

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

# 2018 REPORTING TEMPLATE



(APRIL 2017-APRIL 2018)

Name of Country

Lesotho

## About the 2018 Joint-Assessment

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

## Participants

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

Group	Yes (provide number)/No (= 0)
Government	15
Civil society	2
Donors	0
United Nations	3
Business	1
Science and academia	2
Other (please specify)	

2. How many participated in the Joint-Assessment process? 23

Of these, please indicate how many participants were female and how many were male 6

**Process**

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

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

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?

\_\_\_\_ Yes. \_\_\_\_ It gave us an opportunity to cement our renewed corporation as illustrated in several joint activities such as the Zero Hunger Strategic review, and Stakeholder Mapping exercise that are currently under way. It was a platform for more advocacy for a joint effort in addressing malnutrition and helping relatively new stakeholders to better understand their role in this effort. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**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**

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



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

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

**Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.**

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

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

#### FINAL SCORE : 2

*(One score per progress marker)*

#### 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.)*

- a) Lesotho has managed to establish four national SUN networks (1.Business, 2.Research and Academia, 3. Media, 4. CSO and 5. UN networks) with financial support from REACH, UNICEF and WFP (Please refer to 2017 template for initial process). Out of the 5, the UN network is currently the only one fully functional. Terms of Reference for the MSP are not yet customized, although the Multi-stakeholder Platform is still provided through the traditional means FNCO have been using before.
- b) FNCO is the focal point in the person of the Regional Food and Nutrition Coordinator Mr. Tiisetso Elias, formal official letter has not yet been submitted to the secretariat.
- c) Appointment of other Focal Points/Conveners has not yet been carried out but will be done as soon as the platforms have been established..

### 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, grassroots-focused organisations, or the executive branch of government, for example.*

**FINAL SCORE : 2**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

**Over and above progress reported in the 2017 joint assessment, various achievements have been realized.**

The Food and Nutrition Coordinating Office (FNCO) brought together a wide multi-disciplinary team of experts including many hours of consultations with an even wider array of sectors/stakeholders at both national and district levels and across multiple sectors in conducting the zero hunger strategic review **(Report available online.....)**

The strategy explicitly outline the role that different stakeholders have to play in order to end hunger in Lesotho by 2030. This will go a long way in terms of advocacy for broadening multi-stakeholder participation in addressing malnutrition in the country. This multi-stakeholder collaboration also extended to the development of other important documents to be singularly listed under progress 2 of this report.

**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 : 1**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

**This score remains the same as one for the last joint assessment and for the same reasons.**

### 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 : 2**

*(One score per progress marker)*

#### 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.)*

The situation on this progress marker remains the same, save for the fact that a social change and behaviour change communication strategy for nutrition has been developed with assistance from UNICEF the hope is that operationalization of this strategy will go a long way to enhance progress related to this marker.

### 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 : 2**

*(One score per progress marker)*

#### 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.)*

**An achievement that stand out in this regard is the inclusion of nutrition in the National Strategic Development Plan 2017/18 to 2021/22 which justified the increase of the score from 1 in the last assessment to 2 this time around.**

### Key contribution of each stakeholder to Process 1

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

Stakeholders	Please provide examples
UN	- WFP, UNICEF, WHO
Donor	- REACH/IRISH CONSULATE
Business	- REMOTE FOODS, LESOTHO FLOUR MILLS

CSO	- EGPAF, NUTRIPOWER, WORLD VISION, TED
-----	--

**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)

As will be evident in other progress markers on this template there has been various activities bringing together multi-stakeholders.....



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

**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.)*

- a) The Lesotho nutrition strategy has now been developed and is soon to be costed to facilitate its adoption.
- b) The food fortification legislation as adopted in the nutrition policy is currently under way and is expected be finished before the end of the year, this includes advocacy for bio-fortification, currently promoted through beans.
- c) Nutrition has been integrated into the National Strategic Plan (.....)For the first time.

**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**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

- a) Social behavior change and communication strategy for nutrition has been developed along with a workplace for its implementation.
- b) A multi-sectoral national campaign for 'Early moments matter, a programme designed for early childhood care and development.
- c) WHO HIV/AIDS and nutrition guidelines have been adopted.
- d) AU champion mobilized resources for nutrition to support social protection (this being a nutrition sensitive progress)
- e) Through his efforts as the African Union Champion for nutrition and FAO special ambassador for nutrition Lesotho is due to hold a high-level nutrition forum come October (The forum is supported by World Bank) This will open up many opportunities that will impact on the nutrition situation of the country). Invitations are already being processed including invitation to the secretariat itself.
- f) Various workshops, media briefings and bulletins are continuously carried-out towards disseminating relevant nutrition messages, this will be greatly improved with the adoption of behavior change communication strategy recently developed as illustrated in the above.

**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**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

The Ministry of Health has developed a work plan on non-communicable diseases and is making arrangement to develop a policy on the same.

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

**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.)*

Although there has been much development around this Progress marker, most of our policy and legal frameworks are not at the stage where they can be operationalized or enforced, reference should be made to the 2017 joint annual assessment as well as the policy and legal frameworks currently developed as referred to in the last progress marker.

**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 : 2**  
*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

Please refer to 2017 joint annual report

**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).*

Stakeholders	<i>Please provide examples</i>
UN	- WFP, UNICEF, FAO, WHO
Donor	- Irish aid/REACH

Business	- REMOTE FOODS, LESOTHO FLOUR MILLS, PULAMALIBOHO NUTRITION AND HEALTH CONSULTING
CSO	- EGPAF, NUTRIPOWER, WORLD VISION, TED
<b>OVERALL SUMMARY OF PROGRESS ACHIEVED OVER THE PAST YEAR (April 2017 to April 2018) FOR PROCESS 2: Coherent policy and legal framework</b> (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)	



### 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 : 2**

*(One score per progress marker)*

#### 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.)*

Several tools are in the process of being developed while some await proper adoption in the pursuit to align existing actions around national nutrition target, some of these efforts have been mentioned in the progress markers before:

- a) Zero hunger strategy and roadmap
- b) Monitoring and Evaluation framework contained in the food and nutrition policy
- c) Incorporation of nutrition in the National Strategic Plan 2 and the
- d) The UN inventory of agencies working in areas related to nutrition.

### 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**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

Related policy and legal frameworks and related strategic tools not yet at this stage of operation.

### 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**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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 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**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

Please refer to 2017 joint annual assessment

### 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 : 2**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

**Please refer to 2017 joint annual assessment**

### 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
UN	- Same as in above progress markers
Donor	- Same as in above progress markers
Business	- Same as in above progress markers
CSO	- Same as in above progress markers

### 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 Zero hunger strategic review and the national nutrition strategy will help facilitate a focused Common Results Framework for National Nutrition Plan and aligned 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 : 1**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

**Please refer to 2017 JA**

#### 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 : 1**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

**PLEASE REFER TO JA 2017**

#### 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 : 1**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

**PLEASE REFER TO JA 2017**

#### 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 : 0**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

PLEASE REFER TO JA 2017

### 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**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**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.)*

### Key contributions of each stakeholder to Process 4

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

Stakeholders	Please provide examples
UN	- SEE ABOVE PROGRESS MARKER
Donor	- SEE ABOVE PROGRESS MARKER
Business	- SEE ABOVE PROGRESS MARKER
CSO	- SEE ABOVE PROGRESS MARKER

**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).*

### FINAL SCORE : 2

*(Scaling up nutrition-specific actions)*

### FINAL SCORE : 1

*(Scaling up nutrition-sensitive actions)*

### 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)*

The traditional approach of focus on nutrition specific interventions continues, so that scaling up this interventions still enjoy significant attention, adoption of homegrown school feeding programme is one example.

#### **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)*

Adequate recognition of nutrition sensitive interventions is still a challenge and as such implies a challenge even to score this particular progress marker, as the scoring might not be full representative however, the team scored this progress 1 as indeed there are some trackable nutrition sensitive interventions.

**Annex 1: Identified priorities**

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

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

Please list key 2018-2019 priorities for the MSP

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

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

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

### Annex 2: Emergency preparedness and response planning

<p>1. Within the reporting period (i.e. the past year), has the country faced and responded to a humanitarian situation? If yes, what was the duration and type(s) of emergency (e.g. natural and climate-related disasters, communal violence, armed conflict etc.)?</p>	<p>Yes or No</p> <p>Please explain:</p>
<p>2. Does the country have a national plan on emergency preparedness and response? If yes, does it include nutrition actions and indicators (both nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive)?</p>	<p>Yes or No</p> <p>Please explain:</p>
<p>3. Is the MSP involved in discussions and planning for emergency preparedness and response? If yes, does the MSP engage with humanitarian partners, and how does the MSP contribute to linking development and humanitarian nutrition actions?</p>	<p>Yes or No</p> <p>Please explain:</p>
<p>4. What are the key limitations faced at the country level in terms of linking development and humanitarian nutrition actions?</p>	<p>Please explain:</p>

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

<p>1. Does the MSP engage with a governmental Ministry or Department that is responsible for women's affairs/gender equality? If yes, what is the name of this Ministry/Department?</p> <p>If not a part of the MSP, how do you engage with this Ministry/Department?</p>	<p>Yes or No</p> <p>Please explain:</p>
<p>2. Does the MSP engage with other non-state actors that are responsible for gender equality and the empowerment of women (such as UN Women or civil society organisations)? If yes, with whom do you engage?</p>	<p>Yes or No</p> <p>Please explain:</p>
<p>3. How does the MSP ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls as part of their work plan?</p>	<p>Please explain:</p>
<p>4. What actions are identified and implemented by the MSP to ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls at the community level?</p>	<p>Please explain:</p>
<p>5. Have you analysed or done a stock take of existing nutrition policies, legislation and regulations from a gender perspective?</p>	<p>Yes or No</p>

6.	Does your country have a national gender equality and/or women's empowerment policy or strategy in place?	Yes or No  Please explain:
7.	Has advocacy been undertaken for gender-sensitive and pro-female policy-making and legislation on nutrition?	Yes or No  Please explain:

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

1.	Do you engage with the media to amplify key messages, create awareness and demand for action on nutrition?	Yes or No  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:
2.	Are parliamentarians actively contributing to improve nutrition, in collaboration with the MSP?  <i>Examples could include the existence of an active Parliamentary network or group focusing on food security and nutrition, votes in support of legal or budget changes that the MSP suggested, debates in parliament on nutrition or other concrete actions taken by parliamentarians in support of improved nutrition.</i>	Yes or No  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:
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 or 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	Yes or No  If yes, please provide specific examples of the successes and best practices you have documented, the stakeholders involved in documenting them, as well as

<p>them nationally and/or with regional and global partners?</p>	<p>how you have communicated them. Please share relevant material such as case studies or reports of advocacy successes and/or best practice etc.</p> <p>Examples:</p>
<p>5. Do you plan on organising a high-level event on nutrition in the upcoming period?</p>	<p>Yes or No</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Details:</p>

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

No	Title (Ms./Mr.)	Name	Organisation	Specific SUN role (if applicable)	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in the SUN mailing list?
1.	Ms.	'Mathapelo Sethunya	FNCO	n/a	masethunya@gmail.com	62700547	Not necessary
2.	Ms.	Tselane Ramokhoro	FNCO	n/a	tselaneramokhoro@gmail.com	62999994	Not necessary
3.	Ms.	Pulane Makitle	Disaster Management Authority	n/a	p.makitle@live.com	58068509	Not necessary
4.	Ms.	Mpho Lifalakane	FNCO	n/a	mpholifalakane@yahoo.com	58818388	Not necessary
5.	Ms.	'Mamohau Mohlotsane	Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) - ECCD	n/a	mmohlotsane@rockmail.com	59075330	Not necessary
6.	Ms.	Kekeletso Mabeleng	EGPAF	n/a	kmabeleng@pedaids.org	63031538	Not necessary
7.	Ms.	Nteboheleng Mothae	FNCO	n/a	mothaentebohelengc@gmail.com	63623849	Not necessary

8.	Ms.	Lineo Mathule	UNICEF	n/a	lmathule@unicef.org	to be provided later	yes
9.	Ms,	Maseqobela Williams	FNCO/WFP	REACH FACILITATOR	maseqobela.williams@wfp.org	57372888	yes
10.	Ms.	Mohlakotsana Mokhehle	Ministry of Health	n/a	hlakomok@gmail.com	58900297	Not necessary
11.	Mr.	Tiisetso Elias	FNCO	SUN Government Focal Point	qondaelias@gmail.com	58907765	yes
12.	Ms.	'Matseleng Mojakhomo	FNCO	n/a	mmmojakhomo@yahoo.com	5874494	Not necessary
13.	Mr.	Phoka Mofao	Nutripower Organization	n/a	phoka@nutripower.org.ls	59003732	Not necessary
14.	Mr.	Rethabile Mokorosi	Remote Foods	n/a	rmokorosi@gmail.com	58740001	Not necessary
15.	Ms.	Mamorakane Rafeea	FNCO	n/a	momorakaner@gmail.com	58703095	Not necessary
16.	Ms.	Nthabeleng Sefako	FNCO	n/a	nthabelengsefako@hotmail.com	62880206	Not necessary
17.	Ms.	Merlyn Chapfunga	WFP	n/a	mrlyn.chapfunga@wfp.org	5880070	Not necessary
18.	Ms.	Makamohelo Semoli	Lesotho Agricultural College	n/a	makamohelosemuli@yahoo.co.uk	58023287	Not necessary
19.	Mr.	Jubilee Ntloana	MOET/ECCD	n/a	<a href="mailto:Jntloana70@gmail.com">Jntloana70@gmail.com</a>	58787962	Not necessary
20.	Mr.	Mpaki Makara	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS)	n/a	<a href="mailto:makaramo@yahoo.com">makaramo@yahoo.com</a>	22314231	Not necessary
21.	Mr.	Kebitsaman g Mothibe	National University of Lesotho	n/a	kj.mothibe@nul.ls	to be provided	Not necessary

---

22.	Ms.	Maneo Jane	MAFS- Nutrition		<a href="mailto:manejane@yahoo.com">manejane@yahoo.com</a>	<b>57059459</b>	<b>Not necessar y</b>
23.	Ms.	Bernadett Bereng	Lesotho Correctional Services	n/a	<a href="mailto:Molata.bereng@yahoo.com">Molata.bereng@yahoo.com</a>	<b>63107679</b>	<b>Not necessar y</b>

---



---