



Multi-Partner Trust Fund of the Scaling Up  
Nutrition Movement

# Synthesis of the Consolidated Reponses

To the Independent Evaluation

June 2016

## Contents

Synthesis of Reponses .....	3
Compilation of Responses - Overall Result.....	6
Detailed Responses: Conclusion 1 .....	7
Detailed Responses: Conclusion 2 .....	8
Detailed Responses: Conclusion 3 .....	10
Detailed Responses: Conclusion 4 .....	11
Detailed Responses: Conclusion 5 .....	12
Detailed Responses: Conclusion 6 .....	14
Detailed Responses: Recommendation 1.....	16
Detailed Responses: Recommendation 2.....	17
Detailed Responses: Recommendation 3.....	18
Detailed Responses: Recommendation 4.....	19
Detailed Responses: Recommendation 5.....	21
Additional observations/responses.....	23

## Synthesis of Responses

The Independent Evaluation of the Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) of the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement provides the Management Committee of the SUN Movement MPTF, the SUN Movement Executive Committee<sup>1</sup> and Donors with findings, recommendations and fund design options that are expected to assist in identifying the best course of action for a future financing mechanism that could support the SUN Movement Strategy (2016-2020). The SUN Movement MPTF evaluation terms of reference, [final report](#) and [annexes](#) are available on the SUN Movement website ([here](#)).

As set out in its terms of reference, the objectives of the SUN Movement MPTF evaluation were to: a) assess the performance of the current MPTF in contributing to the Strategic Objectives of the SUN Movement (2012 – 2015), and b) assess the need and propose options for any future catalytic, last resort fund within the SUN Movement (2016 – 2020).

All partners of the SUN Movement MPTF<sup>2</sup> have had the opportunity to provide a response to the evaluation's findings, conclusions and recommendations. The main purpose of the Management Response is to provide an opportunity for those participating in the SUN Movement MPTF to elaborate on and/or clarify points raised in the evaluation. A broader conversation on the need, scope and stewardship arrangement of a future fund is taking place in parallel to the Management Response and all partners potentially involved in a new fund will be consulted.

This report provides an overview of comments received from partners of the SUN Movement MPTF in response to a request for feedback on the findings of the Independent Evaluation. There is also a compilation of different responses together with the scoring. A total of eight comments were received: one Donor to the SUN Movement MPTF (Switzerland), two PUNOs (WFP and UNOPS), the MPTF Office, the Secretariats of the SUN Business Network, of the SUN Civil Society Network and of the UN Network. The SUN Movement Secretariat as Technical Secretariat to the SUN MPTF also provided feedback.

There is a **general appreciation on the comprehensiveness and robustness of the evaluation report** as well as a recognition of the difficulty in evaluating the SUN Movement MPTF and in providing options for a possible future pooled fund in a relative short timeframe. There is as well a general sense of satisfaction that comments raised by members of the Steering Group were taken on board in the final report.

The evaluation has **sparked discussion and reflection on the opportunities and the challenges for a possible new pooled fund** within the SUN Movement after 2016. A lot of useful information is included in the report, however, respondents would have welcomed clearer analysis on certain key aspects, such as existing financing mechanisms, that could have better guided the future direction of the fund. This omission leaves a deal of work to be done by the Visioning Group to make recommendations on options for the future of the fund.

**The responses received to the evaluation reflect agreement among the respondents on the conclusions and recommendations. Nonetheless some areas of disagreement have emerged**, in particular in relation to the conclusions of the underperformance by PUNOs and on the suggested governance options for a future pooled fund which, for some respondents, lack of clear measures that would need to be taken in order to fix what has not worked under the current MPTF. **A comprehensive analysis of the existing multilateral and bilateral financing mechanisms that could respond to the SUN Movement financial needs is missing** from the report and some think the evaluation failed to answer if a new pooled fund within the SUN Movement is really needed given this context or if existing financial instruments could be leveraged so that they can better contribute to strengthening an enabled environment for nutrition. Perhaps this was in part beyond the scope of the evaluation, but expectations have certainly been raised.

On the **performance** of the SUN Movement MPTF, there is a general agreement on the conclusion made by the evaluation that the projects funded through the SUN Movement MPTF have made major contributions towards the Strategic Objectives of the SUN Movement (2012 – 2015). However the issues that might have hindered CSAs performance at the country level, beyond PUNOs failure, are not adequately addressed. The evaluation concluded that there were other activities that could have benefited from small, catalytic grants but went unfunded. One contribution to the Management Response highlights that resources to leverage the technical expertise of the UN agencies to support MPTF Windows activities might have been a valuable option for the use of the MPTF money. One respondent

---

<sup>1</sup> With the implementation of the new stewardship arrangements of the SUN Movement (2016 – 2020), reference to the Transition Stewardship Team in the evaluation TORs should be replaced with Executive Committee of the SUN Movement.

<sup>2</sup> Management Committee, Secretariats of the SUN Networks (Civil Society Network, UN Network, Business Network and UN Network), MPTF Office and SUN Movement Secretariat.

recalls that the SUN Movement MPTF was established to provide catalytic, last resort funding. The SUN Movement MPTF was never meant to respond to all needs within the Movement. [refer to **Detailed Response: Conclusion 1**]

Among the **factors determining the performance** of the MPTF, the respondents agree overall on the analysis conducted on the Implementing Partners, the MPTF Office, the Management Committee and the SUN Movement Secretariat. Some of them disagree with the conclusions on the under-performance by the PUNOs. While there is general recognition on certain key limitations by PUNOs, the other factors (i.e. challenges faced by CSAs at the country level in utilizing funds) affecting the performance of the MPTF funded projects could have been given more attention in the overall performance assessment. [refer to **Detailed Response: Conclusion 2**]

On the **catalytic nature** of the SUN Movement MPTF, there is agreement that the MPTF has been effective in helping to catalyze and enhance engagement in national nutrition processes, not only of CSAs, but also other stakeholders. One respondent considers that the MPTF has only been partially catalytic arguing that while the MPTF has been catalytic regarding the establishment of CSA, the catalytic nature in relation to triggering other resources is not visible nor addressed in the evaluation. [refer to **Detailed Response: Conclusion 3**]

On the conclusion related to the MPTF as a **last resort funding**, only few respondents expressed an opinion. There is agreement with the conclusion that the fund, in some instances, was used as a first rather than last resort and that other funding sources could have been sought. There is an overall lack of evidence to prove that the MPTF has been a last resort source of funds. In the future, it would be extremely useful to consider how to put in place a consistent and reliable method for assessing efforts to secure funding at the country level. This will be very helpful not only in testing the 'last resort' value of pooled funds, but it will also help in strengthening efforts to ensure pooled funds are 'catalytic'. [refer to **Detailed Response: Conclusion 4**]

The respondents, while agreeing on the majority of the **strengths and weaknesses** analyzed by the evaluation, would have valued a more in-depth and detailed analysis on certain key issues such as role of the Management Committee in mobilizing funds and challenges faced by PUNOs in playing their role efficiently. Some factual misinterpretation have been highlighted in relation to the fund management (i.e. call for proposals), the resource mobilization (i.e. earmarked funds) and the monitoring, reporting and accountability. [refer to **Detailed Response: Conclusion 5**]

On the **future needs and options** identified by the evaluation there is agreement among the respondents. In particular they agree that funding for CSAs should be considered as one of the top priorities in the SUN Movement for small grants funding. They support as well the proposal to support SUN Countries to develop national SUN Business Networks. Question is raised about funding for the global CSN and Business Network Secretariats especially if the catalytic, last resort nature of the Fund is to be preserved. One respondent argues that should global level secretariats be considered for funding, all networks including the UN Network Secretariat should then also be considered.

Regarding the proposed criteria for informing the selection of an appropriate host for the fund, it is necessary to have a better and wider appreciation of options. One respondent believes that there are several other financing mechanisms and platforms available that could be better used for scaling up nutrition and recommends that the Visioning process further explore existing financing mechanisms that could be accessed by SUN actors. [refer to **Detailed Response: Conclusion 6**]

There is strong agreement with the recommendations related to the **purpose and scope** of a future SUN Movement pooled fund, in particular the need for being coherent with the SUN Movement Strategy and Roadmap 2016-2020 and integrated with broader SUN Movement governance arrangement and processes at national and global levels. Specifically the Fund should be primarily catalytic and intended to support the strengthening of national capabilities to scale up nutrition, including through strengthened national multistakeholder platforms. Particular attention should be dedicated to enhanced participation of national stakeholders - in particular Civil Society Alliances – in multistakeholder platforms for scale up nutrition. It should provide small, last resort and primarily catalytic funding to specific unmet needs and priorities identified by SUN Countries. However, support could be provided to support SUN stakeholders to consolidate and maintain achievements in exceptional circumstances, i.e. there are inadequate alternative source of funding. [refer to **Detailed Response: Recommendation 1**]

On the recommendations related to the **funding windows and priorities** of a future SUN Movement pooled fund there is general agreement on the proposed enlargement of funding windows including through the strengthening of local national capabilities, national civil society and business networks. The focus should remain the strengthening of the multi-stakeholder platforms at the country level. Funding should also be made available for academic networks and parliamentary networks that are increasingly being established. One respondent highlights that there may be specific

additional funding needs for national UN networks those as well and disagrees that funding should support one specific global network (Civil Society Network). [refer to **Detailed Response: Recommendation 2**]

On the recommendations related to the **theory of change** of a future SUN Movement pooled fund it is recommended that the theory of change should be able to mark the attribution of change into the process. The theory of change will have to be aligned with the SUN Movement Strategy and the M&E framework. [refer to **Detailed Response: Recommendation 3**]

While there is general agreement on the recommendations related to the **governance arrangements** of a future SUN Movement pooled fund, none of the respondent has any specific favor for one of the presented options yet. However some key principles important for a possible new pooled fund have been identified such as **low overhead costs, lean structure** but with a **sound risk management system, clear grant attribution criteria** and **competitive allocation procedures**. On future alternatives, one respondent believes that options that continue requiring a PUNO (or any intermediary) should be analyzed further. Without reforms in the areas outlined by the evaluation, the share of funds allocated to the funneling agent seem unfeasible given the granularity of projects, requirements, etc. Since the review of the current SUN Movement MPTF has been quite favorable, two respondents would have liked to see a more detailed overview of the measures that needs to be taken in order to reform the underperforming aspects of the current MPTF.

One respondent disagrees with two of the proposed hosting options implying the merging of some of the key functions of a multi-partner trust fund – which in the respondent’s opinion will hinder the performance of a new fund. It is reminded that the standard set up of any multi-stakeholder Trust Fund heavily relies on high quality performance of three functions: fund design and administration, fund operation, and fund implementation, with different stakeholders assuming those three roles in order to ensure the proper functioning of a financing mechanism, rather than turning it into a simple multi-country project of one Agency (if all three functions of fund administrator, fund manager and fund implementers are concentrated in one entity). [refer to **Detailed Response: Recommendation 4**]

On the recommendation by the evaluation on the **programmatic and financial quality and monitoring** of a future SUN Movement pooled fund there is an overall agreement how the details of the financial quality and monitoring would need to be better assessed when there is a clearer idea of the next fund mechanism. One respondent highlights that quality of reporting is another problem attributed to PUNOs without further analysis. [refer to **Detailed Response: Recommendation 5**]

## Compilation of Responses - Overall Result

SDC	WFP	UNOPS	MPTF Office	SUN Business Network (SBN)	SUN Civil Society Network (SCN)	UN Network	SUN Movement Secretariat (SMS)
-----	-----	-------	-------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------	------------	--------------------------------

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No opinion
----------------	-------	----------	-------------------	------------

SUN Movement MPTF Independent Evaluation's Conclusions		
1.	<b>Conclusion 1:</b> The performance of the SUN Movement MPTF How far do you agree with the conclusions related to the performance of the SUN Movement MPTF?	Agree
2.	<b>Conclusion 2:</b> Factors determining performance How far do you agree with the conclusions related to the factors determining the performance of the SUN Movement MPTF?	Agree
3.	<b>Conclusion 3:</b> Has the SUN Movement MPTF been catalytic? How far do you agree with the conclusions related to the catalytic nature of the SUN Movement MPTF?	Agree
4.	<b>Conclusion 4:</b> Has the SUN Movement MPTF provided last resort funding? How far do you agree with the conclusions related to the last resort nature of the SUN Movement MPTF?	Agree
5.	<b>Conclusion 5:</b> Summary of strengths and weaknesses of the SUN Movement MPTF How far do you agree with the summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the SUN Movement MPTF?	Agree
6.	<b>Conclusion 6:</b> Future needs and options How far do you agree with the conclusions related to the future needs and options?	Agree
SUN Movement MPTF Independent Evaluation's Recommendations		
1.	<b>Recommendation 1:</b> Purpose and scope How far do you agree with the recommendations related to the purpose and scope of a future SUN Movement pooled fund? In particular, which should be in your opinion the main purpose and scope of any new pooled fund?	Agree
2.	<b>Recommendation 2:</b> Funding windows and priorities How far do you agree with the recommendations related to the funding windows and priorities of a future SUN Movement pooled fund? In particular, which should be in your opinion the priorities of any new pooled fund?	Agree
3.	<b>Recommendation 3:</b> Theory of change How far do you agree with the recommendations related to the theory of change of a future SUN Movement pooled fund?	Agree
4.	<b>Recommendation 4:</b> Governance arrangements How far do you agree with the recommendations related to the governance arrangements of a future SUN Movement pooled fund? In particular, which are in your opinion the major advantages and disadvantages of the indicated options for hosting a new pooled fund? Please indicate one first preferred scenario (if any).	Agree
5.	<b>Recommendation 5:</b> Programmatic and financial quality and monitoring How far do you agree with the recommendations related to the programmatic and financial quality and monitoring of a future SUN Movement pooled fund?	Agree

## Detailed Responses: Conclusion 1

Conclusion 1: The performance of the SUN Movement MPTF		
How far do you agree with the conclusions related to the performance of the SUN Movement MPTF?		
Agree		Explanation
SDC	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The conclusion on the effectiveness of the learning routes, incl. the value of triggering effect for CSN to organize learning routes for national CSA members is shared as well as the value of the CoP on Budget tracking and the conclusion that CSA establishment contributed significantly to lobbying and advocacy work in the countries.</li> </ul>
WFP	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an excessive focus on PUNO's responsibility for limited performance (see additional observations)</li> </ul>
UNOPS	No Opinion	
MPTF OFFICE	No Opinion	
SBN	No Opinion	
SCN	Agree	
UN NETWORK	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the finding that projects funded through the MPTF have made major contributions towards the strategic objectives of the SUN Movement in particular with regards to the establishment and functioning of the CSAs and giving catalytic funding under window I for learning routes and budget tracking: these have certainly created a momentum for SUN countries. The MPTF also contributed to raising awareness of nutrition at the national and sub-national levels.</li> <li>However, it is also important to highlight in the conclusion that other activities at country, regional and global levels could have benefited from small, catalytic grants but went unfunded and that other stakeholders, in addition to civil society, were eligible to receive funds to support activities but did not receive. The opportunity that could have been offered by other stakeholders considering their expertise and experience and on the ground presence has not been explored in the evaluation. More grants to leverage the technical expertise of the UN agencies of the UN Network to support activities under window I might have been a valuable option. It is important in the new Fund to consider best value for money on offer by all SUN stakeholders in support of activities.</li> <li>The SUN Movement/MPTF would have also benefited from a deeper analyses of the local situation in every country. This could have been achieved with the support of the PUNO's Country Offices.</li> <li>There is and continues to be need for increased investment in capacity building for members to enhance nutrition advocacy, aligned to global, national and sub-national nutrition agenda.</li> </ul>

SMS	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SUN Movement Secretariat agrees with the conclusion made by the evaluation that the projects funded through the MPTF have made major contributions towards the Strategic Objectives of the SUN Movement; however it is important to highlight the following:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Issues beyond PUNOs failure are not adequately addressed.</u> Factors that hindered CSA performance such as ‘inadequate dialogue and consultation with governments and other stakeholders regarding priorities’ and ‘CSA activities...driven more by global campaigning priorities of INGOs than an analysis of the local context’ are mentioned on page 50 but not considered in any further detail. These factors should be further examined and understood as part of the visioning process in order to avoid such issues in the future.</li> <li>It is very likely that ‘there were other activities at country, regional and global levels that could have benefited from small, catalytic grants but went unfunded.’ As the evaluators recognize several times, the SUN Movement <u>MPTF was established to provide catalytic, last resort funding.</u> The SUN Movement MPTF was never meant to respond to all needs within the Movement.</li> <li>Given the administrative requirements and capacity required of all actors, including the technical secretariat and the Civil Society Network Secretariat, to not only mobilise funds but also to ensure that a transparent, equitable and inclusive process is put in place to access these funds we do not believe that <u>mobilizing additional resources to support new CSAs before the completion of the SUN Movement MPTF was a viable option.</u> Furthermore as the Independent Comprehensive Evaluation of the SUN Movement took place in 2014 with the Visioning of the new Movement initiated in 2015, it was important that the MPTF aligned its direction to the new priorities of the Movement. For this reason and considering the end date of the MPTF (<u>December 2015 – then extended to December 2016</u>) it was decided to put on hold any new replenishment of the fund until a clear decision was made on the Strategic Objectives of the SUN Movement in its second phase (2016 – 202) and on the future of any possible new pooled fund within the SUN Movement.</li> <li>It is true that ‘there was and continues to be a need to increase investments in national and sub-national government and other stakeholder capabilities to deliver scaled up services and programmes aligned with national nutrition plans and frameworks.’ However, it is important to recognize that funding for CSAs through the <u>SUN Movement MPTF is only one of many efforts contributing to this.</u> In fact, the entire Movement has been focusing on building communities of practice that support the development of <b>a set of capabilities that will empower actors across each stakeholder group at the country level</b> to: continuously improve country planning to end malnutrition; mobilise, advocate and communicate for impact; build core capacities at all levels for multi-sectoral action and ensure equity for all, with women and girls at the centre. For this reason, the Management Committee decided to direct any <u>remaining balance of MPTF funding to help advance the development of these capacities resulting in the budget analysis workshop</u> supported by the SUN Movement MPTF in April 2015.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
-----	-------	---

## Detailed Responses: Conclusion 2

Conclusion 2: Factors determining performance		
How far do you agree with the conclusions related to the factors determining the performance of the SUN Movement MPTF?		
Agree	Disagree	Explanation
SDC	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We share the conclusions and would like to highlight a point which may gain more attention in the future discussion and design: Role of CSA, clearly distinguishing the role of the Alliance CSA versus the role of its participants CSO’s, and this particularly differentiating between the roles for implementation of nutrition interventions for improving nutrition (which we see more as the role of CSO) and the role of a advocacy organization for more resources and interventions towards the governments and for keeping them accountable. This</li> </ul>

		<p>differentiation seems particularly important in view of mobilizing resources (for whom and what exactly) and to assure that CSA as a structure does not start to compete with CSO and their role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We agree with the assessment of the different actors performance and support giving enough attention to the challenges mentioned particularly regarding the structure of the fund and role of PUNO's, the risks that the CSN engaged in activities and the role of the SUN Donor Network at country level.</li> </ul>
<b>WFP</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PUNOs are basically blamed alone for under-performance of funds. We recognize our limitations but we believe other factors (low capacity to absorb funds, late requests for no-cost extensions) are not given their fair weight in the overall performance assessment.</li> <li>As a PUNO, we acknowledge many of the limitations outlined in the report. However, we believe that an unfair share of responsibility for lacking performance is attributed to PUNOs, unfortunately limiting, in some stances, a true analysis of root causes of problems.</li> <li>When stating, in section 9.2 (and other), that "PUNOs have to take a large proportion of the blame for slow disbursements and processing of no-cost extensions", the authors fail to assess the entire performance chain. Factors such low capacity to absorb funds by CSAs (as indicated by the very high volume of no-cost extensions requested) are just as (if not more) hampering to performance and are not nearly analyzed as deeply as PUNO's role</li> <li>On the matter of no-cost extensions, it is simplistic to assume that PUNO's carry most of the blame with one case of delay stated. On our perception, the main reason why most no-cost extensions were signed close to projects ends is that requests have come in very late (and usually in wrong format, requiring additional interactions). Once again, this falls back to CSAs capacity to absorb funds, an issue not enough explored in our opinion.</li> </ul>
<b>UNOPS</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the role of PUNOS and delays in transfer of funds from PUNOS to CSOs; we would like to add that delays can also be caused by request by CSOs to change legal conditions in standard contract instruments in addition to timely submission of satisfactory reports.</li> </ul>
<b>MPTF OFFICE</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	
<b>SBN</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	
<b>SCN</b>	<b>Agree</b>	
<b>UN NETWORK</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the finding that both NGO implementing partners as well as PUNOs and REACH have played valuable role in providing technical support. However the point regarding the fact that providing technical support [to CSAs] is part of the role of the UN agencies anyway needs to be qualified. It should be noted that this technical support often comes in addition to planned tasks and activities by UN staff and if UN are expected to provide this technical support this should be accompanied by adequate resources. REACH staff has often provided this support outside the scope of planned tasks and often in their spare time.</li> <li>Agree with the question around the extent to which the Donor Network is facilitating increased availability of funds at country level.</li> <li>In reference to the sentence that "PUNOs have to take a large portion of blame for slow disbursement of funds to end-users and processing of no-cost extensions..." (pg. 53), we would suggest that the sentence is revised and language modified. This point is noted in the response to question 5.</li> </ul>

<b>SMS</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SUN Movement Secretariat agrees overall on this point but refers back to the comment made on question 1 regarding the need of a broader analysis of PUNOs and donors. The below elements should be considered for the visioning process.</li> <li>In particular, until we are clear on the cost for both PUNOs and implementing partners to implement projects, it is difficult to fairly assess if the administration fees were inadequate. This should be more closely examined in the visioning process. CSAs are clearly struggling to use MPTF funds within the defined grant lifespan and all CSA funded projects are facing a low rate of spending. The evaluation should have explored further the limitations being faced by CSAs in utilizing funds. Such limitations and challenges should become key lessons learned for the development of a possible new pooled fund within the SUN Movement.</li> </ul>
------------	--------------	---

### Detailed Responses: Conclusion 3

<b>Conclusion 3: Has the SUN Movement MPTF been catalytic?</b>		
<b>How far do you agree with the conclusions related to the catalytic nature of the SUN Movement MPTF?</b>		
<b>Agree</b>		<b>Explanation</b>
<b>SDC</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We see only partially that the MPTF was catalytic: regarding the establishment of CSA and their role and importance given to civil society for tackling the nutrition challenge it seems to have worked out, regarding triggering other resources the catalytic nature is not visible and addressed in the evaluation.</li> </ul>
<b>WFP</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
<b>UNOPS</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	
<b>MPTF OFFICE</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	
<b>SBN</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	
<b>SCN</b>	<b>Agree</b>	
<b>UN NETWORK</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the conclusion regarding the catalytic nature of the fund which helps activities get off the ground and created momentum at country, regional and global level. However a distinction should be made between being catalytic to address malnutrition and being catalytic to establish CSAs.</li> </ul>

SMS	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SUN Movement Secretariat agrees overall with the conclusions related to the catalytic nature of the SUN Movement MPTF.</li> <li>• In particular, we refer to the <a href="#">budget analysis workshop</a> that was funded by the MPTF in April 2015. The Asian Regional Workshop took place in Bangkok (25-27 April 2016). It was funded with the remaining MPTF with significant co-sponsorship from development partners. In total there were 18 countries, 3 Indian States and 156 participants.</li> <li>• This year there will be a second African Regional Workshop in Africa on financing for nutrition. This workshop is funded by UNICEF with Canadian funds. We are seeking additional funding sources (e.g. World Bank and ideally the African Development Bank).</li> <li>• The establishment of the SUN Movement Monitoring and Evaluation Framework has proven to be an incredibly valuable exercise for SUN Countries. This '<b>outcome monitoring methodology</b>' approach primarily serves the purpose of <b>mutual accountability</b> among the various stakeholders within the SUN Movement by creating an insight into the contributions of the different groups of stakeholders. This mutual accountability, in turn, serves as a basis for steering of the Movement by the Lead Group (LG) and is considered to be an essential element for the sustainability of the Movement. Joint assessments have taken place in 2014, 2015 and are underway across SUN Countries in 2016.</li> <li>• The <a href="#">learning routes project</a> has also provided a model for sharing and learning that is central to the Movement's approach in supporting countries to access the lessons and expertise of other countries with similar experiences and contexts. In addition, the SUN Civil Society Network is currently planning a second set of learning routes with funding from the Children's Investment Fund Foundation that builds on the lessons and approach established by the MPTF project.</li> </ul>
-----	-------	---

## Detailed Responses: Conclusion 4

Conclusion 4: Has the SUN Movement MPTF provided last resort funding?		
How far do you agree with the conclusions related to the last resort nature of the SUN Movement MPTF?		
Agree		Explanation
SDC	No opinion	
WFP	Strongly Agree	
UNOPS	No Opinion	
MPTF OFFICE	No Opinion	
SBN	No Opinion	
SCN	Agree	

UN NETWORK	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the conclusion that the fund, in some instances, was used as a first rather than last resort and that other funding sources could have been sought. However it should be noted that being catalytic, the fund have helped demonstrate the importance and impact of investing in activities that may not easily attract funding (e.g. CSAs)</li> <li>An activity which not easily attracts funding is coordination, yet it is critical. This is not only valid for CSAs, also UN has difficulty in funding coordination activities.</li> </ul>
SMS	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SUN Movement Secretariat agrees overall on the <u>lack of evidence to prove that the MPTF has been a last resource source of funds</u>. In the future, it would be extremely useful to consider how to put in place a consistent and reliable method for assessing efforts to secure funding at the country level. This will be very helpful not only in testing the 'last resort' value of pooled funds, but it will also help in strengthening efforts to ensure pooled funds are 'catalytic'. Perhaps this is something with which in country donors could assist could assist.</li> </ul>

## Detailed Responses: Conclusion 5

Conclusion 5: Summary of strengths and weaknesses of the SUN Movement MPTF		
How far do you agree with the summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the SUN Movement MPTF?		
Agree	Explanation	
SDC	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We share the majority of the strength / weaknesses analyzed in the table. However, we do not see the role of the MC to mobilized other funds / donors (although we acknowledge that it was as such in the ToR); We miss the weakness identified above: clarification of role of CSA</li> </ul>
WFP	Strongly Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same remarks as above valid</li> </ul>
UNOPS	No Opinion	
MPTF OFFICE	No Opinion	
SBN	No Opinion	
SCN	Agree	

- Agree with the points made but the point on fund administration – PUNOs should capture additional point made in the executive summary that PUNOs did not have the systems in place to begin with to play the role efficiently (pg. 2) Some of these lengthy processes are required to ensure that HACT principles and procedures and/or other appropriate risk-management procedures are followed as the financial accountability rests with the PUNOs.
- Don't agree that onus of delayed transfers of funds is placed only on PUNOs. PUNOs might have contributed to slow disbursement because of delays in the transfer of funds and slow administrative procedures, and lack of clarity on the mode and processes of implementation
- As stated in the executive summary, none of the MPTF funded CSAs were legal entities at the start of the funding (pg. 2). Note also pg 27: some of the delays in the transfer of funds and commencement of projects can be attributed to IPs being slow to finalise proposals and sign agreements with PUNOs. The point on 'weaknesses' should also capture that fact that, as stated on page 55, the relatively small size of the SUN grants has meant that it has been difficult to cover the costs of administrative and oversight functions and indeed to perform these roles to the required standards. Not having sufficient funds to cover admin and reporting support creates a disincentive to apply for future funds.
- On 'fund management and allocation decisions', it would be importance under 'weaknesses' to acknowledge that other stakeholders eligible to receive funds did not receive funds and that more to consult with multi-stakeholder platforms on activities and allocations could have been done.
- On monitoring, reporting and accountability: it would be important to note that the frequency of reporting (quarterly) is a burden on both the PUNOs and implementing agencies. Frequency could be reduced: it would improve the quality of the report itself and free staff time.

SMS	Agree	<p>Some points in this section should be clarified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Fund Management:</b> In response to the stated weakness that the ‘timeframes were very short for the second round of funding’, the efforts to ensure a fair and transparent call for proposals should be noted. For the open call for proposal Window II an announcement of the call and all supporting documentation (including guidelines for applicants) were posted on the SUN Movement website throughout the duration of this period. To raise visibility of the <a href="#">announcement</a>, the call for proposals was highlighted on the SUN homepage, the SUN Civil Society Network page, the main MPTF page, and shared through social media. The call for proposals and the guidelines for applications were advertised in three languages: English, French and Spanish. Members of the Steering Committee used this information to mobilize their own constituencies in different countries. The webpage containing the announcement for the MPTF call for proposals received 5,160 visitors from 11 October to 11 November 2013. 16 percent of these visitors clicked through to the SUN Countries section of the website. This indicates that visitors were interested in learning more about countries in the SUN Movement and whether they were eligible to apply to the MPTF. 56% of the people who visited the SUN Countries section after viewing the MPTF call for proposals announcement revisited the MPTF announcement. This suggests that visitors continued to be interested in the call for proposals and perhaps making an application. During the same period, the permanent MPTF page on the website received an additional 826 visitors of which 50% clicked on the announcement of the call for proposals and 12% clicked through to SUN countries section. From Facebook, posts regarding the MPTF call for proposals reached 333 Facebook users. On Twitter, 30 users clicked the link to the announcement page from the individual tweets regarding the MPTF, with 6 retweets. We cannot estimate the numbers of people who saw the tweets that were put out about the call for proposals, the SUN Movement Twitter channel acquired 512 new followers between October 1 and November 13. A comment-submission function was activated on the SUN website. More than 200 requests were received. </li> <li> <b>Resource Mobilization:</b> In relation to the stated weakness: <i>“Tendency to provide earmarked funds”</i> DFID is the only donor that provided earmarked contributions, and to date has remained flexible to transfer funds when necessary (e.g. please note the <a href="#">summary from the 11<sup>th</sup> Management Committee</a> call in February where DFID confirmed its readiness to move the earmarked money from Window III to Window II for any use as approved by the Management Committee). </li> <li> <b>Monitoring, reporting and accountability:</b> In relation to the stated weakness: <i>“...real time information on actual expenditure against budgets is not easily available at global level”</i>. In accordance with the MPTF Office requirements, each PUNO is required to submit its yearly financial statements no later than end of April. However, each PUNO enters into its own service level agreement with Implementing Partners which dictate the level of detail and timeframes for reporting. Neither the MPTF Office nor the technical secretariat (SMS) are involved in this secondary level of reporting. Nonetheless, this individual agreements should be further explored when considering future options. </li> </ul>
	Agree	

## Detailed Responses: Conclusion 6

Conclusion 6: Future needs and options	
How far do you agree with the conclusions related to the future needs and options?	
Agree	Explanation
SDC	Agree
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We share the proposal to include local small and medium businesses, resp. their networks in policy making as well as strengthening the local capabilities. The proposed criteria for a future host of the fund are shared. Expanding the support to CSA’s for consolidation may be purposeful, but will require clarity on their role and governance structure (see above)</li> </ul>

WFP	Strongly Agree	
UNOPS	No Opinion	
MPTF OFFICE	No Opinion	
SBN	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for using a future fund to support SUN Countries to develop SUN Business Networks (SBNs):</li> <li>• Demand amongst the 57 SUN countries to establish SBNs is high – this is evidenced by the participation of 33 Countries in our Eastern and Southern Africa and Asia workshops in 2015.</li> <li>• A total of 29 countries have requested SBN support to develop their own national networks or business engagement strategies.</li> <li>• Funding to the SBN global team (2017-2020), will not extend to all 57 countries, so there is a need to help countries outside of the SBN’s existing agreements with donors on country level SBN programmes, to access funds to develop country-level SBNs.</li> <li>• The SBN welcomes an MPTF that would allow SUN Countries to apply for funds to initiate SBN strategies, including fundraising strategies (e.g., see SBN Zambia example noted above).</li> <li>• Funds should be dedicated solely to national platform or national strategy development for country-level SBNs.</li> <li>• SBN has developed costed proposals on SBN country development activities, which could be used by SUN countries to request this support.</li> <li>• The SBN does not envisage drawing on MPTF funds to cover its core costs.</li> <li>• The SBN does not recommend SBN Members (businesses) should access MPTF funds. Any new MPTF should support developing national frameworks for business engagement or country-level SBNs.</li> </ul>
SCN	Agree	
UN NETWORK	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reflections as proposed in the report are a basis for the visioning exercise. Agree with the conclusion that funding for CSAs should be considered as one of top priorities in the SUN Movement for small grants funding. Agree that funding for national level needs for national civil society alliances and business networks would be best channeled through a global pooled fund to ensure coordination, equity and efficiency. However questioned is raised about funding for the global CSN and Business networks especially if the catalytic, last resort nature of the Fund is to be preserved, and consideration should be given to more sustainable sources of funding from INGOS, Businesses and other funding options. Should global level secretariats be considered for funding, all networks including the UN Network Secretariat should then also be considered.</li> <li>• It is not clear why, as stated in section 8.1, page 39 of the evaluation report that the funding needs of the UN Network for SUN [and the SUN Donor Network] at global and national levels were also not reviewed because it is widely considered that they should be self-financed. The SMS believes that there would not be any added value in its funding being channeled through a multi-partner trust fund. “The current system of donors providing funds through a UN agency is working well (Source: Head of SMS). It is not clear why this biased statement that the funding needs of the UN Network for SUN at global and national levels should be self-financed and that decision was made not to review UN Network. It is not clear either</li> </ul>

		<p>why decision was made by SMS not to include the review of the UN Network funding needs. Discussions with SMS and other networks include equally considerations for funding needs by the UN Network. The UN Network for SUN secretariat as other network secretariat will require additional funding to operate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration should be given to global pooled fund to support other activities and in particular under window I and in strengthening national multi-sectoral platforms to ensure coordination, equity and efficiency.</li> </ul>
SMS	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the proposed criteria for informing the selection of an appropriate host for the fund, the SUN Movement Secretariat would like to highlight the following:</li> <li>• The Secretariat highly recommend the principles of transparency and inclusiveness. With regards to the quick decision making, “...<i>The design should ensure quick decision making, disbursement of funds, processing of requests for budget revisions, no-cost extensions etc....</i>” While the Secretariat agrees with this point, it is recommended that a <b>balance of transparency and inclusivity</b> is always kept as the main priority rather than ensuring a quick decision making as the main concern.</li> <li>• Overall the Secretariat thinks that for any future funds, it is necessary to have a <u>better and wider appreciation of options</u>. The Secretariat believes that there are several other financing mechanisms and platforms available and could be better used for scaling up nutrition. The Secretariat recommends that the Visioning process further explore existing financing mechanisms that could be accessed by SUN actors.</li> </ul>

## Detailed Responses: Recommendation 1

Recommendation 1: Purpose and scope		
How far do you agree with the recommendations related to the purpose and scope of a future SUN Movement pooled fund? In particular, which should be in your opinion the main purpose and scope of any new pooled fund?		
Agree		Explanation
SDC	Strongly Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We appreciate the proposal to link the fund and its supported activities/ partners close to the overall SUN Movement strategy implementation to assure the funded partners/projects contribute to the movements goal and targets</li> </ul>
WFP	Strongly Agree	
UNOPS	No Opinion	
MPTF OFFICE	No Opinion	
SBN	No Opinion	

SCN	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business networks support at national level – last resort and evidence of trying to obtain funding at national level (from business and donor partners) and global level from business partners first as a prerequisite before applying for funding. Applications need to clearly state how the BN is going to ensure it abides to the SUN Movement principles of engagement and what multi-stakeholder processes are in place or will be established to prevent and manage potential Col. More to be further discussed as part of visioning discussions.</li> <li>• Agreement that CSA funding in future fund should be for catalytic and consolidation of efforts towards sustainability. Prioritizing countries where donors are completely absent and countries where local donors have not supported efforts.</li> <li>• Fund should also allow for funding innovation, maybe a small section of the fund earmarked for innovation pilots OR ensuring innovation pilot proposals are welcomed as part of process (included in individual applications or as separate applications)</li> <li>• Support to help academic networks set up in countries should also be considered through this fund.</li> </ul> <p>A couple of CSAs, on informal discussions with the SUN CSN coordinator on the occasion of the DAKAR Civil Society Workshop on Financial Commitments for nutrition in Dakar, Senegal (May 3-5, 2015) have suggested the visioning exercise consider CSA applications to have a % contribution to be allocated (from each CSA application) to global CSN secretariat for their support services provided to CSAs. Idea to be further discussed and explored as part of the visioning discussions.</p>
UN NETWORK	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the recommendation that there is need for funding. Specifically the Fund should be primarily catalytic and intended to support the strengthening of national capabilities to scale up nutrition, including through enhanced participation of stakeholders. However consideration should be given to the Fund being meant as ‘last resort’. If that is the case the ‘last resort’ nature should be properly documented at country level in the funding decision process. This may be difficult to implement. In addition, being catalytic means that the Fund may seek to invest in activities for which there is little donor interest or fund available. Alternatively, the Fund may seek to invest in already agreed set of catalytic activities identified in the SUN Roadmap and agreed with SUN Executive Committee. These catalytic activities should also be discussed with the Donor Network to understand which activities are expected to be funded from other sources (e.g. TAN).</li> </ul>
SMS	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In general the Secretariat agrees with the Purpose and Scope of a new pooled fund as identified by the evaluation. It will be the Visioning’s responsibility to further elaborate on any additional parameters.</li> </ul>

## Detailed Responses: Recommendation 2

Recommendation 2: Funding windows and priorities		
How far do you agree with the recommendations related to the funding windows and priorities of a future SUN Movement pooled fund? In particular, which should be in your opinion the priorities of any new pooled fund?		
Agree	Explanation	
SDC	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We share the proposed enlargement of funding windows for a future fund, with a particular focus on “strengthening local capabilities”.</li> </ul>
WFP	Strongly Agree	

UNOPS	No Opinion	
MPTF OFFICE	No Opinion	
SBN	No Opinion	
SCN	Agree	
UN NETWORK	Agree Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that funding should be provided for catalytic country level activities and in particular support to strengthening national government capabilities. Government institutions that need to be set up to scale up nutrition could benefit e.g. a catalytic fund can be very helpful to cover operation of a nutrition secretariat e.g. for a year and this funding could pass to government directly or through the UN network. While national civil society and business networks should be considered, networks should also be considered. While expectations are that national UN networks should be self-funded, there may be specific additional funding needs for those as well. Funding should also be made available for academic networks and parliamentary networks that are increasingly being established.</li> <li>• Please note a different position from one of the UN Network Agencies: WHO is not comfortable to have business networks funded by the catalytic fund.</li> <li>• Disagree that funding should support one specific global network. Either any global network should be not funded through this fund or all global networks should be equally funded. As per lead group decision and on-going discussion with SMS and other networks in support of the SUN Roadmap, additional funding will be needed to support the network secretariats to operate and deliver on their activities agreed in the Roadmap.</li> </ul>
SMS	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Secretariat believes that any new pooled fund within the SUN Movement should continue focusing on the strengthening of the multi-stakeholder platforms at the country level.</li> </ul>

### Detailed Responses: Recommendation 3

<b>Recommendation 3: Theory of change</b>	
<b>How far do you agree with the recommendations related to the theory of change of a future SUN Movement pooled fund?</b>	
<b>Agree</b>	Explanation
SDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It seems purposeful to develop a clear theory of change for the support provided by the fund, possibly separated also for the various financial windows</li> </ul>

WFP	Strongly Agree	
UNOPS	No Opinion	
MPTF OFFICE	No Opinion	
SBN	No Opinion	
SCN	Agree	
UN NETWORK	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree, as per comment above, that the ToC should single out two networks when the objectives of the SUN Movement are to be achieved by contributions from all networks; hence suggest to include reference to all networks contributions to the ToC. The TOC should be coherent with the SUN Movement TOC in case the visioning group decides there is a need for global pooled funding.</li> </ul>
SMS	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SUN Movement Secretariat recommends that the theory of change is aligned with the SUN Movement Strategy and the M&amp;E framework (outcome mapping).</li> </ul>

## Detailed Responses: Recommendation 4

Recommendation 4: Governance arrangements		
How far do you agree with the recommendations related to the governance arrangements of a future SUN Movement pooled fund? In particular, which are in your opinion the major advantages and disadvantages of the indicated options for hosting a new pooled fund? Please indicate one first preferred scenario (if any).		
Agree	Disagree	Explanation
SDC	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do not favor any option yet, but will engage in the visioning of the future fund and have some principles important to us for defining a future fund, such as low overhead costs, lean structure but with a sound risk management system, clear grant attribution criteria and competitive allocation procedures (with consideration of malnutrition burden).</li> </ul>
WFP	Strongly Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On future alternatives, we believe that options that continue requiring a PUNO (or any intermediary such as New Venture Fund) should be analyzed further. Without reforms in the areas outlined above, the share of funds allocated to the funneling agent seem unfeasible, even for a more efficient party, given the granularity of projects, requirements, etc. Furthermore, we believe consolidating funds under one PUNO would not bring in the foreseen scale effects: activities will continue on a per-project basis, not subject to economies of scale.</li> </ul>

UNOP	Strongly Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding future funding mechanisms of the SUN Movement, we reiterate interest and availability to continue working with important work being done by the SUN Movement.</li> </ul>
MPTF OFFICE	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the performance of the MPTF Office has been praised for its speed and client orientation, the proposed options weigh heavily on untested models and does not assess fully the performance of the future Trust Fund administrator, its experience, track record, etc. The future options of the fund do not take fully into account the need to fix what was broken – the timely transfer of funding from UN Agencies to CSOs and the oversight and accountability provided by UN Agencies. The standard set up of any multi-stakeholder Trust Fund heavily relies on high quality performance of the following functions: fund design and administration, fund operation, and fund implementation (see below box with detailed activities under each function – and full publication at <a href="http://mdtf.undp.org/document/download/12276">http://mdtf.undp.org/document/download/12276</a>), with different stakeholders assuming those three roles in order to ensure the proper functioning of a financing mechanism, rather than turning it into a simple multi-country project of one Agency (if all three functions of fund administrator, fund manager and fund implementers are concentrated in one entity).</li> <li>When discussing future option, it would be important to compare all three options of the future Trust Fund in terms of: (1) speed of setting up; (2) operational efficiencies, (3) programme coherence, (4) overhead costs, and (5) accountability to donors (some donors have very heavy accountability requirements stemming from internal structure of the government offices, and their legal offices won't allow accountability for the funding passed to rest with the CSOs, as one of the models will entail).</li> </ul>
SBN	No Opinion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SBN does not have a view at this stage on the management structure, or hosting of any future pooled fund, but will be looking to develop this idea with the support of the visioning group. SBN will ensure its existing donors, convenors and Advisory Group are informed of the development of any new proposals for SBN country support.</li> </ul>
SCN	Agree	
UN NETWORK	No Opinion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration should be given to technical secretariat in the new Fund. While recommendation is to keep the SMS at the technical secretariat and with the SMS drawing on the support of the secretariats of the global SUN networks as necessary. This however requires that secretariats have resources to support.</li> <li>Strengthening country level management of pooled funding into national plans and structures could also be an option under consideration.</li> </ul>
SMS	Agree Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SUN Movement Secretariat does not have any strong opinion on the options for governance arrangements of a new fund as presented by the evaluation. However since the review of the current SUN Movement MPTF has been quite favorable, the Secretariat would have liked to see an overview of the measures that needs to be taken in order to fix what has not worked so far under the current MPTF.</li> <li>On Option 1.b: "...the MPTF Office signing agreements directly with Implementing Partners..." This issue of legal entity and financial liability by CSAs needs to be further analyzed if the new Administrative Agent were to sign agreements directly with Implementing Partners.</li> <li>Regarding the continuation of the role of the SUN Movement Secretariat as Technical Secretariat of a possible new pooled fund, the Secretariat agrees with the recommendation "...the SMS is well placed to continue to provide technical secretariat services as long as additional funds are received to enable it to perform the role to the full". It is important</li> </ul>

			indeed that any new fund considers a sufficient allocation of financial resources to recruit the needed staff for the Technical Secretariat.
--	--	--	--

## Detailed Responses: Recommendation 5

Recommendation 5: Programmatic and financial quality and monitoring		
How far do you agree with the recommendations related to the programmatic and financial quality and monitoring of a future SUN Movement pooled fund?		
Agree		Explanation
SDC	Agree	
WFP	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little attention is given to striking the right balance of reporting</li> <li>• Quality of reporting is another problem attributed to PUNOs without further analysis. In our experience, over 90% of reports come with significant incompliances and late (or very close to deadline). We then have to strike a balance between asking for revisions and delaying reporting even further. The additional 1 – 2 interactions usually needed to guarantee compliance (most times small details such as a change in format in one page or one month’s incompatible time window) generate stress and rework. Instead of focusing on PUNO’s blame for lack of quality reporting, we believe the evaluators could have also analyzed the reporting requirements’ fit for purpose, given the long chain of intermediaries.</li> </ul>
UNOPS	No Opinion	
MPTF OFFICE	No Opinion	
SBN	No Opinion	
SCN	Agree	
UN NETWORK	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with all points except for first point on technical assistance to be provided through regular SUN processes and structures. It is too vague and does not really hold any one institution responsible. The technical support provided at country level by PUNOs and REACH, for example, were greatly valued as per the evaluation findings. Having one designated/committed in country partner to provide this technical support is important.</li> <li>• It is also important to strengthen local processes and build capacities of existing monitoring mechanisms and not create parallel SUN monitoring systems: these recommendations should be considered ‘food for thought’ for the visioning group</li> </ul>

SMS	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The SUN Movement Secretariat would like to highlight that the details of the financial quality and monitoring would need to be better assessed when there is a more clear idea of the next Fund mechanism</li></ul>
-----	-------	---

## Additional observations/responses

### SUN Civil Society Network

#### SUN CSN steering group vs members engagement

*The undoubted overload of Secretariat staff is partly a consequence of members the CSN not freeing up enough of organizational time to lead on the implementation of different work streams in the CSN work plan. For example, the Terms of Reference of the CSN state Steering Group members should spend 15 days per year i.e. 5% of their time on CSN issues. It is pertinent to ask if this really enough. If there is real organizational commitment to alignment within civil society, should there not be an expectation of a higher proportion of organization time and resources to support the collective effort? **Extract***

It is important to note that the Steering Group members are members on an individual and NOT an institutional basis. Larger CSO members' engagement is required and may ultimately lead to increased SUN contribution of steering group members as a result of their organization engagement that validates a larger percentage of the steering group member's time being dedicated to CSN support. However, membership engagement underpins this becoming a reality and requires CSN secretariat capacity to do effectively.

#### Recommendations for a revised CSN model

The revised model and ways of working should be based upon the following guiding principles.

- *There should be increased emphasis on sharing of learning between CSAs more than technical support from the global level. This can be perceived as a shift from a vertical, top down to a horizontal approach to CSA learning and development – **How the CSN plans to address this - Investing in the regional approach, learning routes, improved communications system to foster better cross-learning, ensuring CS needs are addressed in the capabilities and SUN support system***
- *CSN member organisations should take on more responsibility for the implementation of activities (e.g. the capturing of impacts and lessons learnt, the provision of technical support to CSAs etc.). **How the CSN plans to address this - CSN secretariat will continue leveraging members to provide more technical support to CSAs (so that the CSN secretariat plays a coordinating role of the technical support as opposed to directly providing technical support to SUN countries) and continued and improved capturing of impacts and lessons learnt as well as capacity strengthening of CSAs to capture best practices. It should be noted that, especially for conflict resolution, external support from the SUN CSN secretariat staff (which is perceived as more neutral than any representative or member of the SUN CSN belonging to another organization) is required.***
- *The global CSN could integrate these costs into its application to the Fund and sub grant to individual organisations or regional groupings. In Africa for example, the Graca Machel Trust, Trust Africa, and African Capacity Building Foundation have strong reputations for civil society capacity building. **How the CSN plans to address this - CSN does have in core activities train of the trainer and Capacity strengthening for community level monitoring and advocacy, advocacy of CSAs and fundraising. Capacity strengthening will, as much as possible, be delivered through SUN capabilities service providers and CSN members directly, with support of the CSN secretariat for coordination. Fundraising remains an area where little support/expertise exists.***
- *As a complementary measure CSAs should be encouraged to include technical support costs in their own budgets and be able to choose the service provider. **How the CSN plans to address this - the CSN has developed [a list of key elements to include in CSA applications](#)***
- *The role of the CSN Secretariat focuses more on facilitation rather than implementation, i.e. matching CSA support needs with service providers, whether they be other CSAs or individual organisations. **How the CSN plans to address this - This is already a focus that continues to be strengthened through our country support system.***

#### Resource mobilization

- *Better-resourced NGOs should be scaling up their funding of the core and activity costs of CSAs and the global CSN. As part of broader discussions with Senior Managers of INGOs on organizational alignment, discuss increased financial contributions (and staff time) to the global CSN and CSA core costs as well as activities **How the CSN plans to address this – The SUN CSN sustainability and strategy task force is in the process of***

developing a funding model proposal focusing on a phased approach to diversification of funding sources. This includes increased contributions from INGO members.

#### Sharing lessons, transparency and accountability

- *The CSN already plans to develop a website which would have dedicated, self-managed pages for each CSA. The CSN encourage CSAs to provide common information on key issues such as Members, Executive Committee and Secretariat staff; governance documents; minutes of meetings; strategic objectives and plans; activities; outputs; achievements; budget and expenditure of different sources of funds. CSAs could build upon the summaries presented in Annex 9 of this report. **How the CSN plans to address this - The SUN CSN continues having country support (coordination and matching of expertise with need for support prioritizing twinning between CSAs and regional discussions in a first instance and matching service providers as a last resort after the CSA has sought in country support and then regional support). The SUN CSN is also continues to plan for the recommendations of its improved communications strategy, addressing in large part MPTF evaluation recommendations, to be addressed and rolled out. This will require financial support***
- *While the operating contexts of CSAs vary, a checklist of variables in tabular form for all CSAs would be highly valuable, and could encourage more coherent approaches. This follows a similar approach to the Progress Markers in the wider SUN Movement monitoring system and the GNR. **How the CSN plans to address this - This is very in line with the conversation the SUN CSN secretariat is having with the SUN Movement Secretariat Country Liaison team around shared BRAIN system as well as harmonizing indicators and using membership process to ensure the SUN CSN can collect the required information on an annual basis to help with the cross-learning piece. It would be great to see the regional hubs addressing this item too as their capacity is strengthened and once coordinators are on board seeing what role these coordinators can play in this area.***

#### For visioning group consideration

- Business networks support at national level – last resort and evidence of trying to obtain funding at national level (from business and donor partners) and global level from business partners first as a prerequisite before applying for funding. Applications need to clearly state how the BN is going to ensure it abides to the SUN Movement principles of engagement and what multi-stakeholder processes are in place or will be established to prevent and manage potential Col. More to be further discussed as part of visioning discussions.
- Agreement that CSA funding in future fund should be for catalytic and consolidation of efforts towards sustainability. Prioritizing countries where donors are completely absent and countries where local donors have not supported efforts.
- Fund should also allow for funding innovation, maybe a small section of the fund earmarked for innovation pilots OR ensuring innovation pilot proposals are welcomed as part of process (included in individual applications or as separate applications)
- Support to help academic networks set up in countries should also be considered through this fund.
- A couple of CSAs, on informal discussions with the SUN CSN coordinator on the occasion of the DAKAR Civil Society Workshop on Financial Commitments for nutrition in Dakar, Senegal (May 3-5, 2015) have suggested the visioning exercise consider CSA applications to have a % contribution to be allocated (from each CSA application) to global CSN secretariat for their support services provided to CSAs. Idea to be further discussed and explored as part of the visioning discussions.
- Discuss as part of the visioning discussions – key areas to ensure are included in CSA applications building on [existing list put together by the CSN](#).

CSAs suggested also that the visioning exercise consider the expansion of the CSN secretariat staff to strengthen support provided to CSAs and ensure improved communications across civil society actors and other stakeholder groups.

#### Individual responses

##### Kyrgyztan CSA:

1. We agree with recommendations, especially with statements about role of CSN. **We would like to add that the human resources of the Secretariat of CSN are limited with small number of people and this lack of people in Secretariat results in limitation of time we can communicate with them.** I suggest, **this comment relates to recommendations for MPTF and may help to increase staff of the Secretariat.**

2. Secondly, we are sure that **the MPTF should catalyze 4 processes to the same extent as it should support the sustainability of achievements**. Catalyzing could be a priority at the beginning of the SUN Movement. Now it is necessary to support what Movement achieved.
3. Thirdly, there is the recommendation regarding 3 main funding windows. It seems to me that we forgot about catalyzing the Academia Network, especially country academia networks. It is very actual in our country. It is worth thinking about.
4. In conclusion, we would like to add to Annex 9 regarding Kyrgyz CSA. One of the achievements of CSA is the commitment of influential member of the Parliament, who is able to involve another MPs to the multi-stakeholder platform and can be champion in nutrition.

### Mozambique CSP

Integrated above (ratings provided)

### Myanmar CSA

After reviewing the executive summary, I feel that it provided an accurate overview of the MPTF's functioning at global level and the experience of specific CSAs at country level. One point that we found particularly relevant for Myanmar was:

*"Donors often place emphasis on SUN stakeholders accessing funds at country level but it is not clear to what extent the global Donor Network is facilitating the increased availability of funds at this level."*

"This has definitely been our experience, not only in terms of accessing funds but also in terms of donor representation on the multi-stakeholder platform. Interest and engagement on the part of donors at the global level does not seem to be translating into engagement in the SUN Movement at the country level. The donor network here in Myanmar has been involved since the country signed up to SUN, but they have not been very active on the MSP. The perceived lack of interest on the part of donors may be a deterrent to increased commitment from the gov

## SUN Business Network

### **SUN Business Network (SBN) Response to the SUN Movement Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) Evaluation**

#### **SBN current funding structure – June 2016**

- SBN currently receives direct donor support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) and Government of the Netherlands for a core global team budget, which covers the network's support to the SUN Movement, including support to develop country SBN programmes.
- The UN World Food Programme (UN WFP) and Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) co-convene the network, with GAIN acting as the accounting body and host of the SBN global team.
- The global SBN team supports 12 SUN Countries to develop strategies to mobilise business in support of national nutrition strategies.
- The SBN has submitted proposals for interim one year funding July 2016- June 2017 with existing donors, to cover global team costs and scale up activities in six priority countries.
- Scaling up activities in these six countries would provide improved models and best practice for all existing country SBNs and for other SUN Countries to establish SBNs. The SBN has not applied for MPTF funds, to date.
- The SBN supports countries to raise funds at national level. An example of this includes the SBN Zambia which successfully raised funds from local donors for a national network (2015-2017).

#### **SBN in the SUN 2.0 phase (2017-2020):**

The SBN is looking to build a sustainable network. To do this a mix of public and private sources will be required:

- The SBN will seek to reduce the cost of the global team through pooling communication, translation and website costs with SUN Movement Secretariat and other SUN Networks.
- The SBN will seek to maintain existing donors (BMGF and Government of the Netherlands) while where possible, phasing in new donors from the SUN Donor Network (SDN).
- The SBN will begin to explore with donors, on a country-by-country basis, the interest in establishing investment funds to provide risk capital to national companies to scale up private sector investment in nutrition.

- The SBN will also consult widely over the potential to move towards business membership fees in some middle income SUN countries. This will require developing a service and platform which develops significant ‘buy-in’ from business over the next two years, so that companies will invest membership fees in sustaining national SUN Business Networks. The SBN will propose such changes in consultation with existing donors and its convenors and Advisory Group from 2017 onwards.
- The SBN will also facilitate In kind contributions from business to include support for global advocacy, secondments to SBN countries, and development of policy and practice toolkits around specific nutrition interventions.

#### **SBN recommendations on the development of a new MPTF:**

##### **Global SBN Team funding:**

SBN continues to receive direct donor support for the costs of its global team and activities in a limited number of countries. SBN will look to expand donor support beyond its two existing donors.

##### **Country SBN development funding:**

*Potential for using a future fund to support SUN Countries to develop SUN Business Networks (SBNs):*

- Demand amongst the 57 SUN countries to establish SBNs is high – this is evidenced by the participation of 33 Countries in our Eastern and Southern Africa and Asia workshops in 2015.
- A total of 29 countries have requested SBN support to develop their own national networks or business engagement strategies.
- Funding to the SBN global team (2017-2020), will not extend to all 57 countries, so there is a need to help countries outside of the SBN’s existing agreements with donors on country level SBN programmes, to access funds to develop country-level SBNs.
- The SBN welcomes an MPTF that would allow SUN Countries to apply for funds to initiate SBN strategies, including fundraising strategies (e.g., see SBN Zambia example noted above).
- Funds should be dedicated solely to national platform or national strategy development for country-level SBNs.
- SBN has developed costed proposals on SBN country development activities, which could be used by SUN countries to request this support.
- The SBN does not envisage drawing on MPTF funds to cover its core costs.
- The SBN does not recommend SBN Members (businesses) should access MPTF funds. Any new MPTF should support developing national frameworks for business engagement or country-level SBNs.

SBN does not have a view at this stage on the management structure, or hosting of any future pooled fund, but will be looking to develop this idea with the support of the visioning group. SBN will ensure its existing donors, convenors and Advisory Group are informed of the development of any new proposals for SBN country support.