**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)

Lao PDR

**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?

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

2. How many participated in the Joint-Assessment process? **more than 10**

Of these, please indicate how many participants were female and how many were male **NA**
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 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and validation</td>
<td>Meeting Email X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<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
4

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- The National Nutrition Committee (NNC) was established in 2013 and it is chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister. Two NNC meetings were held during the reporting period; one in July 2017 and the second meeting in November, 2017 which joint with the National Nutrition Forum which brought together over 200 multi-sectoral stakeholders from the national and sub national levels including development partners, donors and academia. Both meetings were chaired by the Vice Prime Minister. The second National nutrition committee meeting was held back to back with the 1st national nutrition symposium which attended by more than 350 participant form national and international stakeholders, scientist, academicians, policy makers, implementers and others. The symposium were presented evidenced based research finding, the best practices, lessons learnt at global, regional, national and subnational levels.

- The National Nutrition Committee Secretariat is hosted by the Ministry of Health and chaired by its Vice Minister. The NNC Secretariat held quarterly meetings during the reporting period with the participation of the various multi stakeholder platforms. The Secretariat has benefitted from immense logistical and Technical Support from the donors and development partners networks.

- The SUN business network was launched in the country in June 2018 with a total of 220 participants, up to now there are 19 business networks registered. The other SUN Country networks (UN, CSA and Donors) are already in place and actively involved in various SUN activities in the country.

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, grass root-focused organisations, or the executive branch of government, for example.

FINAL SCORE
3

Increased interaction and consultation across departments and ministries was observed during the period under review with various sectors leveraging on technical expertise of the multi stakeholder platforms as part of Technical Working Groups (TWGs)

The NNC Secretariat participates regularly in the SUN global calls and discussions.

The SUN Country Network focal person participated in the global SUN conference in Abidjan in 2017 where country experiences in SUN was shared

Nutrition stakeholders and SUN focal point participate in SUN teleconferences

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.

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.

An overview of the nutrition situation in the country and update on indicators of the NNSPA (2016-20) is an agenda item on the Annual Nutrition Forum. The most recent surveys and institutional reports serve as the basis for reporting. In November 2017, the NNC-Secretariat gave a summary presentation on progress made in achieving the targets of the NNSPA (2016-2020) as well as other global targets such as the World Health Assembly (WHA) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) targets. Key areas where progress has been slow were highlighted for priority action.

One product of the annual nutrition forum is the “Outcome Statement” that highlights key deliberations and decisions. It serves as the rallying point for multi-sectoral collaboration and prioritization of nutrition
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 multi-stakeholder approach in the country enjoys the patronage of duty bearers (politicians). The Vice Prime Minister serving as the Chair of the National Nutrition Committee and the Deputy Provincial Governors as Chairs for the Provincial Nutrition Coordination Committees exemplifies this.
- The high political commitment to sustain the multi-stakeholder approach to nutrition is a result of the sustained advocacy by the various SUN Country Networks (donors, UN, and CSAs).
- The National Assembly has prioritized 2 nutrition indicators (stunted and underweight of children under 5) included the national social economic development and graduation from the least developed country plan. The national assembly has endorsed the target of national indicator annually aligning with the SDG2 target. The updates are submitted biannually by the NNC-Secretariat as part of its progress report.

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>- UNICEF/WFP to comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>- EU to comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>- WFP to comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>- CSA network to comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

Lao PDR continues to harness the opportunities of the various multi-stakeholder platforms for increased nutrition governance at all levels from the national to sub national levels. Government prioritizes nutrition as a development issue and updates on the nutrition situation are submitted biannually to the national assembly.
The reporting period saw an increased interaction among members of the multi stakeholder platforms through various technical working groups.

The SUN business network was successfully launched this year; the other SUN Country Networks are active and hold periodic meetings in advancement of the nutrition agenda.

Ten Provincial Nutrition Coordinators were recruited to facilitate multi stakeholder coordination at the subnational level.

**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**

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

- Landscape analysis on food fortification, Cost of Diet and Nutrient gap analysis were conducted by secretariat of National nutrition committee technical and funding support by WFP. The analysis is informed policy and strategy in particular that is fundamental for development of the national food fortification strategic plan and Midterm review of the National Action Plan 2016-2020
- The code of marketing of breast milk substitutes will be submitted to government for endorsement in 2018. The process of its development have been technical and final support by various agencies including UNICEF, WHO, WFP, Alive Thrives, Save Children and others

**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.

**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**

3

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE**

- NNC Secretariat with support from Development partners (UNICEF, USAID Nurture - led by Save the Children, SUN CSA, EU, World Bank, WFP, WHO) is developing a multi-sectoral Social and Behavioral Change Communication Strategic Action Plan. This is to include a NPAN dissemination plan and advocacy materials.

- The NNC Secretariat is linked to existing sector coordination mechanisms (SWG/TWG, National Assembly sessions and the Round Table process) which facilitates integration of nutrition priorities into national policy, plans and budgets

- The Ministry of Health through its line departments facilitated the development of a number of nutrition specific guidelines and strategies through a broad based consultative process to support service delivery;
  - National Guideline of Integrated Management of Acute Malnutrition
  - National Micronutrients and Deworming Guidelines
  - Nutrition Village Model Guidelines
  - National Social Behavioural Change Strategy
  - National strategic plan for Food fortification
  - Nutrition Supply Forecasting and Management

- A two meeting was organized by the NNC Secretariat to review sectoral indicators contained in the NNSPA and proposals for the establishment of a Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Surveillance System

- The legislation on the Code of Marketing of Breast milk Substitutes will be endorsed in this year then follow by law enforcements

**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**

2

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE**

- 5 months maternity leave for civil servant as Prime-ministerial decree have been nationwide implemented among governmental organizations

- It is currently advocate to health professional for compliance with the Code of Marketing of Breast milk Substitutes, revitalizing baby friendly hospitals and promoting breast milk corner at hospitals
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Please provide examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>- Provided support (UNICEF) for the development of National Guidelines on Integrated Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL SCORE**

1

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE**

The extent to which existing policies and legislations have been evaluated to document and share best practices and lessons learned remains limited.

**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).

**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 country updated and developed a number of guidelines, policies and implementation strategies through broad based consultative processes involving the multi stakeholder platforms. This is expected to strengthen the legal frameworks and ensure that interventions are implemented more coherently in line with recommended protocols. The processes benefitted from the technical and financial support of development partners such as UNICEF, WFP, the EU among others. The code on marketing of breastmilk substitutes was also endorsed by the government. A group of experts are drafting the code in a form of a decree for the endorsement of the General Assembly.
Process marker 3.1: Align existing actions around national nutrition targets/policies

- Provided support (UNICEF) for the development of National Guidelines on Micronutrients and Deworming
- Provided support (WFP) developing Food fortification strategy

**Donor**
- Provides financial assistance in support of the nutrition specific and sensitive intervention including advocacy
- Ongoing advocacy meetings and dialogue in support of relevant policy and legislation update and/ or development.

**Business**
- Initial recruitment of SUN business network with support by WFP

**CSO**
- Regularly CSA network

---

**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.
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 |
- The nutrition Stakeholder and Action mapping which was done in 2016 will be updated in 2018 to determine coverage of the 22 priority interventions as well as actors across the country.
- The results of the Lao Social Indicator Survey (2017) provides another opportunity for evidence based programming and advocacy. Following the release of the results, about 8 provinces were identified as hotspots for stunting and government is rallying support to address the very high prevalence reported.

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 | 3 |
| EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE |
- Lao PDR has a National Plan of Action on Nutrition (NPAN) 2016-2020 updated in 2015 under the leadership of the National Nutrition Committee Secretariat. It places emphasis on reducing high levels of under nutrition among children and women, particularly stunting and anemia and includes national targets to be reached by 2020. This NPAN includes priority interventions (22 first priority and 7 second priority) in health, agriculture and education sectors and multi-sectoral. The Plan includes, for each of the priority interventions: the main activities to be implemented and their estimated cost; the target groups; and the principal stakeholders responsible. The coordination mechanism is also outlined.
- A monitoring and evaluation framework has been drafted with support from MQSUN and input from country level nutrition stakeholders. This is currently being reviewed by the different sectors and is due to be finalized in 2017.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders observed weaknesses in nutrition service delivery primarily due to weak capacity of health staff, use of out dated policies and protocols. The reporting period saw the revision and development of several nutrition specific guidelines, job aids and protocols for the management of acute malnutrition, micronutrient supplementation, SBCC, breastfeeding etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders are coordinating their technical and financial support for the nationwide roll out of nutrition related trainings in the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 contributes towards harmonised targeting and coordinated service delivery among in-country stakeholders.

### FINAL SCORE

| 3 |

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE**

- Efforts are also ongoing to strengthen the information systems that are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition (e.g. HMIS/ DHIS2). An International consultant has been recruited to support in this regard
- A multi-sectoral nutrition surveillance system is been established to monitor progress and implementation of the NPAN.
- Lao initiate the National Nutrition Platform (NIPN) funded by EU through technical support by UNICEF

### 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

| (One score per progress marker) 3 |

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE**

(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

| 3 |

### 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**

Please provide examples
The UN network provides continued financial and technical support to strengthen the information systems which are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition (e.g. WHO support to HMIS/ DHIS2).

Donors - EU, WB, SDC USAID LUX Development have actively involved in Nutrition funding.

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 Lao Social Indicator Survey (2017) was released this year with significant progress made in stunting reduction, Rate of Children Under 5 stunted is 33%, Underweight at 21% and Wasting 9%. The release of the results coincides with the mid term review of the NPAN and expected to inform the update of the Common Results Framework and rally multi stakeholders platform for action.

Strengthening the routine nutrition information management system remains a priority. A multi sectoral nutrition surveillance system is being established to improve stakeholder actions and response as well as monitoring of progress.

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
(One score per progress marker) 3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE
(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

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**  
(One score per progress marker) 3

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE**  
(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.) 3

### 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**  
(One score per progress marker) 3

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE**  
(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)

### 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**

- National budget allocation has increased for some priority nutrition actions: e.g. procurement of nutrition commodities, capacity building and monitoring.
- Key donors have contributed to support the NPAN 2016-2020 and allocate funding to nutrition priorities (e.g. EU, USAID, SDC, Lux Dev, World Bank). Private sector is becoming increasingly engaged (e.g. MMG)
- Budget allocated to nutrition sensitive agriculture has increased thanks to new projects such as GAFSP Efforts to strengthen disbursement tracking are ongoing.

### 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**

- Efforts are increasing by GoL and key donors to provide longer term funding for nutrition.

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Please provide examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>Provided financial and technical support for implementation of nutrition specific and sensitive interventions at the national and sub national levels. The UN agencies co-funded the annual nutrition symposium through the NNC-secretariat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Major donors such as EU, World Bank, Lux Dev, SDC, USAID and others continue to support the implementation of the NNSPA (2016-2020) in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td></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)
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>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINAL SCORE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress in scaling up nutrition-specific interventions**

The GoL continues to prioritize the scale up of high impact and evidence based nutrition interventions at all levels of service delivery within the continuum of health care. During the reporting period, the GoL prioritized development of new guidelines, protocols and policies to support nutrition service delivery. Some nutrition specific interventions such as micronutrient supplementation, Infant and young child feeding counselling, deworming and others are currently delivered nationwide. A detailed roll out plan was developed for Integrated management of severe acute malnutrition in the country. The GoL is also in the process of upgrading the Nutrition Centre to a National Nutrition Institute with mandate to provide technical training and support for implementation of nutrition interventions in the country.

**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. Development of the SBCC SAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strengthening subnational nutrition coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 Provincial Nutrition coordinators were recruited to facilitate multi-sectoral nutrition coordination at the sub national level. The UN and donors (EU) provided support for the recruitment, salary, workstations and vehicles for each of the coordinators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Upgrading the Code of Marketing of Breastmilk substitutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Code of Marketing of Breastmilk substitutes was upgraded and endorsed by the GoL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strengthening the nutrition information system</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>An international consultant is on board to support the establishment of a multi sectoral nutrition surveillance system as well as to review of the routine nutrition information system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. High-level event on nutrition- National Nutrition Forum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The annual National Nutrition Forum came off successfully in November 2017, which brought together over 200 participants from the national and sub national levels including development partners and donors.</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. High Political will and commitment
2. Significant ownership of key sectors at national and subnational level, alignment of internal support to NPAN
3. multispectral coordination strengthened
4. established forum for sharing the best practices evidenced lessons learnt
5. Stunting reduced and underweight reduced

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
   | Please explain:

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
   | Please explain:

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?

   | Please explain: It will be included in the coming midterm review

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? If not a part of the MSP, how do you engage with this Ministry/Department?

   | Yes
   | Please explain:

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
   | Please explain:

3. How does the MSP ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls as part of their work plan?

   | Please explain: Target of implementation are women and children

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: Sensitive and specific nutrition intervention targeted women

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

   | No

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

   | Yes
### Annex 4: Advocacy and communication for nutrition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Do you engage with the media to amplify key messages, create awareness and demand for action on nutrition? | Yes    | If yes, please provide specific examples of how you have engaged the media, which stakeholders were involved in supporting the engagement and what the results have been. Please share relevant material such as communications/ media engagement plans, advocacy material shared with the media, press releases, newspaper articles, video clips etc. 
Examples: Mass media broadcasting on the nutrition advocacy and key messages |
| 2. Are parliamentarians actively contributing to improve nutrition, in collaboration with the MSP? | Yes    | If yes, please provide specific examples of how parliamentarians have engaged, which stakeholders that supported their engagement and what the results have been. Please share relevant material such as ToRs or action plans for Parliamentary networks or groups, budget tracking reports, reports from nutrition debates in parliament, speeches, press releases, newspaper articles, video clips etc. 
Examples: Approval government budget on nutrition, Field visit, advocacy, monitoring the progress of indicator achievement |
| 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? | No     | If yes, please provide specific examples of who the champions are, how they have been engaging, which stakeholders that supported their engagement, and what the results have been. Please also share relevant material such as Nutrition Champion engagement plans, speeches, press releases, newspaper articles, video clips and other material etc. 
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? | Yes    | If yes, please provide specific examples of the successes and best practices you have documented, the stakeholders involved in documenting them, as well as how you have communicated them. Please share relevant material such as case studies or reports of advocacy successes and/or best practice etc. 
Examples: The 1st nutrition symposium outcome |
5. Do you plan on organising a high-level event on nutrition in the upcoming period?

Yes

If yes, please provide details about the objectives and expected outcomes of the event, key stakeholders you plan to involve as well as the estimated date and location.

Details: Annual Nation Nutrition Committee and Nutrition Forum

### 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>DR.</td>
<td>Chandavone PHOXAY</td>
<td>National Nutrition Center</td>
<td>SUN Focal Point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Prosper</td>
<td>Technical Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Karan</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Khizar</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Khamseng</td>
<td>National Nutrition Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Ratthiphone</td>
<td>National Nutrition Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>