

SUN Movement Reporting Template, 2016

Botswana

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 2016¹ 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	Ministries of Agricultural Development & Food Security; Health & Wellness; Local Government & Rural Development; and Finance & Economic Development
Civil Society	None as yet
Science and Academia	National Food Technology Research Centre; Botswana University of Agriculture and Natural Resources; and University of Botswana
Donors	None
United Nations	UNICEF; FAO; WHO
Business	Business Botswana
Other (please specify)	

2. How many people in total participated in the process at some point? 8

¹ 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 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

There was no photo taken. Proof of meetings is a record of the Minutes (which are 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 / No

Why?

Yes the meeting was useful in that participants interacted and discussed issues at hand and shared ideas. The Agenda of the meeting was as follows:

- Joint Assessment Template
- Identification of (potential) nutrition sensitive programmes by sectors
- Criteria for assessing nutrition sensitivity of programmes

Way Forward was that Sectors should assess the nutrition sensitivity of their programmes, and identify gaps and opportunities for future planning

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"> Formal multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordinating structure in place and functioning, such as a high level convening body from government (political endorsement) 	1	There is not yet consensus on the structure responsible for Nutrition Multisectoral Platform. However, there is already a high level structure in place (the Rural Development Council - RDC) that already makes high level decisions on food security issues. The same structure (RDC) could be used for nutrition security issues by expanding the food security reporting to include nutrition policy issues. The RDC is chaired by His Honour the Vice President of the Republic of Botswana.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official nomination of SUN Government Focal Point as coordinator 	3	There is not yet consensus on the substantive Government Focal Point. However, by virtue of the Ministry of Agriculture having organised the Multisectoral Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative (through the support of CAADP, FAO and SADC), Deputy Permanent Secretary in the Ministry Dr Baipoledi, is the Interim Government Focal Person; and he is assisted by Ms. Tidimalo Beauty Rakgantswana as the Technical Focal Point. It was after the Nutrition Capacity Initiative that Botswana joined the SUN Movement.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convene MSP members on a regular basis 	3	There is a national nutrition team that was assembled as early as 2013 in preparation for the CAADP Nutrition Capacity Development Initiative that Botswana (through the Ministry of Agriculture Development & Food Security) hosted. The same team is currently the one used as a platform that addresses nutrition related issues e.g. currently conducting sectoral assessment for the nutrition sensitivity of policies and programmes (in the Ministries of Agricultural Development & Food Security; Health & Wellness; Local Government & Rural Development and Finance & Economic Development). A standard tool has been developed for the exercise. The team meets periodically for updates as well as tackling emerging nutrition mainstreaming issues
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appoint Focal Points/conveners for Key Stakeholder Groups e.g. Donor convener, Civil Society Coordinators, UN Focal Point, Business Liaison Person, Academic representative 	1	Representation of key stakeholder groups within the MSP consists of Government, the UN, Academia, Research and a Business Liaison Person. However, these representatives are not appointed network Focal Points. Civil Society and Media are not yet represented
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional analysis conducted of capacity of high-level structure 	0	Institutional analysis of capacity of high-level structure not yet conducted. Right now the focus is on sensitization of programme officers/implementers; and identifying capacity opportunities and gaps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish or refine terms of reference, work plans and other types of enabling arrangements [Supporting documents requested] 	2	There are Draft Terms of Reference for the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Security Technical Committee/Platform

Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence			
<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"> Expand MSP to get key members on board 	2	<p>Current membership includes Ministries of Agricultural Development & Food Security; Health & Wellness; Local Government & Rural Development and Finance & Economic Development.</p> <p>Ministries of Education; WASH and Trade to be brought on board</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board e.g. nutrition-sensitive sectors 	2	<p>Other agencies on board are research (National Food Technology Research Centre); academia (University of Botswana and Botswana University of Agriculture & Natural Resources) and a Business Liaison Person.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actively engage executive level political leadership 	2	<p>Political-will expressed during the Nutrition Conference of 2015. Further engagement to be pursued.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholder groups working to include new members e.g. Development partners; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics 	1	<p>New members identified (Ministries of Education; WASH and Trade) and are to be brought on board about membership.</p> <p>The MSP is still to identify members from the civil society and media.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with actors or groups specialised on specific themes such as gender, equity, WASH etc. 	0	<p>Still to engage the Department of Gender in the Ministry of Nationality, Immigration and Gender Affairs as well as Education; WASH and Trade to be brought on board</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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] 	0	<p>Not yet established decentralised structures and/or processes that support planning and action at local level</p>

Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/ contribute to multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)			
<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"> Ensure MSP delivers effective results against agreed work-plans 	1	Sectors are currently assessing the nutrition sensitivity of their programmes, to identify gaps and opportunities towards developing work plans
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure regular contribution of all relevant MSP stakeholders in discussions on: policy/legal framework, CRF, plans, costing, financial tracking and reporting, annual reviews. 	1	MSP (health, agriculture and local government) has initiated work towards tracking nutrition programmes costing and financial expenditure. The exercise will be conducted annually and a report produced.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly use platform for interaction on nutrition-related issues among sector-relevant stakeholders 	1	The platform has been used to discuss gaps and opportunities in nutrition mainstreaming and set agenda for next steps for the MSP. Recommendations from the national Nutrition Conference were also reviewed by the platform.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Get platform to agree on agenda / prioritisation of issues 	2	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use results to advocate / influence other decision-making bodies 	1	The MSP will soon develop a work plan to influence policy and programmes in different sectors. Sectors are currently working on identifying key areas for mainstreaming nutrition or strengthening
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholder groups linking with global support system and contributing to MSP/nutrition actions e.g. financial, advocacy, active involvement 	2	Focal persons from sectors of agriculture, health, finance and local government attended the SUN workshop on Financing of Nutrition programmes where they actively engaged with other countries. An action plan was developed which will be discussed at the next MSP meeting. The MSP has also participated in SUN teleconference networks.

Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and critically reflect on own contributions and accomplishments			
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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] 	1	Reporting to internal structures in place
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	1	Work in progress e.g. financial tracking
Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform			
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrate MSP mechanism on nutrition into national development planning mechanisms 	1	Nutrition only implied in national planning goals. However, there is a window of opportunity to include explicit nutrition objectives in the upcoming national planning goals as they are currently being drafted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuous involvement of the executive level of political leadership irrespective of turnover 	2	Political buy-in and commitment is fairly new (as demonstrated by His Honour the Vice President launching the Nutrition Conference). Going forward, we anticipate continued support.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional commitments from key stakeholder groups 	2	Using stakeholder networks to mainstream nutrition by influencing strategies and programmes

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process One
Government	- Mobilisation of stakeholders, funding activities, Organisation of the Nutrition Conference
UN	- UNICEF- Organisation of the Nutrition Conference, member of MSP
Donor	-
Business	- Engaging with Business Botswana continues (An organisation that protects interests of the business community locally) - attended the conference
CSO	-
Others	-

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)		
Achievements: Have structures and programmes in place into which we can incorporate and/or sharpen nutrition focus	Challenges: Buy-in inadequate across key ministries and sectors, and across levels. Capacity issues (understanding of nutrition issues), and coordination is slow and uneasy	Suggestions: Technical support required.

Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

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

Process 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

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

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

DEFINITION	POSSIBLE SIGNS	FINAL PLATFORM SCORE	WHAT ACTIVITIES / INTERVENTIONS UNDERLIE EACH SCORE
This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing nutrition-relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislations are analysed using multi-sectoral consultative processes with representation from various stakeholders, especially civil society representatives. It indicates the availability of stock-taking documents and continuous context analysis that can inform and guide policy making.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular multi-sectoral analysis and stock-take of existing policies and regulations Reflect on existing policies and legal framework Existence of review papers 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 <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the analysed policies and legislations</p>	1	Agriculture specific stock-taking exercise undertaken and report available (exercise supported by CAADP)

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 contribute, influence and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existence of a national advocacy and communication strategy Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and 	N/A (not yet)	
---	--	---------------	--

<p>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 parliamentarian 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>	<p>legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop common narrative and joint statements to effectively influence policy making ▪ Parliamentary attention and support (e.g. groups that deal specifically with nutrition; votes in support of MSP suggested changes) ▪ Influence of nutrition champions in advancing pro-nutrition policies ▪ Key stakeholder groups promote integration of nutrition in national policies and other related development actions ▪ Publications, policy briefs, press engagement examples, workshops ▪ Dissemination and communication of policy / legal framework by key stakeholders among relevant audiences <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: 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"> ▪ Coordinate nutrition policies and regulation between relevant line-ministries E.g. - Existence of national ministerial guidelines / advice / support for mainstreaming nutrition in sector policies. ▪ Key Stakeholder Groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition related policies and legislation (specific and sensitive) ▪ Develop/update policies / legal framework with assistance from other MSP members to ascertain quality. ▪ Existence of updated policies and strategies relevant (specific and sensitive) ▪ Existence of comprehensive legislation relevant to nutrition with focus on International Codes for BMS, food fortification and maternal leave and policies that empower women ▪ Ascertain nutrition policy coherence with other, development-related policies such as trade, agriculture, other <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of the policies and legislations developed through coordinated efforts</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The country put in place the Regulations on Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes in 2005. The regulations are actively enforced and an IBFAN tool is used for compliance. Botswana has continued to perform exceptionally well in this area (monitoring compliance).</p> <p>Labour laws in the country grant working/employed women 84 days maternity leave, and 1 hour breastfeeding break for 12 months.</p> <p>There is extensive consultation with relevant stakeholders across sectors including the public whenever policies are developed and/or reviewed</p>
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"> ▪ Availability of national and sub-national guidelines to operationalise legislation ▪ Existence of national / sub-national mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation [Please share any relevant reports/documents] <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of law enforcement</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Regulations for Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes in existence since 2005.</p> <p>Spot checks are conducted regularly in the local industry to check compliance with the legislation.</p> <p>We also have the following forms of legislation: Food Control Act (under revision now); Public Health Act; Common Salt Regulations (includes iodization); Food</p>

among others.			Labelling & Pre-Packaged Regulations; Livestock and Meat Industries Act; European Union Food Law (Trade); Diseases of Animal Act; and Plant Protection Act
Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislation impact			
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"> Existence and use of policy studies, research monitoring reports, impact evaluations, public disseminations etc. Individual stakeholder groups contribution to mutual learning <p>Minimum Requirements for Scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of lessons learned from reviews and evaluations, such as case studies and reports</p>	3	Periodically, there are policy studies conducted by BIDPA (Botswana Institute for Development Policy Analysis) e.g. the Social Safety Nets

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each Stakeholder to Process Two
Government	-
UN	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	-
Others	-

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)

There are multiple legal frameworks in place and a policy analysis body (BIDPA) that periodically evaluates and analyses national policies and frameworks

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 actions². 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"> ▪ Multi-sectoral nutrition situation analyses/overviews ▪ Analysis of sectoral government programmes and implementation mechanisms ▪ Stakeholder and nutrition action mapping ▪ Multi-stakeholder consultations to align their actions ▪ Map existing gaps and agree on core nutrition actions aligned with the policy and legal frameworks 	1	<p>Common Results Framework for cross/multi sectoral reporting of Governments priority goals is in place.</p> <p>However, there may be a need to form a specific framework for nutrition reporting. This is one of the areas that the MSP is working on.</p>

² ‘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	Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documentation supporting the alignment		
Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition			
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"> ▪ Defining the medium/long term implementation objectives ▪ Defining the implementation process with clear roles for individual stakeholder groups³ ▪ 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&E; capacity strengthening needs and priorities ▪ Assessment of coordination capacity to support CRF <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a robust plan that has been technically and politically endorsed</p>	2	Activity here is still at infancy stage in that a common CRF is not yet developed but individual sectors continue to operationalise their work plans some of which are nutrition specific and/or sensitive
Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework			
This progress marker looks specifically at the national and local capability to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessments conducted of capacity for implementation, including workforce 	2	

³ 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"> ▪ Sequencing of priorities to mobilise and develop capacity of implementing entities in line with assessments and agreed arrangements ▪ Existence of annual detailed work plans with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national level ▪ Institutional reform implemented as needed to increase capacity of coordination mechanism <p>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</p>		<p>Sectors continue to operationalise their annual performance plans (which are developed from Strategic Plans) some of which are nutrition specific and/or sensitive</p>
<p>Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per Common Results Framework</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"> ▪ 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 ▪ Existence of regular progress reports ▪ Conducting of joint annual/regular reviews and monitoring visits ▪ Adjustments of annual plans, including budgets based on analysis of performance ▪ Existence of participatory monitoring by civil society <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4:</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>At national level, National Strategy Office (NSO) and Statistics Botswana monitor national priority actions and key indicators. Sectors monitor at programme level and the nutrition indicators are among the indicators that are being monitored.</p> <p>We do not yet have a joint nutrition specific CRF in place (developed and implemented by the MSP)</p>

	Countries are required to provide evidence of regular/annual joint review of implementation coverage and performance of prioritised actions		
Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact			
<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"> ▪ Reports and disseminations from population-based surveys, implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research ▪ Capture and share lessons learned, best practices, case studies, stories of change and implementation progress ▪ Social auditing of results and analysis of impact by civil society ▪ Advocate for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes <p>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</p>	3	<p>Statistics Botswana conducts periodic population-based surveys with key nutrition indicators e.g. Family Health Survey, Botswana Multi Topic Household Survey.</p> <p>Other partners (such as Harvard, USAID) undertake impact evaluations and operational research</p> <p>At programme level, lessons learned, best practices, case studies, outcomes and challenges are reported to management and shared with stakeholders</p> <p>Through the MSP, there is increased advocacy for increased effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes</p>

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Three
Government	-
UN	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	-
Others	-

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)

Common Results Framework for National Nutrition Plan not in place yet. However sectors continue to implement their nutrition specific and sensitive plans and objectives

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
<p>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).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of costed estimations of nutrition related actions [please provide the relevant documentation] ▪ Existence of costed plans for CRF implementation ▪ Stakeholder groups have an overview of their own allocations to nutrition related programmes/actions [please provide the relevant documentation] <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide documents outlining the costing method, and the costed programmes or plans</p>	2	<p>In 2015, the Ministry of Health engaged consultants who used the One Health tool to cost essential health programmes including nutrition.</p> <p>So only Ministry of Health has conducted an independent costing of nutrition specific programmes.</p> <p>All the nutrition sensitive programs (in the Ministries of Agriculture and Local Government & Rural Development) conducted the exercise for the SUN/UNICEF Public Financing Workshop.</p> <p>Going forward, we intend to include this activity in the annual plan that we are going to have in place from 2017 (for both nutrition specific and sensitive programmes).</p>

Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition			
<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"> ▪ Reporting of nutrition sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector, and financial sources (domestic and external resources) including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Planned spending ○ Current allocations ○ Recent expenditures (within 1-2 years of the identified allocation period) ▪ 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"> ○ Existence of transparent and publicly available financial related information ▪ Social audits, sharing financial information among MSP members, making financial information public. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending</p>	2	<p>Same as above.</p> <p>Additional stakeholders to be brought on board include Ministries of Education & Skills Development; Trade & Industry; Minerals, Energy & Water Resources; Environment, Wildlife & Tourism</p> <p>The format used for the SUN/UNICEF Public Financing Workshop has been contextualised to be used as our reporting mechanism.</p> <p>MSP sectors do share financial information among members. However, the reports are not made public. There is a Government protocol that disseminates such reports.</p>
Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls			
<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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a mechanism to identify current financial sources, coverage, and financial gaps ▪ Government and other In-country stakeholders assess additional funding 	3	<p>A very effective Government Accounting & Budgeting System (GABS) is in place to track real time financial expenditure and financial gaps / shortfalls for government programmes including those for nutrition</p> <p>UN agencies and other partners such as PEPFAR do</p>

<p>alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, setting-up of specific mechanisms.</p>	<p>needs; continuous investment in nutrition; continuous advocacy for resource allocation to nutrition related actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategically increasing government budget allocations, and mobilising additional domestic and external resources. <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of a mechanism for addressing financial gaps</p>		<p>support nutrition work in the country</p> <p>When there are shortfall forecasted (through the GABS), additional funding (supplementary budget) is requested and availed (although the funding levels may be lower than the request due to other competing needs)</p>
<p>Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements</p>			
<p>This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders are able to turn pledges into disbursements. It includes the ability of Donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the fiscal year in which they were scheduled.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Turn pledges into proportional disbursements and pursue the realisation of external commitments ▪ Disbursements of pledges from domestic and external resources are realised through: Governmental budgetary allocations to nutrition related implementing entities ▪ Specific programmes performed by government and/or other in-country stakeholder <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external)</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Most Government programmes are funded by the Government. Where development partners (UNICEF, PEPFAR, EU, WHO, FAO, etc.) have pledged to assist, their disbursements are always timely and in line with the fiscal year in which they were scheduled</p>
<p>Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact</p>			
<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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of a long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy ▪ Coordinated reduction of financial gaps through domestic and external contributions 	<p>2</p>	<p>Budget forecasts are done at different levels: from national level (budget speech) to sectoral and programme levels. Funding is disbursed annually by Government and partners</p>

<p>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"> ▪ Stable or increasing flexible domestic contributions ▪ Existence of long-term/multi-year financial resolutions / projections <p>Minimum requirements for scoring 4: Countries are required to provide evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms</p>		
--	---	--	--

Stakeholders	Description/ Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process Four
Government	-
UN	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	-
Others	-

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)
<p>Over the past year, focal persons from sectors of agriculture, health, finance and local government conducted a budget tracking and analysis for the SUN workshop on Financing of Nutrition programmes. An action plan was developed which will be discussed at the next MSP meeting (to conduct annual budget tracking).</p>

Annex 1: Details of Participants

No.	Title	Name	Organisation	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in SUN mailing list?
1.	Ms	Tidimalo Beauty Rakgantswana	Ministry of Agricultural Development & Food Security	trakgantswana@gov.bw	368 9740	
2.	Ms	Onalenna Ntshebe	Ministry of Health & Wellness (Centres for Child & Adolescent Nutrition)	lenahilnts@gmail.com	362 1832	
3.	Mr	Baeng Ntime	Ministry of Agricultural Development & Food Security	bntime@gov.bw	368 9763	
4.	Ms	Delic Sehunwe	Ministry of Local Government & Rural Development	dsehunwe@gov.bw	397 1916	
5.	Ms	Gae P. Ditebo	Ministry of Local Government & Rural Development	gditebo@gov.bw	397 1916	
6.	Dr	Boitumelo Motswagole	National Food Technology & Research Centre	stokie@naftec.org	544 5500	
7.	Ms	Gomolemo Tselagopo	Ministry of Local Government & Rural Development	gntembwe@gov.bw	397 1916	
8.	Dr	Rosemary Kobue-Lekalake	Botswana University of Agric & Natural Resources	rlekalake@bca.bw	365 0128	
9.	Dr	Segametsi Maruapula	University of Botswana	maruapu@mopipi.ub.bw	355 5220	
10.	Mr	Gabriel Baemedi	Ministry of Agricultural Development & Food Security	gbaemedi@gov.bw	368 9748	
11.	Ms	Kenanao Motlhoiwa	UNICEF	kkmotlhoiwa@unicef.org	395 1909	
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						
16.						

Annex 2: Focus Questions:

1.	How many time has your MSP and/or its associated organs met 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.	A nutrition-specific MSP has only met three times this year (2015/16).
2.	Is your MSP replicated at the decentralised levels ? 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.	The MSP does not have (yet) a structure at local level
3.	Have you organised any high level event 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. A National Nutrition Advocacy Conference in November 2015 for high level national and district policy makers
4.	Are you planning to organise any high level event in the coming months (April 2016 – April 2017)? (Yes/No) If Yes, please provide details of the event to be organised	Yes. The Ministry of Health & Wellness, with support from UNICEF, is planning to invite senior managers from other key ministries to a consultation meeting on recommendations from the Nutrition Conference and facilitating establishment of an MSP coordinating mechanism. Meeting is scheduled for November 2016
5.	Do you have identified Nutrition Champions in your Country? (Yes/No) If Yes, please elaborate on the contributions of the Champions.	Not yet
6.	Are Parliamentarians 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.	Not yet
7.	Are journalists and members of the media 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.	Not yet
8.	Is there any reported Conflict of Interest within or outside your MSP? (Yes/No) If Yes, how was the Conflict of Interest handled?	No
9.	Do you have a Social mobilisation, Advocacy and Communication policy/plan/strategy ? (Yes/No) If Yes, kindly attach a copy or copies of the documents	Not yet
10.	Do you use the SUN Website , if not, what are your suggestions for improvement?	Yes
11.	To support learning needs , what are the preferred ways to: – access information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders? – foster country-to-country exchange?	Both ways - accessing information, experiences and guidance for in-country stakeholders; as well as fostering country-to-country exchange
12.	Would it be relevant for your country to reflect and exchange with SUN countries dealing with humanitarian and protracted crises, states of fragility ?	Yes – for humanitarian crisis related to drought and food insecurity
13.	What criteria for grouping with other SUN countries with similar challenges and opportunities 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)	Emerging Economies; Countries experiencing Double Burden

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"> ✓ Review relevant policy and legislation documents ✓ Situation/Contextual analysis ✓ Mapping of the available workforce for nutrition ✓ Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF) ✓ Development of a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework ✓ 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) ✓ Support with the development guidelines to organise and manage Common Results Framework (CRF) at sub-national levels ✓ Financing of selected programmes (due diligence) ✓ Support with the design and implementation of contextual research to inform implementation decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Engaging nutrition champions to position nutrition as a priority at all levels ✓ Engaging parliamentarians for legislative advocacy, budget oversight and public outreach ✓ Engaging the media for influencing decision makers, accountability and awareness ✓ Utilising high level events, partnerships and communication channels for leveraging commitments, generating investment and enhancing data ✓ Building national investment cases, supported by data and evidence, to drive nutrition advocacy ✓ Developing, updating or implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies ✓ Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs ✓ Strengthening of skills of key actors, such as Multistakeholder Platform member. Skills could include communication and negotiation, team building and leadership, planning and coordination. ✓ 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) ✓ Analysis/ guidance for institutional frameworks at national and subnational levels, including MSP, Coordination Mechanisms, stakeholder groups, or others ✓ Prevention and management of Conflicts of Interest (COI) ✓ Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Develop or review mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies. ✓ Ensuring participation of representatives from marginalised and vulnerable communities in decision-making processes ✓ Adapting, adopting or improving policies that aim to empower among women and girls

<p>✓ Support with the design and implementation of research to generate evidence</p>			
<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <p>We need support in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review relevant policy and legislation documents as well as situation/contextual analysis • Mapping of the available workforce for nutrition • Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF) • Development of a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework • Support with the development guidelines to organise and manage Common Results Framework (CRF) at sub-national levels 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <p>We need support in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging with decision makers to position nutrition as a priority at all levels • Building national investment cases, supported by data and evidence, to drive nutrition advocacy • Developing, updating or implementing multi-sectoral advocacy and communication strategies • Developing evidence based communications products to support the scale up of implementation • Engaging the media for influencing decision makers, accountability and awareness 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <p>We need support in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the broader enabling environment for scaling up nutrition, such as political commitment, or stakeholder group analysis • Support with assessments of capacity and capacity needs • 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. • 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) • Analysis/ guidance for institutional frameworks at national and subnational levels, including MSP, Coordination Mechanisms, stakeholder groups, or others 	<p>Specify your country priorities for 2016-17 and if support is available in-country:</p> <p>We need support in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing or reviewing mechanisms that address equity dimensions in nutrition plans, policies and strategies • Ensuring participation of representatives from non-state agencies such as CSOs in decision-making processes • Ensuring participation of representatives from marginalised and vulnerable communities in decision-making processes • Adapting, adopting or improving policies that aim to empower among women and girls

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

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

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