

SECTION 1: POLICY ENVIRONMENT

SUB-SECTION 1.1: EXISTENCE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES ON FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY, AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, SOCIAL PROTECTION

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.1	Existence and implementation of a national policy or programme on FNS	Existence of a national policy or programme (no or not up-to-date = 0, up-to-date policy and programme = 1)			
		Implementation level of the national policy or programme (weak = 0, delayed = 1, according to plan = 2)			
		Implementation involvement level of various partners (primarily by the partners = 0, minor State involvement = 1, significant State involvement = 2)			

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.2	Existence and implementation of a national policy or programme on nutrition	Existence of a national policy or programme (no or not up-to-date = 0, up-to-date policy and programme = 1)			
		Implementation level of the national policy or programme (weak = 0, delayed = 1, according to plan = 2)			
		Implementation involvement level of various partners (primarily by the partners = 0, minor State involvement = 1, significant State involvement = 2)			

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.3	Existence and implementation of a national policy or programme on social protection	Existence of a national policy or programme (no or not up-to-date = 0, up-to-date policy and programme = 1)			
		Implementation level of the national policy or programme (weak = 0, delayed = 1, according to plan = 2)			
		Implementation involvement level of various partners (primarily by the partners = 0, minor State involvement = 1, significant State involvement = 2)			

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.4	Existence and implementation of a national policy or programme on agriculture (farming, livestock, fishing, forestry)	Existence of a national policy or programme (no or not up-to-date = 0, up-to-date policy and programme = 1)			
		Implementation level of the national policy or programme (weak = 0, delayed = 1, according to plan = 2)			
		Implementation involvement level of various partners (primarily by the partners = 0, minor State involvement = 1, significant State involvement = 2)			

Primary constraints		Accountable entity	
---------------------	--	--------------------	--

**SUB-SECTION 1.2 OVERALL COMPLIANCE: WORKING RELATIONSHIPS
BETWEEN DIFFERENT NATIONAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES**

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.5	Relationship between the national FNS policy or programme and nutrition	Relationship between the national FNS policy or programme and nutrition (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		Implementation terms of the synergistic measures described by each sector's policies and programmes (no = 0, one sector = 1, two sectors = 2)			
		Implementation of synergistic measures (none = 0, partial = 1, thorough = 2)			

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.6	Relationship between the national FNS policy or programme and social protection	Relationship between the national FNS policy or programme and social protection (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		Implementation terms of the synergistic measures described by each sector's policies and programmes (no = 0, one sector = 1, two sectors = 2)			
		Implementation of synergistic measures (none = 0, partial = 1, thorough = 2)			

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.7	Relationship between the national FNS policy or programme and agriculture	Relationship between the national FNS policy or programme and agriculture (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		Arrangements to implement measures promoting synergy described in each sector's policies and programmes (no = 0, one sector = 1, two sectors = 2)			
		Implementation of synergistic measures (none = 0, partial = 1, thorough = 2)			

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.8	Relationship between the national FNS policy or programme and other development sectors	Relationship between the national FNS policy or programme and other development sectors (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		Implementation terms for the synergistic measures described by each sector's policies and programmes (no = 0, one sector = 1, two sectors = 2)			
		Implementation of synergistic measures (none = 0, partial = 1, thorough = 2)			

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.9	Degree to which the different forms of food insecurity (temporary, cyclical and chronic) are taken into account as well as the different response tools	Differences between the types of FNS are clearly described in the national FNS policy, programme and response plan (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		The corresponding prevention and response strategies for different forms of FNS are outlined in the policies and programmes (no = 0, partially = 1, consistently = 2)			
		The strategy for implementing these different response options is carried out with the systematic leadership of the State (no = 0, partially = 1, consistently = 2)			

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.10	Degree to which the particularities of different types of insecure areas are taken into account	The differences between the types of insecure areas (State-controlled, non-State-controlled, sporadic insecurity, war zones) are clearly described in the national FNS policy, programme and response plan (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		The corresponding prevention and response options for the different types of food and nutrition insecure areas are outlined in policies and programmes (no = 0, partially = 1, consistently = 2).			
		The strategy for implementing these different response options is carried out with the systematic leadership of the State (no = 0, partially = 1, consistently = 2)			

Primary constraints		Accountable entity	
---------------------	--	--------------------	--

SUB-SECTION 1.3 COMMUNICATION, MONITORING & COMPLIANCE TOOLS

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.11	Channels for communicating and sharing information on government actions	The country has operational channels for communicating about government activities related to FNS (no = 0, partially = 1, yes = 2)			
		There are external channels for communicating about FNS (no = 1, yes = 0)			
		All communications related to FNS pass through government channels (no = 0, partially = 1, yes = 2)			

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
1.12	Tools for monitoring FNS funding	The country has tools to monitor funds earmarked for the FNS sector (no = 1, yes = 0)			
		The tools used to monitor funds earmarked for the FNS sector are used by all stakeholders (State only = 0, partially by the TFPs = 1, consistently by all the TFPs = 2).			
		The tools used to monitor funds earmarked for the FNS sector channel all of the allocated funds (State only = 0, partially for the TFPs = 1, consistently by all the TFPs = 2).			

Primary constraints		Accountable entity	
---------------------	--	--------------------	--

SECTION 2: FOOD AND NUTRITION CRISIS PREVENTION & MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

SUB-SECTION 2.1: NATIONAL PREVENTION AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
2.1	Existence and level of functionality of national food and nutrition crisis prevention and management system	A sustainable food and nutrition crisis prevention system is in place (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		Level of functionality of the food and nutritional crisis prevention and management system (no holding of meetings = 0, irregular meetings = 1, regular meetings in accordance with the rules = 2)			
		Co-ordination of the food and nutrition crisis prevention and management system (lack of co-ordination by a structure with an official mandate = 0, ineffective co-ordination by the mandated structure = 1, effective co-ordination by the mandated structure = 2)			

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
2.2	Influence of the national food and nutrition crisis prevention and management structures on the sector	The national food and nutrition crisis prevention and management system regularly issues recommendations that are submitted to high-level government authorities (no = 0, yes = 1).			
		The prevention and management system recommendations are discussed by high-level State authorities and the necessary steps are taken (not discussed = 0, discussed but no decision made = 1, implementation decisions made = 2).			
		Implementation level of the prevention and management system recommendations (no action = 0, partial implementation = 1, full implementation = 2)			

Primary constraints		Accountable entity	
---------------------	--	--------------------	--

SUB-SECTION 2.2 FRAMEWORK FOR DIALOGUE AND TOOLS TO ENSURE RELIABLE INFORMATION AND A UNIFIED RESPONSE

Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
2.3	A framework for dialogue and tools to ensure reliable information and a unified response exist and are functional	Existence of a framework for dialogue to ensure reliable information and a unified response (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		Dialogue framework's level of functionality to ensure reliable information and unified responses (no holding of meetings = 0, irregular meetings = 1, regular meetings in accordance with the rules = 2)			
		Dialogue framework co-ordination to ensure reliable information and unified responses (lack of co-ordination by a structure with a formal mandate = 0, ineffective co-ordination by the mandated structure = 1, effective co-ordination by the mandated structure = 2)			
Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
2.4	Influence of the framework for dialogue to ensure reliable and agreed-upon information	Procedures and methodologies for generating information for prevention and management are harmonised and reviewed where necessary (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		The country has agreed-upon procedures and tools for validating the information generated for prevention and management (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		Information production roles and responsibilities are well delineated and up-to-date and all required information is being produced under the State's leadership (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		All the necessary prevention and management information is produced on time, to the required standards, and under the State's leadership (no = 0, partially = 1, yes fully = 2).			
Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
2.5	Unified response tools/options in the national response plan under the State's leadership	The government has response tools to address the different types of food and nutrition insecurity and the different types of crises (no = 0, yes = 1).			
		Tools/response options are based on agreement and revised if necessary (no = 0, partially = 1, yes by all partners = 2)			
		The tools/response options are used by all partners (no = 0, partially = 1, yes by all partners = 2)			

2.6	Procedures for communicating and disseminating the findings of the evaluation	The country has well-functioning procedures in place for disseminating the results of FNS evaluations that are used as the only channel of communication (no = 0, partially = 1, yes = 2).			
		Extra-governmental mechanisms are in place to disseminate the results of FNS evaluations (no = 1, yes = 0)			
		All communications on FNS evaluations are channelled through government mechanisms (no = 0, partially = 1, yes = 2)			
Primary constraints			Accountable entity		

SUB-SECTION 2.3 THE PREVENTION AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM'S FINANCING MECHANISMS					
Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
2.7	The prevention and management system's sustainable financing framework	The country has a sustainable framework for financing the prevention and management system (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		The sustainable framework for financing the prevention and management system is used by the State and its partners (State only = 0, partially by the TFPs = 1, systematically by all the TFPs = 2).			
		The sustainable financing framework of prevention and management system receives all the allocated funds (State only = 0, partially for the TFPs = 1, systematically by all the TFPs = 2).			
Primary constraints			Accountable entity		

SECTION 3: WORKING TOGETHER TO PROMOTE CO-ORDINATION, CONVERGENCE, ALIGNMENT AND EFFECTIVENESS IN OUR COMMON CAUSE FOR ACHIEVING FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY					
SUB-SECTION 3.1 CO-ORDINATION OF SECTOR-SPECIFIC INTERVENTIONS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY					
Issue		Criteria	Score		Evidence
3.1	A framework exists and functions to co-ordinate government activities related to FNS	A framework/co-ordinating body for government interventions targeting FNS exists (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		Level of functionality of the framework/co-ordinating body for government interventions targeting the FNS sector (no meetings = 0, irregular meetings = 1, regular meetings in accordance with the rules = 2)			
		Co-ordination of the framework/co-ordinating body responsible for sector-specific government interventions that contribute to FNS (lack of co-ordination by a structure with a formal mandate = 0, ineffective co-ordination by the mandated structure = 1, effective co-ordination by the mandated structure = 2)			
3.2	Influence of the authority/ framework on co-ordinating government activities related to FNS	There are many co-ordination frameworks (food security, nutrition, social protection) with a functional unifying authority that implements/looks for the synergies (no = 1, yes = 0).			
		The roles and responsibilities in the implementation of synergistic activities are clearly defined and include all the major players (no = 0, yes = 1).			
		The country has procedures and tools for creating synergies between FNS interventions (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		Formal mechanisms to monitor the implementation of the framework's/co-ordinating authority's resolutions on FNS exists. These mechanisms are functional and the information generated influences decision making (no = 0, not agreed-upon or incomplete tools = 1, agreed-upon and complete tools = 2)			
3.3	Sustainable financing mechanism for frameworks and authorities for dialogue on inter-sectoral policy co-ordination	The country has a sustainable mechanism for funding frameworks and authorities for dialogue on the inter-sectoral co-ordination of government activities (no = 1, yes = 0).			
		The sustainable financing mechanism for frameworks and authorities for dialogue on inter-sectoral co-ordination of government activities is used by the State and its partners (State only = 0, partially by TFPs = 1, systematically by all TFPs = 2).			
		The sustainable mechanism for funding frameworks and authorities for dialogue on inter-sectoral co-ordination of government activities receives and/or co-ordinates all allocated funds (State only = 0, partially for TFPs = 1, systematically by all TFPs = 2).			
Primary constraints			Accountable entity		

SUB-SECTION 3.2 CO-ORDINATION OF SECTOR-SPECIFIC INTERVENTIONS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY					
3.4	Frameworks/ institution/ mechanisms for dialogue to promote alignment exist and are functional	A framework or authority for dialogue supporting the alignment of partner interventions exists (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		The level of functionality of the dialogue framework or authority to promote a more aligned response from partners (no meetings = 0, irregular meetings = 1, regular meetings in accordance with the rules = 2).			
		Co-ordination of the functional dialogue framework or authority fostering a more aligned partner response (lack of co-ordination by a structure with a formal mandate = 0, ineffective co-ordination by the mandated structure = 1, effective co-ordination by the mandated structure = 2)			
3.5	Influence of the consultative authority/ framework in co-ordinating food security and nutrition security interventions	Existence of a multitude of co-ordination frameworks (food security, nutrition, social protection) with an operational umbrella agency implementing/steering the co-ordination of interventions (no = 1, yes = 0)			
		The country has procedures and instruments in place to align FNS interventions (no = 0, incomplete or non-agreed-upon tools = 1, complete and agreed-upon tools = 2)			
		Formal mechanisms exist to monitor the implementation of the framework's/coordinating authority's resolutions to align FNS interventions. Mechanisms are functional and recommendations are implemented (no = 0, partial implementation = 1, full implementation of recommendations = 2)			
3.6	An engagement framework used by the government exists and is functional	Existence of an engagement framework as stipulated by the PREGEC Charter (no = 0, yes = 1)			
		The level of functionality of the engagement framework (no monitoring missions or irregular missions = 0, regular missions in accordance with the prevention and management cycle = 1)			
		Co-ordination of the engagement framework (no co-ordination to include civil society and legislators or ineffective co-ordination = 0, effective and inclusive co-ordination = 1)			
		The country has formal instruments/mechanisms for dialogue and official receipt of recommendations and questions. The mechanisms are functional and the information generated influences decision-making (no = 0, not agreed-upon or incomplete tools = 1, agreed-upon and complete tools = 2).			
Primary constraints			Accountable entity		