

JOINT-ASSESSMENT BY THE NATIONAL MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PLATFORM,
IN LINE WITH THE SUN MONITORING,
EVALUATION, ACCOUNTABILITY AND LEARNING
(MEAL) SYSTEM

2018 REPORTING TEMPLATE



(APRIL 2017-APRIL 2018)

Name of Country: **ETHIOPIA**

About the 2018 Joint-Assessment

We invite you to provide us with the following details, to help the SUN Movement Secretariat (SMS) better understand how inputs into the 2018 Joint-Assessment were compiled by stakeholders, and, to what extent this process is deemed useful.

Participants

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

Group	Yes (provide number)/No (= 0)
Government	3
Civil society	1
Donors	1
United Nations	3
Business	1
Science and academia	0
Other (please specify)	

2. How many participated in the Joint-Assessment process? 9

Of these, please indicate how many participants were female and how many were male 7 males and 2 females

Process

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

Step	Format					
Collection	Meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	yes	Email	<input type="checkbox"/>	yes
Review and validation	Meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	yes		<input type="checkbox"/>	Email yes

4. If an information gathering or validation meeting took place, please attach a photo.

Insert photo.

Usefulness

5. If an information gathering or validation meeting took place, would you say that the meeting was deemed useful by participants, beyond the usual work of the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)?

Yes/No

Why? Yes.

It has enabled the different SUN network members to review the networks performance and identify areas that need improvements. These have been included in the action plan.

Use of information by the SUN Movement

Please note that this template will be featured on the SUN Movement website, unless the SMS is otherwise notified. Analysed results of this Joint-Assessment will also form the basis of the 2018 SUN Movement Progress Report.

Scoring key

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

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

Coordination mechanisms or platforms enable stakeholders to better work for improved nutrition outcomes. These platforms can serve to bring together a specific stakeholder, or they can be multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral platforms (MSP), with a broader membership, and may help to link stakeholder-specific platforms. Platforms can exist at both the national and sub-national level, with the two levels often being linked. MSPs are seen as operational when they enable the delivery of joint results, on issues relevant to nutrition. MSPs are also deemed functional they enable the mobilisation and engagement of relevant stakeholders, assist relevant national bodies in their decision-making, spur consensus around joint interests and recommendations, and foster dialogue, at the sub-national level.

Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.

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

This progress marker looks at the presence of both stakeholder-specific and multi-stakeholder platforms or mechanisms, and how they are linked. The platforms that now focus on scaling up nutrition may have either been developed from existing mechanisms, or have created recently, and specifically, for this purpose.

FINAL SCORE:

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- Terms of reference that explain how the MSP works are available and outline the roles of actors or other mechanisms that the MSP brings together;
- There is evidence the MSP has been endorsed politically, formally or informally; federal and regional level coordination body are established.
- Technical working group meet on quarterly basis and the biannual and annual review meetings are being held.
- The local government provides leadership, and supports sub-national coordination mechanisms.
- A convener has been nominated, such as a SUN government Focal Point, a donor convener, a civil society coordinator, a UN focal point, a business convener, or an academic representative, etc.;
- Members have identified a common set of priorities
- The MSP coordination mechanisms are not fully functional at sub-national level.

Progress marker 1.2: Coordinate internally and expand membership/engage with other actors for broader influence

This progress marker looks the internal coordination, among members, achieved by the multi-stakeholder platform. It also looks at efforts to increase collective influence by engaging new actors and stakeholders, resulting in expanded membership. This can encompass sub-national platforms or actors, grassroot-focused organisations, or the executive branch of government, for example.

FINAL SCORE

2

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- Dedicated sub-national governing and technical coordination mechanisms are established
- National mechanisms are decentralised;
- National and sub-national mechanisms can be linked in many ways, including:
 - National actors participate in sub-national mechanisms, and vice versa;
 - Communication between the central and local levels is institutionalised, including sharing reports,

or organising periodic meetings.

- Though the establishment of national and subnational coordination mechanisms has been attained the linkage between them in terms of accountability and monitoring their performances is yet to be strengthened.

Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/contribute to the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)

This progress marker looks at whether the MSP fosters collaboration among stakeholders, at the national level, on issues most relevant to the nutrition agenda, in addition to commitment and follow-through. When relevant, interactions at the sub-national level should also be addressed.

FINAL SCORE

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- The MSP prioritises important issues, especially identifying nutrition problems and solutions;
- The MSP takes into account legal frameworks, planning, finance, advocacy and communication;
- The MSP agrees on priorities and develops work plans, with roles and responsibilities for stakeholders and actors
- The interaction of the MSP coordination at national level with the sub-national level is so far limited to the annual review meeting which needs to be expanded to engaging in identified priorities.

Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and reflect on own contributions and accomplishments

This progress marker looks whether the MSP tracks and reports on implementation of agreed actions, by individual actors and stakeholders, and their contribution to the MSP's collective progress towards agreed priorities. The MSP's ability to foster accountability is also considered.

FINAL SCORE

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- The MSP technical committee tracks, and reflects on the implementation of its work plan every three months
- The MSP communicates progress among its members during annual review meetings
- The MSP regularly reports on its achievements to the national nutrition coordination body led by the State Minister of Health, delegated by the Deputy Prime Minister.

Progress marker 1.5: Sustain the political impact of the multi-stakeholder platform

This progress marker looks at the extent to which a multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is accepted as a national priority and institutionalised by all stakeholders.

FINAL SCORE

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- The MSP finalized the food and nutrition policy where its endorsement will enable the establishment of the national food and nutrition council and governing body responsible to provide leadership for all food and nutrition strategies implementation in Ethiopia. The government endorsed the Seqota Declaration, a commitment to end stunting by the year 2030.
- At federal level and 2 regions the government has established a Seqota Declaration Program Delivery unit dedicated for coordinating the nutrition multi-sectoral work their contribution to end stunting goal of the government. Partners has also demonstrated their commitment to expand the Program Delivery Unit approach to other regions.

Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process 1

As of this year (2018), the Secretariats of the SUN Global Networks (UN, Donor, Business and Civil Society) will use the Joint-Assessment to examine their contributions, in a bid to reduce the reporting burden. If a stakeholder is not involved in the MSP, please write **not applicable** (N/A).

Stakeholders	Please provide examples
UN	- Progress marker 1.1: UN SUN network is in place and is led by UNICEF. This platform includes WHO, FAO and WFP. These four agencies are working together to support government objective set in the NNP2 and in the Seqota Declaration, eliminating stunting by 2030. The UN SUN network reach out frequently to Donor network in the framework of the Nutrition Development Partners Forum (NDPF) and is represented in the Multi-sectoral National Nutrition Coordination Body (NNCB). UN SUN network members participate in development of policy, strategic and programmatic framework.
Donor	-
- Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supported by the Ministry of Industry, Business Stakeholders are in the process of establishing the SUN Business Network, the National Technical Working Group of which will represent the business community in SUN joint assessments. In 2017, GAIN facilitated the development of a strategic plan to set up the SUN Business Network – SBN Ethiopia. A draft strategic plan was developed, following consultation with relevant businesses and key stakeholders. - Consultation was undertaken with key stakeholders, during which the draft SBN strategy was presented to members of the Nutrition Development Partners Forum (NDPF) as well as to millers at their Millers Association General Assembly. The draft strategy was also discussed with key donors. - A review and validation workshop was organised to enrich the SBN strategy. - A profiling, catalytic financing and segmentation was undertaken of refined oil and blended food producers, which are growing food sectors in Ethiopia. - The draft SBN Ethiopia strategy has been welcomed by the Ministry of Industry, which has confirmed it is keen to support and facilitate the establishment of the SUN Business Network in Ethiopia to ensure that industries play their irreplaceable important role in the fight against malnutrition. To this effect the Ministry of Industry intends to organize a one-day workshop to facilitate the establishment of SBN Ethiopia. - GAIN is seeking funding for a 2-3 year SBN Ethiopia program and intends to fundraise, with Government support, to be able to deliver on the strategy and develop the governance structure for the network.
CSO	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2017 to April 2018)

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)

In Ethiopia MSP coordination mechanisms are established at national and sub-national level with clear ToR. Moreover, the performance is regularly monitored through quarterly review meeting of the Technical Committee and biannual and annual review meeting of the Coordination Body. To catalyse its implementation the government also made a commitment to end stunting in Ethiopia, Seqota Declaration, which brings new way of nutrition coordination and implementing stakeholders performance management using the Program Delivery Unit.

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 conflict 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.

Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.

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

This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing nutrition-relevant (specific and sensitive) policies and legislation are analysed using multi-sectoral consultative processes, with inputs from various stakeholders, and civil society in particular. It denotes the availability of stock-taking documents and continuous context analysis to inform and guide policy-making.

FINAL SCORE

2

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

The MSP and its members engage in various policies developments in Ethiopia. Some of the examples are Maternity leave extension consulted: Parliament/ women sector/ professional associations/ CSO/ UN/ Donors and legal affairs

NSA – strategy developed by MOA in collaboration with nutrition stakeholders

BMS regulation status: by FMHACA

Fortification standards: by MOI – with private sector, MOT,

Integration of nutrition in productive safety net program

However, to identify a gap in existing policies and documents no formal consultative meetings were held by the MSP platform.

The draft strategy describes the responsibility of the SUN Business Network to monitor its progress against its objectives and demonstrate the impact that the Network is having on business and nutrition at the country level on a regular basis. Common indicators have been developed for national SBNs to report against at the local level.

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

This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders work together and contribute, influence and advocate for the development of updated or new improved nutrition policy and legal frameworks for and their 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 legislation and evidence-based policies that empower women and girls through equity-based approaches.

FINAL SCORE

2

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Various advocacy activities are undertaken to influence the decision makers. Parliamentarians' actively involved in the document of the NNP II and all the members were oriented on National Nutrition Program II. Deputy Prime Minister, Ministers and Regional Presidents active involvement to execute the government commitment to end stunting by 2030, Seqota Declaration. Former First lady was a nutrition champion and she was active involvement in support of the national nutrition program implementation. There is no effort made to conduct policy gap analysis and use the information to inform the decision makers to influence for policy update to achieve the NNP II.

Progress marker 2.3: Develop or update coherent policies and legal frameworks through coordinated and harmonised in-country stakeholder efforts

This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders – the government (i.e. line ministries) and non-state partners – coordinate their inputs to ensure the development of coherent policy and legislative frameworks.

FINAL SCORE

4

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

National Nutrition Program phase I implementation completed and the NNP II finalized through a consultative process among the various government and non-state actors. The food and nutrition policy is developed in consultation with the sectors, academia, UN, NGOs as well as parliamentarians and legal institutions.

Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise/enforce legal framework

This progress marker looks at the availability of mechanisms to operationalise and enforce legislation, such as the International Code of Marketing of Breast-milk Substitutes, maternity protection and paternity and parental leave laws, food fortification legislation, they right to food, among others.

FINAL SCORE

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Policies like maternity leave extension are operationalized and food fortification strategy has been approved.

Progress marker 2.5: Track and report for learning and sustaining the policy and legislative impact

This progress marker looks at the extent to which existing policies and legislation have been reviewed and evaluated to document good practices, and the extent to which available lessons are shared by different constituencies within the multi-stakeholder platforms.

FINAL SCORE

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

The learning platform that exist is the annual review meetings held among the NNP II technical committee and coordination bodies. The implementing sectors and non-state actors share their achievements, challenges and lessons learned on annual basis. Currently there is an ongoing effort to develop Unified Nutrition Information System which improves the routine nutrition performance monitoring among implementing partners to get real time data. Various nutrition related assessments has been conducted including human resource needs for nutrition, etc and the baseline survey conducted for Seqota

Declaration implementing woredas.

Key contributions of each stakeholder to Process 2

*As of this year (2018), the Secretariats of the SUN Global Networks (UN, Donor, Business and Civil Society) will use the Joint-Assessment to examine their contributions, in a bid to reduce the reporting burden. If a stakeholder is not involved in the MSP, please write **not applicable** (N/A).*

PROCESS 3: Aligning actions around common results

The alignment of actions across sectors that significantly contribute to improvements in nutrition 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 everyone, women and children in particular, benefit from improved nutrition. This process delves into the operational side of policy and legal frameworks and how they translate into action. The term ‘Common Results Framework’ is used to describe a set of expected results agreed upon across different sectors of government 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.

Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.

Stakeholders	<i>Please provide examples</i>
UN	- UN SUN network, with other networks, Donor and civil society networks mainly support government effort to ensure a comprehensive and enabling environment to accelerate progress toward achieving NNP and Seqota Declaration goals. This include the development of the first ever Ethiopian Food and Nutrition Policy, the revision of the CMAM guidelines, the development of the Unified Nutrition Information System for Ethiopia (UNISE) and the development of food fortification standards to name few.
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2017 to April 2018) 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)

Efforts has been made to endorse policies and strategies that support the implementation of the national nutrition program. This includes the nutrition strategy for agriculture, the engagement of policy makers, consultative review to assess the progresses made for the NNPII and baseline for Seqota Declaration are some of them. However, there is still a need for more intentional existing policy analysis and use the data to influence the policy makers to update the policies as well as generation of routine information to inform decision makers to make timely decisions.

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

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 among relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition.

Please note: While progress marker 2.1 looks at the review of policies and legislation, progress marker 3.1 focuses on the review of programmes and implementation capacities.

FINAL SCORE

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Development of the national nutrition program II and common result frame work. Development of 15 years road map and three years Seqota Declaration innovation phase investment plan. Multi-sectoral performance indicators (targets also set for sectoral interventions). However, operationalization still remains.

Progress marker 3.2: Translate policy and legal frameworks into an actionable Common Results Framework (CRF) for scaling up nutrition at the national and sub-national level

This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders agree on a Common Results Framework to effectively align interventions for improved nutrition. The CRF is recognised as the guidance for medium to long-term implementation of actions, with clearly identified nutrition targets. Ideally, the CRF should identify coordination mechanisms (and related capacity) and define the roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder. It should encompass an implementation matrix, an M&E Framework and costed interventions, including costs estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.

FINAL SCORE

2

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

NNP II result framework and development of the key performance indicators Cascading the performance monitoring framework to the woreda level through the Seqota Declaration. There is an ongoing effort to establish web-based monitoring systems to collect NNP II implementing sectors and implementing stakeholders' performance and get real time data for analysis and decision making.

Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework

This progress marker looks at the sequencing and implementation of priority actions at the national and sub-national level. 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 technical expertise to timely respond to the identified needs, in a coordinated manner.

FINAL SCORE

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Guidance is provided on annual level for NNP II implementing parnters to develop annual work plans which is reviewed on quarterly basis by the technical working groups and annual level for the entire country program performance. Sub-national level coordination comittees and technical comittees also provide the same guidance at the subnational level. However, the quality of the

plan, sequencing of the various actions and prioritization of high impact nutrition intervention actions and allocation of resources for the prioritized action is a critical gap.

Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per the Common Results Framework

This progress marker looks at how information systems are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for good nutrition. It looks at the availability of joint progress reports that can meaningfully inform and guide the refinement of interventions and contribute towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.

FINAL SCORE 2
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE At national and subnational level coordination and technical committees are established. The technical committee is expected to meet on quarterly basis to review the progress while the coordination body on biannual basis. Annual review meetings are also organized on annual basis to review the performance. However, the frequency of the meetings and utilization of common result framework is not fully excuted.

Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate the implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact

This progress marker looks at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision-making and building the evidence base for improved nutrition.

FINAL SCORE 3
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE To assess the impact national nutrition program performance evaluation was conducted at the end of Phase I and based on that the National Nutrition Program II was designed. Through the Seqota Declaration sub-national level baseline survey is conducted to set targets and monitor the progress for the Seqota Declaration Innovation Phase.

Key contributions of each stakeholder to Process 3

*As of this year (2018), the Secretariats of the SUN Global Networks (UN, Donor, Business and Civil Society) will use the Joint-Assessment to examine their contributions, in a bid to reduce the reporting burden. If a stakeholder is not involved in the MSP, please write **not applicable** (N/A).*

Stakeholders	<i>Please provide examples</i>
UN	- The common result framework for nutrition in Ethiopia is the NNP 2 result framework around which guide action of all partners, including UN SUN network members. UN SUN network members are member and participate in the National Nutrition Technical Committee (NNTC) and the National Nutrition Coordination Body sessions and contribute to stock taking of progress made against implementation of the NNP2 (the CRF for Ethiopia). In the same vain, UN SUN Network also support develop of interventions and operation plans to accelerate progress.
Donor	-

Business	-
CSO	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2017 to April 2018) 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)

The national nutrition program II and the Seqota Declaration has enabled the implementing sectors to plan and implement nutrition sensitive and specific interventions. Though the NNP II provided a common result framework where the government and stakeholders can utilize it for planning, allocate adequate resources for its execution and performance management. The Seqota Declaration is catalysing the NNP II implementing through its ending stunting vision in two regions but requires engaging all the regions to engage actively for ownership of the NNP II and allocation of adequate resources. However, unitization of the common result framework among the the NNP II implementing partners to provide real time data as well as use of the common result framework for performance management is still an area of improvement.

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) align and contribute resources to national priorities, estimate the required budget for implementation and identify financial gaps.

Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.

Progress marker 4.1: Cost and assess the financial feasibility of the CRF

This progress marker looks at the extent to which the government and all other in-country stakeholders provide inputs for the costing of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions across relevant sectors (costing exercises can be performed in various ways, including reviewing current spending or estimating unit costs).

FINAL SCORE

2

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

The NNP II is developed in consultation with various stakeholders which consisting of the costs for nutrition specific and sensitive actions. However, this was not adjusted considering the current spending as well as not supported by dedicated funding allocation.

Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition

This progress marker looks at the extent to which the government 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 and report on finance data, in a transparent manner, with other partners of the MSP, including the government.

FINAL SCORE 4
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE National level nutrition financing has completed for 2017. A consultant is working to conduct the second national level financial tracking. Preparation is underway to conduct a sub-regional level financial tracking in two regions.

Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls

This progress marker looks at whether the government and other in-country stakeholders identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds, through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, and setting-up of specific mechanisms.

FINAL SCORE 2
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE The estimated resources required to implement the national nutrition program II and Seqota Declaration is identified. However, except the traditional government, donors and implementing development partners allocation for various nutrition specific and sensitive interventions there was no systematic resource mobilization strategy and responsible body for its implementation to finance the NNP II and the Seqota Declaration.

Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements

This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders turn pledges into disbursements. It includes the ability of donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the scheduled fiscal year.

FINAL SCORE 2
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE Large numbers of development partners, donors and sectors have made commitment to support the implementation of NNP II and Seqota Declaration. However, there is still a huge resource gap for full execution. Government sectors have started developing strategies (education, agriculture, social protection) but even this sectors did not fully mainstreamed nutrition and allocated resources. The contribution from the donors and some projects period. However, there is still more to be done.

Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact

This progress marker looks at how the government and in-country stakeholders collectively ensure predictable and long-term funding for better 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.

FINAL SCORE 2
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE The national nutrition program II shows the funding estimate for five years. However, there is no predictable and long term funding mechanism neither, from the government treasury nor from the donors,..... and development partners to finance the NNP II. Some in-country stakeholders had some multi-year funding allocation but this is a very small part of the NNP II funding.

Key contributions of each stakeholder to Process 4

As of this year (2018), the Secretariats of the SUN Global Networks (UN, Donor, Business and Civil Society) will use the Joint-Assessment to examine their contributions, in a bid to reduce the reporting burden. If a stakeholder is not involved in the MSP, please write **not applicable** (N/A).

Stakeholders	Please provide examples
UN	- MOH/GoE lead the costing of the NNP 2 and that of the Seqota Declaration. Likewise FMOH is constantly tracking resource allocation to nutrition interventions. UN SUN Network members take part in and facilitate the process.
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	-

OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2017 to April 2018) FOR PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation (i.e. Overall achievements/positive changes/ key challenges and suggestions for improvement/ other relevant activities in the context of scaling up nutrition efforts in-country)

The government and in-country stakeholders has put in place a resources needed for the national nutrition program II and the Seqota Declaration. Moreover, sectors like education and agriculture has developed sector specific strategies. However, except some allocations on annual basis there is no multi-year commitment from the government to finance the NNP II. Some in-country stakeholders have made multi-year commitment which is a very small part of the entire NNP II. This is also true for the Seqota Declaration commitment.

NEW OUTCOME MARKER: Review of progress in scaling up nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions over the past 12 months

In line with the SUN Movement MEAL system, this outcome marker looks at how processes put in place are effectively contributing to scaling up nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions. In compliance with principles of equity, equality and non-discrimination for all, participants are asked to reflect on their implementation progress, considering geographical reach and targeting of children, adolescent girls and women as well as delivery approaches that promote a convergence of interventions (e.g. same village, same household or same individual) or integration of nutrition interventions in sector programmes (e.g. nutrition education in farmer field schools or provision of fortified complementary foods for young children as part of food aid).

FINAL SCORE

4

FINAL SCORE

2

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Progress in scaling up nutrition-specific interventions

Infant and young child, management of acute malnutrition, infant feeding in emergency and community based nutrition program are implemented at scale across the country. In addition the national strategy for food fortification has got approval from the council of ministers. Management of Moderate acute malnutrition guideline has been revised and implementation started. Iron Folate for adolescents girls study has been completed and ready for scale up.

Progress in scaling up nutrition-sensitive interventions

To scale up the nutrition sensitive interventions the ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Resources has developed a Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture Strategy, the Ministry of Education has developed School health and nutrition strategy. Moreover, the social sector has integrated nutrition into the Productive Safety Net Program. However, other sectors though they implement their traditional interventions they still require more efforts to make the interventions nutrition smart.

Annex 1: Identified priorities

Please describe the status of the priorities identified in your most recent Joint-Assessment (for instance 2016-2017)

Priorities identified in most recent JAA? <i>Enter priority</i>	Has this priority been met? <i>Yes or No</i>	What actions took place to ensure the priority could be met? <i>Please outline stakeholders' contributions (government, UN, CSOs, donors, etc.)</i>	Did you receive external technical assistance to meet this priority? <i>If yes, please explain</i>
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			

Please list key 2018-2019 priorities for the MSP

Consider what has been working well during the past year and what achievable targets can be identified and prioritised. Please also include network-specific priorities.

- 1. Strengthening the SUN networks**
- 2. Financing for NNP II and the Seqota Declaration and tracking the existing investment**
- 3. Utilization of the common result framework for planning and performance tracking & reporting**
- 4. Nutrition sectors mainstreaming guideline**
- 5. Current policy analysis to identify gaps on nutrition actions**

If you are seeking external support from the global Networks and/or external technical mechanisms, through the SUN Movement Secretariat, please provide relevant information

Annex 2: Emergency preparedness and response planning

<p>1. Within the reporting period (i.e. the past year), has the country faced and responded to a humanitarian situation? If yes, what was the duration and type(s) of emergency (e.g. natural and climate-related disasters, communal violence, armed conflict etc.)?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Please explain: the country responded to a mix of emergencies. Drought has affected the pastoralist areas, there was a community violence and internal displacement in different parts of the country which the public, government and development partners are responding.</p>
<p>2. Does the country have a national plan on emergency preparedness and response? If yes, does it include nutrition actions and indicators (both nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive)?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Please explain: both nutrition sensitive and specific actions are part of the plan.</p>
<p>3. Is the MSP involved in discussions and planning for emergency preparedness and response? If yes, does the MSP engage with humanitarian partners, and how does the MSP contribute to linking development and humanitarian nutrition actions?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Please explain: the MSP involved in discussing the emergency preparedness and response. One good example the endorsement of the management of moderate acute malnutrition guideline in the country.</p>
<p>4. What are the key limitations faced at the country level in terms of linking development and humanitarian nutrition actions?</p>	<p>Please explain: all the development partners are not fully aware and equally involved, in many sectors the preparedness plan is not part and parcel of the regular development plan and finally the human resource capacity to link the development with humanitarian nutrition action is limited.</p>

Annex 3: Ensuring gender equality and that women and girls are at the centre of all SUN Movement action

<p>1. Does the MSP engage with a governmental Ministry or Department that is responsible for women's affairs/gender equality? If yes, what is the name of this Ministry/Department?</p> <p>If not a part of the MSP, how do you engage with this Ministry/Department?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Please explain: Ministry of Women and Children Affairs is a member of the National Nutrition Coordination Body and the National Nutrition Technical Committee.</p>
<p>2. Does the MSP engage with other non-state actors that are responsible for gender equality and the empowerment of women (such as UN Women or civil society organisations)? If yes, with whom do you engage?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Please explain: Yes the CSO Coalition for SUN and its members are fully involved.</p>
<p>3. How does the MSP ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls as part of their work plan?</p>	<p>Please explain: In the NNP II and the Seqota Declaration gender equality and the empowerment of women is one of the priority agenda which is mainstreamed in all sectoral interventions.</p>

4.	What actions are identified and implemented by the MSP to ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls at the community level?	Please explain: there are various activities that the sectors implement. Some examples are the Productive Safety Net Program has put a soft conditionality where pregnant and lactating women should not participate in labor activities but only to engage in SBCC, the Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture prioritizes women in nutrition dense crop and economic empowerment, the school health and nutrition strategy prioritizes interventions that support girls stay in schools (separate latrines, menstrual hygiene).
5.	Have you analysed or done a stock take of existing nutrition policies, legislation and regulations from a gender perspective?	Yes The NNP II, Seqota Declaration, the Food and Nutrition Policy development has been supported by gender experts to ensure gender perspectives are considered.
6.	Does your country have a national gender equality and/or women’s empowerment policy or strategy in place?	Yes or No Please explain:
7.	Has advocacy been undertaken for gender-sensitive and pro-female policy-making and legislation on nutrition?	Yes or No Please explain:

Annex 4: Advocacy and communication for nutrition

1.	Do you engage with the media to amplify key messages, create awareness and demand for action on nutrition?	Yes Media experts were trained on NNP II and media engagement is part of the annual work plan for the nutrition case team at the Federal Ministry of health. The Seqota Declaration has also brought on board Communication experts relevant for public movement through engaging media and other stakeholders. Examples:
2.	Are parliamentarians actively contributing to improve nutrition, in collaboration with the MSP? <i>Examples could include the existence of an active Parliamentary network or group focusing on food security and nutrition, votes in support of legal or budget changes that the MSP suggested, debates in parliament on nutrition or other concrete actions taken by parliamentarians in support of improved nutrition.</i>	Yes Parliamentarians are supportive of the national nutrition program. The Standing Committee for Social Affairs participates in during biannual and annual review meetings. They also took part in the review of the food and nutrition policy. Examples:
3.	Is there one or several nominated Nutrition Champions (including for example high-level political leaders, celebrities, journalists, religious leaders etc.) actively engaging to promote nutrition at national and/or local level?	Yes The former First Lady of Ethiopia has served as a nutrition Champion. Moreover, recently orientation was given to athletes, musicians and influential known people to take of in nutrition advocacy. Examples:

4. Have you documented advocacy successes and best practice in reducing malnutrition through multi-sector and multi-stakeholder action, and shared them nationally and/or with regional and global partners?	No
5. Do you plan on organising a high-level event on nutrition in the upcoming period?	Yes The objective of the high level event is to revitalize the government and various stakeholders' commitment for the Seqota Declaration. Implementing sectors, incountry stakeholders and donors will be part of the meeting.

Annex 5: Participants at the 2018 Joint-Assessment of the national multi-stakeholder platform

No.	Title (Ms./Mr.)	Name	Organisation	Specific SUN role (if applicable)	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in the SUN mailing list?
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							
11.							
12.							
13.							
14.							