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Background
Background and Rationale

• High burden of malnutrition in Uganda

• National Food Consumption Survey (2008) identified important micronutrient intake gaps

• Mandatory legislation for large-scale fortification of salt, oils and fats, and wheat and maize flour

• No recent data available on:
  • Performance of large-scale fortification programs,
  • Who benefits from fortification programs,
  • If vulnerable populations are being reached, and
  • Household coverage and intake of fortified foods
The Fortification Assessment Coverage Tool (FACT)

Coverage
- Proportion of the population that uses a:
  - Vehicle
  - Fortifiable vehicle (centrally produced)
  - Fortified vehicle

Utilization
- Intake of food from modified dietary recall
  - Household
  - Women of reproductive age; children <2 years of age

Product quality
- Nutrient content (laboratory assessment) of fortified vehicles from community or household samples

Sampling
- Large representative sample stratified by factors that might modify coverage, utilization, and risk of inadequate diet such as poverty, region of residence (urban/rural), dietary diversity

“dietary contribution”
Objectives

1. To **assess the coverage and consumption** of fortified vegetable oil and fats, wheat flour, maize flour, and salt among households.

2. To **measure levels of select nutrients** in samples of vegetable oil, wheat flour, maize flour, and salt gathered at the household.

3. To **estimate the contribution** of fortified vegetable oil, wheat flour, maize flour, and salt among households **to the intake of select nutrients** among women of reproductive age (15-49 years).

4. To **evaluate other health and nutrition indicators** and their association with coverage and consumption of fortified foods.
Uganda FACT
Methods & Design
Survey Design and Sampling

Survey design

- Cross-sectional cluster household survey
- Representative nationally with urban and rural stratification
- Target population: Households and women of reproductive age (15 to 49 years)
- Sample size: 489 women of reproductive age per stratum
  - 526 households per urban stratum, 575 households per rural stratum (1,101 total)

Sampling

A two-stage stratified random sampling strategy was applied:

- First stage of sampling selected 35 PSUs per stratum by probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling
- Second stage of sampling selected 15 or 16 households per PSU by random selection

PSU, Primary Sampling Unit
Data Collection

- Administered questionnaire to participants:
  - Household questionnaire to the person most familiar with food purchasing and preparation for the household (≥ 15 years)
  - Individual questionnaire to all women of reproductive (15 to 49 years)

- Modules included:
  - Demographics
  - Living standards
  - Fortified food use
  - Dietary intake

- Food sample collection of vegetable oil, wheat flour, maize flour, and salt, if available
Indicators of risk
Why assess risk if the intervention is intended for the whole population?

Population

Consumers

At-risk population who are consumers
Rural residence
Multidimensional poverty index (MPI)

Weighted sum of dimensions of health, education and living standards that are linked to the millennium development goals (MDG).

Sensitive measure of acute poverty related to Millennium Development Goals

Source: Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative
Inadequate women’s dietary diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food groups</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FG1 : Starchy staples</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG2 : Beans and peas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG3 : Nuts and seeds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG4 : Dairy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG5 : Flesh foods</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG6 : Eggs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG7 : Vitamin-A rich dark green leafy vegetables</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG8 : Other vitamin-A rich vegetables and fruits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG9 : Other vegetables</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG10: Other fruits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators of coverage
Adapted Tanahashi coverage model

Coverage model adapted from: Tanahashi Bull WHO 1978
Assessing coverage of staple food fortification – Step 1 the household
Assessing household coverage and intra-household intakes

If the vehicle is a staple in the household:

What is the main [vehicle] type consumed?

Is [vehicle] fortifiable (i.e. how is it processed, from where?)

Is [vehicle] fortified?

Is [vehicle] adequately fortified?

Detailed household roster to calculate intra-household estimates (adult male equivalent (AME) method)

How much is purchased?

How long does the amount last?
Assessing coverage of staple food fortification – Step 2 the individual
Assessing individual coverage and intakes

Adapted from: Margetts BM and Nelson M. (1995)
Determination of fortification status
## Fortification status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household sample provided</td>
<td>• Fortification status confirmed by quantitative lab analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sample provided but brand reported</td>
<td>• Household linked to fortification status of that brand based on median fortification level of all samples collected from that brand by quantitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sample provided nor brand reported</td>
<td>• Fortification status unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National coverage, Uganda 2015: 
Food vehicle usage at household level

*Fortifiable refers to a food vehicle that was not made at home and is assumed to be industrially processed.
**Households were classified as fortified if they provided a sample or reported consuming a brand that was confirmed to be fortified by quantitative analyses.
N= 949 for all vehicles.
National Coverage, Uganda, 2015: Wheat flour usage at household level

Consumes wheat\textsuperscript{a}  Consumes fortifiable wheat\textsuperscript{b}  Consumes fortified wheat\textsuperscript{c}

\begin{itemize}
\item Don't know
\item Not fortified
\item Yes
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{a}Reported; \textsuperscript{b}Fortifiable refers to a food that was not made at home and is assumed to be industrially processed; \textsuperscript{c}Households were classified as fortified if they provided a sample or reported consuming a brand that was confirmed to be fortified by quantitative analyses; Don't know refers to a household that could not be classified because no food sample was available and no brand was reported. * P < 0.05
Urban and Rural Coverage, Uganda, 2015: Wheat flour usage at household level

Consumes wheat\textsuperscript{a}  Consumes fortifiable wheat\textsuperscript{b}  Consumes fortified wheat\textsuperscript{c}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\hline
& \text{Urban, Don't know} & \text{Rural, Don't know} & \text{Urban, Not fortified} & \text{Rural, Not fortified} & \text{Urban, Yes} & \text{Rural, Yes} \\
\hline
\text{N=509} & 8.3 & 7.5 & 26.4 & 6.3 & 18.7 & 4.1 \\
\text{N=440} & & & & & & 20 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{a}Reported; \textsuperscript{b}Fortifiable refers to a food that was not made at home and is assumed to be industrially processed; \textsuperscript{c}Households were classified as fortified if they provided a sample or reported consuming a brand that was confirmed to be fortified by quantitative analyses; Don't know refers to a household that could not be classified because no food sample was available and no brand was reported. * P < 0.05
Urban and Rural Coverage, Uganda, 2015: Maize flour usage at the household level

Consumes maize\(^a\)  Consumes fortifiable maize\(^b\)  Consumes fortified maize\(^c\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=509</td>
<td>91,2</td>
<td>73,0</td>
<td>14,9</td>
<td>15,3</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>8,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=440</td>
<td>95,2</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,5</td>
<td>38,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Reported; \(^b\)Fortifiable refers to a food that was not made at home and is assumed to be industrially processed; \(^c\)Households were classified as fortified if they provided a sample or reported consuming a brand that was confirmed to be fortified by quantitative analyses; Don’t know refers to a household that could not be classified because no food sample was available and no brand was reported.
Poverty Risk
National coverage by poverty risk, Uganda, 2015: Wheat flour usage at household level

Consumes wheat\textsuperscript{a}  Consumes fortifiable wheat\textsuperscript{b}  Consumes fortified wheat\textsuperscript{c}

\textsuperscript{a}Reported; \textsuperscript{b}Fortifiable refers to a food that was not made at home and is assumed to be industrially processed; \textsuperscript{c}Households were classified as fortified if they provided a sample or reported consuming a brand that was confirmed to be fortified by quantitative analyses; Don’t know refers to a household that could not be classified because no food sample was available and no brand was reported. * P < 0.05
Dietary Diversity
National wheat flour coverage by dietary diversity, Uganda, 2015: Wheat flour usage at household level

Consumes wheat\textsuperscript{a}  Consumes fortifiable wheat\textsuperscript{b}  Consumes fortified wheat\textsuperscript{c}

\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\textbf{Percent} & \textbf{Consumes wheat\textsuperscript{a}} & \textbf{Consumes fortifiable wheat\textsuperscript{b}} & \textbf{Consumes fortified wheat\textsuperscript{c}} \\
\textbf{n=280} & 11,0 & 12,6 & 1,9 \\
\textbf{n=474} & 10,4 & 12,0 & 1,3 \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{a}Reported; \textsuperscript{b}Fortifiable refers to a food that was not made at home and is assumed to be industrially processed; \textsuperscript{c}Households were classified as fortified if they provided a sample or reported consuming a brand that was confirmed to be fortified by quantitative analyses; Don’t know refers to a household that could not be classified because no food sample was available and no brand was reported. * P < 0.05
Adherence to standards
National fortification coverage, Uganda, 2015*

*Based on food samples analyzed for fortification compliance

- Oil: N=278
  - Unfortified: 14.4%
  - Inadequately Fortified: 27.7%
  - Adequately Fortified: 57.9%
  - Over-Fortified: 0.4%

- Wheat flour: N=43
  - Unfortified: 23.4%
  - Inadequately Fortified: 14.9%
  - Adequately Fortified: 53.2%
  - Over-Fortified: 0.4%

- Maize flour: N=238
  - Unfortified: 70.6%
  - Inadequately Fortified: 3.4%
  - Adequately Fortified: 25.6%
  - Over-Fortified: 0.4%

- Salt (national standards): N=820
  - Unfortified: 80.6%
  - Inadequately Fortified: 18.5%
  - Adequately Fortified: 0.5%
  - Over-Fortified: 0.4%
Consumption patterns
Daily consumption\(^1\) of fortifiable wheat flour by WRA in Uganda, National and by residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortifiable wheat flour consumed (g/day)(^2)</td>
<td>127.4 (30.0, 209.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortifiable wheat flour consumed (g/day)(^2)</td>
<td>24.8 (9.8, 52.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRA, Women of reproductive age (15 to 49 years)
\(^1\)Results based on household assessment and adult male equivalent (AME) methodology
\(^2\)Values shown are median (25%, 75%)
Contribution to dietary intake of micronutrients
Dietary contribution (% RNI) of select nutrients from consumption\(^1\) of fortified foods among WRA in Uganda

RNI, Recommended Nutrient Intake; WRA, Women of reproductive age (15 to 49 years);
\(^1\)Results based on household assessment and adult male equivalent (AME) methodology
Summary of key results

**Oil**
- There is potential for important contributions to dietary intake of vitamin A from fortification of oil but further efforts are required to improve quality control and enforcement

**Wheat flour**
- Household wheat flour consumption is lower than other vehicles but quality is good indicating potential for impact among a subset of the population, particularly in urban areas

**Maize flour**
- Potential for impact from fortified maize flour is higher in urban areas than rural areas, but fortification quality remains a challenge due to many small-scale producers who may not fall under the mandatory fortification legislation

**Salt**
- Nearly universal coverage of iodized salt; however, salt intakes are above recommended amounts resulting in high dietary contributions of iodine above recommended nutrient intakes (RNI)
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For more information...

• Full survey report will be distributed in June 2016
Thank You!