UN Network for SUN
2016 Global Report
UN Network Reporting Exercise

✓ For the first time ever, UN Networks at the country level reported on their collective contributions to nutrition.

✓ The reporting exercise was launched in January 2017 and it covers the period: January 1 to December 31, 2016.

✓ It was conducted through the UN Network Reporting Tool, an online survey to capture UN Network activities.

✓ It is structured around the 5 outcomes of the UN Network Results Framework. Specifically:

  • Data gathered on the UN Network’s outcomes 1-4 captures UN Networks’ contributions towards SUN processes at the country level, including the support provided by the UN Network and REACH (where present) to multi-stakeholder platforms and other in-country stakeholder partners and SUN Networks.

  • Data gathered under outcome 5 pertains to activities aiming at increasing internal UN harmonization and coordination.

  • Data was collected on each outcome through a series of questions, including detailed quantitative and qualitative sub-questions.

✓ Reporting within the UN Network Reporting Exercise is also designed to capture data on enhanced partnerships between UN agencies and civil society organisations, donors, and the private sector in support of national nutrition efforts.
UN Network Reporting Exercise – Purpose

✓ Mechanism for internal UN accountability
  • In line with the UN Network Strategy and SUN Movement strategy and Roadmap – is used for regular and transparent reporting of progress of UN Networks against plans and commitments as presented in UN Network for SUN Strategy 2016-2020

✓ Baseline of the functionality of the UN Networks in all SUN countries
  • It gathers important data that are not currently captured by the SUN Joint Annual Assessment Exercise (collective UN Network contributions and agency-specific data)

✓ Articulation of UN Network contributions to SUN processes at the country level
  • The exercise helps gather UN Network collective outputs to feed into the SUN Joint Annual Assessment Exercise and SUN Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) System

✓ Opportunity for UN Networks to reflect on their own functionality and strengthen their cohesion
  • Network building and important opportunity to reflect on achievements and status of the Networks
UN NETWORK PERFORMANCE IN 2016
- COUNTRY-LEVEL -
The UNN Reporting Tool elicits ‘Yes/No/Not Applicable’ responses to gather data on UN Network’s activities that contributed towards the UN Network Results Framework in 2016. Specifically:

- **YES** = If the activity has been carried out by the UN Network during the period January 1 - December 31, 2016. This also includes activities that started but were not completed in 2016
- **NO** = If the activity hasn’t been carried out by the UN Network during the period January 1 - December 31, 2016 but it was part of the expected and agreed 2016 UN Network deliverables
- **Not applicable (N/A)** = If the activity hasn’t been carried out by the UN Network during the period January 1 - December 31, 2016 because it was not part of the expected and agreed 2016 UN Network deliverables
Process and Participation

UN Network Reporting Exercise Process

Exercise Launched (2 February 2017)
- Communication sent to UN Networks in 57 SUN countries requesting participation

Data Collection (February 2017)
- Focal Points and Chairs in SUN Countries compiled, discussed and entered data

Quality Assurance (March 2017)
- UN Network/REACH Secretariat reviewed data and liaised with countries where necessary

Analysis (March-April 2017)
- Quantitative
- Qualitative

Reporting (From April 2017)
- UN Network 2016 Global Report
- Global Nutrition Report
- SUN Annual Progress Report 2017

UN Network Participation in the Reporting Exercise

% (#) of UN Networks, out of those invited to conduct the exercise (n=57)

- 82% of SUN countries participated
- 18% of UN Networks did not participate

82% of SUN countries participated in the UN Network Reporting Exercise
### UN Network for SUN Results Framework

#### Percent of participating SUN countries where the UN Network supported government’s efforts and SUN processes (n=47)

| Outcome 1: Increased awareness of the causes of malnutrition and potential solutions | Output 1.1 | Multi-sectoral nutrition analyses completed and informing national nutrition processes | 78.7% |
| Outcome 1: Increased awareness of the causes of malnutrition and potential solutions | Output 1.2 | Advocacy for nutrition increased and sustained | 75.0% |
| Outcome 1: Increased awareness of the causes of malnutrition and potential solutions | Output 1.3 | Nutrition knowledge sharing mechanisms in place and functional | 57.0% |
| Outcome 2: Strengthened and increasingly resourced national policies and programmes | Output 2.1 | National nutrition SMART targets in place | 80.9% |
| Outcome 2: Strengthened and increasingly resourced national policies and programmes | Output 2.2 | Quality sectoral & multi-sectoral nutrition policies, strategies, plans & programmes in place and up-to-date | 93.6% |
| Outcome 2: Strengthened and increasingly resourced national policies and programmes | Output 2.3 | Nutrition integrated into national development plans | 71.1% |
| Outcome 2: Strengthened and increasingly resourced national policies and programmes | Output 2.4 | National access to finance for scaling up nutrition increased | 68.5% |
| Outcome 3: Increased human and institutional capacity to support the scaling up of nutrition actions at all levels | Output 3.1 | Capacity for scaling up nutrition strengthened | 69.9% |
| Outcome 3: Increased human and institutional capacity to support the scaling up of nutrition actions at all levels | Output 3.2 | Multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder platforms in place and functional | 91.5% |
| Outcome 4: Increased efficiency and accountability of national efforts | Output 4.1 | National nutrition information systems (including surveillance) strengthened | 78.7% |
| Outcome 4: Increased efficiency and accountability of national efforts | Output 4.2 | Plans and programmes effectively monitored | 53.6% |

Percentages refer to countries that reported supporting a given output, out of 47 countries who participated in the exercise. Only questions answered with “Yes”, “No” or “N/A” were included in the results shown on this slide. Where there exist multiple questions for one output, the % displayed refers to the % of “Yes” responses, aggregated and averaged across all of the output’s sub-questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 5: Harmonized and coordinated United Nations nutrition efforts</th>
<th>Output 5.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN Network Chair or Co-Chairs appointed</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Network Focal Points appointed (3 or more)</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Network annual work plan developed</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 5.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN Networks completed a full UN Nutrition Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Networks developed a UN Nutrition Strategy/Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Networks participated in the Reporting Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Networks contributed to the nutrition content of joint UN frameworks (UNDAF and UNDAP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 5.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN joint programmes being implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 5.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN Network resourcing strategy for nutrition developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 5.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common nutrition narrative developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Networks jointly engaged in nutrition events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Network jointly engaging in advocacy and communication efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages refer to countries that reported supporting the output, out of 47 countries who participated in the exercise. Only questions answered with “Yes”, “No” or “N/A” were included in the results shown on this slide.
Summary Results (1/2)

Number of UN Networks Supporting Each Output (Outcomes 1-4) in 2016

Number of UN Networks who reported Yes to supporting each output in 2016
(n = 47, except for questions marked with an * where 1 to 2 fewer countries reported)

1.1.1 Has the UN Network supported the completion of multi-sectoral nutrition analyses? 37
1.2.1. Has the UN Network supported the development and/or implementation of national nutrition advocacy and/or communication strategies? 33
1.2.2. Has the UN Network supported the development and/or implementation Behaviour Change Communication (BCC) strategies? 37
1.2.3. Has the UN Network supported advocacy efforts of media, national nutrition champions and parliamentarians? 35
1.3.1. Has the UN Network supported the establishment and/or strengthening of multisectoral nutrition knowledge sharing portals (virtual platforms)? 20
1.3.2. Has the UN Network supported the organization of nutrition knowledge-sharing events? 33
2.1.1. Has the UN Network supported setting and/or reviewing national SMART nutrition targets? 38
2.2.1. Has the UN Network provided support to develop and/or update sectoral/multi-sectoral nutrition policies/strategies/plans/programmes, including costing? 44
2.3.1. Has the UN Network provided support to integrate nutrition into national economic and social development plans? 32
2.4.1. Has the UN Network provided support to increase domestic financing for scaling up nutrition? 32
2.4.2. Has the UN Network provided support to increase access to (in-country and international) donor resources for scaling up nutrition? 31
### Summary Results (2/2)

**Number of UN Networks Supporting Each Output (Outcomes 1-4) in 2016**

Number of UN Networks who reported **Yes** to supporting each output in 2016

(n = 47, except for questions marked with an * where 1 to 2 fewer countries reported)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number of UN Networks Supporting Each Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1. Has the UN Network provided support to identify nutrition capacity needs and develop a plan to address those needs?</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2. Has the UN Network provided support to strengthen capacity in service delivery and programme implementation of both nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions?</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1. Has the UN Network provided support to establish/strengthen effective functional multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder coordination platforms (MSP) both at national and/or decentralized level?</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1. Has the UN Network provided support to establish and/or operationalize national sectoral and/or multi-sectoral nutrition information systems (including surveillance systems)?</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 Has the UN Network provided support to measure and report coverage of national nutrition interventions (both specific and sensitive)?</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2. Has the UN Network provided support to track and report budgets and expenditures related to nutrition (within a sector as well as multi-sectorally)?</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3 Has the UN Network provided support to develop M&amp;E Frameworks or similar Results Frameworks linked to national nutrition plans?</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top 4 outputs most supported by the UN Networks at country level in 2016

Number of UN Networks who reported Yes to supporting each output in 2016 (n varies by question)

Output 2.1.1. Set and/or review national SMART nutrition targets
- 81% of UN Networks
- 38 outputs

Output 2.2.1. Develop and/or update sectoral/multi-sectoral nutrition policies/strategies/plans/programmes, including costing
- 94% of UN Networks
- 44 outputs

Output 3.1.2. Strengthen capacity in service delivery and programme implementation of both nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions
- 96% of UN Networks
- 44 outputs

Output 3.2.1. Establish/strengthen effective functional multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder coordination platforms (MSP)
- 92% of UN Networks
- 43 outputs

Outcome 2: Strengthened and increasingly resourced national policies and programmes

Outcome 3: Increased human and institutional capacity to support the scaling up of nutrition actions at all levels

Highlights: In 2016, UN Networks focused their support on nutrition-related sectoral and multi-sectoral policies, strategies, plans and programmes including SMART target setting; capacity strengthening for service delivery, including programme implementation; and support to the functioning of multi-stakeholder coordination platforms.
Top 5 outputs least supported by the UN Networks at country level in 2016

Number of UN Networks who reported No to supporting each output in 2016 (n varies by question)

Output 1.3.1. Establishing / strengthening multisectoral nutrition knowledge sharing portals (virtual platforms) - 47% 22

Output 3.1.1. Identifying nutrition capacity needs and developing a plan to address those needs - 51% 24

Output 4.2.1. Measuring and reporting coverage of national nutrition interventions (both specific and sensitive) - 39% 18

Output 4.2.2. Tracking and reporting budgets and expenditures related to nutrition (within a sector and multi-sectorally) - 37% 17

Output 4.2.3. Developing M&E Frameworks or similar Results Frameworks linked to national nutrition plans - 35% 16

Outcome 1: Multi-sectoral nutrition analyses completed and informing national nutrition processes

Outcome 3: Increased human and institutional capacity to support the scaling up of nutrition actions at all levels

Outcome 4: Increased efficiency and accountability of national efforts

Highlights: In 2016, the outputs least supported by the UN Network were primarily linked to identifying nutrition capacity needs and developing a plan to address them and, overall, to increasing efficiency and accountability of national efforts.
Outcome 1: Increased awareness of the causes of malnutrition and potential solutions
Outcome 1

Number of UN Networks who reported Yes to supporting each output in 2016 (n varies by question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1. Completion of multi-sectoral nutrition analyses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
<td>37 (79%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1. Development / implementation of national nutrition advocacy &amp; communication strategies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 (15%)</td>
<td>33 (70%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2. Development / implementation of BCC strategies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 (15%)</td>
<td>37 (79%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3. Advocacy efforts of media, national nutrition champions and parliamentarians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7 (15%)</td>
<td>35 (76%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1. Establishment / strengthening of multisectoral nutrition knowledge sharing portals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22 (47%)</td>
<td>33 (72%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2. Organization of nutrition knowledge-sharing events</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 (22%)</td>
<td>33 (72%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights:
- Under Outcome 1, the UN Network most often supported: 1) completion of multi-sectoral nutrition analyses, 2) development or implementation of behavioral change communication (BCC) strategies and 3) advocacy efforts of media, national nutrition champions and parliamentarians.
- Less than half (43%) of UN Networks supported the establishment or strengthening of multi-sectoral nutrition knowledge sharing portals / virtual platforms.
Outcome 1, by region *

Percentage of UN Networks who reported Yes to supporting each analysis in 2016 (n varies by region)

Highlights:
- Activities most supported by the UN Network included:
  1) development / implementation of national nutrition advocacy and/or comm. strategies (LAC);
  2) development / implementation of Behaviour Change Communication Strategies (WCA and MEAP);
  3) the completion of multi-sectoral nutrition analyses (SEA and MEAP)
- Across the 4 regions, the establishment or strengthening of multi-sectoral nutrition knowledge sharing portals was the least supported activity, mirroring the aggregated results for outcome 1

1.1.1 Completion of multi-sectoral nutrition analyses
1.2.1. Develop/implement national nutrition advocacy and/or communication strategies
1.2.2. Develop/implement Behaviour Change Communication strategies
1.2.3. Support to advocacy efforts of medical, national nutrition champions and parliamentarians
1.3.1. Establish/Strengthten multi-sectoral nutrition knowledge sharing portals
1.3.2. Organization of nutrition knowledge-sharing events

* The UN Network regional grouping is based on a mapping of UN agencies’ regional presence and on the need to facilitate cross-country coordination and communication given the different agencies’ geographical configurations.
Output 1.1.1: Types of Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Analyses Supported

Number of UN Networks who reported Yes to supporting each analysis in 2016 (n=37)

Note: More than one analysis could be selected.

Highlights:

- The Policy and Plan Analysis, followed by the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Overview, were the analytical exercises most supported by the UN Network in 2016.
- 10 UN Networks did not carry out the Stakeholder and Nutrition Action Mapping, despite this activity being planned as part of the UN Network deliverables for 2016.
Output 1.1.1: Partners Supporting Multi-Sectoral Analyses

Number (%) of multi-sectoral nutrition analysis types that engaged each type of partner in 2016 (n=101, the total number of analysis types reported)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Engagement Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights:

- Partners most often engaged in Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Analyses included governments, followed by civil society organizations, donors, and academia.
- Private sector engagement is relatively less frequent compared to others.
Output 1.1.1: Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Analyses, by region *

Percentage (#) of UN Networks who reported Yes to supporting each analysis in 2016 (n varies by region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Overview</th>
<th>Policy and Plan Analysis</th>
<th>Stakeholder and Nutrition Action Mapping</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin American &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC (n=4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West and Central Africa</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCA (n=17)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and East Africa</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA (n=15)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East, Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAP (n=11)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights:

- Across the 4 regions, Policy and Plan Analysis was the most common analytical exercise conducted by the UN Network in 2016.
- The only exception was represented by LAC, where Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Overviews were most often reported.

* The UN Network regional grouping is based on a mapping of UN agencies’ regional presence and the need to facilitate cross-country coordination and communication given the different agencies’ geographical configurations.
Outcome 2: Strengthened and increasingly resourced national policies and programmes
Outcome 2

Number of UN Networks who reported Yes to supporting each output in 2016 (n varies by question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1. Setting and/or reviewing national SMART nutrition targets</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1. Development / update of sectoral/ multi-sectoral nutrition policies, strategies, plans, or programmes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1. Integrating nutrition into national economic and social development plans</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1. Increasing domestic financing for scaling up nutrition</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2. Increasing access to in-country and international donor resources for scaling up nutrition</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highlights:**

- All of the outputs under Outcome 2 were supported by over two-thirds of participating UN Networks, indicating that strengthening and increasingly resourcing national policies and programmes was a priority for the UN Network globally.
- In line with UN agencies’ mandates, the focus of UN Network support was concentrated on the development/update of sectoral/multi-sectoral nutrition policies, strategies, plans, or programmes.
- The UN Network less frequently supported activities aimed at increasing countries' financing and access to both domestic and external resources for scaling up nutrition.
### Outcome 2, by region*

Number of UN Networks who reported **Yes** to supporting each analysis in 2016 (n varies by region)

| Region                          | Number of Networks (n) | Support (%)
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------
| Latin American & Caribbean (LAC) | 4                      | 50% 100%
| West and Central Africa (WCA)   | 17                     | 53% 65% 88%
| South and East Africa (SEA)     | 15                     | 53% 73% 80% 100%
| Middle East, Asia and the Pacific (MEAP) | 11       | 73% 82% 91% 100%

*The UN Network regional grouping is based on a mapping of UN agencies’ regional presence and the need to facilitate cross-country coordination and communication given the different agencies’ geographical configurations.*

**Highlights**

- Across the 4 regions, the development / update of sectoral/ multi-sectoral nutrition policies, strategies, plans, or programmes and SMART target setting were the activities most often supported by the UN Network, mirroring the global aggregated results for outcome 1.

- Support to increase access to donor/in-country resources and domestic financing for scaling up nutrition was most often reported by the SEA and MEAP regions and less often reported by LAC and WCA regions.

---

2.1.1. Set and/or review national SMART nutrition target(s)
2.2.1. Develop and/or update the sectoral / multi-sectoral nutrition policies / strategies / plans / programmes
2.3.1. Integrate nutrition into the national development plan(s)
2.4.1. Increase access to (in-country and international) donor resources for scaling up nutrition
2.4.2. Increase domestic financing for scaling up nutrition
Outcome 3: Increased human and institutional capacity to support the scaling up of nutrition actions at all levels
Outcome 3

Number of UN Networks who reported Yes to supporting each output in 2016 (n varies by question)

3.1.1. Identify nutrition capacity needs and develop a plan to address those needs

- Yes: 24 (45%)
- No: 2
- N/A: 2

3.1.2. Strengthen capacity in service delivery and programme implementation of both nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions

- Yes: 44 (96%)
- No: 1

3.2.1. Establish and/or strengthen effective functional multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder coordination platforms (MSP) both at national and/or decentralized level

- Yes: 43 (92%)
- No: 1

Highlights:

- Outcome 3 was supported by the majority of UN Networks, with 96% of them having supported the strengthening of capacity for service delivery & programme implementation, and 92% reporting the support to multi-stakeholder coordination platforms.
- However, less than half of the participating UN Networks supported the identification of capacity needs and the subsequent development of plans to address these needs.
- The identification of capacity needs and development of plan to address these identified needs is the output least supported by the UN Network, across all Outcomes 1-5.
Output 3.1.1: Partners involved in capacity needs assessments

Percentage of UN Networks who reported the engagement of each type of partner in assessing nutrition capacity needs in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights:
- Almost all nutrition capacity needs assessments were conducted with the engagement of governments (95%).
- The private sector and donors were less involved in all nutrition capacity needs assessments (50%-55%).
Outcome 3, by region*

Number of UN Networks who reported Yes to supporting each analysis in 2016 (n varies by region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>LAC (n=4)</th>
<th>WCA (n=17)</th>
<th>SEA (n=15)</th>
<th>MEAP (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin American &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West and Central Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and East Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East, Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights

- Across almost all regions, the most supported output was related to strengthening capacity in service delivery/programme implementation. This is in line with the global aggregated results presented earlier.
- However, in the LAC region, support to MSPs was the most frequently supported output.
- Mirroring the global aggregated data, the output least supported was linked to the identification of capacity needs and the subsequent development of plans to address these needs.

3.1.1. Identify nutrition capacity needs and develop a plan to address these needs

3.1.2. Strengthen capacity in service delivery and programme implementation of nutrition-specific and sensitive interventions

3.2.1. Establish/strengthen effective functional multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder coordination platforms (MSP)

* The UN Network regional grouping is based on a mapping of UN agencies' regional presence and the need to facilitate cross-country coordination and communication given the different agencies' geographical configurations.
Outcome 4: Increased efficiency and accountability of national efforts
### Outcome 4

Number of UN Networks who reported **Yes** to supporting each output in 2016 (n varies by question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1. Establish and/or operationalize national sectoral and/or multi-sectoral nutrition information systems</td>
<td>23 (50%)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1. Measure and report coverage of national nutrition interventions</td>
<td>24 (52%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5 (95.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2. Track and report budgets and expenditures related to nutrition (within a sector as well as multi-sectorally)</td>
<td>27 (59%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3. Develop M&amp;E Frameworks or similar Results Frameworks linked to national nutrition plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Highlights:

- 3 out of 4 outputs under Outcome 4 were supported by approximately half of UN Networks (50%-59%) and rank as the least supported outputs across all outcomes.

- The most supported output was Output 4.1.1, linked to the establishment or operationalization of national nutrition information systems. However, only half of these UN Networks supported *multi-sectoral* information systems (in 16-17 countries), whereas all but one UN Network supported *sectoral* information systems.
Output 4.1.1.: Types of information systems supported

Number of UN Networks who reported supporting each type of information system in 2016 (n=37)

Highlights

- Strengthening sectoral information systems was the most frequently supported output when compared to supporting multi-sectoral information systems

* The UN Network regional grouping is based on a mapping of UN agencies’ regional presence and the need to facilitate cross-country coordination and communication given the different agencies’ geographical configurations.
Outcome 4, by region*

Number of UN Networks who reported **Yes** to supporting each analysis in 2016 (n varies by region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin American &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>LAC (n=4)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West and Central Africa</td>
<td>WCA (n=17)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and East Africa</td>
<td>SEA (n=15)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East, Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>MEAP (n=11)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highlights:**

- Measuring and reporting coverage of nutrition interventions was one of the least supported output in the region, with the exception of the SEA region.
- LAC region did not support this output in any of the 4 participating SUN countries.
- Tracking and reporting expenditures and the development of M&E frameworks were also less frequently supported in line with the global, aggregated data.

- 4.1.1. Establish and/or operationalize national nutrition information system(s)
- 4.2.1. Measure and report coverage of national sectoral and multi-sectoral nutrition interventions
- 4.2.2. Track and report expenditures related to the national sectoral and multi-sectoral nutrition intervention
- 4.2.3. Develop M&E Frameworks and/or Results Frameworks linked to national nutrition plans

* The UN Network regional grouping is based on a mapping of UN agencies’ regional presence and the need to facilitate cross-country coordination and communication given the different agencies’ geographical configurations.
Outcome 5: Harmonized and coordinated United Nations nutrition efforts
Outcome 5.1

UN Network Chair(s) Appointed

Number of SUN countries (n=57) ¹

- Yes: 37 (65%)
- No: 20 (35%)

Three or more UN Network Focal Points Appointed

Number of SUN countries (n=57) ¹

- Yes: 54 (95%)
- No: 3 (5%)

UN Network 2016 Work Plan Developed

Number of SUN countries as reported in the UN Network Reporting Exercise (n=45)

- Yes: 22 (49%)
- No: 21 (47%)
- N/A: 2 (4%)

Highlights:

- UN Networks are making progress in the establishment of their networks, with high numbers of focal points and chairs appointed.
- Half of UN Networks who participated in the exercise have developed joint work plans for their networks.

¹ Source: UN Network for SUN Secretariat Contact List Database
Outcome 5.2

Output 5.2.1. UN Nutrition Inventories Completed
Number of SUN countries reporting (n=46)

No 23 (50%)
Yes 19 (41%)
N/A 4 (9%)

Output 5.2.2. UN Network Strategy/Agenda Completed
Number of SUN countries reporting (n=46)

No 31 (67%)
Yes 11 (24%)
N/A 4 (9%)

Output 5.2.3. UN Networks developing the nutrition content of joint UN frameworks (e.g. UNDAF)
Number of SUN countries reporting (n=46)

No 10 (22%)
Yes 32 (69%)
N/A 4 (9%)

Highlights:
- The majority of SUN Countries who reported conducting UN Nutrition Inventories and developing Strategies/Agendas are supported by REACH facilitators.
- UN agencies are frequently coming together to shape the nutrition content in joint UN frameworks such as the UNDAF.
Output 5.2, by region*

Number of UN Networks who reported Yes to supporting each output in 2016 (n varies by region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>LAC (n=4)</th>
<th>WCA (n=17)</th>
<th>SEA (n=15)</th>
<th>MEAP (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support to develop nutrition content</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition strategy/agenda developed</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Inventory completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights:
- Overall and across regions, support to develop the nutrition content of joint UN frameworks is the most supported.
- Nutrition strategy/agenda was not worked on in LAC.
- The UN Nutrition Inventory was the output most worked on in WCA and MEAP.

5.2.1. The UN Network has fully completed a UN Nutrition Inventory

5.2.2. A UN Nutrition Strategy/Agenda has been completed by the UN Network

5.2.3. The UN Network contributed to develop or update the nutrition content of joint UN frameworks

* The UN Network regional grouping is based on a mapping of UN agencies’ regional presence and the need to facilitate cross-country coordination and communication given the different agencies’ geographical configurations.
A Functionality Index has been created from the following variables and calculated for all UN Networks:

- UN Network Chair(s) nominated
- 3+ UN Network Focal Points appointed
- UN Network Work Plan developed
- UN Network Reporting Exercise completed
- UN Nutrition Inventory in place
- UN Network Strategy/agenda in place

All the variables have equal weighting (yes=1, no=0)

Average Score: 3.4

Most: 25% (14 countries)
Some: 42% (24 countries)
Very few/none: 33% (19 countries)

UN Network set-up
Minimum elements in place:
- Most (Scores 5-6)
- Some (Scores 3-4)
- Very few/none (Scores 0-2)
**UN joint programming currently in place and implemented**

- Number of UN Networks (n=45)
  - Yes: 27
  - No: 14
  - N/A: 4

- 30 countries reported
- 59 UN joint programmes

**Implementation setting of UN joint programmes**

- Number of UN joint programmes (n=57)
  - Development: 36 (63%)
  - Humanitarian: 9 (16%)
  - Both: 12 (21%)

**Frequency of partnerships between UN agencies**

- Number of UN joint programmes (n=56)
  - FAO, UNICEF, WFP, WHO: 14
  - UNICEF, WFP, WHO: 9
  - FAO, UNICEF, WFP: 7
  - FAO, WFP: 6
  - UNICEF, WFP: 3
  - UNICEF, WHO, UNFPA: 2
  - FAO, UNICEF, WFP, WHO, UNFPA: 2
  - FAO, UNICEF, WFP, UNDP: 2
  - UNICEF, WHO: 1
  - UNICEF, UNFPA: 1
  - FAO, WFP, WHO: 1
  - FAO, IFAP, WFP: 1
  - WHO, UNDP: 1
  - FAO, WHO: 1

**Highlights**:
- UN joint programmes are most often implemented in development settings
- UN joint programmes most frequently involve all four REACH founding agencies

Note: While 59 joint programmes were reported, information about the agencies, partners, thematic areas and implementation setting was not reported for all 59 programmes. Therefore N varies by dimension being analysed.
Output 5.3.: Categories being supported jointly by UN joint programming

Number of UN joint programmes working on the main categories listed within one UN joint programme (n=56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food, Agriculture &amp; Health Diets (Food/Ag)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal and Child Care</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Protection</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Ag &amp; Care</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Ag &amp; Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Ag &amp; Social Protection</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care &amp; Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Ag &amp; Care &amp; Health</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Ag &amp; Health &amp; Social Protection</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care &amp; Health &amp; Social Protection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Ag, Care, Health &amp; Social Protection</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights: The highest combination of categories in UN joint programmes is: Food/Ag & Care & Health

Note: Thematic areas were only listed for 56 of the 59 joint programmes reported.
### Output 5.3. Frequency of Thematic Areas Supported by UN Networks

% of all thematic areas reported in UN joint programmes (n=232, the total number of thematic areas mentioned across all UN joint programmes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Consumption Practices for Healthy Diets</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops/Horticulture</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and Fisheries</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food processing, Fortification and Storage</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant and Young Child Feeding</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Interventions delivered through reproductive and paediatric health services</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronutrient Supplementation</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Acute Malnutrition</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease Prevention and Management</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Insurance</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Assistance</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Market Programmes</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other thematic areas</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highlights:** The thematic areas most frequently supported in UN joint programmes are: *Food Consumption Practices for Healthy Diets* and *Infant and Young Child Feeding*
Outcome 5.3: Thematic areas in UN joint programming, by region*

Percent of UN joint programmes involving each thematic area, out of all thematic areas being addressed (n varies by region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Middle East, Asia &amp; Pacific (n=11)</th>
<th>South and East Africa (n=15)</th>
<th>West and Central Africa (n=17)</th>
<th>Latin America &amp; Caribbean (n=4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food consumption practices</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops / Horticulture</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and fisheries</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food processing, fortification and storage</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYCF</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Interventions thru. Health svcs.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronutrient Supplement.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt. of Acute Malnutrition</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease prevention and mgmt.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social assistance</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour market programmes</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other thematic areas</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow cells = Most supported areas in the region

* The UN Network regional grouping is based on a mapping of UN agencies’ regional presence and the need to facilitate cross-country coordination and communication given the different agencies’ geographical configurations.
5.4. Resources (human and financial) for nutrition

Human Resources:
Number of UN staff dedicated to nutrition

Number of staff dedicated to nutrition, by category

- Consultants: 111 (15%)
- UNV: 14 (2%)
- Int’l Cluster Coord.: 9 (1%)
- P1-5: 134 (18%)
- JPO: 6 (1%)
- G2-7: 133 (18%)
- NOA-D: 326 (45%)

Financial resourcing strategy for nutrition

Number of UN Networks (n=45)

- Yes: 6 (13%)
- No: 29 (65%)
- N/A: 10 (22%)

Highlights:

- The most frequent category of staff dedicated to nutrition are national staff, NOA-D.
- Only 6 SUN countries reported developing a UN Network joint resourcing strategy (13%).
5.4. Human Resources dedicated to nutrition, by UN agency

Number of staff working on nutrition, by UN agency

- **Staff members dedicated to nutrition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Staff Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reported</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highlights:**

- The UN agencies with more operational mandates have the highest numbers of staff dedicated to nutrition (over 50% of work time spent on nutrition).
- “Other reported” agencies include among others: UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNOPS, UN Women.
- As UN Networks’ memberships are growing, additional agencies outside of the traditionally nutrition-focused ones are joining the UN Networks.
- Other agencies may be working on nutrition in-country but have not been reported for this exercise.
5.4. Human Resources dedicated to Nutrition, by region*

**Highlight:**

- The largest number of UN staff dedicated to nutrition is in East and Southern Africa, despite the fact that this region does not have the largest number of SUN countries who participated in the exercise.

---

* The UN Network regional grouping is based on a mapping of UN agencies’ regional presence and the need to facilitate cross-country coordination and communication given the different agencies’ geographical configurations.
5.5.1. Common Nutrition Narratives Developed

Number of UN Networks who reported Yes to developing a Common Nutrition Narrative (n=46)

- Yes: 13 (28%)
- No: 27 (59%)
- N/A: 6 (13%)

5.5.2. UN Networks engaged jointly in nutrition events

Number of UN Networks who reported jointly engaging in nutrition events (n=46)

- Yes: 30 (70%)
- No: 13 (30%)

5.5.3. UN Network engaged jointly in advocacy / communications efforts

Number of UN Networks who reported jointly engaging in advocacy/comms. efforts (n=46)

- Yes: 32 (74%)
- No: 11 (26%)

Highlights:

- One third of UN Networks have developed common nutrition narratives.
- Three quarters of UN Networks jointly engaged in nutrition events, and most often in MEAP region.
- Two thirds of UN Networks jointly engaged in advocacy and communications efforts. These were less frequent in LAC.

* The UN Network regional grouping is based on a mapping of UN agencies’ regional presence and the need to facilitate cross-country coordination and communication given the different agencies’ geographical configurations.
2016 KEY ACHIEVEMENTS AND CHALLENGES
2016 KEY ACHIEVEMENTS AND CHALLENGES*

Among the key achievements, country-UN Networks reported:

- Building the UN Network at country level, which facilitated the harmonisation of actions, coherent approaches, and exchanges with other partners
- Support to SUN Government Focal Points in coordinating efforts of other Networks and inter-Network collaboration
- Support to policy development/revision and planning processes (including costing)
- Implementation of joint activities and programmes aligned with national multi-sectoral plans, including nutrition emergency responses
- Integration of nutrition into joint UN frameworks (e.g. UNDAFs)
- Joint advocacy efforts and elevation of nutrition on the national development agenda

Key challenges faced by the UN Network included:

- Limited resources available – both human and financial resources – for nutrition and for UN joint activities
- Complexity of working in humanitarian crises and in changing political contexts
- Prioritization of nutrition among other competing agendas within the UN system
- Varying levels of engagement and contributions across members in the activities of the UN Network
- Need to further strengthen the functioning of the UN Networks and foster internal communications

* = Reported as part of the qualitative data collection
KEY MESSAGES
KEY MESSAGES: SUMMARY

- The response rate was very high with 82% of in-country UN Networks participating in the exercise.

- For outcomes 1-4, activities most supported by the UN Networks at the country level in 2016 included:
  - Development/review of nutrition policies, strategies, plans and programmes
  - SMART target setting/review
  - Capacity strengthening for in service delivery and programme implementation
  - Support to the functioning of multi-stakeholder, multi-sectoral platforms

- For outcomes 1-4, activities least supported by UN Networks at the country level in 2016 included:
  - Identification of capacity needs with relative development of plans to address them
  - Establishment/strengthening of multi-sectoral nutrition knowledge-sharing platforms
  - Establishment/strengthening of multi-sectoral nutrition information systems
  - Support to increased access to domestic financing and in-country and international donor resources
  - Overall efforts to increase accountability
    - Measuring and reporting coverage of nutrition actions
    - Tracking and reporting budget and expenditures related to nutrition
    - Development of M&E frameworks linked to national nutrition plans
KEY MESSAGES: SUMMARY

✓ For outcome 5, the establishment of UN Networks in all SUN countries has significantly progressed in 2016. As of December 2016, UN Network Chairs (usually an agency Representative or a Deputy) were appointed in 37 out of 57 countries (65%), whereas over 3 UN Network nutrition focal points were nominated in 95% countries.

✓ The functionality index points to different set up stages: 25% of UN Networks were in an advanced stage of their formation; the majority (42%) was ‘in progress”, and 33% was in early development stages.

✓ UN Nutrition Inventories and Agenda were mostly done in countries supported by REACH facilitators

✓ The UN Network had 733 staff dedicated to nutrition in 2016 across all SUN countries; of this 733, the majority being national staff, NOA-D, (45%).

✓ The set up of the Network was reported as one of the key 2016 achievements by those participating in the exercise, as it helped to harmonise actions and approaches and increased coherence in the interactions with other partners.

✓ Further efforts are needed to continue strengthening the functioning of the Network after this initial set-up phase. Results indicated the need for increased participation and contribution by all members of the UN Network at the country level; enhanced inter-agency communications; greater senior level engagement.