

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)

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	Yes (17)
Civil society	Yes (8)
Donors	Yes (4)
United Nations	Yes (6)
Business	Yes (2)
Science and academia	Yes (3)
Other (please specify)	Yes (4 INGs, National Council for Child welfare, national lab, national food research centre, Office of Attorney).

2. How many participated in the Joint-Assessment process? 26 different bodies

Of these, please indicate how many participants were female and how many were male 38 female and 18 male

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

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



Usefulness

5. If an information gathering or validation meeting took place, would you say that the meeting was deemed useful by participants, beyond the usual work of the multi-stakeholder platform (MSP)?

Yes/No

Why?

Yes, the report was circulated to all of four SUN networks in Sudan and to MSP, to have their input and views, then big meeting organized chaired by government and SUN secretariat, and attended by all government sectors, academia, UN, Donor, SBN, and CSA network, including members for each (photo attached).

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

3

Nearly completed

Implementation complete with gradual steps to processes becoming operational

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.)

- Official nomination of a SUN Government Focal Point
- Appoint Focal Points/conveners for key stakeholder groups, i.e. a donor convener, civil society coordinators, UN focal points, business liaison persons, academic representative
- Convene MSP members on a regular basis: 8 meetings for UN network coordination structure took place.
- Establishment and refining the terms of reference, workplans and other types of enabling arrangements for the coordination structures is ongoing.
- Having chair and co-chair agencies for the key stakeholder's groups: UN Network, Civil Society Network and Health in all policies (HiAPs) focal persons.
- Both technical and senior level meetings have been taken place for the UN network and government.
- Convene country network meetings with all 4 networks: Donor, UN, CSN, Business
- UN Network is managed by various UN agencies on a rotational basis
- The Donor Network (DN) has been recently established in the country. More specifically, since the beginning of 2018, regular meetings have been held among members on a monthly or bi-monthly basis. Its functional mechanism is still at an early stage: the Terms of Reference have been defined and a mapping tool is being developed to track all Donors interventions in the nutrition sector in Sudan.
- The SUN Civil Society Alliance has established Chair, Co-Chair and Reporter/secretory organizations
- The Chair, Co-chair and secretor represents the CSA in the external platforms including multi stakeholder platforms
- The transitional Executive Committee for CSA has been formed of 12 organizations

- The CSA Subcommittees are working under Executive Committee
- The Executive Committee of CSA is reporting back to a larger group on a quarter basis
- Meeting and Coordination events calendar developed for CSA for 2018 (attached)

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
On-going

- Expansion MSP to get key members on board, such as Women union, NCCW; diverse civil society groups; private sector partnerships; media; parliamentarians; scientists and academics
- Additional relevant line ministries, departments and agencies on board, for Sudan this significant group has been formed as official network as part of the SUN structure in the country.
- Frequent engagement with actors or groups specialized on specific themes such as gender, equity and non-discrimination, education, social protection and WASH, still there is a room for systemizing this engagement
- Ensure that the MSP membership is expanded to – or better able to – support women’s leadership, for Sudan the leadership of the Civil society network is chaired by Women Union as signal of women empowerment and leadership.
- Establishment of decentralized structures and/or processes that support planning and action locally (identification of decentralized structures and Terms of Reference development is ongoing.), for Sudan this significant groups is planned to be formal network as part of SUN structure.
- Involve representatives from local levels in the national mechanism or create feedback mechanisms between the central and local levels, including the community and vulnerable groups.
- The DN includes about 10 members. This is not fully representative of the Donor community in the country, because some Donors, which are active in the country (i.e. the non-traditional ones), are not members of the Network although we have approached them in several occasion.
- The Civil Society Network has planned National Workshops on bi-annual basis to invite NGOs, CBOs from national and subnational levels
- A list of 223 NGOS, CBOs is already prepared to reach NGOs/CBOs at subnational levels as well
- Around 37 NGOs/CBOs at Khartoum and some other states are meeting regularly in Khartoum

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
Started

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 systems exist but not a lot has been achieved on the roadmap because of divergent interests and bottlenecks in financing.
- The MSP is used regularly to interact on nutrition-related issues among stakeholders.
- The DN is part of the MSP, which has been established since the beginning of 2018 in the country. The Donor Convener, on behalf of all Network, has regularly attended the meetings of the MSP and has been contributing to the discussion to scale up nutrition in the national political agenda. However, from the Donors’ perspective, the MSP should agree on practical steps to overcome the challenges for its effective functioning.
- The MSP is still only a national mechanism with no decentralization at the sub-national one. There is not real communication between the central and local levels, as well as between different state actors (such the Ministries). The Donors have generally to liaise singularly with the relevant state Ministries in their areas of intervention.
- The CSN has been active part of the multi stakeholder platform at national level by participating in the country network meeting where UN network, Donor Network, Business Network and inter-ministerial committee members are participating. In addition, CSN had reached the donor network for receiving supportive letter from the Italian cooperation, to apply for the SUN global pooled fund.

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
Not started

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nothing related to MSP tracks and reports is in place yet. The first step in this direction should be the definition of priorities and the development of workplans, with roles and responsibilities for the stakeholders and actors. If a MSP workplan is not outlined, it is quite hard to measure and report the progress against the achievement of its objectives. ▪ Also, the DN due to its recent set up, has not defined yet its workplan, and is not reporting on its achievement to the local institutions. ▪ Monitoring exercises are not started. ▪ Reports are not yet available on websites and other communication platforms. ▪ Key stakeholders report on their progress during meeting but information on nutrition expenditures are not available.

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
0
Not started

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Nutrition is recognized like a national priority, but it's a sensitive issue in the political agenda. As evidence of that, Ministries show low coordination among them and partial disclosure on budget allocation to nutrition.

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	<i>Please provide examples</i>
UN	- The 6 UN agencies (WHO, WFP, UNICEF, FAO, UNFPA and IFAD) plus the World Bank has signed an MOU to support the government upstream work on Nutrition multi sectorial planning, (the 6 UN agencies + WB are acting as the formal UN network for Sudan composed of technical working group and Heads of Agencies heading this group and represents the network in the Focal person meetings)
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more active, and functional this year with having clear structure for their role and responsibilities - Various CSN related documents are under process of development such as ToR, Plan of Action, Sudan specific CSN Logo

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)

Efforts to bring people together in the same space for action have definitely made considerable progress with more active involvement of stakeholders, expansion of the membership of the platform, efforts made to realign efforts around a common platform and set of priorities as well as collaborating more in national activities. Plans are in place to roll out the nutrition MSP to the national level, especially during the current and upcoming planning processes. More needs to be done to effectively communicate within the platform and report on its activities.
Overall this process indicator can be scored 1 for Sudan and the activities are just started.



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

1

Started

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE:

- There are National Nutrition Policy, Micronutrient Strategy, IYCF Strategy, national Nutrition strategy, Code of Breast Milk Substitute, Maternity leave legislation, Policy brief on malnutrition
- National Health Policy , Health in all Policies (HiAP), School Health Strategy, The environmental strategy
- There are national Nutrition strategy, national food security strategy and national nutrition and food security strategy note, these strategic documents were prepared in a consultative manner with participation from all relevant stockholders from Nutrition, health, agriculture water sanitation, food security and social welfare.
- The review and analysis of the policies and strategies has not actually started.
- The CSN has been involved in the HiAP development process.
- MOU agreement for salt iodization.
- Endorsement of health in all policies.
- National council for child welfare mandate for child convention rights, following up of implementation of child convention 1999, monitoring and evaluation of the articles and coordination between all responsible partners.
- Endorsement of Child legislations and regulations.
- School feeding strategy between Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education.
- Strategy towards organic products (led by Ministry of Agriculture) this initiative enables the private sector to add on the organic products.
- Policy brief for food fortification
- A legislation for breastfeeding
- Pesticides law led by Ministry of agriculture.
- The DN has not been involved yet in a consultative process of existing policies and regulations. However, a few members have given their individual inputs on specific issues of policy tools in the framework of their bilateral relationship with the Government of Sudan (GoS).
- Civil Society organizations are well informed through the CSN network that they should be part of policy and legislation development process
- The chair of the CSN has been part of various national documents development however it has to be extended further to other CBOs
- The ToR of the SUN CSN is reflecting the responsibility of the CSN to be engaged in the policy developments and revision process

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 1 Started
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SUN focal person is actively advocating for nutrition. Some activities are also being engaged to undertake advocacy around nutrition. ▪ Some Advocacy has been conducted for the parliamentary and private sector to influence having a mandatory law for the food fortification in Sudan ▪ SUDAN has supported the execution of the S3M results to be used as a new tool for advocacy through legislation councils at the state levels ▪ A planned Social Mobilisation, Advocacy and Communications Strategy has not been developed. ▪ Each Donor has carried out some advocacy on nutrition with the government institution to influence the policy making process and budget allocation but collective action as a Group has not been put in place yet. ▪ The MoU Signed among Alafia Association/Women union and Federal Ministry of health for the implementation of the national health policy ▪ The ToR of the SUN CSN is reflecting the responsibility of the CSN to be engaged in advocacy for the developments and revision of important documents and policies, particularly that empower women and girls.

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 Started
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE The coordination of the relevant policies and legislations is ongoing, there is focus on the BMS code, maternal protection law, and this work is being undertaken in complementarity between the line ministers such as ministry of health, social welfare, labour and human resources. National Nutrition Policy, National Nutrition Strategy are going to be all updated

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

1 Started
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The decision was issued to form state council for food security and nutrition as part of the country’s decentralization nature, national council for Child welfare NCCW mandated to ensure implementation of decentralization as well as implementation of laws and hold relevant ministries accountable ▪ There is no mandatory national fortification policy. ▪ Maternity Laws are being enforced; ▪ Advocacy for extension of maternal leave are 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 Started
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing nutrition related policies, impact evaluation reports, surveys are shared by sectors on the MSP. ▪ Some research studies available at academia level, however; have not been shared with stakeholders and policy makers. ▪ Individual stakeholders have largely not contributed to mutual learning.

Key contributions of each stakeholder to Process 2

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

Stakeholders	<i>Please provide examples</i>
UN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFP is supporting the renewal of the national nutrition strategy, the national micronutrient strategy, the iodized salt manual and protocols. - UNICEF is supporting the national IYCF strategy, the RMNCH strategy and the CMAM quick references development, maternity protection law, - Jointly supporting the National Nutrition Investment Case development and operationalization - FAO: Nation Council for food security and nutrition through support provided FSTS, IPC reporting - The Cost benefit Analysis for Flour fortification - WHO is supporting the update of the national nutrition policy, FF legislations, update of the inpatient treatment guideline, development of the micronutrient fortification guideline and trainings manual, micronutrient fortification communication guidelines and

	materials, Implementation of BMS code, baby friendly hospital initiative (BFHI) guideline, national IYCF Curriculum, micronutrient surveillance system
	-
Donor	- The Donor network has not been involved yet, in a consultative process of the existing policies and regulations, however a few member have given their individual inputs on specific issues of policy tools in the framework of the bilateral relationship with the government of Sudan.
Business	-
CSO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The MoU Signed among Alafia Association/Women union and Federal Ministry of health for the implementation of the national health policy - The CSN has been involved in the HiAP development process

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)

Several activities have been undertaken to ensure a coherent policy and legal framework. At the national level, Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) Strategy has been developed. This FNS strategy will be used to review the draft National Nutrition Policy. The next national development policy framework will prioritise nutrition issues. Some partners are contributing to the review and formulation of nutrition relevant policies and legislation., particularly at the household level whilst also increasing incomes. More needs to be done to convert commitment statements to concrete actions and to enforce legislation, especially at the sub-national level. The planned nutrition research agenda must be followed through. Stronger links between academia and policy makers will be pursued to improve the current level of collaboration. Effective implementation of laws/policies remains a challenge.

All stakeholder platforms started to play a significant role in this process indicator, which overall, can be scored 1 as the necessary policy and legal frameworks started and enforced. Efforts continue to be made to refine these and ensure coordinated and collaborative implementation.



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

Started

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- Multi sectorial nutrition situation analysis is being done in the humanitarian context, the humanitarian response plans for the past 3 years 2017-2020 was multi sectorial in terms of joint planning and implementation.
- The programme is aligned to national nutrition-relevant policies, but there are still some gaps and bottlenecks – particularly around nutrition-sensitive policies.
- Other individual initiatives are recognized; however, need to be connected with the nutrition targets/policies.
- One of the main objective of the DN is aligning their actions according the national policies and priorities. To this purpose the DN has started the development of a tool for mapping their nutrition interventions in the country. When the data collection and analysis will be finalized, existing gaps and bottlenecks will be identified, and Donors will be able to align and integrate their actions.

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	1 Started
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The medium and long-term objectives are set in the respective sectors’ strategies, forming a common long and med-term objective are planned to be under the council for food security and nutrition as one guiding document for all actors. ▪ The exercise of mapping the capacities of the actors has not yet started 	

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	1 Started
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE	
<p>The national Nutrition Investment case contributed in drawing the broad expenditure lines as well as prioritization of the funding allocation, the committee formed by the SUN focal person is working on setting up a clear prioritization criterion for fund expenditure and eventually fund mobilization, the committee is composed of the relevant sectors.</p>	

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	1 Started
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE	
<p>The platform for the multi sectorial reporting, monitoring and evaluation exists at the National Council for Child Welfare, plans to engage the NCCW and build the capacity of the council to accommodate the indicators as well as the reporting mechanisms.</p> <p>Humanitarians are prioritizing to fund Multisectoral projects that are derived by nutrition needs.</p> <p>The DN has not conducted joint monitoring actions, therefore has not produced any joint progress reports.</p>	

Progress marker 3.5: Evaluate the implementation of actions to understand, achieve and sustain nutrition impact

This progress marker looks at how results and success is being evaluated to inform implementation decision-making and building the evidence base for improved nutrition.

FINAL SCORE

2
On-going

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Monitoring mechanism is in place with different degree of intensity depending on the programmes. For example, within health sector, quarterly reporting of the results of nutrition specific interventions is practised, but mechanism is to track, and report implementation results of nutrition sensitive interventions is less clear. The donor-funded programmes typically have a structured monitoring and evaluation framework, including baseline and end line population-based. Some Donors have supported individually the development of case studies, reports, surveys, impact evaluations and researches to build evidence base for improved nutrition; but as DN no common action has been undertaken in this framework.

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	- Supporting the Fill the Nutrients Gap study, Cost of Hunger in Africa, S3M, FF laws and monitoring, MSGs, SBCC, humanitarian development nexus piloting, Micronutrient survey, Cost Benefit Analysis of the flour fortification, Stepwise survey Sudan
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	- The CSN has plan to be actively engaged in the National S3M and Micronutrients Survey

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)

Studies, joint sector assessments and impact evaluations were carried out at national, sector and state levels, with the hope of providing evidence for decision making. Government, Development Partners and Academia were most active in achieving the progress made under this process indicator. Overall, this Process Indicator can be scored 1 the planning and implementation already being initiated in some areas.



PROCESS 4: Financial tracking and resource mobilisation

Assessing the financial feasibility of national plans to implement actions for improved nutrition is essential to determine funding requirements. The latter is based on the capability to track planned and actual spending on nutrition across relevant government ministries and from external partners. The existence of plans, with clearly costed actions, helps government authorities and key stakeholders (e.g. UN, donors, business, civil society) align and contribute resources to national priorities, estimate the required budget for implementation and identify financial gaps.

Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.

Progress marker 4.1: Cost and assess the financial feasibility of the CRF

This progress marker looks at the extent to which the government and all other in-country stakeholders provide inputs for the costing of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions across relevant sectors (costing exercises can be performed in various ways, including reviewing current spending or estimating unit costs).

FINAL SCORE

1

Started

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

The national nutrition costed investment case was developed launched and implementation plans are ongoing to be developed and actioned in a multi sectorial manner.

There is planning to conduct nutrition financial tracking study which inclusive of nutrition sensitive and specific intervention. Civil Society Organizations will be active part of this exercise. This can be used as a base or country experience for the coming costing of the CRG

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

2

On-going

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

The national council for Child Welfare NCCW, expressed interest in acting as pooling institution for information collecting, analysis and reporting, yet capacity building on the respective technical issues for the nutrition sensitive and specific areas.

The NCCW has representation at both federal and states level with good reporting mechanisms and structures, mandated to ensure reporting and enforcement of laws which makes it a suitable actor to handle this part.

The DN has just started the mapping exercise of their interventions to get a joint overview of their allocations to nutrition related programmes and actions, including overlaps and gaps.

Nutrition Budget tracking study under-implementation covering all related government entities and international donors

Progress marker 4.3: Scale up and align resources including addressing financial shortfalls

This progress marker looks at whether the government and other in-country stakeholders identify financial gaps and mobilise additional funds, through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, and setting-up of specific mechanisms.

FINAL SCORE

1
Started

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

The stage of common budgeting, identification of sustainable funding sources and funds mobilization is an area for advocacy yet, work has started with provision of examples such as the investment case, the ministry of social welfare funding ministry of health to treat malnutrition with considerable funding (50 M USD) annually, bringing all actors together under one budgeting forum is a work in progress. In- country stakeholders should improve the information sharing about their budget allocations in order to address the financial resources towards the country's priorities and mobilize additional resources, as needed. Eight of SUN CSOs have applied for the Global SUN Pooled fund 2018. Understanding current available resources is ongoing process by the end of the resource mapping and completeness of the CRF and scaling-up interventions, costed, shortfalls can be identified.

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.

0
Not started

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Not started for CRF

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
Not started

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

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

Key contributions of each stakeholder to Process 4

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

Stakeholders	Please provide examples
UN	-
Donor	-
Business	-
CSO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eight of SUN CSOs have applied for the Global SUN Pooled fund 2018. - Civil Society Organizations were active part of the financial tracking study which is inclusive of nutrition sensitive and specific intervention.

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)

Progress on the Process indicator has been limited. Although efforts to undertake financial tracking, there are data gaps for some sectors, as well as off-budget expenditures for donors with inconclusive results and limited dissemination. Expenditure tracking is under implementation. The lack of funds and limited resource mobilisation has been by far the greatest challenge to the SUN Movement. It is expected that due to the current planning processes, costed plans for scaling up nutrition will be produced. This should help to support resource mobilisation and advocate for and lobby politicians and parliamentarians for increased financial resources. Costed sector and district plans can also be used as a tool to mobilise resources or collaborate with other partners. Yet, previous country experience showed low conversion of pledges and commitments to disbursements, both domestically and from foreign sources. Sustainable multi-year funding is not available, even for the development partners. This makes it difficult to adequately plan and effectively implement nutrition interventions, as many activities are funded on an ad hoc basis or funding only being made available on predetermined conditions that are not always aligned to national priorities

Overall, this progress indicator can be scored 1, with all stakeholders generally started progress on this front.

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

(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) **No priorities have been set for 2016 and 2017 as SUN was very new and most of its structures were not in place**

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

Please list key 2018-2019 priorities for the MSP:

- Develop National Multi sector Nutrition Plan
- Formation of national coordination mechanism
- Update policies and strategies for Nutrition

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. CSA priority:

- Strengthen coordination between CSOs
- Mapping of CSA all over Sudan to insure equal distribution of services and program run by different CSOs

2.

3.

4.

5.

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

-

Annex 2: Emergency preparedness and response planning

<p>1. Within the reporting period (i.e. the past year), has the country faced and responded to a humanitarian situation? If yes, what was the duration and type(s) of emergency (e.g. natural and climate-related disasters, communal violence, armed conflict etc.)?</p>	<p>Yes or No Yes</p> <p>Please explain: There is protracted emergency in Sudan in addition to the South Sudanese influx about 100,000 people run off to Sudan because of civil war and have been settled by the government in official camps in three states.</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</p> <p>Please explain: Sudan developed three years Multi sector human train response plan and Nutrition is part of the (2018-2020)</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</p> <p>Please explain: Multisectoral engaged with humanitarian all partners through regular Nutrition Sector meeting on monthly basis. No clear link, forum or mechanism between different sectors and no linkage with development.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Repeated emergency (protracted) - No transitional plan when planning emergency

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

<p>1. Does the MSP engage with a governmental Ministry or Department that is responsible for women's affairs/gender equality? If yes, what is the name of this Ministry/Department?</p> <p>If not a part of the MSP, how do you engage with this Ministry/Department?</p>	<p>Yes or No yes</p> <p>Please explain: There is department within the Ministry of Social Security and Development (Women Department) responsible of women affairs. This ministry works closely FoMH, supporting treatment of malnutrition, as well as supporting other MCH activities at MoH.</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 Yes</p> <p>Please explain: AHFAD University for Women is mainly admit women and is having programs and department teaching and training</p>

		gender (Master and Diploma programs) and it is part of MSP.
3.	How does the MSP ensure gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls as part of their work plan?	Please explain: All sectors make sure gender mainstreamed in their plans
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: Non
5.	Have you analysed or done a stock take of existing nutrition policies, legislation and regulations from a gender perspective?	Yes or No
6.	Does your country have a national gender equality and/or women's empowerment policy or strategy in place?	Yes or No Please explain:
7.	Has advocacy been undertaken for gender-sensitive and pro-female policy-making and legislation on nutrition?	Yes or No Please explain:

Annex 4: Advocacy and communication for nutrition

1.	Do you engage with the media to amplify key messages, create awareness and demand for action on nutrition?	Yes or No If yes, please provide specific examples of how you have engaged the media, which stakeholders were involved in supporting the engagement and what the results have been. Please share relevant material such as communications / media engagement plans, advocacy material shared with the media, press releases, newspaper articles, video clips etc. Examples:
2.	Are parliamentarians actively contributing to improve nutrition, in collaboration with the MSP? <i>Examples could include the existence of an active Parliamentary network or group focusing on food security and nutrition, votes in support of legal or budget changes that the MSP suggested, debates in parliament on nutrition or other concrete actions taken by parliamentarians in support of improved nutrition.</i>	Yes or No If yes, please provide specific examples of how parliamentarians have engaged, which stakeholders that supported their engagement and what the results have been. Please share relevant material such as ToRs or action plans for Parliamentary networks or groups, budget tracking reports, reports from nutrition debates in parliament, speeches, press releases, newspaper articles, video clips etc. Examples:
3.	Is there one or several nominated Nutrition Champions (including for example high-level political leaders, celebrities, journalists,	Yes or No If yes, please provide specific examples of who the champions are, how they have been engaging, which stakeholders that supported their engagement, and what

	religious leaders etc.) actively engaging to promote nutrition at national and/or local level?	<p>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>
4.	Have you documented advocacy successes and best practice in reducing malnutrition through multi-sector and multi-stakeholder action, and shared them nationally and/or with regional and global partners?	<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.	Do you plan on organising a high-level event on nutrition in the upcoming period?	<p>Yes or No</p> <p>If yes, please provide details about the objectives and expected outcomes of the event, key stakeholders you plan to involve as well as the estimated date and location.</p> <p>Details:</p>

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

No.	Title (Ms./Mr.)	Name	Organisation	Specific SUN role (if applicable)	Email	Phone	Should contact be included in the SUN mailing list?
1.	Officer	Ghada Abdalwadood Alhadary	NCCW National Council for Child welfare	MSP	Ghada_hadari@yahoo.com	+249126883594	yes
2.	Nutrition Specialist	Talal Mahgoub	UNICEF	UNN	tmahgoub@unicef.org	+24912161225	yes
3.	Manager	Abuabdalla Albukhari Ibrahim	Industry Chamber of Commerce	SBN	emmoroug@gmail.com	+249912252500	no
4.	Nutrition manager	Nada Altied Abdrahman	ALMANAR (NNGO)	CSA	Nutrition.manager@almanargroup.org	+249912933306	yes
5.	Health Officer	Salwa Mudather Ismaeil	Health in All Policies	GOV.FMoH	Smuddthir1965@gmail.com	+249963637201	yes
6.	Health manager	Margherita Capalbi	AICS	Donor NW	margherita.capalbi@coopitsudan.org	+249907428771	yes

7.	Officer	Asma noureldien abdalmabood	MoE	MSP	Asmanor234@gmail.com	+249912565596	yes
8.	Projects Manger	Mohamed Osman Hamid	W.bank	Donor NW	mmohamed@worldbank.org	+249912335606	yes
9.	General Secretary	Suad Ibrahim Abdalla	NCCW	MSP	Suad_gamaleldin@yahoo.com	+249912111903	yes
10.	Undersecretary	Rida Ali Saeed Mohamed	Ministry of development and social security	MSP	Dr.ridaali@hotmail.com	+249997525071	yes
11.	Hunger control unit	Nemta Mohamed Eltegani	Ministry of development and social security	MSP	Numat.eltigani722@gmail.com	+249122103507	yes
12.	Manger	Amal Omer Ali Elhussien	Mo Investment	MSP	Amal.invest@gmail.com	+249918215828	yes
13.	WASH Officer	Zeinab Mahdi Ahmed	Mo Electricity and irrigation and water resources	MSP	Zeinabmahdi53@yahoo.com	+249126063132	yes
14.	Univ. Professor	Mahdi Abbas Shakak	Sudan University for sciences and technology	Academia	Shakak2007@gmail.com	+249912256746	yes