

# The 2020 SUN Movement Joint-Assessment

EXPLANATORY NOTE: PROGRESS MARKERS



Scaling Up  
Nutrition



#SUNassessment20



## PROCESS 1: BRINGING PEOPLE TOGETHER IN THE SAME SPACE FOR ACTION

*Coordination mechanisms or platforms enable stakeholders to better work towards improved nutrition. Platforms can exist at both the national and sub-national level.*

*Multi-stakeholder platforms (MSPs) are seen as operational when they enable the delivery of joint results, on issues relevant to nutrition. MSPs are also deemed functional when 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.*

### **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 these are linked, or new identified financing mechanisms with potential high impact for nutrition.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Multi-stakeholder platform(s) exist and are convened, on a regular basis.
- » Each stakeholder group has a functional coordinating mechanism (such as a Network or a convener).
- » Relevant sectors (such as health, food systems and agriculture, water and sanitation, education, and women's affairs) play a key role in the multi-stakeholder platform.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of stakeholders from various sectors working together, consistently, over time, towards common priorities – with the support of the highest level of Government.

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

This progress marker looks at 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 (such as grassroots-focused organisations or the executive branch of Government, for example), resulting in expanded membership. It also encompasses national platforms linked to innovative, nutrition-related mechanisms, sub-national platforms and relevant actors.

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » New, dedicated sub-national mechanisms are established, or existing ones are adapted and engage with communities and populations most in need.
- » National-level coordinating mechanisms, such as SUN Civil Society Alliances, work with and support grassroots-based organisations or platforms.

- » The multi-stakeholder platform has diversified beyond 'traditional' SUN stakeholders and Networks (such as non-traditional donors, new sectors within the Government or coalitions).

**Note:** In the new thematic section on sub-national actions, you will be asked more questions on scaling up nutrition, and multi-stakeholder platforms or mechanisms, at the sub-national level.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of the existence of sub-national level coordinating mechanisms, that these mechanisms amplify voices from the community or grassroots level, and that new, non-traditional stakeholders have been brought onboard – for broader influence.

### **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. Where relevant, interactions at the sub-national level should also be addressed.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » The multi-stakeholder platform focuses on strategic agenda-setting, for effective results.
- » The multi-stakeholder platform encourages, sustains and increases meaningful engagement among actors.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of substantial engagement from members towards priorities set.

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

*This progress marker looks whether the multi-stakeholder platform tracks and reports on implementation of agreed actions, by individual actors and stakeholders. The Platform's ability to foster accountability is also considered.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Key stakeholder groups report on activities undertaken to fulfil their commitments – on a regular basis and as per agreed workplans – and share results.
- » The multi-stakeholder platform tracks and reflects on the implementation of its workplan(s) to achieve agreed priorities, covering all relevant sectors.
- » The multi-stakeholder platform communicates progress among its members, using various means such as newsletters, reports, a website, etc.

- » The multi-stakeholder platform regularly reports on its achievements to the executive level of Government.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of annual reports and other publicly available documents that showcase accomplishments and contributions made by different stakeholders.

### **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 improved nutrition is accepted as a national priority and institutionalised by all stakeholders. It also looks at whether the coordination mechanisms put in place are sustainable.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Executive levels of Government recognise nutrition as a national priority, and the need to address malnutrition through a multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral approach, for example through the adoption of a declaration
- » Parliament adopts and/or revises policies and legislation for improved nutrition.
- » A specific budget line for nutrition coordination in national and/or sub-national Government budgets and/or in development partners' budgets exists.
- » The multi-stakeholder platform, or its key functions, is integrated into national and/or sub-national planning and reporting mechanisms or processes.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of how processes and budgets of the Government and other stakeholders have been influenced, and how the platform has cemented its role as key to bring together sectors and stakeholders for improved 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. This process focuses on the enabling policy and legal environment.*

### **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.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Analysis, stocktaking or reviews of sectoral or thematic policies and legal frameworks has taken place.
- » Policies and legal frameworks are assessed to find out if they are coherent with nutrition goals and country context; whether they are gender-sensitive; whether they are fit-for-purpose; and whether they are enforced.
- » Policy review results are published and made readily available for policy-makers.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of reviews/analyses of policies and legislation, by also describing the type of consultation that has taken place.

### **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 improved nutrition policies and legal frameworks and their dissemination (i.e. advocacy and communication strategies are put in place to support the dissemination of relevant policies).*

*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.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » A national advocacy and/or communication strategy in support of the national nutrition plan exists and includes awareness-raising and behaviour change communication at the community level.
- » Advocacy for reviewing or revising policies and legal frameworks has taken place to determine their quality, whether they are fit-for-purpose and gender-sensitive, funded and implemented.

- » Joint messaging, narratives or strategies, across stakeholder groups – to influence policy-making and financing – has been determined across stakeholder groups and used at national and sub-national levels.
- » Up-to-date nutrition evidence (including national demographic and health surveys, SMART surveys or global reports) has been used to feed into advocacy messaging and publications
- » Traditional and social media is used to amplify key messages, create awareness and build demand for action on nutrition.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of joint advocacy and/or communication that has successfully had an impact on policy and legal frameworks and supporting strategies.

### **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.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Updated nutrition-relevant policies and strategies exist.
- » Policies have been updated to better address and promote gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls.
- » Key stakeholder groups coordinate and harmonise inputs to national nutrition-relevant policies and legislation.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of updated policies, legislation or the existence of review frameworks, developed through coordinated and harmonised stakeholder efforts.

### **Progress marker 2.4: Operationalise/enforce legal frameworks**

*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, food safety regulations, the right to food, among others.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Guidelines exist, at national and sub-national levels, to put legislation into practice.
- » Regulatory or inspection agencies or mechanisms exist (such as food standard agencies, food safety inspection mechanisms), at national and/or sub-national levels.
- » Monitoring mechanisms or agencies have the authority to fine non-compliers.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of guidelines, regulations and enforcement mechanisms put in place to enforce legislation.

### **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 platform.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Policy reviews, monitoring reports and impact evaluations exist and are used, by various audiences.
- » Stakeholders foster mutual learning by sharing lessons learnt in the implementation of policies and legislation.
- » Consultative workshops have been held to share policy evaluation results, to inform future decision-making.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of case studies or reports that showcase lessons learned.



## PROCESS 3: ALIGNING ACTIONS AROUND COMMON RESULTS

*The alignment of actions across sectors that significantly contribute to improving nutrition demonstrates the extent to which multiple sectors and stakeholders are effectively working together, and the extent to which policies and legislation are operationalised – to ensure that everyone, women and children, in particular, benefit from improved nutrition.*

*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. 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 to scale up nutrition.*

### **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 national policies and priorities. It focuses on the alignment of actions across sectors and among relevant stakeholders that significantly contribute towards improved nutrition.*

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 their implementation, including capacities.

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » A stocktake or analysis of the nutrition situation and of sectoral government programmes and implementation mechanisms has taken place.
- » Mappings of stakeholder nutrition actions have been undertaken.
- » Sectoral programmes have been designed to be more nutrition-sensitive.
- » Mappings of gaps in gender-sensitive core nutrition actions, aligned with policy and legal frameworks, have been undertaken.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of alignment of actions, across sectors and relevant stakeholders, towards national nutrition targets/policies.

## **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 (CRF) to effectively align interventions for improved nutrition. The CRF is recognised as the guidance for the medium to long-term implementation of actions, with clearly identified nutrition targets. Ideally, the CRF should identify coordination mechanisms (and related capacities) and define roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder. It should encompass an implementation matrix, a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework and costed interventions, including cost estimates for advocacy, coordination and M&E.*

### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Medium or long-term implementation objectives are defined and the contributions of sectoral objectives toward common nutrition goals have been clarified.
- » Clear indicators have been set, alongside sources of information for each indicator.
- » The process of implementation has been defined, with clear roles given individual stakeholder groups at the national and sub-national level.
- » The Common Results Framework for scaling up nutrition has been set.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of a robust CRF or plan that has been endorsed (both politically and technically).

## **Progress marker 3.3: Organise and implement annual priorities as per the Common Results Framework**

*This progress marker looks at the implementation of priority actions, at the national and sub-national level.*

### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Capacity assessments, to ensure implementation of priorities, have been undertaken.
- » Mobilising and strengthening the capacity of implementing entities, in line with assessments and agreed arrangements, have taken place.
- » Annual, detailed workplans exist – jointly developed by relevant stakeholders – with measurable targets to guide implementation at national and sub-national levels.
- » Training and/or support supervision has been provided, to increase the coordination and the implementation capacity at national and sub-national levels – for the achievement of annual priorities.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of aligned actions around annual priorities, such as an annual workplan or implementation plan, at the national and sub-national level.

### **Progress marker 3.4: Jointly monitor priority actions as per the Common Results Framework**

*This progress marker looks at how information systems and joint progress reports are used to monitor the implementation of priority actions for improved nutrition.*

- » An information system, or another mechanism, has been put in place to regularly collate data from existing systems or portals, analyse this data and share indicators – focusing on measuring implementation coverage and performance.
- » Joint annual or regular reviews and monitoring visits are undertaken to feed into progress reports or to change the approach taken.
- » Participatory monitoring and evaluation, by civil society or other stakeholder groups, has taken place.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of regular/annual joint implementation reviews of progress towards prioritised actions.

### **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 decision-making and build the evidence-base for improved nutrition. It also looks at how findings and recommendations have been used to share lessons across regions, provinces or districts.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Findings from implementation studies, impact evaluation and operational research are gathered and shared.
- » Lessons learnt, good practices, case studies, stories of change – especially those that empower women and girls – and progress are capture and shared.
- » Advocacy for more effective coverage of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive programmes has been undertaken.
- » Minimum requirements for scoring 4: The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of evaluation of actions having taken place to demonstrates nutrition impact and results are made publicly available.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of evaluation of actions having taken place to demonstrates nutrition impact and results are made publicly available.



## 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. This 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 the Government and key stakeholders (e.g. UN, donors, business, civil society) align and contribute resources towards national priorities, estimate the required budget for implementation and identify financial gaps.*

### **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 give their input for the costing of nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions across sectors. Please explain how financial data is shared transparently with other partners of the MSP and the SUN Movement Secretariat.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Cost estimates of nutrition-related actions at the national and sub-national level have been ascertained.
- » Costed plans national strategy and/or plan exist.
- » Stakeholder groups have a common overview of allocations towards nutrition-related programmes and actions, including potential overlaps and gaps.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of costing methods and the costed programmes or plans.

### **Progress marker 4.2: Track and report on financing for nutrition**

*This progress marker looks at the extent to which the Government and other in-country stakeholders are able to track their allocations and expenditures (if available) for nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive actions across relevant sectors and/or identified new financing mechanisms/initiatives (with a credible impact for nutrition). The SUN multi-stakeholder platform – including the Government – should be able to report on financial data, in a transparent manner. On financial tracking, please explain how relevant stakeholders have been included in the exercise, and whether levels of commitment from these stakeholders across the years in which your country performed a budget analysis exercise have varied.*

#### **EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:**

- » Members of the multi-stakeholder platform take part in financial tracking and reporting.

- » Members of the multi-stakeholder platform have produced a shared report on nutrition-sensitive and specific interventions, disaggregated by sector and sex and financial resources (domestic and/or external) including allocations versus expenditures.
- » Members of the multi-stakeholder platform track planned and actual disbursements of funds for nutrition-specific and sensitive interventions at the sub-national level (where appropriate).
- » Reporting mechanisms that provide transparent and publicly available financial information exist.
- » Social audits have been undertaken, financial information is shared among members of the multi-stakeholder platform, and financial information has been made public.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of publicly available information on current allocations and recent actual spending.

### **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, (including from new identified financing mechanisms/initiatives with a credible impact on nutrition), through increased alignment and allocation of budgets, advocacy, and setting-up of specific funding mechanisms. This includes innovative financial mechanisms for nutrition, such as The Power of Nutrition and the Global Financing Facility.*

Note: This progress marker focuses on whether and which pledges are made, while progress marker 4.4 looks at whether the pledges are disbursed and used.

#### **EXAMPLES OF WHAT PROGRESS COULD LOOK LIKE:**

- » Members of the multi-stakeholder platform prioritise additional funding needs and identify financial resources (domestic, external or both) and gaps.
- » Government partners strategically align their allocations towards identified priorities, including re-programming large sectoral investments to make them more nutrition-driven, or re-directing or increasing resources towards areas/populations most in need.
- » Development partners align their funds to address shortfalls and mobilise additional resources, as needed.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of how they have identified financial gaps and mobilised additional funds through, among others, better alignment of resources or setting up specific mechanisms.

## Progress marker 4.4: Turn pledges into disbursements

*This progress marker looks at how governments and other in-country stakeholders turn pledges (as described in progress marker 4.3) into actual disbursements. It includes the ability of donors to look at how their disbursements are timely and in line with the scheduled fiscal year.*

### EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:

- » Governments disburse funds in a timely and predictable way, reduce delays, at both national and sub-national levels, and address absorption concerns.
- » Development partners disburse funds in a timely and predictable way and disclose the timeline for disbursements – in agreement with the Government.
- » The Government reports on funding received and disbursed from domestic and external resources (through national budgets or other finance platforms).

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of disbursements against pledges (domestic or external), including how bottlenecks in disbursing funds in a timely and predictable way have been addressed.

## 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 addressing funding gaps, sustainably.*

### EXAMPLES OF PROGRESS:

- » A long-term and flexible resource mobilisation strategy exists.
- » A coordinated reduction of financial gaps, through domestic and external contributions, is seen at the national and sub-national level.
- » Finance mechanisms that aim to ensure a continuum between humanitarian and development funding exist.

**Minimum requirements for scoring 4:** The multi-stakeholder platform can give evidence of multi-year funding mechanisms.



**FIND OUT MORE**

[www.scalingupnutrition.org](http://www.scalingupnutrition.org)

[www.facebook.com/SUNMovement](https://www.facebook.com/SUNMovement)

[www.twitter.com/SUN\\_Movement](https://www.twitter.com/SUN_Movement)

