Introduction
Ghana joined the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement in May 2011, with the aim of reducing the proportion of children who are malnourished through the scaling up of proven cost-effective nutrition specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions.

In view of the above, the 2017/2018 Ghana Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement Joint Assessment was held on Wednesday 23rd May 2018, at the National Development Planning Commission’s Conference Room in Accra. This annual exercise brought together various stakeholders which included relevant Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Development Partners (DPs), Academia and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) to assess progress being made by Ghana in its efforts to scale up nutrition during the preceding year. The assessment workshop was essentially held to identify the current state of institutional transformations for scaling up nutrition in Ghana.

The workshop was opened by Dr Mensa-Bonsu on behalf of the Acting Director General of the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC). Dr Mensa-Bonsu highlighted that the workshop was convened to identify progress made in the implementation of nutrition related programmes with clear results and impact made.
The objectives of the meeting were to:
1. Promote stakeholder engagement in institutional transformation for scaling up nutrition in Ghana;
2. Outline challenges and obstacles faced in the implementation of nutrition related programmes;
3. Set common priorities for 2018-2019, and deliberate on support available for achieving them;
4. Provide concrete inputs to the decision-making process of the global SUN system and its support system.

Participation
The table below shows the breakdown of representatives who participated in the meeting. In all, thirty-five participants were present with twenty-one (21) participants from various government agencies, three (3) from CSOs, three (3) from donor agencies, three (3) from UN agencies, three (3) from the business sector, one (1) from science and academia and one (1) from media. Of the thirty-five (35) who participated, twenty-one (21) were female, while fourteen (14) were male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes (provide number)/No (= 0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and academia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1 (media)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How many participated in the Joint-Assessment process? __35________
Of these, please indicate how many participants were female and how many were male __21 Female; 14 Males__

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Meeting Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and validation</td>
<td>Meeting Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. If an information gathering or validation meeting took place, please attach a photo.

![Meeting Photos]

**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)?

The meeting was useful. Participants were able to better acquaint and recommit themselves to the principles and objectives of the SUN Movement. Despite the fact that some members participated in the exercise for the first time, they were able to provide information on progress made in the implementation of the activities of SUN Movement in Ghana over the last year. Priorities were also set for the upcoming year.

**Scoring key**

The scoring key in the table below were used to score each progress marker:

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

A multi-stakeholder platform known as the Food and Nutrition Security Cross-Sectoral Planning Group (CSPG) has been in existence since 2011. The Academia, and CSOs have different platforms, while the donor and UN agencies have a single platform known as the Nutrition Development Partner Platform convened by USAID. The Business platform has not yet been set up but some private sector institutions engage in the SUN Movement in Ghana.

Even though some structures are in place, meetings of the CSPG are not regular and with some of the platforms not fully functioning.

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

This progress marker looks at 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, grassroots-focused organisations, or the executive branch of government, for example.

**FINAL SCORE: 3**

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE**

Efforts are being made to engage the political leadership to increase political ownership of the SUN agenda. More Development Partners are regularly involved in SUN activities. New Ministries, Departments and Agencies such as the Ministry of Sanitation and Water Resources, as well as Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) are regularly involved in national SUN activities.

The Ghana Health Service (GHS), in collaboration with Regional Coordinating Councils and some Development Partners have established MSPs in 5 regions in Ghana; however, there is minimal feedback from these sub-national MSPs. There is inadequate support, planning and action at the community level. NDPC has tried to raise the awareness of food and nutrition security (FNS) at the district level by requesting that each district assembly’s plan and budget adequately incorporate FNS issues into them. This was done through the issuance of District Medium-Term Development Planning Guidelines (See attached Document). The preparation of nutrition relevant
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:** 2

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE**

A work plan/roadmap for the CSPG that requires multi-stakeholder collaboration has been developed but it is yet to be fully rolled out. Only a few of the planned activities have been undertaken such as the organization of nutrition dialogue and planning workshops with the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection to mainstream nutrition into key nutrition sectors. Efforts are still being made to implement the other key activities in a collaborative way.

Multi-stakeholder collaboration was also evident in the development and finalization of critical policy documents over the last year which will lead to the integration of nutrition activities in sector and district medium-term development plans. These documents were as follows:

1. The Long-Term Food and Nutrition Security Strategy; (this was a component of the Social Development section of the draft Long-Term National Development Plan (LTNDP: 2018-2057));
2. The President’s Coordinated Programme of Economic and Social Development Policies - An Agenda for Jobs: Creating Prosperity and Equal Opportunity for All (CPESDP: 2017-2024)
3. The Medium-Term National Development Policy Framework – An Agenda for Jobs: Creating Prosperity and Equal Opportunity for All (2018-2021); (this operationalises the CPESDP);

All these documents have a nutrition component and were developed in a participatory manner and was validated by relevant nutrition stakeholders (Please find attached copies of these documents).

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**

Although there is no structured or specific reporting mechanism for the FNS CSPG, actors and stakeholders report on their contributions in the annual joint assessment exercises. In addition, government agencies produce and submit quarterly and annual reports to NDPC, the convenor of the FNS CSPG. These reports provide valuable information on nutrition relevant interventions carried out by sectors and districts. These reports, are largely based on administrative data and at times, feed into the national Annual Progress Reports (APR).

Existing national accountability mechanisms have been adopted. Therefore, government agencies report to various institutions, such as parliament, NDPC, Regional Coordinating Councils, Ministry of Finance (MOF), Office of the Head of Civil Service (OHCS) and Local Government Service Secretariat (LGSS). The performance of sectors on various indicators can determine financial rewards, incentives and contract extensions. Efforts are still being
made to integrate nutrition as key indicators for these accountability mechanisms. These existing accountability mechanisms however pertain largely to government agencies only. CSOs, Development Partners, Academia and Business partners do not report directly to the CSPG on their nutrition activities.

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: 4**

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE**

At the highest level, the President has launched the CPESDP in fulfilment of a constitutional requirement in Article 36 Clause 5 which requires that “the President shall present to Parliament a coordinated programme of economic and social development policies, including agricultural and industrial programmes at all levels and in all the regions of Ghana.” This document provides an analysis of the food and nutrition security situation in the country and offers policy direction for resolving the issues. The document was produced in a collaborative manner with key sectors contributing to the crafting of policy initiatives in association with the Office of the President.

Flagship programmes such as “Planting for Food and Jobs,” a key agricultural policy to increase food security, employment and income, as well as the “One-Village-One-Dam” are some of the special initiatives that “is expected to move Ghana closer to the long-term national development vision enshrined in Article 34 (1) of the Constitution, which requires every Government to pursue policies towards the “establishment of a just and free society”, where every Ghanaian has the opportunity to live a long, productive, and meaningful life” (CPESDP: 2017).

The sector and district medium-term development planning guidelines have prioritized food and nutrition security as a key development issue. These require every nutrition-relevant sector and all districts to prioritise food and nutrition security.

The First Lady of the Republic of Ghana, has taken the lead in championing the fight against malaria and malnutrition. She is collaborating with a number of key nutrition stakeholders to prioritise interventions to reduce malnutrition in all its forms. An example of this was her recent launch of the Girls’ Iron-Folate Tablet and Folic Acid Supplementation (GIFTS) programme in October 2017. (https://www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/health/First-Lady-launches-supplement-programme-to-improve-girls-nutrition-S90273)

**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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Please provide examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>• In collaboration with Ministry of Planning, NDPC and FAO, a high-level stakeholder meeting was organized in December 2017. The objective of the meeting was to create awareness on the targets and indicators under SDG 2 (ending hunger, malnutrition and promoting sustainable agriculture). The meeting assessed Ghana’s progress and provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recommendations for the country to achieve the targets.

Donor
- Donor Network holds regular monthly meetings, have an action plan, and have completed a donor matrix showing where they are working, indicating their programs, geographical coverage and funding sources. WFP supported the Kufuor Foundation to convene stakeholders to develop the Zero Hunger Strategy Review Report.

Business

CSO
- The CSO platform organized a National Nutrition Summit in October 2017 with 250 participants in attendance. The purpose of the summit was to, provide a platform for consensus building, share experiences, make nutrition interventions very visible at the national level and to initiate a stocktaking analysis of progress made since Ghana joined SUN in 2011.
- The CSA platform participated in the global SUN gathering held in Cote d'Ivoire in 2017
- The Alliance was part of a training workshop on nutrition budget advocacy which brought together 13 West African countries in Dakar in April 2018
- SEND Ghana, a member of the CSO platform in Ghana, has actively implemented its People for Health Project (P4H) which has some nutrition components. The P4H project seeks to strengthen organizational and institutional capacities of government and civil society organizations (CSOs) for mutual accountability in health, HIV, water and sanitation, and nutrition policy formulation and implementation.
- The Hunger Project Ghana is collaborating with the Ghana Health Service to improve Maternal Health and Infant and Young Child Feeding in their epicentres (cluster of communities) in the Eastern, Central and Volta Regions.

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)

Ghana continues to make steady progress on this process indicator. Collaboration continues to be evident on the policy front, as stakeholders worked together to develop a long-term food and nutrition security, strategy, incorporate food and nutrition security as a priority issue in the President’s Coordinated Programme of Economic and Social Development Policies and the Medium-Term National Development Policy Framework. The CSO, Development Partner and Academia Platforms continue to meet and provide impetus to the SUN agenda. Political engagement and advocacy continues to be pursued to push the nutrition agenda as high up the political agenda as possible. More stakeholders are joining the SUN Movement in Ghana.

Despite these achievements, significant challenges still persist. The Nutrition MSP in Ghana, does not meet regularly. Not all stakeholders are as active in achieving the SUN agenda in a collaborative and coordinated way, with some sectors still operating largely in their silos. It is hoped that dialogue and continued engagement will assist in promoting unity and oneness of purpose.
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 3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

No new specific nutrition policy has been developed over the last year. Analysis on existing nutrition-relevant policies and legislation, has however been undertaken for a number of documents. The Coordinated Program for Economic and Social Development Policies (CPESDP), and the Medium-Term Development Policy Framework (MTDPF), Long-Term Food and Nutrition Security Strategy (LTFNS) were developed with intensive analysis of existing nutrition policies, and the nutrition situation in the country. The National Development Planning Commission has distributed development planning guidelines that requires all sectors and districts to mainstream and integrate nutrition into their medium-term development plans. The integration of nutrition requires that an analysis of various nutrition indicators be undertaken, with activities developed to achieve positive nutrition outcomes. Many sectors and districts have carried out this analysis.

An independent, analytical and consultative exercise was undertaken by the John Agyekum Kufuor Foundation in association with World Food Program to develop the Zero Hunger Strategy Review Report. JICA supported a process of analysing the nutrition situation in Ghana, with special emphasis on anaemia in all parts of Ghana. The food security situation was also reviewed in detail, in terms of strategies being developed to address anaemia in three regions of Ghana, that is, the Northern, Central and Volta regions. This assessment was carried out under the Initiative for Food and Nutrition Security in Africa (IFNA) in a collaborative manner.

Administrative data systems are not very robust and there is therefore a reliance on survey data. A national Iodine Survey was conducted in 2015 with support from UNICEF and GAIN, and a national Micronutrient Survey was conducted in 2017 with support from the Government of Canada and UNICEF. No new survey has been carried out since 2014 to provide new data on nutrition indicators [especially Iron (anaemia), Vitamin A, food fortification and anthropometric indicators]. Preparations for an agricultural survey have been initiated. The analysis carried out on the policy and legislative framework was therefore undertaken with slightly old survey information as the recent survey results had not yet been disseminated.
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 parliamentarian 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

Development Partners hold regular meetings to consider potential areas of financial and technical support for nutrition programs with government agencies and CSOs. The CSOs held a forum in November 2017 to advocate for nutrition support and this was attended by parliamentarians. The Minister for Gender, Children and Social Protection continues to advocate for social protection and nutrition particularly under the school feeding programme, cash payments under the Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) programme among others. There is continuing engagement with the Press in a structured manner where the key persons and ministers hold press conferences and briefing. There is however no standard and comprehensive advocacy strategy at the national level. This needs to be developed.

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

There is in place “The Coordinated Program of Economic and Social Development Polices 2017” presented by the President of Ghana to Parliament on 20th October 2017. Page 73 of the document provides explicit guidance on nutrition policy and implementation. This document was developed through a comprehensive stakeholder engagement and adopted by Parliament. This document updated the previous government’s agenda. Subsequently the Medium-Term National Development Policy Framework which operationalises the CPESDP, has been developed and is being translated into sector and district plans.

The Food and Drugs Act was recently revised making provisions on food supplementation, advertising, salt iodization and labelling of nutritional facts in appropriate language and font among others

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

The Labour law, Act 651, 2003, has provisions for three months mandatory maternity leave with annual leave being added where necessary. Consideration for extra days is provided in special cases of twins or multiple births being born or illness. This law is enforced across the formal sector with most employers in the formal sector
The Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations has oversight responsibility over the implementation of this law. There is however no paternity leave in Ghana. The Labour Law and the Civil Service conditions of service also provide for maternity protection and leave. Those who work in the informal sector do not however benefit much from these provisions.

The legislative instrument for breastfeeding regulation (LI 1667: 2000) is being enforced by the Food and Drugs Authority with support from Ghana Health Service. The Food and Drugs Legislative Instrument provides guidelines on food supplementation and the marketing of breastfeeding substitutes for babies. The Food and Drugs Authority has successfully prosecuted offenders during the period under review. There is a taskforce that works in association with the police to ensure salt for human and animal consumption is iodated before being sold in the market. Guidance on iodated salt is provided, with the Ports and Harbour Authority, the Customs Authority and Ministry of Trade and Industry checking the importation of iodated/iodised salt and the iodates whilst ministerial directives have been provided for food fortification. The Public Health Act 851 (2012) Part 7, Section 107 also gives directives on food fortification whilst other provisions on the production, handling, marketing, and transportation of food stuffs is provided for in this act. The constitution provides for the right to food security. Enforcement for all these legislative instruments however needs to be strengthened.

**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 University of Ghana’s School of Public Health in association with Yale University and other development partners have undertaken a comprehensive evaluation on the breastfeeding promotion legislative instrument, assessing how baby friendly the legal provisions are. The report assessed the breastfeeding initiatives, advocacy and implementations in the country.

An evaluation of the Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) 1000 initiative was undertaken. LEAP 1000 is a social safety net that provides a cash grant to poor and vulnerable pregnant and lactating women. This evaluation was carried out with support from UNICEF.

The Maternity leave policy is being reviewed to align with the ILO Maternity Protection Convention, 2000, No. 183.

The Long-Term Food and Nutrition Security Strategy reviewed past food and nutrition security policies and legislation.

The Agricultural sector development plan (METASSIP II) has been evaluated and results are influencing the development of the New Agriculture Investment Plan. The FAO is undertaking a food and nutrition assessment to guide the development of the agriculture Medium-Term Development Plan for the next 5 years.

As part of the ongoing process of developing Medium Term Development Plans for various MDAs, policies are to be reviewed to assess successes and challenges faced in implementing and enforcing policies and laws. Nutrition relevant policies and legislation will be part of this process.

**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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Please provide examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>• UN agencies have provided both technical and financial support to the review of documents including FNS Strategy, LEAP 1000, evaluation of the METASSIP 2 to inform the development of the agricultural sector development plan and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>• The CSO platform organized a National Nutrition Summit in October 2017 with 250 participants in attendance. The purpose of the summit was to, provide a platform for consensus building, share experiences, make nutrition interventions very visible at the national level and to initiate a stocktaking analysis of progress made since Ghana joined SUN in 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

The Long-Term Food and Nutrition Security Strategy, CPESDP (2017 – 2024), MTNDPF (2018-2021), district and sector planning guidelines, the Zero Hunger Strategy Review Report and IFNA country report have been developed over the past year. These documents analysed the current nutrition situation in the country, whilst efforts have been made to review and enforce some nutrition relevant legislation. Political advocacy around nutrition keeps improving. Ghana therefore has made substantial progress in the area of coherent policy and legal framework.
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.

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

There is an increased multi-stakeholder effort to align activities toward the national nutrition priorities but there is a huge gap with the private sector, especially those involved in active agribusiness. Non-traditional sectors such as the Ministry of Water Resources and Sanitation, as well as Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection, have increasingly linked their activities to nutrition, to contribute to improved nutrition outcomes. The MTDPF along with the development planning guidelines all provide relevant nutrition stakeholders with the policy direction and guidance on how to and what to plan for with regards to nutrition. CSOs, Development Partners and the Private sector are all encouraged to align their activities with the strategies in the MTNDPF. An example of this is evidenced by an increasing number of businesses attempting to link their activities to flagship programs of the government such as “Planting for Food and Jobs” and “One-District-One-Factory.”

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

The Medium-Term National Development Policy Framework provides medium-term policy objectives and strategies which have been approved by all stakeholders. The MTNDPF, has an annex called National Results
Framework, that provides indicators, definition of indicators, time periods, targets and responsible institutions for all sectors, districts and other stakeholders to prepare their medium-term plans. Key/core nutrition indicators that measure impacts and outcomes have been included in the results matrix to achieve the nutrition-related policy objectives of the MTNDPF and the SDGs. Sectors and districts are to prepare costed plans (nutrition being integrated) that will help to meet these national targets. The sectors and districts are aligning their programs and indicators to the national key/core indicators. Plans are still being drafted and will be completed soon. These plans will then be endorsed technically and politically by national, regional and district stakeholders. These plans will have Annual Action plans, that indicate any nutrition activities and monitoring and evaluation arrangements.

**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**

The annual joint assessment is the main forum at which nutrition stakeholders are able to jointly set priorities. Annual review and planning meetings have not however been held to assess progress and determine priorities. Planning for nutrition activities is carried out for a four-year period. These medium-term plans are broken into four annual work plans which are a reflection of the priorities of sectors and districts which have been agreed upon by all stakeholders. These annual work plans are open to slight adjustments based on identified needs and agreed priorities.

Nutrition stakeholders do not always meet as a group to agree on annual priorities, although at organisational level, each sector and district is required to holistically review their plans and adjust them accordingly to achieve the objectives and targets set out in the medium-term policy framework and the results framework. There is often a clear understanding of the gaps in terms of delivery capacity and implementation based on the annual review of the implementation of plans.

**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**

Key national indicators captured in the National Development Results Framework are jointly monitored by all stakeholders. Key nutrition indicators are however obtained from survey data which comes every three or four years.

Multi-sectoral planning is done to monitor and implement priority actions of nutrition activities. Monitoring and evaluation of some key interventions are however often done in isolation or amongst just a few stakeholders, particularly between implementing sectors and financing development partners. Joint progress reports are therefore not meaningfully informed to guide interventions and contribute towards harmonized targeting and coordinated service delivery.

The Nutrition Budget Tracking exercise carried out from February to May 2018, is an example of joint monitoring involving all key stakeholders.
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**

Recommendations made from annual progress and evaluation reports are often used to inform programming that will improve nutrition outcomes. Evaluation reports are often well disseminated. The maternal health survey and national micro-nutrient survey were completed and disseminated during the reporting period. An example of such dissemination can be found in the following report. (https://www.businessghana.com/site/news/general/166522/GHS-holds-joint-dissemination-workshop-on-Ghana-s-Micronutrient-Survey).

Social auditing of results is however limited.

**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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Please provide examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Various Development Partners, including both UN and donors have undertaken the following: • provided technical inputs for various policy development processes • supported government in carrying out population-based surveys such as maternal health survey and national micro-nutrient survey in 2017 and disseminations of results • aligned development partners priorities to national policy and plans and have produced a SUN partner development plan in consultation with NDPC • Provided support for planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the national action plan at different levels through various projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>• Provides nutrient specific products for women in reproductive age and vulnerable groups in Ghana. Some of these products have a seal of approval from the Ghana Standards Authority, certified to provide 18 critical nutrients to women, known as the “Obaasima” seal. These products were developed to support governments efforts in reducing malnutrition in Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>• The CSO platform organized a National Nutrition Summit to assess progress made in implementing the SUN agenda in Ghana and provided a platform for consensus building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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)
There is an increased multi-stakeholder effort to align activities toward the national nutrition priorities that are set in national development policy documents such as the CPESDP and the MTNDPF. The MTNDPF along with the development planning guidelines provide nutrition stakeholders with policy direction and guidance on how to and what to plan for with regards to nutrition from 2018 to 2021. CSOs, Development Partners and the Private sector are all encouraged to align their activities with the strategies in the MTNDPF. Government flagship programs present opportunities to implement nutrition-sensitive interventions. Multi-sectoral planning is done to monitor and implement priority actions of nutrition activities.

The National Results Framework provides targets for all stakeholders to work towards. The set targets are aligned to the SDG targets. Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), as well as sub-national Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies (MMDAs) are in the process of developing costed medium-term plans that are expected to integrate nutrition. Development planning guidelines have been shared with MDAs and MMDAs to prepare their 2018-2021 Medium-Term Development Plans (MTDPs). These planning guidelines have considered nutrition as a critical development priority that needs to be integrated into their plans. Collaboration is a key requirement in developing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating these plans.

Annual nutrition review and planning meetings are not a regular feature of Ghana’s SUN Movement. Annual Joint Assessments provide opportunities for reviews to be undertaken with priorities set to push the nutrition agenda. There is a clear understanding of the gaps in terms of delivery capacity and implementation based on the annual review of sector plans. Key national indicators captured in the National Development Results Framework are jointly monitored by all stakeholders. Key nutrition indicators are however obtained from survey data which comes every three or four years. Monitoring and evaluation of some key interventions is occasionally done in isolation or amongst just a few stakeholders. Annual reports and surveys provide recommendations to improve nutrition programming.

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
Costed estimations of nutrition related actions exist in nutrition relevant sectors such as health, education, WASH, agriculture, and social protection. Budget guidelines are provided by the Ministry of Finance to guide in the costing of budgets. Development partners and CSOs provide inputs into the costing of action plans, whilst parliament reviews the budget allocated to these sectors.

Costed comprehensive multi-sectoral action plans for implementation of nutrition interventions are integrated into sector and district medium-term plans.

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: 2
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE
Budget allocations (estimated expenditure) tracking has started for some government agencies (Agriculture, Health, Education, WASH, Food and Drugs Authority and Social Protection as well as the research body Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). The Food and Nutrition Security Cross-Sectoral Planning Group has attempted to develop a country-specific Budget Tracking Mechanism. There are significant challenges in identifying nutrition relevant programs and the associated budgets allocated. It is hoped that with the preparation of new development plans, Institutions will better isolate nutrition interventions, whilst the Ministry of Finance will code all nutrition-relevant programs to better track allocations and expenditures. Actual expenditure tracking has not yet started.

Progress made in the budget tracking exercise has been shared with all stakeholders (government, CSOs and donor partners)

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: 3
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE
Government Sectors and districts have medium term plans which have indicative financial plans based on the fiscal framework which provides an indicative ceiling for each year. However, sectors and districts prepare annual action plans which identify funding gaps, based on the budget ceilings in guidelines from the Ministry of Finance.

Multi-sectoral platforms provide an avenue for sectors to engage donors on their planned activities and funding gaps for support where necessary. At the implementation level, sectors work with donors to identify areas of funding support, and the funding gaps required.

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: 3
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE
Nutrition-related sector programmes such as the Planting for Food and Jobs program, Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP), School Feeding Program etc. have received pledges from donors. The Ministry of Finance, through the bilateral and debt management systems, follows up to ensure pledges are actualized.

The SUN Donor Partner’ Group also follows up on pledges to ensure they are actualized.

**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: 3**

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE**

The medium-term development plans provide a multi-year development framework, which is implemented through sector and district plans that operationalize policy objectives and strategies that form a compendium of actions for nutrition funding. Government provides budget ceilings for all government agencies three years in advance though the Ministry of Finance’s Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF). Development Partners are able to provide predictable funding through the Multi-Donor Budget Support system that coordinates their support of Government programs. MDAs and MMDAs are able to engage development partners, private sector and CSOs to develop plans that have indicative budgets that highlight off-budget sources of 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Please provide examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>Donor partners have provided various amounts to implementing partners to support programme implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Donor partners have provided various amounts to government sectors to support implementation of programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>The Alliance was part of a training workshop on nutrition budget advocacy which brought together 13 West African countries in Dakar in April 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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)

Funding for nutrition activities is provided for by Government and development partners. Sector and district medium-term development plans provide the basis for costing and allocating finances for nutrition activities. Budget allocations tracking has been undertaken for the 2017 and 2018 financial years. There are however significant challenges in identifying nutrition relevant programs and the associated budgets allocated.
MDAs and MMDAs produce nutrition relevant costed medium-term plans which form the basis for the development of budgets. Due to financial constraints, annual action plans identify funding gaps that development partners and private entities are invited to support. Government provides budget ceilings for all government agencies three years in advance through the Ministry of Finance’s Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF). Development Partners are able to provide predictable funding through the Multi-Donor Budget Support system that coordinates their support for Government programs.

Nutrition-related sector programmes such as the Planting for Food and Jobs program, Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP), School Feeding Program etc. have received pledges from donors. The Ministry of Finance, through the bilateral and debt management systems, follows up to ensure pledges are actualized. The SUN Donor Partner Group also follows up on pledges to ensure they are actualized.
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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINAL SCORE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Scaling up nutrition-specific actions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL SCORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Scaling up nutrition-sensitive actions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Progress in scaling up nutrition-specific interventions
Examples include the promotion of infant and young child feeding, micronutrient supplementation, management of acute malnutrition, food fortification and nutrition education. For each example, please specify the geographical reach, targeted population and delivery approach. (Reference: 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition and the 2016 UN Compendium of Action for Nutrition)

Progress in scaling up nutrition-sensitive interventions
Choose clear examples from relevant sectors that you are including in your review. For each example, please specify the geographical reach, targeted population and delivery approach. (Reference: 2013 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Nutrition and the 2016 UN Compendium of Action for Nutrition)
Annex 1: Identified priorities

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities identified in most recent JAA?</th>
<th>Has this priority been met?</th>
<th>What actions took place to ensure the priority could be met?</th>
<th>Did you receive external technical assistance to meet this priority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enter priority</strong></td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td>Please outline stakeholders’ contributions (government, UN, CSOs, donors, etc.)</td>
<td>If yes, please explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Formation of inter-ministerial committee under the Office of the President to shore up political will for prioritising nutrition</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Streamlining SUN coordination at all levels</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Completion of a nationally costed nutrition scale-up plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Completion of budget and expenditure tracking exercise with resource mobilisation strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Launching of the SUN Business Platform</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Create a database/platform for all
2. Convene regular meetings, maintain focal persons from institutions, and strengthen leadership
3. Intensify local level coordination
4. Strengthen nutrition advocacy, look for champions and finalise advocacy and communication strategy
5. Set up business platform
6. Strengthen monitoring of 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

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.)?
   - Yes
   - Army worm infestation affected thousands of maize farms

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)?
   - Yes
   - An Emergency Preparedness Response Plan was developed to respond to a recent cholera outbreak. It is nutrition sensitive

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?
   - No
   - Please explain:

4. What are the key limitations faced at the country level in terms of linking development and humanitarian nutrition actions?
   - Although the key agencies responsible for responding to emergencies, that is the National Disaster Management Organisation (NADMO) and the Ministry of Defence (MoD), have not been directly engaged by the CSPG on linking development to humanitarian nutrition actions, NADMO has worked with agencies like Ghana Health Service in cases of emergency, to provide nutritious foods and health services.

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

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?
   - Yes
   - The Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection (MoGCSP) are a part of Ghana’s nutrition MSP

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?
   - Yes
   - The CSPG engages UNICEF and GHACCSSUN

3. How does the MSP ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls as part of their work plan?
   - Government of Ghana insists that gender equality and equity is mainstreamed into all development programs. The development planning guidelines requests all MDAs and MMDAs to be gender sensitive in their programming.
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?

Laws and policies are gender sensitive. Social protection schemes such as the LEAP 1000 targets pregnant and lactating mothers from poor backgrounds for financial support to improve their nutrition status.

5. Have you analysed or done a stock take of existing nutrition policies, legislation and regulations from a gender perspective?

Yes

6. Does your country have a national gender equality and/or women’s empowerment policy or strategy in place?

Yes, launched in May 2015 by the former Minister of Gender, Children and Social Protection. This policy is nutrition sensitive.

7. Has advocacy been undertaken for gender-sensitive and pro-female policy-making and legislation on nutrition?

Yes, gender rights are ensured by the 1992 constitution. Many institutions and individuals regularly advocate for the rights of women and girls, whilst successive policy frameworks and presidential CPESDP’s have advocated for the implementation of gender sensitive programmes.

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

The Kufuor Foundation launched the Zero Hunger Strategy in collaboration with WFP. Numerous media houses were invited to the event.

2. Are parliamentarians actively contributing to improve nutrition, in collaboration with the MSP?

Yes

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.

There is a Parliamentary Caucus on Hunger and Malnutrition which is often engaged by GHACCSSUN.

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 First Lady of Ghana and the Minister of Gender, Children and Social Protection. Parliamentarians such as Honourable Appiah-Pinkrah continue to champion nutrition in parliament.

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

CSOs Nutrition Summit (November 2018)
### Annex 5: Participants at the 2018 Joint-Assessment of the national multi-stakeholder platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title (Ms./Mr.)</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Specific SUN role (if applicable)</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Should contact be included in the SUN mailing list?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tadria Sophie</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sophie.tadria@fao.org">Sophie.tadria@fao.org</a></td>
<td>0265406509</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abdallah Yussif</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Abdallahy11@gmail.com">Abdallahy11@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>0547230110</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Aboagye</td>
<td>WIAD-MOFA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:pkfaboagye@yahoo.com">pkfaboagye@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0550239019</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jolene Mateko Nyarko</td>
<td>CSIR (FRI)</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jolenenyako@yahoo.co.uk">jolenenyako@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>0268615206</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sethina A. Okornoe</td>
<td>MSWR</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sethinao@yahoo.com">sethinao@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0243282100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mavis Adoko</td>
<td>MSWR</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mavis_ad@yahoo.com">Mavis_ad@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0244060989</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deborah Aboagye</td>
<td>MELR</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Akosuaghanah6@gmail.com">Akosuaghanah6@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>0548029281</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Welbeck Amoani Twum</td>
<td>MoGCSP</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bmswelbeck@yahoo.com">bmswelbeck@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0244138096</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kie Kanda</td>
<td>JICA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kanda.kie@jica.go.jp">Kanda.kie@jica.go.jp</a></td>
<td>0244871042</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abraham Mahama</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:amahama@unicef.org">amahama@unicef.org</a></td>
<td>0504230042</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Juliana Pwamang</td>
<td>USAID-Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jpwamang@usaid.gov">jpwamang@usaid.gov</a></td>
<td>0244311932</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Georgina N A Borlu</td>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Georgina.borlu@ndpc.gov.gh">Georgina.borlu@ndpc.gov.gh</a></td>
<td>0506781368</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moses Agyemang</td>
<td>PEF</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:magyemang@pef.org.gh">magyemang@pef.org.gh</a></td>
<td>0262957954</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick Yangtul</td>
<td>PEF</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:f.yangtul@yahoo.com">f.yangtul@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>050600450</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kwaku Botwe</td>
<td>GNUTA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kwakubotwe@execs.com">Kwakubotwe@execs.com</a></td>
<td>0244998642</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gloria Aryee</td>
<td>FDA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Gloria.aryee@fdaghana.gov.gh">Gloria.aryee@fdaghana.gov.gh</a></td>
<td>0243089522</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Efua Amissah-Arthur</td>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:e.amissah-arthur@afdb.org">e.amissah-arthur@afdb.org</a></td>
<td>0246611518</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac F Mensa-Bonsu</td>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ifmensabonsu@ndpc.gov.gh">ifmensabonsu@ndpc.gov.gh</a></td>
<td>0208171556</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Nyamiah</td>
<td>MoF</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Nyamiah63@yahoo.com">Nyamiah63@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0266151538</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony T. seddoh</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:aseddoh@ifc.org">aseddoh@ifc.org</a></td>
<td>0544341835</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aminu Zuleaha</td>
<td>MOH</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mazulleiha@gmail.com">mazulleiha@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>0244710156</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leticia Osafo-Addo</td>
<td>Samba</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sambaolec@yahoo.com">sambaolec@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0244694682</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Elfrida A. N. D. Ashong</td>
<td>MESTI</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elfridapremier@yahoo.com">elfridapremier@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0244976561</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Harriet Agyei-Asare</td>
<td>MoE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Harriet.moegh@gmail.com">Harriet.moegh@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>0243054211</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Wilhelmina Okwabi</td>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:waokwabi@yahoo.com">waokwabi@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0244212352</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Paulina S. Addy</td>
<td>WIAD-MOFA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Addypolly@yahoo.com">Addypolly@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0244422712</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Sandra Amankwa</td>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sandra.kesse-amankwa@ndpc.gov.gh">Sandra.kesse-amankwa@ndpc.gov.gh</a></td>
<td>0244691931</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Emmanuel K. Abotsi</td>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Emmanuel.abotsi@ndpc.gov.gh">Emmanuel.abotsi@ndpc.gov.gh</a></td>
<td>0204095051</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Noye Gifty</td>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Gifty.noye@ndpc.gov.gh">Gifty.noye@ndpc.gov.gh</a></td>
<td>0546237955</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Mercy A. Issah</td>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mercy.azoomahissah@ndpc.gov.gh">Mercy.azoomahissah@ndpc.gov.gh</a></td>
<td>0546237955</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Christopher P. K. Conduah</td>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Christopher.conduah@ndpc.gov.gh">Christopher.conduah@ndpc.gov.gh</a></td>
<td>0246108875</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Lovia Afoakwa</td>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lovia.afoakwa@ndpc.gov.gh">Lovia.afoakwa@ndpc.gov.gh</a></td>
<td>0242957709</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Nii-Odoi Odotei</td>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Niiiodoi.odotei@ndpc.gov.gh">Niiiodoi.odotei@ndpc.gov.gh</a></td>
<td>0504228675</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Eugenai Awuah-Adjapong</td>
<td>NDPC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Eugenia.donkoh@ndpc.gov.gh">Eugenia.donkoh@ndpc.gov.gh</a></td>
<td>0242773859</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Joshua Nana Yirenkyi</td>
<td>Hunger Alliance</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yknanakwesi@gmail.com">yknanakwesi@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>0265509035</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>