

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)

## Liberia

### 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	Yes/ (4), MOH, MOA, MOE, MOC
Civil society	Yes/ (1)
Donors	Yes/(1)
United Nations	Yes/ (2) Unicef, WFP
Business	NO
Science and academia	NO

Other (please specify)	Yes (CRS, MTI)
------------------------	----------------

2. How many participated in the Joint-Assessment process? 18

Of these, please indicate how many participants were female and how many were male 6 and 12

**Process**

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

Step	Format
Collection	<u>Meeting</u> Email
Review and validation	Meeting <u>Email</u>



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, Yes

Why? Coming to a consensus in a constructive way was very helpful, everyone where open and willing to understand each other views and provide feedback/reaction right away.

---

## 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**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE :** Liberia has an interim SUN Focal point, awaiting formal appointment by the executive via the Chief Medical Officer facilitation. Few regularly MSP meeting held and planning of activities completed for 2018.

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

### 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 :** The MSP is gradually expanding internally by the involvement of other line ministries.

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

### 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.)*

### 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: 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.)*

### 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: 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.)*

### 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	- Provides support and chairs donor convener by co-chairing the Nutrition sector.
Donor	N/A
Business	- N/A, not yet established
CSO	- CSO coordination body, organized alliance that is active in the SUN MSP meetings.

#### 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)

Overall, the MSP membership has grown and more line-ministries are involved. Interest in SUN efforts is very high but limited political will to support the process. However it is now a fully functional MSP, meetings has not minutes due to lack of human resource support, available technology.

## PROCESS 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

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

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

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

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

**FINAL SCORE: 2**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE :** There is a regulation on Food Fortification and MOA has a strategic plan that is yet to be operationalized or integrated into policies or legislation.

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

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

*This progress marker looks at the extent to which in-country stakeholders work together and contribute, influence and advocate for the development of updated or new improved nutrition policy and legal frameworks for and their dissemination (i.e. advocacy and communication strategies in place to support the dissemination of relevant policies). It focuses on how countries ascertain policy and legal coherence across different ministries and try to broaden political support, by encouraging parliamentary engagement.*

*It also focuses on the efforts of in-country stakeholders to influence decision-makers for legislation and evidence-based policies that empower women and girls through equity-based approaches.*

**FINAL SCORE: 2**

*(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.)*

Engaged line ministries to be review and update the National Nutrition Policy;

Parliamentarian engagement in planning stages, Code of Marketing on Breastmilk on MOH minister desk.

### 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: 2**

*(One score per progress marker)*

**EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE :** All policies fragmented but planning is being done to harmonized upcoming policies and legal framework.

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

### 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**

*(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.)*

Food Fortification completed for flour, oil, salt and Breast-milk substitute code ongoing

### 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: 1**

*(One score per progress marker)*

Review process is currently ongoing.

### 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	Please provide examples
UN	- Unicef and WFP supports technically and financially
Donor	N/A
Business	N/A
CSO	- Lobby and Advocates for government to prioritize SUN operationalization.

**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)

Some line ministries have updated policy and others do not. The process is ongoing to have all the policies update before integration into legal framework. Most recent ongoing NNP review and update has more stakeholders than past time.

### 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: 1**

*(One score per progress marker)*

Creating actions and aligning existing actions around national targets still in planning stages

### 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: 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.)*

### 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: 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.)*

**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: 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.)*

**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: 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.)*

**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	- None
Donor	- None
Business	- None
CSO	- None

**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)

Policies are being updated in order for actions to be created. Policies update are ongoing and national actions in planning stages.

## 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).*

<p><b>FINAL SCORE: 0</b></p> <p><i>(One score per progress marker)</i></p>
<p><b>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE</b></p> <p><i>(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</i></p>

#### 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.*

<p><b>FINAL SCORE: 0</b></p> <p><i>(One score per progress marker)</i></p>
<p><b>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE</b></p> <p><i>(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</i></p> <p>Planning to begin 2018/2019</p>

#### 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.*

<p><b>FINAL SCORE: 0</b></p> <p><i>(One score per progress marker)</i></p>
<p><b>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE</b></p> <p><i>(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</i></p>

#### 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**

*(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.)*

**Power of Nutrition to Liberia 2016 via Unicef and Irish Aid intention to invest via REACH 2018.**

#### **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: 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.)*

**Liberia is in a recovery period post Ebola toward development where sourcing multi-year funding is beginning.**

#### **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	- Planning and coordinating to begin financial tracking and resource mobilization
Donor	N/A
Business	N/A
CSO	Advocates in meeting for increase domestic funding.

**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)

Nutrition programs and interventions are mainly funded by government partner such as Unicef, WFP, FAO etc. there are limited financial resource from government. However, government does provide human resources and facility to support programs.

## 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: 3

*(Scaling up nutrition-specific actions)*

### FINAL SCORE: 3

*(Scaling up nutrition-sensitive actions)*

### EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

**Progress in scaling up nutrition-specific interventions:** Community and IYCF counseling in 12 of the 16 counties, micronutrients in some health facility in government owned facilities but varies in private and community management of acute malnutrition for severe malnutrition in 6 of the 16 counties.

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

Fortification of flour, oil and sugar with logo of fortification, nutrition friendly policies at agriculture ministry, gender child and social protection, public works and commerce such as the Zero Hunger Strategy, Food Security and Nutrition strategy.



## 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?	Has this priority been met?	What actions took place to ensure the priority could be met?	Did you receive external technical assistance to meet this priority?
<i>Enter priority</i>	<i>Yes or No</i>	<i>Please outline stakeholders' contributions (government, UN, CSOs, donors, etc.)</i>	<i>If yes, please explain</i>
To set up the SUN movement national secretariat.	No	Engaging newly elected ministers	No
For president to appoint new SUN focal point	No	MOH minister engaged and letters submitted by CSO to executive in past government	No
To establish MSP	Yes, partially	MSP meeting regular but MSP not fully functional	No
To establish CRF	No		No
To review and develop a NNP and multi-sector strategic plan by 2018	No	NNP policy review ongoing by MSP	No
Please list key 2018-2019 priorities for the MSP			
<i>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.</i>			
To complete interim SUN Government Focal Point appointment			
To engage newly elected parliament to advocate for nutrition			
To set up the SUN movement national secretariat.			
To review and develop a NNP and multi-sector strategic plan			
To make MSP fully functional			
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:** Yes,

Liberia needs external support from REACH to make the MSP fully functional, technical assistance with multi-sector strategic plan and donor support in making the SUN focal point office functional until government can provide budget for SUN activities in-country. In addition capacity building of the MSP for SUN related activities as needed.

### 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 <u>No</u></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 <u>No</u></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 <u>No</u></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>awareness, human resources, technical knowledge,</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><u>Yes</u> or No</p> <p>Please explain:</p> <p>Ministry of gender and social protection engagement ongoing but full participation is not yet active</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 <u>No</u></p> <p>Please explain: MSP recently aware to do so, we have plans to engage.</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: women are head of the some TWG within the MSP.</p>

4.	What actions are identified and implemented by the MSP to ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls at the community level?	Please explain: Members and heads of TWG, most nutrition sector position occupy by women.
5.	Have you analysed or done a stock take of existing nutrition policies, legislation and regulations from a gender perspective?	Yes or <u>No</u>
6.	Does your country have a national gender equality and/or women's empowerment policy or strategy in place?	Yes or <u>No</u>  Please explain:
7.	Has advocacy been undertaken for gender-sensitive and pro-female policy-making and legislation on nutrition?	Yes or <u>No</u>  Please explain:

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

Do you engage with the media to amplify key messages, create awareness and demand for action on nutrition?	Yes or <u>No</u>  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:
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 <u>No</u>  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:

<p>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?</p>	<p><b>Yes or <u>No</u></b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Examples:</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><b>Yes or <u>No</u></b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Examples:</p>
<p>Do you plan on organising a high-level event on nutrition in the upcoming period?</p>	<p><b><u>Yes</u> or No</b></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.	Mameni V. Linga	MOH	SUN Focal Point	<a href="mailto:mameni-linga@gmail.com">mameni-linga@gmail.com</a>	+231886017027	Y
2	Mrs.	Teta Lincoln	Irish Aid	Donor	<a href="mailto:teta.lincoln@dfa.ie">teta.lincoln@dfa.ie</a>	+231880060832	Y
3	Mrs.	Kou T. Baawo	MOH	MSP member	<a href="mailto:ktbaawo@gmail.com">ktbaawo@gmail.com</a>	+231770512987	Y
4	Mr.	Morris Fahnbulleh	WFP	MSP member	<a href="mailto:morris.fahnbulleh@wfp.org">morris.fahnbulleh@wfp.org</a>	+231775225160	Y

5	Mr.	Samuel Kope	WFP	MSP member	<a href="mailto:samuel.kopi@wfp.org">samuel.kopi@wfp.org</a>	+231776500271	Y
6	Mr.	Samuel Ayamba	CRS	MSP member	<a href="mailto:samuel.ayamba@crs.org">samuel.ayamba@crs.org</a>	+231888269904	Y
7	Mr.	Franklin Gonpue	NSL/MOCI	MSP member	<a href="mailto:gonpue.franklin22@gmail.com">gonpue.franklin22@gmail.com</a>	+231886135780	Y
8	Mr.	Sam R. Yoryor III	MOA	MSP member	<a href="mailto:royal40335@yahoo.com">royal40335@yahoo.com</a>	+231880529900	Y
10	Mrs.	Leela Zaizay	Unicef	MSP member	<a href="mailto:lzaizay@unicef.org">lzaizay@unicef.org</a>	+231770267479	Y
11	Mr.	Andrew Musiyoiuku	Unicef	MSP member	<a href="mailto:asammy@unicef.org">asammy@unicef.org</a>	+231770267475	Y
12	Mr.	J. Jeremiah Wolobah	MOH	MSP member	<a href="mailto:jjwolobah68@yahoo.com">jjwolobah68@yahoo.com</a>	+231886580812	Y
13	Mr.	George Kaine Jr.	MTI	MSP member	<a href="mailto:gkaine@medical-teams.com">gkaine@medical-teams.com</a>	+231886558769	Y
14	Mr.	Solomon Gofleeto	SUNCSAL	MSP member	<a href="mailto:unionrural@yahoo.com">unionrural@yahoo.com</a>	+231777496510	Y
15	Mr.	Joseph P. Tubman	SUNCSAL	MSP member	<a href="mailto:setupcsa@gmail.com">setupcsa@gmail.com</a>	+231886466035	Y
16	Mrs.	Florence Y. Kiatamba	MOH/NCD	MSP member	<a href="mailto:yahnqueefy25@yahoo.com">yahnqueefy25@yahoo.com</a>	+231775820477	Y
17	Mrs.	Agatha S. Kennedy	WFP	MSP member	<a href="mailto:agatha.kennedy@wfp.org">agatha.kennedy@wfp.org</a>	+231770764993	Y
18	Mr.	Emmanuel B. Waydon	MOE	MSP member	<a href="mailto:ewaydon@moe.gov.lr">ewaydon@moe.gov.lr</a>	+231777953459	Y
19	Mr.	Tebah Y. Smith	MOH/ND	MSP member	<a href="mailto:tscoop2005@yahoo.com">tscoop2005@yahoo.com</a>	+231886556428	Y