

In-country consultation of Nepal and regional consultation on Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement 3.0 draft strategy

Summary of inputs, key issues and recommendations

Date: Thursday, 20 August 2020

Moderator: Dr. Kiran Rupakhetee -Joint Secretary, National Planning Commission, SUN Government Focal Point of Nepal and SUN Executive Committee member.

Participating Countries: Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Kyrgyzstan and Yemen

Part A: Perception on the SUN 3.0 draft strategy

I. Missing parts and parts to be further explained in the SUN 3.0 draft strategy

1. **Definition of success** in section 8: “..... acceleration in the improvement of nutrition outcomes....” Acceleration is a range. The definition lacks the measurable point for the success. - Need to **review and include the parameters** (indicators) of success and **made it measurable**. The **Outcomes** should be at two levels including **capacity and actual measurable changes** that will produce desired impact.
2. **Why SUN 3.0?** - Need **evidence based explanation** on why is it needed? - Add the **summary of SWOT analysis** before the ‘why New Strategy’?
3. **The strategy document has defined “What we should do?” How part (Process)** is missing which is **equally important**, and thus need to be explained in the document.
4. **Language/ wording:** Need revision in language/wording on the document. Since the document has to be used in the global level; the audiences (participants of consultations) have recommended for formal and simple (easy to understand) language in the document.
5. The **SDG indicators and targets with milestones** (beyond WHA targets) need to be emphasized for fulfilling the Global Commitment.
6. Nutrition specific components are more focused in the document. However, **Nutrition sensitive components should be equally focused for nutritional outcomes**.
7. Need explanation on **Operational mechanism and Governance mechanism**, which leads to effective and result oriented execution in the field level. An **accountability and performance mechanism** should be in place and performance should be measured against **pre-set key performance indicators (KPIs)** for SUN components.
8. The **link** between SUN Networks, SUN Secretariat and SUN Government Focal Point **need to be explicitly defined** focusing the essence of SUN Movement i.e. **harmonization and synchronization**.
9. Need more **concrete and proved tools/concepts/experiences/country analysis** on what has worked and what has not.

Summary of inputs, key issues and recommendations on SUN 3.0 draft strategy

10. **SUN Movement in the Conflict-affected context** - how SUN Movement can work in conflict affected fragile states? - Need to explain the **Principle, structure and governance of SUN in conflict-affected context**.

“No one should be left behind”- all people in the conflict affected fragile states should be taken into consideration; the responsibilities of UN and SUN Movement in this context need to be defined in the strategy.

11. **Reaching at sub-national level** is one of the major gaps in SUN 2.0, and **that is yet to be more reflected- focusing mainly on how SUN 3.0 will go beyond global and national, and then reaches** the actual beneficiaries at sub national and community level.

12. The draft has **overlooked achievements of the Movement to date**. - Need to add information on nutrition related intervention and success stories from the countries.

II. Positive parts of the SUN 3.0 draft strategy

1. **Anyone who cares about nutrition as a maker and marker of sustainable development** and is willing to do something about it, while adhering to SUN principles - is SUN Movement.
2. SUN now must re-orientate to be: **country-led, country-driven and action-oriented** rooted in country structures.
3. Country Priority setting and its implementation along with the financial and TA support from inside and outside are the most important.
4. The strategy 3.0 has embodied to make individual country more responsible at the national and sub-national levels.
5. SUN 3.0 draft strategy identified some good indicators related to program, process, policy and impact.
6. Technical Assistance (TA) mechanism being country need driven.
7. More results and investment focused strategy.
8. Engagement of other sectors such as climate change and considering emerging/other potential challenges such as COVID-19 etc.

Part B: Develop and implement Country Action Plan (CAP)

How Multi Sector Nutrition Plan (MSNP) and Country Action Plan (CAP) differ?

Is CAP really needed in country's context?

1. More clarity is needed on the **value addition** of Country Action Plans versus National Nutrition Plans.
2. **MSNP** is a national guiding document in nutrition, is enough for the action plan. Additional action plan under the SUN can create confusion and competition. So, we should be rigid in one action plan that may be MSNP or CAP with explicit set of evidence-informed country-determined priorities.
3. The **CAP should be a by-product of MSNP** that would support MSNP by explicitly presenting the detailed implementation plan listing the donors alongside of each activity.

Summary of inputs, key issues and recommendations on SUN 3.0 draft strategy

So the countries having national plan should have the action plan. Because national plans are mostly very ambitious having a wish-list. While action plan may be realistic and based on the doable taken from the national plan

4. **MSAPN vs CAP – doesn't matter** what would be the name of the document as long as it is aligned with major Nutrition and Food Security policies and properly costed.
5. The MSNP can be developed into Multi Sector Nutrition Action Plan to have only one Country Action plan.
6. **Need further analysis on developing Country Action Plan in country's context.**

Part C: SUN Governance

I. Notion/approach of Country-led, country-driven and action-oriented SUN 3.0 strategy

Following parts need to be defined in the strategy:

1. How country will contextualize the strategy- linking with **country led and country driven** approach? – Need to be addressed.
2. **Notion/approach of “Country-led and country-driven”** to be made possible by:
 - a. By having a costed, mutually agreed action plan.
 - b. By establishing strong coordination with Networks at country level backed by SMS.
 - c. Effective and regular engagement with country leadership by Lead Group/SMS.
 - d. Strong support to SUN Government Focal Point/Country Coordinator by SMS; and regular engagement in SUN Movement related initiatives.
3. **National coordinating body should be responsible** at country level for multi sector and multi stakeholder coordination and facilitating the collaboration.
4. **SUN Global movement should advocate with** governments / higher politicians and policy makers in prioritizing nutrition.
5. The political commitment and ownership from the central, provincial and local level political leaders would be crucial and thus need to be addressed in the strategy for effective SUN movement to reach a greater impact at national and subnational levels.
6. **Developing action plans for each network and support SUN Government Focal Point/Country Coordinator and Secretariat** to coordinate among the SUN networks and implement integrate interventions and financial mobilization for the National Action Plans.
7. Multi-stakeholder team/platform (MSP) has supportive role for SUN Government Focal Point/Country Coordinator to perform his/her job effectively; and they have crucial role in the effective implementation on nutrition plan and conducting nutrition interventions at all levels within the country. So, role of SUN Movement Secretariat in capacity strengthening of national MSP and providing technical support for them - has to be emphasized in the strategy.

II. Country leadership and shifting of SUN Government Focal Point to Country Coordinator

Shifting from the SUN Government Focal Point (FP) to Country Coordinator.
Anticipated complication/challenge (if any) due to this shift.

1. **More clarity** required on the **introduction and ToR** of SUN Government Focal Points versus Country Coordinators.
2. **Country leadership** is more emphasized with empowerment and accountability. Whether the **existing SUN Government Focal Point feels empowered or not**. If not, who should be the other empowered person- to take the agenda of Country Coordinator forward?
3. The title “SUN Government Focal Point” suggests; firstly, the incumbent is representative of SUN and secondly, the incumbent is from the government of country. Thus **Institutionalization and positioning of the Country Coordinator** has to be decided from the country level.
4. **Change of nomenclature** of SUN Government Focal Point to Country Coordinator **should make no difference**, the person will remain same. **Current SUN Government Focal Point can be elevated to SUN Country Coordinator position**. But, he/she should be given full executive authority and operational autonomy and budgetary flexibility.
5. The **political elevation in transitioning of position** from SUN Government Focal Point to Country Coordinator **would raise the problem of instability** in the system and **difficult to ensure accountability** in long-term.
If Country Coordinator is a political position, there will be a **challenge**- how s/he will deal with the multi sectoral aspect? How s/he will have control over different ministries and departments? Change in the government lead to change in political positioning creates **issues of stability, accessibility, acceptability, capacity and control** over different stakeholders.
6. **No clear mechanism of transitioning** - How this change will happen. What will be the role of SMS and who at country will take the lead etc.?
7. **If there is no existing SUN Government Focal Point**, the selection procedure of Country Coordinator has to be transparent; multi –sector platform has important role to play in selecting Country Coordinator.
8. No anticipated complication/challenge due to change from SUN Government Focal Point to SUN Country Coordinator title. This approach strengthens the role of the position. The Country Coordinator should possess skills, knowledge and allocate sufficient time to take agenda forward.

III. Accountability

SUN Government Focal Point/Country Coordinator should be accountable to whom- respective country authorities / SUN coordinator / both / or others?

Summary of inputs, key issues and recommendations on SUN 3.0 draft strategy

1. **Accountability is created through right, authority and resources.**
2. In the first place **it has to be country authority because the laws of the land governs and secondly to SUN Movement.**
3. The SUN Government Focal Point/Country Coordinator **should be accountable to the respective country authorities and law.** Certainly, they could “Inform” to or “Consult” with the SUN coordinator while delivering.
4. The positions have different roles and line management. In terms of effective implementation and support/resources is being received from SMS- there should be an accountability mechanism.
5. SUN Government Focal Point/Country Coordinator should be accountable to both government and SUN Coordinator. (Feedback received from 2 out of 6 countries participated in the consultation process)

IV. Ownership and leadership -Are you inspired by what you have read in the draft strategy?

1. Along with ‘ownership and leadership’, the members are looking forward to have the commitment and ‘**walking the talk**’ attitude, not only in the paper, but in action.
2. The **SUN governance and structure tailored to fit the stable context and not clear enough in regard to the conflict-affected context.** More clarity needs to be placed regarding the **SUN governance and structure in the conflict-affected context** based on the reality and in close consultations with SUN secretariats in these states and countries.
3. In the strategy, fragile context was mentioned, and the SUN seems to be led by Clusters which not the case in some conflict affected countries. The notion “Government-led, government-owned” is not manifested in this case. - More clarification is required.

V. Changing role of SUN Executive Committee and SUN Lead Group

1. The SUN 3.0 draft strategy has mentioned: The **SUN Movement Executive Committee to be transformed into a governing board**; and Standing Committees with key responsibilities have been proposed within the SUN Ex-Com. The strategy has emphasized on stepping up of existing structure of SUN Ex-Com to the more empowered component (committee)- this is a **positive aspect of SUN 3.0**. Similarly, the SUN Lead Group has important role in providing policy guidance to make SUN 3.0 more robust in coming phase. The SUN 3.0 strategy need to give more emphasis on strengthening the role of both existing SUN Lead Group, Executive Committee and Coordinator – considering the importance of synchronization and harmonization among the SUN governance system to achieve the vision of SUN Movement aligning with SUN Principle.

Part D: Technical Assistance (TA)

Summary of inputs, key issues and recommendations on SUN 3.0 draft strategy

1. The SUN phase 3 should be more focused on effective and transparent donor harmonization and coordination parts in financing side from the secretariat, Ex-com & global networks.
2. Need to **review the indicators**- to be efficiently used for **assessing TA need of the country**. The TA support need to be **structured** into country's context and mechanism.
3. Need analysis on **mobilization and harmonization** of TA, budget allocation in country context- with respect to **managing conflict of interest**.
4. The SUN Phase 3 is developed focusing on more nutrition indicators and other required provision. However, it would be better to **explain in detail about budgetary mechanism** with detail budgetary forward and backward linkages, on-budget and off-treasury system for TA - might be accelerated for fast track budgetary operationalization mechanism.
5. **Kind of TA that would be beneficial in phase 3** (*in comparison to TA accessed during SUN Movement phase 2*) for improving nutrition outcomes:
 - a. To develop Country Action Plan, nutrition markers, advocacy strategies and capacity (technical and institutional) building in nutrition sensitive programming
 - b. Capacity building of SMEs to promote nutrition (Product development & marketing)
 - c. Financial tracking, resource mobilization, knowledge management, strategic communication and leadership, evidence-based studies and MEAL.

Part E: Recommitment from the country and global players for the SUN phase 3

1. **It is not re-commitment; it is a continuation of commitment** and it should be renewal of the commitment in the new context for better nutrition outcomes in country.
2. There is no harm to recommit to the SUN Movement. However, it is necessary that the country endorses the recommitment through appropriate authority and process within the country.
3. Recommitment would be done as per the changes (**ToC**). It would be beneficial since it could be raised accountability towards the success of the movement. Recommitment should come from government including all the sectors, SUN networks and individual.
4. **Recommitment- Depends on the country context: If the SUN country is active and making progress no need for re-commitment.** However, if the member country is stagnant, the re-commitment is essential to urge the country to take real actions towards improving nutrition; to show their willingness to continue to the SUN Movement and work for achieving its objectives.

Part F: Gender equality to be integral part of the SUN 3.0.

1. Affirmative action to be made for the targeted groups to ensure equity.
2. Need to improve the capacity of SUN countries on gender equality in nutrition.

Summary of inputs, key issues and recommendations on SUN 3.0 draft strategy

3. Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) have to come in CAP as well; and need to be integrated in the policy of subnational level, implementation and practice.

Inputs compiled by: Dr. Kiran Rupakhetee (Joint Secretary, National Planning Commission, SUN Government Focal Point of Nepal and SUN Executive Committee member) with the support of National Nutrition and Food Security Secretariat (NNFSS)/ National Planning Commission (NPC), Government of Nepal.

Participants:

1. **In-country consultation (Nepal):** SUN Networks- United Nation Network, Donor Network, Civil Society Network, Business Network/Private sectors, MSNP sectorial ministries, departments and nutrition experts.

Regional consultation: Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Kyrgyzstan and Yemen