

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)

The Gambia

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
Civil society	Yes
Donors	
United Nations	Yes
Business	
Science and academia	Yes
Other (please specify)	

2. How many participated in the Joint-Assessment process? 22

Of these, please indicate how many participants were female and how many were male (12 male and 10 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 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

Why?

It offered members to learn about other institutions and their work. It also provided an update on the achievement of other stakeholders

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 and 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

4

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

A Nutrition Technical Advisory Committee comprising of stakeholders was established by the National Nutrition Policy before The Gambia joined the SUN Movement. This Committee has been expanded to include other stakeholders so that it becomes the MSP for the National SUN Movement. This Committee meets on a quarterly basis to discuss nutrition related progress.

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

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

More stakeholder institutions have been contacted to join the MSP and the need for their membership of the Platform has been discussed. Institutions such as The Gambia Chamber of Commerce and Industries (GCCCI) – for the Business Community, University of The Gambia – the academia, Association of Health Journalists – the media and The Association of Non-Governmental Organizations – the CSO have all been consulted to encourage them partake in the MSP considering their important roles in nutrition improvement.

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

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- Working together as partners to conduct the mid-term review of the National Nutrition Policy 2010 – 2020 and develop a new policy 2018 – 2025.
- Regular NTAC quarterly meetings that discuss and share information
- Joint Annual Assessment (JAA) exercises

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

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- There is limitation on this point
- NaNA reports on its financial commitments and Nutrition for Growth commitments
- Other individual stakeholders report on their contributions to scaling up nutrition.
- The financial tracking has started and still ongoing to cover all relevant institutions
- Nutrition activities and monitoring reports are 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

4

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

1. MSP involved in the development of the National Development Plan and United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
2. Existence of the NNC and chaired by the Vice President
3. UN Country Team has a Nutrition Focal Agency
4. Nutrition integrated within sector policies and programmes e.g, Health, Education and Agriculture

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial and technical support - Capacity building
Donor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial and technical support
Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - N/A
CSO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programme implementation - Resource mobilisation

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)

Achievements:

- Expansion of the National Multi-stakeholder Platform membership.
- Annual tracking financial investment in Nutrition.
- Participated in SUN teleconference.
- Integration of nutrition into the UNDAF and other UN agency specific country programme documents.
- Integration of nutrition into some sectorial policies and programmes (health, education and agriculture) and national development plan (2018 to 2021)

Challenges:

- Getting financial report from all sectors to be able to track investment in nutrition adequately
- Getting the business sector on board the MSP
- Incorporating nutrition into all relevant sectoral policies and programmes
- Development of a common result framework for nutrition



PROCESS 2: Ensuring a coherent policy and legal framework

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

Need some guidance? See the progress marker explanatory note.

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

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

FINAL SCORE

3
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The review of the national nutrition policy (2010 to 2020) based on emerging issues and current nutrition situations in the country leading to the development of the national nutrition policy 2018 – 2025

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.

<p>FINAL SCORE 4</p>
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Social and behavioural change communication strategy, nutrition communication strategy and health promotion and education strategy developed. . Development of community mobilisation strategy . Validation of the National Nutrition Policy (2018 – 2025). . The existence of National Assembly Select Committees on Health, Agriculture, Women, Youth and Children . The Vice President acts as Champion for Nutrition and promotes pro-nutrition policies as chair of the National Nutrition Council . The MSP participated in the development of the National Development Plan and UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) . Engagement of the press and media through interviews and workshops

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.

<p>FINAL SCORE 4</p>
<p>EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The composition of NNC itself reflects the involvement of various relevant ministries • The Nutrition Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC) and Technical Working Groups coordinate and harmonise inputs for the review of nutrition policies and legislations • MSP members supported the development and review of the National Nutrition Policy and Strategic Plan • Development of the national policy on food fortification in progress with support from FAO and United Purpose (national NGO)

--

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 4
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Breastfeeding Promotion Regulation which is based on the International code of marketing of breast milk substitutes, Food Fortification and Salt Iodisation Regulation to support the enforcement of the Food Act 2005 • Existence of trained Law Enforcement Agencies at the Regional Level to enforce the regulations such as the Police, Customs and excise, Public Health officials • Existence of draft regulations to enable the enforcement of the Food Safety and Quality Act 2011

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 4
EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A national micronutrient survey (MNS) and the Multiple indicator cluster survey (MICS) were conducted. But the results are yet to be out. The results of these studies will be used to inform policies and programmes. • The micronutrient survey also collected data to provide a synopsis of the situation of non-communicable diseases in the country.

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	- Financial and technical support
Donor	- Financial and technical support
Business	- N/A
CSO	- Advocacy

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)

Achievements

- A new national nutrition policy developed
- Efforts to develop a National Food fortification policy and relevant legislations

Suggestions

- A costed strategic plan and business plan needs to be developed
- Continue to advocate for mainstreaming nutrition into other relevant policies and programmes



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

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- The NTAC meetings conducted to review progress of programme implementation
- School meals currently operates in all 7 regions, providing meals to a total number of 369 schools. The government has taken responsibility of LRR and WCR with support from WFP, while WFP fully operates and provides school meals in the other 5 regions.
- Adoption of the home grown school feeding programme

- The involvement of multiple stakeholders in the food fortification programme
- The screening for malnutrition in five of the seven health regions

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)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- There is no Common Results Framework (CRF) but the MSP is proposing to develop one now that the national nutrition policy is finalized.

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

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- No CRF available as yet

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

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- No CRF available as 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

4

'q

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

-

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	- Financial and technical support
Donor	- Financial and technical support
Business	- N/A
CSO	- Advocacy, Programme implementation

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)

Achievements

- Several surveys are being finalised to provide information on the progress of programme implementation

Challenges

- Yet to develop a CRF



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

4

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

- National Budget Estimates, UNICEF/Gambia Government Rolling Work Plan, National Health Strategic Plan
- National Development Plan 2018-2021
- FAO Bio fortification
- WFP TSF Program
- P2RS Project
- United Purpose (UP) Biofortification project
- GAFNA on gardening
- MCHRP project on FNS
- EU support projects
- Child Fund the Gambia
- AATG

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)

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

-National budget (Fiscal estimates) are normally printed and distributed among stakeholders. There each sector can know how much resources are available for nutrition interventions.
Each sector can track the amount of resources expended over a period, however this is not normally done.

-The IFMIS can provided budget execution rate over each period, but there is no specific platform where this information is collated to track investment into Nutrition interventions

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

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

-Other than the Costed National Nutrition Strategy which expired in 2015, there is no national document that is developed to identify resource Gap for Nutrition.
- Government have been steadily increasing allocation for Nutrition over the period but those allocations are mainly for Personal Emoluments.
- Donors and partners are putting lots of support into Nutrition but nationally the country cannot clearly identify the extent of resource coverage in terms of programmes nor can we identify the gaps due.
-Government allocation towards school feeding program in 2 out of 6 regions

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

3

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Most donors who pledged to support nutrition interventions are disbursing funds regularly and the Government even though its commitment is minimal is honouring commitment to certain extent.

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

1

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

The Costed National Nutrition Strategy has been used by donors and partners to a certain extent in determining support to nutrition interventions but Government is not using this document for national resources allocation for nutrition.

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	- UNICEF, WFP, FAO
Donor	- EU, WORLD BANK
Business	- N/A
CSO	- GAFNA, FAWEGAM, CHILDFUND GAMBIA, CONCEPT UNITS FOUNDATION, UNITED PURPOSE, ACTION AID THE GAMBIA, ADWAC, PACA, MRCG, AATG

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

4

FINAL SCORE

EXPLANATION OF THE FINAL SCORE

Progress in scaling up nutrition-specific interventions

The promotion of infant and young child feeding, micronutrient supplementation, management of acute malnutrition, food fortification and nutrition education are rolled out nationally. These interventions are accompanied by SBCC activities.

Building Resilience Through Social Transfer (BReST) and the Maternal and Child Nutrition and Health Results Project (MCNHRP) particularly the Food and Nutrition Security component. The BReST is operating in 10 facilities with the highest Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rates in 4 out of the 7 health regions and targeting 6176 children under 2 years. The MCNHRP is being implemented in 5 out of the 7 health regions and targeting 800,000 (40% of the national population) for improved access and utilization of community nutrition, primary maternal and child health services.

Progress in scaling up nutrition-sensitive interventions

-WFP provides target supplementary feeding for children for moderately malnourished children 6-59 months. The distribution is done through community based distribution centers under the supervision of Government employed Community Health Nurses and supported by staff from the National Nutrition Agency (NaNA) yearly target is 16,900 children, within the four of the regions(LRR, NBR E/W, CRR, URR).

- WFP provides blanket supplementary feeding, used as a preventative measure for all children 6-23 months. Yearly target is 40,000 children, in the four regions (LRR, NBR E/W, CRR, and URR.)

-WFP provides targeted supplementary feeding for pregnant and lactating mothers at the health centers. Yearly target is 7,500 women and girls in the four regions (LRR, NBR E/W, CRR, and URR.)

- GAFNA conducts nutrition education to refugees and host communities during workshops and seminars in collaboration with the Ministry of Health

- Livelihood programmes through food security for self-reliance for refugees and the host communities, provides farming implements and inputs, gardens and garden tools, animal rearing and support small businesses to increase income levels and purchasing of essential food stuff.

Annex 1: Identified priorities

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

<p>Priorities identified in most recent JAA?</p> <p><i>Enter priority</i></p>	<p>Has this priority been met?</p> <p><i>Yes or No</i></p>	<p>What actions took place to ensure the priority could be met?</p> <p><i>Please outline stakeholders' contributions (government, UN, CSOs, donors, etc.)</i></p>	<p>Did you receive external technical assistance to meet this priority?</p> <p><i>If yes, please explain</i></p>
<p>✓ Review relevant policy and legislation documents is ongoing. The review of the Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy was completed, the review of the National Nutrition Policy is ongoing</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Review meetings, taskforce comprising of UN agencies, government, academia, CSOs</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>✓ Strategic planning to define the actions to be included in the Common Results Framework (CRF). This awaits the finalisation of the revised nutrition policy</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>✓ Development of a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework.). This awaits the finalization of the revised nutrition policy</p>	<p>no</p>	<p>no</p>	<p>no</p>

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. Development of Common Results Framework (CRF)
2. Development of the costed Strategic and Business Plans for nutrition
3. Strengthen public private partnership (participation of the business sector in the MSP)

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

Need assistance for the development of the CRF and the support of the SUN business network in the development of the national SUN business network.

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- instances of flash floods during the last rainy season</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 there is a national emergency plan under the National Disaster Management Agency (NDMA). The National Nutrition Policy also has a section on nutrition and emergencies.</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, but not as an MSP. It is individual institutions working with the NDMA.</p>
<p>4. What are the key limitations faced at the country level in terms of linking development and humanitarian nutrition actions?</p>	<p>Limited capacity</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 the agency is the Women's Bureau under the Office of the Vice President.</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, working FAWEGAM and Concept Units Foundation, both are CSOs.</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>Including stakeholders whose programs are geared towards gender equality.</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>Mainstreaming gender issues in our policies and programs at all levels.</p>
<p>5. Have you analysed or done a stock take of existing nutrition policies, legislation and regulations from a gender perspective?</p>	<p>Yes because the focus of the policy is on gender equality.</p>

6.	Does your country have a national gender equality and/or women's empowerment policy or strategy in place?	Yes we have the Women's Act and the Gender and Women Empowerment Policy.
7.	Has advocacy been undertaken for gender-sensitive and pro-female policy-making and legislation on nutrition?	Yes

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?	<p>Yes by organising press briefings and granting interviews to media houses. Coverage of nutritional activities and programs by the media. Using social media to disseminate information and messages on nutrition.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Examples:</p>
2.	<p>Are parliamentarians actively contributing to improve nutrition, in collaboration with the MSP?</p> <p><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></p>	<p>Yes the health select committee of the National Assembly attended a training in Ivory Coast through the support of UNICEF on...</p> <p>The health select committee of the National Assembly has been meeting with the National Nutrition Agency to discuss nutrition issues.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Examples:</p>
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?	<p>No</p> <p>If yes, please provide specific examples of who the champions are, how they have been engaging, which stakeholders that supported their engagement, and what the results have been. Please also share relevant material such as Nutrition Champion engagement plans, speeches, press releases, newspaper articles, video clips and other material etc.</p> <p>Examples:</p>
4.	Have you documented advocacy successes and best practice in reducing malnutrition through	Yes

<p>multi-sector and multi-stakeholder action, and shared them nationally and/or with regional and global partners?</p>	<p>If yes, please provide specific examples of the successes and best practices you have documented, the stakeholders involved in documenting them, as well as how you have communicated them. Please share relevant material such as case studies or reports of advocacy successes and/or best practice etc.</p> <p>Examples:</p>
<p>5. Do you plan on organising a high-level event on nutrition in the upcoming period?</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.	Mr.	Modou Cheyassin Phall	National Nutrition Agency	Executive Director and SUN Movement Focal Point (MSP) Gambia	Modoucheyassin@yahoo.com	+2209975511	No
2.	Mr.	Malang N. Fofana	National Nutrition Agency	Member	Kekendoo@yahoo.com	+2203992531	No
3.	Mr.	Bakary Jallow	National Nutrition Agency	Member	Bakaryjallow24@yahoo.com	+2203997407	No
4.	Mr.	Alieu Kujabi	National Nutrition Agency	Member and Secretary MSP Gambia	Kujabialieu@hotmail.com	+2203430522c	No
5.	Ms	Catherine Kutu Gibba Omo	National Nutrition Agency	Member	catherinegibba@yahoo.com	+2203836826	No
6.	Ms	Sarjo Camara	Department of Community Development	Member	sarjo@gmail.com	+2207940734	yes
7.	Mr	Adama Sanneh	GAFNA	Member	Adamasanneh439@gmail.com	+2203663678	yes

8.	Mr	Malang S. Ceesay	GAFNA	Member	ceesaymals@hotmail.com	+2207799512	yes
9.	Mr.	Martin M. Mendy	FAWEGAM	Member	Martin.mendygm@gmail.com	+2207941240	yes
10.	Ms.	Lalia a Jawara	FSQA	Member	ljawara@fsqa.gm	+2207798444	yes
11.	Ms	Ndey Naffie Ceesay	PACA	Member	naffiessc@gmail.com	+2209967766	yes
12.	Mr.	Alhaji Jabbi	University of The Gambia	Member	ajabbi@utg.edu.gm	+2203850300	yes
13.	Mr.	Pa Bojang	National Environment Agency	Member	big.boys@live.co.uk	+2209998312	yes
14.	Ms	Ida Mboob joseph	Concept Units foundation	Member	idamboobjoseph@gmail.com	+2202380118	yes
15.	Mr	Robert Sambou	DHPE	Member	robealsam@gmail.com	+2207435776	yes
16.	Ms	Musu Komma	Child Fund The Gambia	Member	mkomma@childfund.org	+2209958356	yes
17.	Mr.	Chaba Saidyleigh	Department of Water Resources	Member	chabasaidy@yahoo.com	+2203773721	yes
18.	Ms	Gabriela Barajas	WFP	Member	gabriela.barajas@wfp.org	+2207241079	yes