

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)

Mozambique

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 (1)
Civil society	Yes (1)
Donors	Yes (1)
United Nations	No
Business	No
Science and academia	No
Other (please specify)	

2. How many participated in the Joint-Assessment process? 5

Of these, please indicate how many participants were female and how many were male 3/2

Process

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

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

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

We had a meeting of the technical coordination group (MSP) where, in addition to other subjects, we started the process of self assessment and, posteriorly, the different sectors were working and sent the comments and validation of the data by email. Unfortunately we did not take photos of the meeting.

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?

_____ No _____

Use of information by the SUN Movement

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

Scoring key

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

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

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

Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.

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

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

FINAL SCORE

(One score per progress marker)

4

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 establishment of a technical working group for the Multisectoral Action Plan to Reduce Chronic Malnutrition (GT-PAMRDC) was established in 2012 as the main coordinating mechanism for the PAMRDC. The Working Group is established under the technical secretariat for food security and nutrition (SETSAN) in line with the mandate of SETSAN to coordinate on FSN matters and is composed of members from the 8 central ministries (Ministry of health, ministry of agriculture and food security, ministry of education and human resources, ministry of youth and sports, ministry of industry and commerce, ministry of Sea, Inland Waters and Fisheries, ministry of Public Works, Housing and Water Resources and ministry of Gender, Child and Social Action), development partners, UN and civil society.

At the province level, GT-PAMRDC has been established in all provinces. However, the provincial level (and in some cases district level) establishment of the GT-PAMRDC is compromised due to the limited capacities at these levels, as well as an imperfect organization and selection mechanisms for participation, which limits the capacity of the GT-PAMRDC.

The decentralization of the PAMRDC is currently ongoing at the district level. This process is complicated at the very limited technical and financial resources available at district level.

To strengthen the commitment by the Republic of Mozambique towards FSN, a National Council for Nutrition and Food Security (CONSAN) has been established under the Prime Minister's Office. CONSAN will have the following member composition:

- Minister of Agriculture and Food Security - First Vice-President;
- Minister of Health;
- Minister for Sea, Inland Waters and Fisheries;
- Minister of Public Works, Housing and Water Resources
- Minister of Industry and Commerce;
- Minister of Gender, Child and Social Action;

- Minister of Education and Human Development;
- Minister of Science, Technology and Higher Education;
- Executive Secretary of the Technical Secretariat for Food and Nutrition Security;
- Deputy Executive Secretary of the Technical Secretariat for Food and Nutrition Security;
- Executive Secretary of the National AIDS Council;
- Director General of the National Institute of Disaster Management;
- Director General of the National Institute of Social Action;
- Three civil society representatives working in the SAN and DHAA area (criteria for selection is currently being defined);
- Three representatives of academic institutions (criteria for selection is currently being defined);
- Representatives the from private sector (criteria for selection is currently being defined).

Under CONSAN, SETSAN’s mandate has been revised to provide CONSAN with technical advice related to FSN. The operationalization of the mechanisms is currently being undertaken. With the establishment of CONSAN a strengthened accountability to ministries implementing FSN sensitive activities under the PAMRDC should be established and hence active participation in the GT-PAMRDC is foreseen to be enhanced.

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

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

FINAL SCORE

(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.)

Within the newly established CONSAN, Civil Society, Academia and Private Sector will be given a seat at the table to engage with key stakeholders from the engaged ministries. The terms for selection/election and participation is currently being drafted. Furthermore, CONSAN will have provincial and district counterparts (COPSAN and CODSAN). COPSAN will be placed in the office of the governors to ensure strong engagement at the highest political level. The legal framework and operationalization of these institutions are currently being drafted.

Another new actor is the ministry of rural development (MITADER), who has been asked to facilitate a nutrition campaign to be led by the First Lady. In order to proper coordinate the efforts planned by the First Lady’s campaign, a working group will be established to support two consultants on aligning the efforts planned for the First Lady and the existing plans on SBCC, communication and advocacy.

Furthermore, a civil society platform for SUN, with the collaboration of government sectors members of the GT-PAMRDC, is developing community monitoring tools to promote a more effective dialogue between citizens and the government, with a view to increasing the accountability of nutritional services at provincial and lower levels.

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.

<p>FINAL SCORE (One score per progress marker)</p> <p>3</p>
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE (Refer to the <i>progress marker explanatory note</i> for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</p> <p>The national working groups (GT) on various matters, such as the GT-SBCC and GT-PAMRDC, are well established and with active participation from different sectors and national institutions as well as development partners and UN organizations. These working groups act as a forum for interaction and information sharing on issues related to FSN in order to obtain consensus among stakeholders. Outputs from these working sessions are reported and submitted to the Council of Ministers and translate into concrete policy recommendations to be implemented by sectors as well as to be utilized as an advocacy tool.</p>

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.

<p>FINAL SCORE (One score per progress marker)</p> <p>4</p>
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE (Refer to the <i>progress marker explanatory note</i> for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</p> <p>The members of the technical working group has the duty to report to the group (considered a national platform) the nutrition actions and the process of implementation of PAMRDC of their sector. They take the information from the MSP to be sheared at their sectors through different mechanisms (Ministerial Consultative Councils, emails, workshops, etc.)</p>

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.

<p>FINAL SCORE (One score per progress marker)</p> <p>3</p>
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE (Refer to the <i>progress marker explanatory note</i> for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</p> <p>SETSAN is currently undertaking an assessment of the impact of the trainings of the integrations of FSN into the provincial social and economic plans with the goal of evaluating the impact of the training conducted last year.</p> <p>Currently, the organization and roll-out of the Provincial Council for Food Security and Nutrition (COPSAN). COPSAN will be placed under the Governors and are to strengthen the involvement of the executive level of political leadership at the provincial level in the same way that CONSAN is to do at the national level.</p>

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	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	- Started the process of expanding/establishing civil society platforms for SUN in all the remaining provinces (6) and to 15 districts

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)

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

(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.)

In 2017, the ESAN II (Strategy on Food Security and Nutrition) was evaluated. ESAN III is planned for elaboration taking into account the findings of the ESAN II, inclusion of the objectives in the PAMRDC and the progress made / lesson learned from implementing the two from a multi stakeholder viewpoint.

Furthermore, an in-depth review of the implementation progress in the PAMRDC was conducted in addition to the annual analysis of the PAMRDC indicators. The in-depth review highlighted the lack of alignment between the PAMRDC and the sector activities and indicators. It was highlighted that there is a need to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the indicators used, to ensure they are working towards achieving the main objectives in the PAMRDC in a way that allows for the progress to be measured against the targets set in the PAMRDCs.

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

(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.)

A communication expert has been hired under the MDG1c Programme to assist with the implementation of the Communication and Advocacy Plan for the reduction of chronic malnutrition (PCA-PAMRDC). The main objective is to support the definition of a harmonized communication plan to highlight the actions of all programmes coordinated by SETSAN. Furthermore, it is foreseen that the expert will analyse the gaps on nutrition education and communication material available in Mozambique, providing key stakeholders with an overview of what is missing and what is existing and available to use at a larger scale. As part of the process, the PCA-PAMRDC will be evaluated.

During the calendar year April 2017 to April 2018, a list of comprehensive studies on FSN has been completed or partially completed in Mozambique. The Cost of Hunger Assessment (COHA) and the Fill the Nutrition Gap (FNG) must be mentioned as central here. These studies provide stakeholders with up-to-date nutrition evidence and are being used as reference material and justifications for a list of projects. A press-release was held at the launch of the FNG.

The GT-SBCC has furthermore initiated a collection of materials and experience from implementing SBCC activities with the objective of promoting existing materials aligned with the national strategy for SBCC and establish a set of 'best practises'.

Another progress in terms of improved intersectorial coordination can be found in the collaboration with the ministry of rural development (MITADER) and the First Lady's office on an advocacy campaign to be led by the First Lady. The involvement of the First Lady is being developed taking into consideration how it will support the existing communication plans and advocacy efforts.

Finally, a high-level forum on FSN led by H.E. the President of the Republic of Mozambique is currently under development. The forum will take place in November 2018 and will serve as a forum to obtain consensus and commitment on the new strategic plans proposed for the improvement of FSN. Resource mobilization and strategic and programmatic alignment in the coordination and implementation of FSN actions in Mozambique will be central aspects as well.

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

(One score per progress marker)

3
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE <i>(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</i></p> <p>In this period of analysis they were developed or adjusted some documents that make up the legal framework that are embodied in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children's Food Policy • Fisheries Policy and Strategy • National Agricultural Investment Plan - extension phase • Rural Development Strategy • Integrated Strategy for School-Age Children • Integrated Youth Development Strategy • Family Planning Strategy • Among others <p>In 2015 the National PAMRDC was deployed in provincial plans and were approved five plans (PAMRDC) namely Niassa, Cabo Delgado, Nampula, Gaza and Maputo. The development of these plans is the result of work of coordination and harmonization of information made by the technical groups that are composed of all stakeholders</p>

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.

<p>FINAL SCORE <i>(One score per progress marker)</i></p> <p>2 (all these policies exist; the problem is in monitoring the implementation of these)</p>
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE <i>(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</i></p> <p>Another significant result from the in-depth review of the PAMRDC was the lack of a proper operationalization guideline for the provinces to use during planning in order to properly incorporate the objectives of the PAMRDC into the provincial context.</p>

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.

<p>FINAL SCORE <i>(One score per progress marker)</i></p> <p>2</p>
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE <i>(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</i></p>

In 2017, both ESAN II and the PAMRDC underwent evaluations/reviews. To facilitate the evaluation of the ESAN II, a task force consisting of members from different government institutions across the multisectoral approach, development partners and the UN organizations.

With regards to the PAMRDC review, two workshops were held to discuss and validate findings with participation from different government institutions across the multisectoral approach, development partners and the UN organizations.

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	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	- In December 2017, the CSO Platform got funds from EU-Mozambique for the next 3 years; under the result 3 (Public awareness about nutrition policies and nutrition services is increased through: i) advocacy targeting decision makers, and ii) expanded use of media to influence both public opinion and policy makers), it is intended to share information and advocate among national and provincial parliaments.

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)

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

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.

the review of programmes and implementation capacities.

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.)

SETSAN has established a webpage for development partners, government institutions, NGO’s and others to register projects related to FSN (<http://setsan2.infomoz.net/>). Furthermore, the SBCC working group held a seminar with implementing partners in order to map the SBCC activities undertaken in Mozambique in order to ensure alignment with the national strategy and develop a catalogue with best practices and existing materials. The PAMRDC serves as the common framework of all the actors in this area.

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*(One score per progress marker)*

2

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.)*

While the medium and long term objectives are clearly defined in the PAMRDC, there is no functional agreement on it as a common results framework. This also means that both government and development partners implementation and prioritization of FSN are not always aligned with the main objectives set in the national strategies.

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)*

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.)*

As highlighted earlier in this assessment, CONSAN has been established in order to strengthen the commitment and organization for better implementation. It is also expected that annual priorities for CONSAN (still to be defined) will contribute to this.

Currently, another aspect to strengthen the capacity is being undertaken by UNICEF in close collaboration with SETSAN. UNICEF and SETSAN are assessing the capacity of SETSAN (national and in two provinces) to coordinate and lead efforts on FSN.

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*(One score per progress marker)*

2

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.)*

Since April 2017, SETSAN has been working towards establishing support for developing a national information system. Currently, terms of reference has been developed and are being reviewed to make sure they meet the needs of the multisectorial stakeholders. A technical working group is to be established with participants across central ministries.

This establishment of a national information system will improve the data quality (the annual assessment of the PAMRDC indicators which are being submitted to the Council of Ministers).

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)

2

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.)

As previously highlighted, a consultant to support advocacy on the PAMRDC has been hired supported by the MDG1c through the EU. Furthermore, the Champions Programme is currently being strengthened through the Advocacy Campaign under the First Lady. The commitment of the First Lady on promoting FSN also provides Mozambique with a unique opportunity to highlight the importance of FSN amongst government leaders at both national and provincial level.

Furthermore, the SBCC working group is currently working on establishing a set of best practices in accordance with the national strategy. This would provide government institutions and development partners with information on successful implementation.

The afore mentioned evaluations of the PAMRDC and ESAN II also highlighted best practices to follow up on in Mozambique, such as the Geração Biz programme and PCAAN.

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	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	- PAMRDC is the common framework, and it is also the framework used by the CSO members of the platform.

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)

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)

2

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.)

On April 24th the preliminary results of a Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA) was presented. The study was supported by USAID and DUKE university. The results presented the costs of interventions related to WASH interventions, malaria, iron folic acid, school feeding, increased availability of natural nutritious foods and prevention of early pregnancies. The results was distributed across stakeholders from government and development partners.

Currently, there are no financial tracking lines related to nutrition (specific and sensitive). This also limits the capacity to create an overview of allocations, especially with regards to gaps and overlaps, as there is also no strong mechanism in place to track nutrition-related programmes and actions.

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)

2

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.)

Since last year, support has been established to access the public financial management system and develop specific nutrition sensitive budget lines. This is supported by DFID through Nutrition International. Currently, a set of TORs are developed and being reviewed in collaboration with the Public Financial Management Working Group to ensure the compatibility with the national financial tracking system, e-sistafe.

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 <i>(One score per progress marker)</i> 2
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE <i>(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</i> Since last year's assessment, a Policy Task Force, consisting of SETSAN and senior management representatives from Central Development partners, has been established. The scope of work of the Task Force is to allow a small core group, representing several constituents to meet regularly to proactively steer policy development by monitoring and supporting (gap filling) progress in completion of the products mentioned above. In doing so, complex cross-cutting strategic themes and bottlenecks can be identified and course corrections more quickly implemented to leading to higher quality action and creative, timely resolution of unforeseen challenges. The work of the Task Force is also to discuss gaps in financing and possibilities of accommodating these gaps, while aligning efforts.

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 <i>(One score per progress marker)</i> 2
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE <i>(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</i> Resources for implementation of PAMRDC comes both from the Government and from the various cooperation partners. The Partners who are currently committed to support are EU, Irish Aid, UNICEF, FAO, WFP, the Belgian Embassy, and others, who has made disbursement which allows carrying out the actions. We have several other donors who are also working in the provinces that support the implementation of PAMRDC at provincial level.

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 <i>(One score per progress marker)</i> 1
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE <i>(Refer to the progress marker explanatory note for specific examples or provide your own. Please share relevant documentation as evidence.)</i> The Government has been to ensure the resources for nutrition through the annual allocation of funds to different sectors to finance the sectoral economic and social plans (PES) in order to operationalize the five-year Government program. It should be noted that SETSAN has been developing actions to ensure that PAMRDC actions are included in the sectoral PES in order to ensure that they have financing guarantees. On the side of the partners previsibilidade of funds are ensured by the commitments they have signed with the Government for the

implementation of PAMRDC actions both in terms of sectors and in the provinces. We have as examples of financing agreements between the governments of the provinces of Inhambane and Niassa and Irish Aid as well as the provinces of Zambézia and Nampula with UNICEF for funding provincial PAMRDCs among others.

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	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	- CSO got funded for the next 3 year (2017-2020), as mentioned above (EU funds)

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 <i>(Scaling up nutrition-specific actions)</i>				
FINAL SCORE <i>(Scaling up nutrition-sensitive actions)</i>				
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE				
Area	Indicator	2015	Actual 2016	Responsible sector
Objective 1: To strengthen activities with an impact on the nutritional status of adolescents				
Teen deworming	Children aged 5-14 who received deworming tablets	98	100	MoH
	Districts covered by elimination campaigns	100	100	MoH
Early pregnancy	Girls 10-24 years of age at the SAAJ who received contraceptives	16	36	MoH
	Sanitary units with SAAJ	43	44	MoH
Pre-natal care	Pregnant women receiving two doses of TIP	56	57	MoH
	Women dewormed in prenatal care	71	83	MoH
	Women receiving 3 doses of ferrous salt w/ folic acid	48	54	MoH
	Pregnant women who received ARV for PTV	94	92	MoH
Deworming children	Supplementation with Vitamin A in postpartum	68	73	MoH
Vitamin A children	New users in modern methods of Family Planning	34	33	MoH
Vitamina A post-natal	Child friendly hospitals accredited	0	0	MoH

Family planning	APES that provide services in the community	80	81	MoH
ALCP	Children 12-59 months dewormed (SNS)	101	102	MoH
	Children 6-59 months supplemented with Vitamin (SNS)	102	106	MoH
Production of nutritious foods	Food availability of fish (ton)	73	75	Sea,
	Per capita fish consumption (kg / year)	82	93	Sea
	Technical assistance to small-scale fish farmers	71	42	Sea
	Producers participating in demonstrations of production technology	28	29	MoA
	Producers who practice improved agricultural production technology	25	23	MoA
Processing and storage	Producers participating in demonstrations of improved processing and storage	3	2	MoA
	Producers who store their crop in improved barns	2	1	MoA
Social protection	Households receiving PASD transfers (food kits and breast milk substitute)	38	44	INAS
	Households with 0-18 year-old children attending the PSSB	26	26	INAS
Fortification	National production of iodized salt	45	50	MIC
	National production of fortified wheat flour	50	75	MIC
	National production of fortified vegetable oil	50	75	MIC
Water	Water supply in urban areas (piped water)	83	85	MOPH
	Water supply in rural areas	60	62	MOPH
Sanitation	Adequate sanitation services in urban areas (improved latrines)	58	60	MOPH
	Adequate sanitation services in rural areas (improved latrines)	13	18	MOPH
Nutrition education	PE teachers with nutritional education	20	77	MoE
	Schools that implement PRONAE	4	6	MoE

Progress in scaling up nutrition-specific interventions

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

Progress in scaling up nutrition-sensitive interventions

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

Annex 1: Identified priorities

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

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>
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. Approval and Implementation of the new Food and Nutrition Security Strategy (ESAN III) in a multisectoral way in line with sectoral strategies;
2. Strengthen the integration of nutrition and food security into sectoral economic and social plans (PES) and ensure their budgeting;
3. Accelerate the process of creation and training of District Technical Groups in the planning and monitoring of PAMRDC;
- 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 NO 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 YES, Explain: The Contingency plan that is made every year containing actions to respond to natural calamities and which takes into account food aid among others.</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 YES Please explain: SETSAN is a member of the Disaster Management Technical Council which is composed of several other sectors that are part of the MSP. It is in this forum that all aspects of the emergency response process are discussed and harmonized</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? If not a part of the MSP, how do you engage with this Ministry/Department?</p>	<p>Yes or No Yes Please explain: The Ministry of Gender, Child and Social Action is participating in both CONSAN and GT-PAMRDC. At the provincial level, the directorate of Gender, Children and Social Action is participating.</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 No. 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</p>	<p>Please explain:</p>

	women and girls at the community level?	
5.	Have you analysed or done a stock take of existing nutrition policies, legislation and regulations from a gender perspective?	Yes or No: NO
6.	Does your country have a national gender equality and/or women's empowerment policy or strategy in place?	Yes or No YES 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 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: Through the support of development partners, video, print and other advocacy material on nutrition has been distributed to the public. Furthermore, the Executive Secretary collaborates with local media on stories regarding events on nutrition. Amongst others, the national health week and the launch of the Fill the Nutrition Gab can be mentioned as examples of there the ES participated in interviews.
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 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 Yes. 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>Examples: The national nutrition champions include high level political figures such as Graca Marcel and the Minister of Agriculture and Food Security as well as public figures such as singers and actors.</p>
4.	<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>Yes or No</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>
5.	<p>Do you plan on organising a high-level event on nutrition in the upcoming period?</p>	<p>Yes or No</p> <p>Yes.</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: A high level forum on FSN is planned for November 30th with the participation of H.E. the President of the Republic of Mozambique. TORs for the event is currently under development.</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.	Claudia Lopes	SETSAN	SUN focal Point	claudia.lopes@setsan.gov.mz clolopes2003@yahoo.com.br		Yes
2.	Ms.	Marla Amaro	Ministry of Health	SUN Co-focal Point	marlaamaro80@gmail.com	+258 824883690	Yes
3.	Mr.	Almeida Tembe	SETSAN	Technical Working Group of PAMRDC facilitator	almeida.tembe@setsan.gov.mz tembe.almeida@gmail.com	+258 823952760	Yes
4.	Ms.	Camilla B. Pedersen	DANIDA - SETSAN	Embassy of Denmark	c.bruhnp@gmail.com	+258 8436 74 604	Yes
5.	Ms.	Carina Ismael	ANSA	ANSA – CS Platform	carinaismael@gmail.com	+258 828863110	Yes

6.	Ms.	Ligia Mutemba	ANSA	ANSA – CS Platform	mutembaligia@gmail.com	+258 824742270	Yes
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							
11.							
12.							
13.							
14.							
15.							
