

# Country Consultation

Date: August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2020

Lead and Chair: Mme Gladys Mugambi, SUN Focal Point for Kenya

Participating Countries Present: Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, South Sudan (7/11)

Presence ():

## 1. Context

The group of countries lead by Mme Gladys Mugambi, held consultations to improve the strategic grip of the SUN Movement next phase strategy to be more country led and country oriented. The aim is to anchor the strategic orientations to have better impact at subnational level and be align to country priorities. Following on, this consultation aims to:

- ❖ Look back: Review progress in delivering the previous Sun Strategy 1 & 2
- ❖ Fit for purpose: Assess the Sun's Movement readiness to implement the new Strategy 3.0
- ❖ Look forward: Assess the Sun's Movement approach as fit to support country priorities and major actor in provision of solid backbone for international investment support nutrition in countries.

The results of the country consultations, along with its other evaluations/consultations, would informs the development of the SUN 3.0 Strategy 2021-2026.

## 2. General Comments on the Sun 3.0 Strategy

In the introduction the Chair highlighted that participants can also share written comments to help the feedback and that the meeting aims just for the participants to provide summary of their findings.

The first general comments were related to the lake of understand about the change in semantic made to the new strategy such as the Country coordination and the country operation plan. Further comments were also directed to the strategic objectives 1, 2 and 3 which the participants mentioned that it needs to be more country specific, the lack of specificities about the TA provision and the approach.

## 3. Vision/Objectives & Approaches

The main intervention was made around the fact that the new strategy is not really connected with the country's reality as well as the current context of countries. The Strategic Objectives are not linked to each other and to the Theory of Change, specifically the SO 1, 2 and 3 and also the coordination mechanism. In sum the strategy does not show it can strengthen countries to improves nutrition status at subnational level:

- Coordination constitute is huge issue vis a vis global Movement, Global Partners. One common frameworks is needed.: The Sun should acknowledge the 2 levels of coordination, the SUN Focal Point which is a Political Personality with political leverage in government, with a rather high position to drive political processes and a Technical Coordination of the SUN at MSP level, making things happen. No politician

has the time nor the energy to do this. Political is separated from technical coordination.

- The Strategy should be more country oriented and less prescriptive. Changing the name is rather confusing. SUN has not taken the trouble to take a look at the systems that are there. The new strategy has to consider contingency measures, this will be considered in every policy, response strategy at country level.  
The Change of nomenclature is also very confusing: the key thing and point is that there should be some visibility of Nutrition as key marker and maker to drive policy design and development of frameworks to tackle issues at sub national level. This visibility could be reinforced with capacitation of countries for domestic resources mobilization driven at the highest level of the countries. If more domestic resources were mobilize, countries could drive more concretely the nutrition strategy at subnational level.
- The SUN Movement should help countries to build capacity. Sustainability is very critical, Capacity to develop, implement and measure effectively nutrition and multisectoral nutrition programs is key to systemic change: This is very important, the countries wants more impact results rather than beautiful policies and plans. We need to track the implementation and build the capacity for implementation. Evidence generation does not come very clearly. It is absolutely necessary to have evidence-based support and nutrition programming in the countries.
- Referring to national level (activities and commitment). We are missing the subnational level. Commitment should also be commitment of regional, subnational levels.
- Regarding the strategic objectives:
  - SO1: Aspect of costing and commitment should be addressed as well. Give the countries the opportunity to mobilize resource, allocations from domestic budget.
  - SO2: Need to include operational, incidence, advocacy to promote at country level. Humanitarian and development context are missing. This is a big concern. Transition period to development should be accompanied and consistent.
  - SO3: Yes, but countries will. have to rely on local expertise for sustainability. Its not about lack of expertise. It is about the fact that Funding and coordination are not present at country level.
  - Resource mobilization: support in resource mobilization and pledging. Countries are competing between each other, but fighting against malnutrition in all. Its forms.
  - Coordination of strategic guidances for Sun countries: This is where there are problems. We need to improve interstate coordination through evidence based programming and sharing of best practices. Measurable outcomes can be collected through some common indicators. So far there is no common indicator available every year.
- Mutual accountability between countries and apply principles of aid effectiveness. Table 1: in the past there was a disconnection between ExCom and countries. They don't represent people from countries. Same with the Lead Group needs to evolve to a more consultative process/approach, assuring the decentralization of SUN: Direct contact to regional offices is very importance for the next phase. Proposal to have offices in Dakar, Nairobi, Abidjan and organize annual events.
- Sustainability: Making sure nutrition visible is key. Page 5: All forms of malnutrition. Countries should also include NCDs responses to nutrition programming.

- Nutrition should be also present in contingency plans in case of emergency. Due to the current pandemic, Strategy to be accepted by leaders now with COVID ongoing, its quite challenging. Alternative situation to address the strategy
- Knowledge and TA provision: Also good to reflect on the manpower at country level. For sustainability issues. The process to send a request, it is not clear. Need to document lessons learned, countries in the region. Showing and explaining best practices to work better together with countries.

## 4. Conclusions

The conclusions and recommendations presented below aims to operate a shift in the dynamic and way of working and induce systemic change to end Malnutrition in all its forms.

- Issue of Coordination is key: Technical and Political.
- Emphasis on country specific context: No prescriptive document, allow countries to implement as they think best
- Take acknowledge of the COVID situation.
- Strengthen the country systems
- Use a consultative approach to be able to involve all actors
- SUN Country Coordinator, not prescriptive
- Issue of funding
- Issue of re-commitment
- Evidence based approaches
- Humanitarian and ethnic issues
- Better documentation and sharing of experiences

## 5. Comments and Questions

- The SUN Country Coordinator:
  - Very prescriptive
  - Countries should place it wherever they feel its relevant. Should not be indicative
- Re-commitment:
  - How is this going to happen? This is not clear, we need more detail. New pronouncements? New FPs? High level letters?
- Budget: it is not clear the budget to implement the strategy.
- Dr Chris will send comments on Monday
- Country coordinator at highest level. FP should still remain as FP