

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- South Sudan

## 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	02
Civil society	03
Donors	0
United Nations	03
Business	0
Science and academia	0
Other (please specify)	

2. How many participated in the Joint-Assessment process? 08

Of these, please indicate how many participants were female and how many were male 03 Male and 05 female

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Email	<input type="checkbox"/>
Review and validation	Meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	Email	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4. If an information gathering or validation meeting took place, please attach a photo. (Pg 18: See photo of meeting during the completion of the joint assessment tool at the bottom of this report)

**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

Why?

The meeting was more participatory than the usual MSP and provided an opportunity for joint team reflection

**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** 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.)*

Planned nutrition programme interventions are ongoing. Each stakeholder are implementing their respective mandates on the nutrition response in South Sudan. Interventions include preventive and curative services including nutrition specific and sensitive projects.

The SUN CSA have adopted a terms of reference for the membership and developed as well as a 3-year strategic plan- both here attached. Humanitarian cluster, especially the ICWG has been equally crucial in mobilizing and bringing people together for integration

### 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.)*

Coordination is ongoing among both internal and external actors. Coordination efforts are ongoing through the UN Network, CSO platform, the Nutrition Cluster at national and subnational, and the SUN steering committee.

The SUN CSA recently hired a consultant to conduct awareness creation across various platforms in South Sudan. Sensitization and registration sessions were held with WASH, Food security and Health Clusters. As a result, 35 members subscribed to the alliance and remained active since. Partnership with grassroot organization has enabled round table dialogues to flesh out opportunities and threats at community level. Participation in the regional Annual workshop in South Africa in July 2018

### Progress marker 1.3: Engage within/contribute to the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)

*This progress marker looks at whether the MSP fosters collaboration among stakeholders, at the national level, on issues most relevant to the nutrition agenda, in addition to commitment and follow-through. When relevant, interactions at the sub-national level should also be addressed.*

#### FINAL SCORE 2

*(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.)*

Collaboration is ongoing mainly among the UN agencies including FAO, UNICEF, UNHCR, WFP, WHO, as well as CSOs through the Nutrition Coordination mechanism and the SUN CSO platform.

### Progress marker 1.4: Track, report and reflect on own contributions and accomplishments

*This progress marker looks whether the MSP tracks and reports on implementation of agreed actions, by individual actors and stakeholders, and their contribution to the MSP's collective progress towards agreed priorities. The MSP's ability to foster accountability is also considered.*

#### FINAL SCORE 3

*(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.)*

Tracking of results are done at various levels. Results for nutrition programme responses are mainly tracked through the Nutrition Information System (NIS) managed by the Nutrition Cluster, UNICEF and WFP. Need to reconcile the NIS with RRM tracking system maintained by FAO. Government is in the process of finalizing DHIS 2 that will converge all the parallel databases

### 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.)*

Nutrition is a priority for the Ministry of Health and Ministry of Agriculture but more political support is required. Institutionalization by everybody is yet to be realised

### 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	- The UN Network (FAO, UNICEF, UNHCR, WHO, and WFP) in South Sudan are actively involved the multi-stakeholder (Steering Committee) coordination, as well as mobilize other partners for their active participation.
Donor	- N/A
Business	- N/A
CSO	- The SUN Civil society Alliance was activated in September 2017 and has since grown to 35 registered members and adopted a terms of reference and a 3-year strategic plans. The CSA is Chaired by CARE International and Co-chaired by the save the children while Christian Aid is the secretariat constituting the secretariat. The Executive committee includes the secretariat members plus World Vision, CRS, Nile Hope and Action Against Hunger

**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 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.)*

Analysis has mostly been conducted as part of nutrition guideline review processes. The process is mostly driven by a consultant through an all-inclusive process. There is still need for a separate policy analysis

**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.)*

Advocated to government officials, undersecretaries and parliamentarians, DGs, CSOs and donors to prioritize nutrition in a one-day workshop. Other activities include; the launch, selection of CSOs, participation in SUNGG, formation of the steering committee etc

The CSA has planned and already conducted several advocacy drives including a public lecture with a call to integrated nutrition into food value chains in South Sudan. As part of the SUN jumpstart projects (pooled grant) advocacy activities including round table dialogues and meetings with parliamentarians and private sector are planned

**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 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.)*

In-country consultations on development of the National Nutrition and Food policy has commenced. This requires improvement as in-country coordination and policy framework has been mostly driven by the humanitarian cluster through the annual response planning and to a less extent by the nutrition sector (government)

### 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, the right to food, among others.*

**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.)*

South Sudan is yet to adopt a legal framework.

### 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 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.)*

Similar to 2.4

### 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	- NA
Business	- NA
CSO	- Mobilization of 35 CSOs to scale up nutrition sensitive programming. Recently won the SUN pooled grant to scale up activities in three states

**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.*



**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.**

*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.*

<p><b>FINAL SCORE</b> <i>(One score per progress marker)</i></p>
<p><b>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE</b> <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 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.*

<p><b>FINAL SCORE 0</b> <i>(One score per progress marker)</i></p>
--



**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.)*

No legal framework in place yet.

**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.)*

CRF yet to be developed in country. Annual nutrition plans in place

**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.)*

No common results framework in place yet.

**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.)*

This evaluation will be conducted once a common results framework is developed and implemented.

**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 above
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	- Same as above

**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; 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.)*

Joint costing yet to be conducted. At the moment, costing of nutrition specific interventions have been done by UNICEF and WFP and implementing partners encouraged to adopt the dollar handles

**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 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.)*

In-country financial tracking has previously been conducted by the clusters through the FTS however Government has not come up with a joint financial tracker.

**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 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.)*

Due to the South Sudan context, needs assessments and prioritization and donor engagement is currently led by the humanitarian cluster as government lacks capacity.

**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.)*

This has not been jointly done

**Progress marker 4.5: Ensure predictability of multi-year funding to sustain implementation results and nutrition impact**

*This progress marker looks at how the government and in-country stakeholders collectively ensure predictable and long-term funding for better results and impact. It looks at important changes such as the continuum between short-term humanitarian and long-term development funding, the establishment of flexible but predictable funding mechanisms and the sustainable addressing of funding gaps.*

**FINAL SCORE 2**

*(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.)*

There has been concerted advocacy for multiyear funding which has gradually started to pay off. Several donors have started considering multiyear funding including DFID, Dutch and Canadian governments. Equally UNICEF has started issuing multi-year agreements to partners as opposed to the previous annual or shorter ones

**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	- Currently, UN Agencies including the Nutrition Cluster track donor funding contributions to nutrition programming in South Sudan. Financial contribution is mainly for nutrition emergency response and little contribution to early recovery.
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	- Same as previous ones

**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)

Not much has been achieved but government with regards to financial tracking however most agencies have achieved this through cluster coordinated mechanisms. Through the same platforms, joint advocacy has resulted in some multi-year funding though there is still need to increase on multiyear funding for nutrition sensitive interventions

## 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 17**

*(Scaling up nutrition-specific actions)*

**FINAL SCORE**

*(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)*

***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)

<b>Priorities identified in most recent JAA?</b>  <i>Enter priority</i>	<b>Has this priority been met?</b>  <i>Yes or No</i>	<b>What actions took place to ensure the priority could be met?</b>  <i>Please outline stakeholders' contributions (government, UN, CSOs, donors, etc.)</i>	<b>Did you receive external technical assistance to meet this priority?</b>  <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 Please explain: Yes, South Sudan is a protracted emergency situation with active fighting in some locations, 60% of the population insecure and 7.1 in need. The target of the response is 5.1 m</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 Please explain: Yes, the Humanitarian response Plan exists focusing on nutrition specific and sensitive interventions</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 Please explain: The MSP is involved in annual response planning and prioritization however the linkage with development programming remains rather low because of the weak sectors</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: Because of the protracted emergency context, with limited resources, programming is mostly humanitarian with a focus on saving lives. South Sudan is also a young country whose economy has been crippled by civil strife hence the government lacks funds, structures and capacity to finance longer term development plans.</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 Please explain: The ministry of gender, child and social welfare is engaged.</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 Please explain: Yes, CSO are part of the CSA network in South Sudan. They participate at the steering committee</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: yes, MSP has been using the IASC guidelines including the guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action to ensure gender mainstreaming is realized</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: inclusion of women and women led groups as decision makers in SUN, disaggregation of data by sex</p>

		and age, inclusion of women and people with disability in grassroots advocacy
5.	<b>Have you analysed or done a stock take of existing nutrition policies, legislation and regulations from a gender perspective?</b>	Yes  Gender analysis had been however by individual organizations but not jointly. This needs to improve
6.	<b>Does your country have a national gender equality and/or women’s empowerment policy or strategy in place?</b>	Yes  Please explain:
7.	<b>Has advocacy been undertaken for gender-sensitive and pro-female policy-making and legislation on nutrition?</b>	Yes  Please explain: This has been done by various organizations but no joint efforts in place in terms of policy making and legislation

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

1.	<b>Do you engage with the media to amplify key messages, create awareness and demand for action on nutrition?</b>	Yes  Examples:  Media has been engaged mostly during campaigns and awareness creation efforts. In the SUN pooled grant the CSA have planned several media engagements and talk shows
2.	<b>Are parliamentarians actively contributing to improve nutrition, in collaboration with the MSP?</b>  <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>	<b>Yes</b>  <b>Examples:</b>  This is one of the activities planned by the Civil Society Alliance under the pooled grant but scheduled for later in the year
3.	<b>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?</b>	Yes  The Champion is Isaka Number 1 – Musician  Examples: In 2017, he composed a national song on breastfeeding and time to introduce complementary foods. The song is used for promoting breastfeeding week campaigns since last year. Have video clip while he was performing during this year’s World Breastfeeding Week (WBW).
4.	<b>Have you documented advocacy successes and best practice in reducing malnutrition through</b>	<b>Yes</b>



	<b>multi-sector and multi-stakeholder action, and shared them nationally and/or with regional and global partners?</b>	<b>Examples</b> Articles have been shared with the SUN emergency network as well as field exchange. Some have been published while others are in the pipeline
5.	<b>Do you plan on organising a high-level event on nutrition in the upcoming period?</b>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p>Details: several events are planned including the launch of the SUN pooled grant, breakfast meetings for parliamentarians among others</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	Rebecca Alum William	Ministry of Health	Represent the SUN Focal Point	alum.williamg@gmail.com	+211 920 040 205	Yes
2.	Mr	Joseph Senesie	UNICEF	Represent UNICEF in the UN Network	jsenesie@unicef.org	+211 915 27 00 76	Yes
3.	Mr	Isaack Manyama	Nutrition Cluster	Nutrition Cluster Coordinator	ssnutritioncluster.coordinator@gmail.com		Yes
4.	Mr	Robert Akua	WFP		Robert.akua@wfp.org	+211920512313	Yes
5.	Ms.	Joyce Akandu	Save the Children		joyce.akandu@savethechildren.org		Yes
6.	Ms.	Night	CARE	CSO SUN Consultant			Yes
7.	Ms.	Mercy Laker	CARE	CSO Platform - Chair	mlaker@care.org	+211924053818	Yes
8.	Ms	Josephine Uttua	MOH				Yes

---

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

---

**2018 Joint Assessment Report: South Sudan SUN Steering Committee Meeting at MOH Conference Hall in Juba on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2018**

