

## SUN Movement Reporting, 2016

### Zimbabwe

#### 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	4
Civil Society	18
Science and Academia	Are part of CSO
Donors	6
United Nations	4
Business	4
Other (please specify)	

\*\*\*Please Note: These are the number of organisations within a particular stakeholder group that participated in the joint assessment

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? 150 participants.

<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.

Deleted: 7/4/2016 10:58:00 AM

Deleted: 4 July 2016

**Process**

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

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

4. If a collection or validation meeting did take place, please attach a photo of it if possible. Not Available

**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

Why?

Networks took the opportunity to reflect on progress as individual networks and for the MSP as a whole. It was also an

---

opportunity to discuss challenges and measures to mitigate them and possible recommendations going forward

---

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
<b>Not applicable</b>	<b>Not started</b>	<b>Started</b>	<b>On-going</b>	<b>Nearly completed</b>	<b>Completed</b>
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**

<b>PROCESS 1: Bringing people together in the same space for action</b>			
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.			
<b>Progress marker 1.1: Select / develop coordinating mechanisms at country level</b>			
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> </ul>	3	The Government through the multi-stakeholder Food and Nutrition Security Committees has managed to capacitate 8 Provincial Food and Nutrition Security Committees to establish District Food and Nutrition Security Committees (DFNSCs) in their respective districts. To date, 33 out of 60 districts now have FNSCs though at varying levels of functionality. The Community Based Multisectoral (CBM) approach for food and nutrition security has managed to establish 118 Ward Food and Nutrition Security Committees (WFNSCs). The Donor Group met on various occasions to address a number of emerging issues such as the El Nino and response strategies were developed with coordination from the Government. The CSO network has managed to establish a Steering Committee and 4 regional networks that convene civil society organisations in their respective regions including a broad spectrum of civil society organisations involved in livelihoods, human rights, women groups, humanitarian and assistance and consumer groups. The Business Network now has a focal point who is working closely with the SUN focal point to ensure that the network is established and functional.

**Commented [ZG1]:** On CBM may you also indicate the involvement of UN network through UNICEF since we have also supported the establishment of the committees and support implementation of the CBM

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><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>		
--	---	--	--

<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</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>Members of the MSP continue to be engaged in key government processes that influence food and nutrition security. All the SUN networks were represented at the 2015 Global Gathering including the Business network which took advantage of the opportunity and continues to engage with other SBNs. In response to the prevailing El Nino, SUN networks are participating in meetings that are convened and coordinated by the Government to formulate strategies and mobilise resources to respond to the drought. Four engagement meetings were convened with parliamentarians. The last meeting was on food and nutrition security in disaster situations. The UN network has developed key emergency documents including Humanitarian Needs Overview and Humanitarian Response Plans targeting 32,739 children aged 6-59months. One meeting on nutrition and the Sustainable Development Goals with parliamentarians who sit in the parliamentary portfolio committee on SDGs is pending. An Honourable Member of Parliament was appointed as the nutrition champion and continues to advocate for nutrition issues within her circles of influence. The CBM approach for food and nutrition security has a community engagement module that allows community members to give feedback on key food and nutrition security issues that their communities are facing and the performance of extension services to mitigate these challenges. A National Nutrition Surveillance System has been established with information from the Health Facility level right up to national level. Community sensitization through the media is ongoing with the media reporting on key food and nutrition security issues that are emerging and are of public health concern.</p>

	<p>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]</p>		
<p><b>Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)</b></p>			
<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> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>Cross network engagement continues within the MSP as partners are supporting Government efforts in all sectors from Agriculture, Nutrition and Health, Social Protection, Gender and WASH. The MSP continues to work towards the strengthening of networks that are already established and the establishment of those networks that are yet to be established. Efforts have been made to establish a standing business network. An interim steering committee was identified and has held 3 meetings to date. Work on development of a concept note to establish a standing secretariat for the network is also ongoing. Other formal engagements of the MSP have been through participation in conference calls and meetings where network focal points meet and discuss progress on activities being conducted and way forward for SUN in Zimbabwe.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><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>		
--	--	--	--

<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>Various platforms have been used to engage with multiple stakeholders to track on contributions and accomplishments. The Nutrition Technical Working Group (NTWG) meets on a monthly basis. This platform is coordinated by Government and members include government sectors and partners implementing nutrition interventions. It is an opportunity for stakeholders to meet and discuss their contribution towards scaling up nutrition in the country and networking for individuals. The Nutrition Technical Working Group was also used as a platform to lobby for resources in response to the El Nino. The UN and CSO networks are also members of the NTWG. They have reported that members were trained on policy and budget analysis. The Donor Network through USAID organised a Nutrition Learning Summit where key nutrition behaviour change models being implemented in their programmes were reviewed and reflected for scale up in future programming. This was also an opportunity for organisations to share experiences and lessons learnt in implementation of nutrition programmes.</p> <p>Through the CBM’s Near Real Time Data Monitoring (NRTDM) component, data is collected at household level and is captured into a system that produces dashboards and allows for the tracking of key food and nutrition security indicators in near real time. The system has a feedback mechanism where the community receives alerts about key food and nutrition security issues that need to be addressed.</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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>The country focal point continues to collaborate and coordinate the multi-stakeholder platform with support from the highest office in the country that is the Office of the President and Cabinet. Relevance and impact of the platform can be seen through advocacy initiatives which continue to engage nutrition champions that have some political influence such as Parliamentarians. Efforts to further</p>



<p>mechanisms and in lasting political commitments, not only by the government executive power but also by the leadership of agencies and organisations.</p>	<p>planning mechanisms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover</li> <li>▪ Institutional commitments from key stakeholder groups</li> </ul>		<p>engage Parliamentarians to support SUN initiatives is ongoing through the CSO network. The Community Based Multisectoral approach also ensures that communities are engaged and that impact of programmes and policies is at the household level. The model strengthens accountability at localised level for actions to address stunting, as well as community ownership of food and nutrition programs in their communities. Private sector successfully took up the World Breastfeeding Week Commemorations showing a commitment towards operationalising legal frameworks that promote and support breastfeeding in the workplace. The private sector also continues to support Government initiatives such as the national food fortification programme which is now at the legislation formulation stage moving towards mandatory fortification.</p>
--	--	--	---

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
<b>Government</b>	<p>Government has continued to bring various stakeholders together at national and subnational levels through interaction of multistakeholder platforms to ensure that policies are put into practice. The resuscitation of Food and Nutrition Security Committees at district levels is an ongoing process to ensure a multisectoral response to food and nutrition insecurity. Through the implementation of the Community Based Multisectoral approach for food and nutrition security, multi stakeholder platforms are also being established at ward and village levels to ensure that communities participate in decision making about their food and nutrition security needs.</p>
<b>UN</b>	<p>UN SUN Network officialised – UNICEF and FAO Co-conveners. They have supported and continue to support the establishment of multisectoral Food and Nutrition Security Committees (FNCSs) at national, provincial, district and ward levels. With UN Network support by the end of 2015, all 8 PFNCSs and 33 DFNCSs were established and functional. The support also included convening of coordination meetings at these levels. A Community Based Multisectoral approach focused on contextual analysis and understanding of local drivers of stunting is being piloted in 4 districts. The UN Network is also supporting the SUN Business and Civil Society Networks through managing their funding and provision of technical support. Fundraising for this support is also continuing and more is expected. UN Network is providing technical support to the national MSP and linking up with global support particularly for the SUN Business Network. The UN Network is continuously fund-raising for nutrition, implementing interventions and gathering evidence than can be used to advocate for further support to nutrition</p>
<b>Donor</b>	<p>The Donor Convener has identified a Donor platform where nutrition issues have been discussed but a SUN Donor platform is still required. The Donor Group is the platform where SUN issues are being discussed in terms of mobilising resources for more support towards nutrition and possible support to other networks. This platform is also being used as an advocacy platform for fundraising in response to the El Nino. However, the implementation of a dedicated platform where SUN issues are identified and addressed, has been mostly hampered by limited capacity and dedicated (human) resources.</p>
<b>Business</b>	<p>The private sector has supported the SUN movement in Zimbabwe like advocacy for more companies to create baby-friendly working environment. Moreso efforts are being made to ensure that the network has a standing committee and a secretariat.</p>

<b>CSO</b>	The CSO network has established strategies that monitor honouring of government commitments such as the N4G commitments. The network recently held a press conference on micronutrient deficiencies as advocacy towards addressing micronutrient issues in the country. Each members meeting held capacitated organisations through shared learning. International and national organisations took time to share their projects, lessons learnt and future plans. This also helped shape other organizations’ projects. Sharing was done through videos, power point presentations, cases studies and policy briefs, ZCSOSUNA also established a website where members’ projects are shared. Members also access different policy documents on the website. ZCSOSUNA also participated in regional and national platforms. Information acquired from these platforms was shared amongst members thereby enhancing their capacity.
<b>Others</b>	- N/A

**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)**

Key achievements include the convening of a high level platforms for discussion and planning for food and nutrition security, through FNCSs from national to district level and NTWG as a nutrition coordination platform. The piloting of the CBM for food and nutrition security has also seen coordination platforms established at community level. Another key achievement is the high level advocacy for nutrition issues at the highest level that is the Office of the President and Cabinet. 4 out of 5 networks are now functioning with all of them having identified focal points. The Business community is continuously engaged in SUN although they have not yet been established into a formal network.

An improved outreach is required for participation and commitment to nutrition agenda which will ensure as well the participation of key sector experts. There is a strong and urgent need to engage the academia and research associations to begin linkages between research and evidence based programming. Tracking of commitments remains a challenge because some of the commitments made were not SMART and are difficult to track. Donor network honoured most commitments related to resource allocation but government still lags behind in honouring its commitments. The networks need to develop costed action plans that are shared with the focal point and reviewed regularly. Regular meetings of the MSP need to be held in order to track on commitments and progress towards nutrition initiatives.

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

N/A Not applicable	0 Not started	1 Started	2 On-going	3 Nearly completed	4 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 operational

					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>	4	A review of food and nutrition security policies and strategies was undertaken to determine alignment of various policies and strategies to the National Food and Nutrition Security Policy. The policy review process also looked into the strengths, weaknesses and gaps of various food and nutrition surveillance systems and surveys and assessments in the country. A review process of the Public Health Act by the Ministry of Health and Child Care is ongoing to align to public health emerging issues and global public health concerns. The Child Survival Strategy also places nutrition as an important component in the survival of children. The recently endorsed National Constitution recognises food and nutrition security as a national human right. Through the Ministry of Agriculture, Mechanisation and Irrigation Development, Zimbabwe continues to be engaged in CAADP and this has resulted in the development of the Zimbabwe Agriculture Implementation Plan which aims to mainstream nutrition, gender and climate smart agriculture into agriculture initiatives. The National Food Fortification Strategy was launched and officiated and legislation is now being developed to ensure that mandatory fortification of cooking oil, sugar, flour and maize meal begins.

	<p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the analysed policies and legislations</b></p>		
<p><b>Progress marker 2.2: Continuously engage in advocacy to influence the development, update and dissemination of relevant policy and legal frameworks</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders are able to contribute, influence and advocate for the development of 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. 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</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> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>Dissemination of key food and nutrition security frameworks is ongoing. The National Food and Nutrition Security Policy continues to be the guiding framework for implementation of food and nutrition security programmes in the country. The National Food Fortification Strategy was launched at a high level event and dissemination is ongoing. Some key policies and strategies such as the National Nutrition Strategy and the ZimASSET are reaching communities through the Community Based Model for food and nutrition security. A Nutrition Communication for development strategy was also developed with coordination from the Ministry of Health and Child Care. The Nutrition Communication Strategy was developed through a highly multi-stakeholder consultative process intentionally done to broaden the ownership, responsibility and commitment towards its implementation among stakeholders. It is committed to provision of adequate communication strategies in nutrition programming and facilitating desired behavior change that promote optimal nutrition practices among communities. It aims to respond to challenges emanating from the absence of standardised guidance relating to communicating nutrition related messages as well as monitoring and evaluation.</p>

<p>disadvantaged (children and women) through equity-based approaches.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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</li> </ul>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>key stakeholders among relevant audiences</p> <p><b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4:</b> Countries are required to provide evidence of advocacy impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies</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> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>Multi-stakeholder consultations have been ongoing and coordination of member inputs has been strategically placed within the Office of the President and Cabinet. The office is led a process of policy analysis with the aim to harmonise existing policies and where there is need, new policies will be developed.. The</p> <p>Ministry of Health and Child Care led a process of developing Infant and Young Child Feeding Guidelines and tools which are used when training communities on child feeding. The Code of Marketing of Breastmilk substitutes continues to be recognised in the country through participation of other players such as the private sector. The UN network supported with technical expertise and with resources to the development of the guideline. The private sector supported the national breastfeeding week and are in the process of implementing the Code by ensuring that they have workplace policies that promote breastfeeding in the workplace.</p> <p>The Ministry of Agriculture developed the Livestock Development Policy. The goal of the livestock policy is to develop a coordinated, efficient, diverse and competitive livestock industry and improve production and productivity of all classes of livestock. The Ministry also developed an Irrigation and Mechanisation Policy. The irrigation and mechanisation policy seeks to effectively contribute towards increased and efficient production and productivity of food, commercial and industrial crops and livestock through provision of appropriate irrigation and agricultural mechanisation services for guaranteed food and nutrition security</p> <p>A national Gender Policy was drafted that has seen the mainstreaming of Gender across various sectors. Gender focal points are now within most ministries and parastatals and within most programmes being implemented at decentralised levels. There was the development of a gender budget which gave rise to a Women’s Fund. Within the Ministry of Women Affairs, Gender and Community Development (MoWAGCD), there are Ward Development Coordinators, who are part of the existing government structures and they have been equipped with knowledge and skills to provide infant and young child feeding counselling and group education at village level using various women empowerment groupings as delivery platforms.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>The Social Protection Policy developed by the Ministry responsible for Social Welfare has a goal with a focus on food and nutrition security to ensure food security and improve nutrition for all vulnerable people in Zimbabwe. The National Action Plan for children developed under the same Ministry seeks to ensure that there is household economic security. The Ministry developed a harmonised cash transfer programme with the aim of strengthening the income security of households to enhance their food security, the majority of which have vulnerable children.</p>
<b>Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise / enforce the legal frameworks</b>			
<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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation</li> <li>▪ Existence of national / sub-</li> </ul>	<p>4</p>	<p>The National Food and Nutrition Security Policy remains the overarching framework for food and nutrition security in the country. The establishment of FNCSs at various levels aims to monitor implementation of policies and strategies at community level. The multi-sectoral CBM has further disseminated the Policy to 118 wards in 4 districts. PFNSCs have been engaged to operationalise an Accelerated Action Plan for the Millennium Development Goals. Costed plans and strategies have been</p>



<p>Laws, Food Fortification Legislation, Right to Food, among others.</p>	<p>national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation [Please share any relevant reports/documents] <b>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of law enforcement</b></p>		<p>developed to accelerate implementation of food and nutrition security interventions to accelerate the MDGs linked to food and nutrition security.</p> <p>Enforcement of the Code of Marketing of Breastmilk substitutes remains the responsibility of the Ministry of Health and Child Care. The implementation is carried out through Environmental Health Technicians (EHTs) who are responsible for monitoring and enforcing the implementation of the code.</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 different constituencies within the multi-stakeholder platforms.</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>2</p>	<p>The tracking and reporting of results for the FNSP is through the FNSCs which report on a quarterly basis on a set of indicators identified as contributing to food and nutrition security. These indicators are being integrated into a broader Food and Nutrition Security Information System that will be centralised and used to track and monitor impact of interventions informed by guiding frameworks in food and nutrition security. Through the Donor network, DFID and EU have supported the SHINE (Sanitation, Hygiene Infant Nutrition Education) project and this has contributed to the building of evidence base knowledge to inform future interventions in the sector. The UN Network is also supporting research on the mycotoxin contamination in the maize and groundnut value chain which might lead to review an assessment on some key policies.</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two
<b>Government</b>	<p>The process of policy analysis was conducted with review of key policies and strategies relevant to food and nutrition security being reviewed including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food and Nutrition Security Policy</li> <li>• National Nutrition Strategy</li> <li>• National Food Fortification Strategy</li> <li>• ZIMASSET</li> <li>• Zimbabwe Agriculture Investment Plan</li> <li>• Irrigation and Mechanisation Policy</li> <li>• IYCF Policy</li> <li>• Livestock Development Policy</li> <li>• Comprehensive Agriculture Policy framework</li> <li>• Social Protection Policy</li> <li>• Gender Policy</li> </ul>
<b>UN</b>	<p>The UN SUN Network led and provided technical support towards the following key documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The National Nutrition Strategy</li> <li>• Food Fortification Strategy</li> <li>• National Nutrition Communication for Development Strategy for MIYCF</li> </ul> <p>All these documents were informed by a national sectoral analysis and reflect commitments of various stakeholders to addressing nutrition and the UN Network is supporting implementation and full operationalization of these documents. The UN Network is also developing and disseminating training and communication materials for use by multiple stakeholders – the Healthy Harvest Manual. The UN Network is also generating key evidence on the extent and spread of the problem of mycotoxin in the maize and groundnut value chains in Zimbabwe. This evidence will further inform development national risk based control mechanisms for controlling the problem. The UN Network is also conducting district profiling for food security and nutrition to inform national priorities for interventions.</p>
<b>Donor</b>	<p>More work needs to be done to increase dissemination and awareness raising among other donors for improved mainstreaming of nutrition outcomes in respective programming and agree on a set of indicators to track. Donors remain interested to actively contribute to any relevant policy dialogue or debates.</p>
<b>Business</b>	<p>The private sector supported the national breastfeeding week and are in the process of implementing the Code by ensuring that they have workplace policies that promote breastfeeding in the workplace.</p>
<b>CSO</b>	<p>Parliamentary portfolio committees on Health, Agriculture and SGDs are advocating for Nutrition to be on the parliamentarians agenda. ZCSOSUNA engaged parliamentarians on the 5<sup>th</sup> of May to raise awareness among parliamentarians on the global SUN movement and influence parliamentarians for better nutrition strategies and increased budgets. ZCSOSUNA also participated in the pre and post national budgeting processes together with parliamentarians.. Convening separate meetings with parliamentarians is a challenge, the alliance suggests we sit with parliamentarian committees during their Tuesday meetings.</p>
<b>Others</b>	<p>- N/A</p>

**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)**

Most parliamentarians are now aware of nutrition challenges that the nation is facing. Continuous engagement will ensure the government honours commitments it makes. There is more work that needs to be done to ensure proper follow up to implementation of existing national policies,

ZCSOSUNA engage in the development and formulation of Government commitments and help ensure the voice of local communities are taken into account in national and global financial, legal, programmatic and political commitment on Scaling-Up Nutrition

**Recommendations**

- Engage academia and research bodies in SUN
- Policy review processes should be shared wider
- Peer reviews and learning are necessary in nutrition programming

### 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
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. Note: while Progress Marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislations, Progress Marker 3.1 focuses on the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews</li> <li>Analysis of sectoral government programmes and implementation mechanisms</li> <li>Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping</li> </ul>	2	The Government has developed guiding frameworks that clearly outline priorities in food and nutrition security. These guiding frameworks also promote multisectoral collaboration as they spell out responsibilities of multiple stakeholders. Partners continue to align their priorities and actions around government priorities as set out in the frameworks. Un and CSO networks currently undertaking a stakeholder mapping exercise. Partners working in respective districts were also actively engaged in the Annual Rural Livelihoods Assessment through providing technical , financial and human resources. Where relevant, donor programming on nutrition is aligned with national policies and national priorities. However, proper mapping analysis and consultation to align actions and plans is still outstanding.

<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’

Deleted: 7/4/2016 10:58:00 AM

Deleted: 4 July 2016

<p>review of programmes and implementation capacities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions</li> <li>▪ Map existing gaps and agree on core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment</b></p>		
<p><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</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</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>A validated and costed National Nutrition Strategy was developed to implement Commitment 5 of the NFNSP. The NNS has also been adopted by the SUN Networks as the CRF for Zimbabwe. NNS has 6 thematic areas including: Health and Nutrition, Food Fortification, Agriculture and Nutrition, Early Warning Food and Nutrition Security Information Systems ,Education and Nutrition and Social Protection and Nutrition. It also clearly outlines the key nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive actions that need to be implemented in order to reduce malnutrition. The NNS is used as the guiding framework to develop other strategies such as the National Food Fortification Strategy and the Nutrition Communication for development strategy. Implementation of the CRF is mostly through the Ministry of Health and Child Care. However, through the CBM, the CRF has been disseminated at various levels including at district level. The Zimbabwe National Nutrition Strategy was officially launched on the 29th of April 2015 by the Vice President.</p>

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

<p>interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&amp;E.</p>	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessment of coordination capacity to support CRF</li> </ul> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a robust plan that has been technically and politically endorsed</b></p>		
---	---	--	--

Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework			
<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 expertise to timely respond to the identified needs in a coordinated way.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce and other resources</li> <li>▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements</li> <li>▪ Existence of annual detailed 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>3</p>	<p>The resuscitation of Food and Nutrition Security Committees has enabled a more coordinated approach towards implementation of legal frameworks and policies. FNSCs have developed annual work plans on how they will work together to improve food and nutrition security in the different districts and provinces that they operate in. All work plans of the FNSCs are aligned to the seven commitments of the National Food and Nutrition Security Policy (NFNSP), the ZIMASSET food security and nutrition cluster implementation plan and the six thematic areas of the NNS. The FNSCs have also been the platform for dialogue across sectors on various issues around food and nutrition security. The FNSCs are also responsible for the overall coordination of all food and nutrition security programmes including monitoring and evaluation of who is doing what and where in their respective districts. Through the CBM for addressing stunting, community micro-plans will be developed and implemented to operationalize the NFNSP, the ZimASSET and the NNS. This process will be replicated at ward and village levels.</p>
<p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries</b></p>			

	are required to provide evidence of aligned actions around annual priorities such as an annual work plans or implementation plan		
<b>Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework</b>			
<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</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>Through the CBM, WFNSCs are a critical component in the functionality of the Near Real Time Data Monitoring (NRTDM) component which is a system for monitoring food and nutrition security indicators at community level. The NRTDM system is a dual system that facilitates the gathering, transmission, visualization and utilization of near real-time data relevant for managing a multi-sector response to food and nutrition insecurity.</p> <p>Zimbabwe also conducts annual livelihoods assessments to collect vital provincial and district level information on food and nutrition security indicators. Annual livelihoods assessment are a monitoring mechanism that facilitates the tracking of key indicators that are nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive and inform policy reviews and development, programming and decision making. The livelihoods assessments are conducted by a multisectoral committee at national level that is coordinated by the Office of the President and Cabinet through the Food and Nutrition Council. The Government network, UN network, CSO network actively participate, to the lowest administrative levels, in these assessments.</p> <p>The Annual Livelihoods Assessments and the monitoring system are part of a developing National Food and Nutrition Security Information System (FNSIS) that will be centralized as the source of all food and nutrition security information.</p>



	<p>monitoring by civil society</p> <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><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> </ul>	<p>2</p>	<p>The Ministry of Health and Child Care is managing the implementation of the CRF. A number of key achievements have been the development and adoption of the Food Fortification Strategy which is one of the outcomes of the NNS. The Fortification Strategy is now being implemented through voluntary fortification which will soon become mandatory through a legal framework. The Infant and Young Child Feeding Policy was also born out of the NNS and provides guidelines on the feeding of children under five. It is also currently being implemented. The Nutrition Communication for Development Strategy is also part of the implementation of the NNS.</p> <p>Through the Health Information System that was developed, key nutrition and health data can be tracked at Health Facility level and captured at national level with a feedback loop that communicates to the health facility for action. The Rural Wash Information Management System (RWIMS) was developed to track key indicators for WASH which will inform local as well as national level planning and action.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>		
--	---	--	--

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
<b>Government</b>	The National Food and Nutrition Security Policy is the overarching framework for food and nutrition security. From the FNSP, government crafted the National Nutrition Strategy which is the CRF for SUN in Zimbabwe. The tracking of the implementation of the CRFs is ongoing through FNSCs. A comprehensive food and nutrition security information system is still being developed to track progress of indicators relevant to food and nutrition security.
<b>UN</b>	UN network support national food security and nutrition assessments that generate useful information for planning and programming – MICS, ZIMVAC, ZDHS. UN network also supporting establishment of information systems in the government, notably the HIS, the National Food and Nutrition Security Information System. The Network also supported in the establishment of committees and support of the Community Based Model for Food and Nutrition Security for Stunting reduction. The National Nutrition Strategy also has a common results framework to monitor and track implementation and impact of interventions. UN Network is also supporting development of real-time food and nutrition security monitoring system that is directly linked to the decentralised multisectoral structures being established in the country
<b>Donor</b>	Various donor agencies carried out regular evaluation exercises to ensure high standards and levels of accountability across various funded actions (including initiatives with nutrition outcomes); in some instances, these also contribute to build lessons learnt and best practice for wider dissemination and future planning. A comprehensive donor based result framework is yet to be elaborated. Donors are overall aligned with national policies and strategies on nutrition. In addition to an increased level awareness on the above policies framework, donors still feel that they should design their own Result Framework, capturing all relevant nutrition sensitive sectors.



<b>Business</b>	
<b>CSO</b>	CSO network conducts regular regional meetings. These regional member’s meetings have an objective to ensure they align the projects activities with national policies and strategies.
<b>Others</b>	-

**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)

Networks generally align actions to national priorities outlined in policies and strategies.

**Recommendations**

- The MSP needs to conduct a joint mapping exercise and develop a database of who is doing what and where which is continuously updated.
- The MSP needs to develop a coordinated costed national plan of action guided by the CRF
- There is need to create more knowledge sharing platforms

**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</li> </ul>	2	The National Nutrition Strategy which is Zimbabwe’s CRF is costed and has already estimated the financial resources needed to address the 6 Key Thematic Areas during the period 2014-2018. Mapping on current spending still requires substantial analysis to identify both nutrition specific and sensitive interventions which contribute to specific key result areas and national nutrition commitments.

Deleted: 7/4/2016 10:58:00 AM

Deleted: 4 July 2016

	<p>the relevant documentation]  <b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</b></p>		
<p><b>Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition</b></p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at the extent to which governments and all other in-country stakeholders are able to track their allocations and expenditures (if available) for nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions in relevant sectors. This progress marker also aims to determine whether the financial tracking for nutrition is reported and shared in a transparent manner with other partners of the MSP including the government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector, and 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</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>1</p>	<p>Government has not effectively tracked expenditure on nutrition, financial tracking system has not been fully developed /implemented. There are tracking systems within the Ministry of Finance and the Office of the President and Cabinet but these only track budgets that have been allocated to Ministries.</p>

	<p>allocation period)</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</li> </ul>	<p>3</p>	<p>Active resource mobilisation for nutrition exists. Detailed gap analysis for Zimbabwe still to be undertaken while mobilization of resources to address key intervention areas is being initiated (eg donor and private sector contribution towards food fortification). Zimbabwe is also in the process of implementing the Cost of Hunger which has potential to act as an advocacy tool for more budget allocation towards nutrition specific and sensitive interventions. A response strategy and mapping has been developed to mobilise resources towards response to the El Nino. The Government and the humanitarian community has committed resources towards this.</p>

	<p>budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources.</p> <p><b>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</b></p>		
<b>Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements</b>			
<p>This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders are able to turn pledges into disbursements. It includes the ability of Donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the fiscal year in which they were scheduled.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments</li> <li>▪ Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through: Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related</li> </ul>	2	<p>Political commitment towards nutrition needs to be matched with financial commitment. Overall Commitments from donors and other stakeholders have translated into timely disbursement and spending. Commitments from Donors have progressively translated into disbursement that is LFSP, ENSURE, AMALIMA, ZVITAMBO.</p>



	<p>implementing entities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>		
<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> </ul>	<p>1</p>	<p>Joint resource mobilisation strategies do not exist but individual organisations mobilise resources for nutrition. The Donor community and partners have committed to support both nutrition sensitive and specific interventions. Additional funding resources are sought to complement current Government funding commitments. Additional funding resources can be sought to complement current funding commitments as complementary to funding commitment from the Government. Through the Cost of Hunger, long term funding towards nutrition will be advocated for.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>		
--	---	--	--

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
<b>Government</b>	There is continued resource mobilisation for implementation of food and nutrition security. However, financial tracking exercise is yet to be implemented which might influence budget allocation towards nutrition specific and sectoral allocation towards nutrition sensitive interventions. Government has initiated steps towards developing an investment case for nutrition through the Cost of Hunger for Zimbabwe.
<b>UN</b>	The UN Network provided technical support for cost estimation of the National Nutrition Strategy document. The Network is also fundraising for further support in costing and financial tracking of nutrition investments in country to the Government and Civil Society Networks.
<b>Donor</b>	This is a Key Result Area for the Donor community and they are in the process of mobilising resources in response to the drought. It will be important for the donor community to identify and share lessons learnt and best practice from donors engaged in the SUN movement in other countries.
<b>Business</b>	Financial commitment from the private sector has been through the National Food fortification programme and other initiatives that promote food and nutrition security.
<b>CSO</b>	Resource mobilisation strategy exists for the CSO. The alliance also trained its members on Fund raising and proposal writing
<b>Others</b>	- N/A

**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)

There is need for mapping of current and planned nutrition sensitive and nutrition specific interventions but this is still to be developed and analysed. There is need to strengthen resource mobilisation in order to address financial shortfalls in the Nutrition sector. However, these should be complementary to similar commitments from Government. Lessons learnt and best practice need to be captured and shared. The country is currently undertaking a Cost of Hunger initiative which if well resourced can potentially be a tool for advocacy towards financial commitment towards nutrition. The MSP needs to develop network plans of action that indicate financial commitment and this can be integrated into a financial tracking system to identify commitment and gaps that need to be addressed.

## Annex 1: Details of Participants ( representatives of Networks)

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.	MS	SIBONISO CHIGOVA	FOOD AND NUTRITION COUNCIL	schigova@sirdc.ac.zw	0026377302 4897	Yes
2.	MS	NESTER GUMBO	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE	gumbonester@gmail.com	0772728717	No
3.	MS	TATENDA MAFUNGA	FOOD AND NUTRITION COUNCIL	tatema@gmail.com	0779117794	Yes
4.	MR	KUDAKWASHE ZOMBE	ZCSOSUNA	nutritionist.zombe@gmail.com	0779660556	Yes
5.	MR	ZEPHENIA GOMORA	UNICEF	zgomora@unicef.org	0773206539	No
6.	MS	PATIENCE HOTO	FAO	patience.hoto@fao.org	0773981501	No
7.	MR	MICHELE SCHIVO	EU	Michele.SCHIVO@eeas.europa.eu	0772128298	Yes
8.	MS	NERENCY MASEKO	MINISTRY OF HEALTH	nerrymaseko@gmail.com	0775878826	No
9.	MS	THOKOZILE NCUBE	UNICEF	tncube@unicef.org	0774587146	No
10.	MS	VANDANA AGARWAL	UNICEF	vagarwal@unicef.org		Yes
11.						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						

Deleted: 7/4/2016 10:58:00 AM

Deleted: 4 July 2016

**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.	Nutrition Technical Working Group 5 Interministerial meetings
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.	Yes, the provincial, district and ward Food and Nutrition Security Committees (FNCS).  CSO have regional committees in Manicaland, Masvingo, Matebeland and Midlands
3.	<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, Global Day of Action which was attended by high level officials  A one day workshop was held with the Parliamentary portfolio committee on SDGs, Agriculture and Health
4.	<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, a breakfast meeting with Parliamentarians on Nutrition programming  Accelerated Agricultural Plan Update  WBW commemoration will be hosted in remote district with high level officials
5.	Do you have identified <b>Nutrition Champions</b> in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	Yes, an Honourable Member of Parliament was identified as a Nutrition Champion. She has managed to advocate for nutrition issues in Parliament
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, but more needs to be done to increase awareness on key nutrition issues that need to be addressed and their roles and responsibility.
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, although there is need to provide more up to date information on Nutrition. Planned media workshops for the coming year

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?	Yes, it came in when Breast milk manufacturing company was part of the Infant Nutrition Committee and it was handled by setting out guidelines on the Code of marketing BMS
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	Yes, a Nutrition Communication for Development Strategy is available.
10.	Do you use the <b>SUN Website</b> , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	Yes
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?	Carry-out peer reviews/visits  Increase on the various forms of communication to increase on knowledge learning  Setting up a regional SUN country platform  Regular country-country learning 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, for planning and learning purposes.
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)	1. Maturity in the SUN movement 2. Emerging economies

**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 Multi-stakeholder 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>✓ Mapping of the available workforce for nutrition</li> <li>✓ Development of a Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (M&amp;E) framework</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>✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence</li> </ul> <p><b>All the above we have local skill but may need external support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Support better management of data (e.g. Estimation of costs to implement actions</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(in country support is available)</li> <li>✓ Engaging parliamentarians for legislative advocacy, budget oversight and public outreach((in country support is available)</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,</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>✓ Strengthening of skills of key actors, such as Multi-stakeholder Platform member. Skills could include communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination. <b>(mainly capacity building for all networks with external support)</b></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) <b>( external visits with country or peers that have excelled in the area will be beneficial)</b></li> <li>✓ Analysis/ guidance for institutional frameworks at national and subnational levels, including MSP, Coordination Mechanisms,</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>✓ 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>(national and/or sub-national level)Financial tracking (national and/or sub-national level)-<b>outside technical support is required</b>)</p>	<p>supported by data and evidence, to drive nutrition advocacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Developing, updating or implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies</li> </ul> <p><b>Local expertise is available ,peer country to country learning may be vital to learn of best practices</b></p>	<p>stakeholder groups, or others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Prevention and management of Conflicts of Interest (COI)</li> </ul>	
--	---	---	--

**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.