis, however the external resources mobilized through YHRP to cover the humanitarian needs</li> </ul>

	<b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</b>		
<b>Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders are able to turn pledges into disbursements. It includes the ability of Donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the fiscal year in which they were scheduled.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments</li> <li>▪ Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through: Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related implementing entities</li> <li>▪ Specific programmes performed by government and/or other in-country stakeholder</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</b></p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The current emergency situation result in melting down of the governmental resources</li> <li>▪ The current ongoing interventions based on the humanitarian needs which are also partially funded</li> </ul>
<b>Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks specifically at how governments and in-country stakeholders collectively engage in long-term predictable funding to 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SUN plan is budgeted but the current situation contributed to the inability of coordination between internal &amp; external contributions to fill the funding gaps</li> <li>▪ Multiyear Financial projections isn't predictable due to instability of the current situation &amp; current funding is focusing on the humanitarian needs only.</li> </ul>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
Government	Updating financial situation for each sector & focus on funding gaps, SUN plan include cost estimation per sector
UN	Advocate for resources mobilization, highlight funding gaps
Donor	Focusing more on Humanitarian aspects (more than development) while considering support to Yemen
Business	Weak role till now , but there is potential for the future
CSO	Implementing agencies & has active role in YHRP development
Others	Implementing agencies & has active role in YHRP development

**OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (APRIL 2015 – APRIL 2016) FOR PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation** (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)

**Positive changes:**

- Advocate for resource mobilization & mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps exist within the clusters mechanism ( emergency focused)
- Financial reports per sector submitted to MOPIC regularly
- SUN plan include the cost estimation for each sector which is clear for the stakeholders
- YHRP addressed the needs in the major areas as Nutrition, Health & Wash were addressed ( specific more than sensitive nutrition interventions)

**Key challenges:**

- Still there is no transparent and publicly available financial related information
- Melting down of financial situation due to the current crisis, which resulted in inability of coordination between internal & external contributions to fill the funding gaps and the inability to predict a multiyear financial projections
- The current ongoing interventions& cost estimations are based on the humanitarian needs which are also only partially funded

**Suggestions for improvements**

- Include the developmental goals in the financial focus besides the emergency ones
- Ensure that SUN planned activities cost included in each sector financial plans

**Annex 1: Details of Participants**

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.	Focal Point of SUN	Dr.Mutahar Abdulaziz Al-Abassi	MoPIC	dr.alabbasi@gmail.com	777000127	Yes
2.	Asistant Focal Point	Mr.Abdullah Hassan Al-Shatter	MoPIC	abdullahalshater@gmail.com	777117716	Yes
3.	Head of SUN Secretariat	Mutahar Mohammed Al-Falahi	MoPIC	Mutahar2010@gmail.com	771413413	Yes
4.	Nutrition Specialist, YCSD	NagibAbdulbaqi A. Al	UNICEF	nabdulbaqi@unicef.org		Yes
5.	SUN Secretariat	Ahlam Abdullah Albashiri	SUN Secretariat	ahlamialbashiri@yahoo.com	734555642	Yes
6.	Food Security Information System National Coordinator	Dr.Mansor Al Qadasi	FAO	Mansoor.Alqadasi@fao.org	738401772	Yes
7.	Director General of International Environmental Conventions	Mohammed Hodaesh	MoWE	Hodish2005@yahoo.com	711747402	Yes

8.	Director General of Information System	Ali Kohail	CSO	Kohail_de_eco@yahoo.com	777615058	Yes
9.	Director General of Planning	AbdulrahmanAlsaydi	MOF	Adb32010@gmail.com	770613873	Yes
10.	Nutrition Specialized	Dr.RadheaAlgill	FSIS	Allgill73@yahoo.com	777121429	
11.	Nutrition Debarment	Faosal Ali Gamhan	MOH	Camhan55@yahoo.com	771838089	
12.	Curative medicine sector	Nasr Ali Mohammed	MOH	Nasr.ps@gmail.com	733811068	
13.	M&E	Abdullah Al Wageh	MOPIC	Aalwjech2007@gmail.com	771361746	
14.	Director General of the Consumer Protection	Mahmood Al Naqeeb	MOCI	Abomaab88@gmail.com	777815155	
15.	Health Project officer	Dr.ZakaryaShamsaddeen	Save the Children	Zakarya.acf.org@savethechildren.org	771313125	Yes
16.	Therapeutic feeding official	Dr.AmrAbdulhakeemAlabsi	WFP	Amr.alabsi@wfp.org	739555026	Yes
17.	Marking Stability FP	Monther Abdulaziz Ameen	MoCI	montherabdulaziz@gmail.com	770790306	
18.	Head of Nutrition department	Lina Abdullah Al-Eryani	MOH-Nutrition department	Moph.nut@gmail.com	770991735	Yes
19.	Nutrition officer	Mohammed Radman	IMC	Mradman@internationalmedicalcorps.org	771887454	
20.	Head of policy department	Moaamer Omer Al-Nahari	MO Agriculture	moamar2@yahoo.com	777833601	Yes
21.	Deputy of H&N head of department	Hala Ali Ahmed	ACF	depnuthod@ye.missions-acf.org	738525147	

22.	Branch Executive Director	Asrar Abdulhakim Al-Absi	FAD/Alataa institution	<a href="mailto:Fad.association@gmail.com">Fad.association@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:asrar@alatta.org.ye">asrar@alatta.org.ye</a>	773902077	
23.	General manager of FYCCI	Mohammed ALQaflah	Federation of Yemen chamber of commerce & industry	Qaflahu9@yahoo.org	733203479	
24.	Information manager	Hasham Algiathi	M&E unit – MOPIC	<a href="mailto:hashemalgathy@gmail.com">hashemalgathy@gmail.com</a>	771690418	
25.	Coordination & communication FP	Abdulkareem Nasser Ahmed	MOPIC ( SUN secretariat)	krmnasser@gmail.com	739088178	Yes
26.	SUN secretariat	Majid Mohammed Alqubati	MOPIC ( SUN secretariat)		772072781	
27.	Head of M&E department	Mohammed Moseid Khalid	MOE	<a href="mailto:moseid1964@gmail.com">moseid1964@gmail.com</a>	777188628	Yes
28.	Health system strengthen specialist	Rashad G. Sheikh	UNICEF	<a href="mailto:rbinshujaa@unicef.org">rbinshujaa@unicef.org</a>	712223132	Yes
29.	Nutrition specialist	Rasha Al-Ardhi	UNICEF	<a href="mailto:ralardi@unicef.org">ralardi@unicef.org</a>	712223014	Yes

## Annex 2: Focus Questions:

1.	<b>How many 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.	During the Reporting Period, there was no meeting for steering or technical committees held, but communication was through focal points at different sectors. Ad hoc need-based meetings were conducted with WFP, FAO&UNICEF
2.	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.	No MSP still existed at the central level which has not been replicated at the decentralised level. Subnational clusters are existed who mainly

		focus on humanitarian response coordination.
<b>3.</b>	<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.	Yes There was one big high level multi-sectoral event took place during the second half of 2015 which is the workshop for discussion of objectives and priorities of humanitarian response plan.
<b>4.</b>	<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	Yes An advocacy workshop focussing in particular to the role of private sector, and for the review and the support for the national plan.
<b>5.</b>	Do you have identified <b>Nutrition Champions</b> in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	No It goes on in informal way. Currently, the main advocates are MoPIC and MoPHP and UN agencies for nutrition and food security issues.
<b>6.</b>	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.	No Not Applicable in the given context
<b>7.</b>	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 Media continues disseminating news, reports and statements in regard to the nutrition and the food security situation. But it still not actively involved as required
<b>8.</b>	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?	Yes There is such conflicts of interests but it was not reported.
<b>9.</b>	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
<b>10.</b>	Do you use the <b>SUN Website</b> , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	Yes
<b>11.</b>	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
<b>12.</b>	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 Very relevant
<b>13.</b>	<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)	Countries with fragile situation as Yemen, and with similar humanitarian crisis



### 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)</li> <li>✓ Estimation of costs to implement actions (national and/or sub-national level)</li> <li>✓ 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</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>

<p>decision-making</p> <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>✓ Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF)</li> </ul> <p>Needs both internal and international support</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>✓ Building national investment cases, supported by data and evidence, to drive nutrition advocacy</li> </ul> <p>Needs both internal and international support</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>✓ 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> </ul> <p>Needs internal support</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>✓ 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> <p>Needs internal support</p>
<p><b>One priority has been sorted out during the discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The secretariat should be supported technically and financially to maintain the coordination mechanism working including the organising of regular meeting for steering and technical committees as well as stakeholder groups, and to track the progress in different sectors. This support is needed to strengthen advocacy activities.</li> </ul>			

