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Global anaemia prevalence (WRA) and fortification legislation

Mild prevalence (5 - 19.9%)
- n=63; 28 with legislation

Moderate prevalence (20 - 39.9%)
- n=96; 40 with legislation

Severe prevalence (>40%)
- n=33; 19 with legislation

Mandatory fortification legislation of at least one cereal grain and/or oil (n=89)

Anemia prevalence data source: WHO Global Health Observatory, 2019
Fortification legislation data source: GFDx dashboards and FFI country profiles

* Source: Data/estimates received by FFI (for cereal grains) and GAIN (for oil)

Only 22% of industrially-milled grains and a much-lesser proportion of industrially-milled oil are currently fortified*

* Source: Data/estimates received by FFI (for cereal grains) and GAIN (for oil)
Global gaps - along Fortification Program Impact Pathway

Potential to benefit (presence of micronutrient deficiencies)

Fortification policy created and legislation passed

Bioavailable fortificant is mandated for food(s) that are consumed by the nutritionally needy

Foods are fortified at mandated levels and compliance is monitored and enforced

Fortified foods are consumed in adequate amounts (meaningful contribution to requirements)

Public health impact (reduction in micronutrient deficiencies)

- Overall lack of usable data
- Lack of understanding of feasibility in optimal mix of interventions

- Purposeful under-fortification (commitment)
- 84 additional countries with high potential have not legislated fortification of staples

- Inadequate fortification standards - not aligned with public health need/global guidance in many countries

- Weak in-country enforcement
- Unfavorable business environment
- Low availability of compliance and/or quality data (25% of countries have data that indicates regulatory monitoring and enforcement is in practice)
- Low availability of coverage data (62% of countries have any data on coverage of a fortified food)

- Not optimizing on utilizing all potential platforms/programs to reach all population groups, including the most vulnerable (say through social protection programs)

- Lack of evidence and understanding of impact modelling to help countries make appropriate decisions

Nutrition International’s support in addressing fortification technical and program gaps

Senegal
- Feasibility, supply chain assessment - rice fortification
- Fortification monitoring system

Ethiopia
- Legislation
- Monitoring system

Pakistan
- Legislation
- Impact assessment
- Adequacy of standards

India
- Social protection programs
- Optimal mix of interventions
- Revision of standards

Bangladesh
- Social protection programs
- Adequacy of standards

Cote d'Ivoire
- Impact assessment - rice fortification

Kenya
- Monitoring system

Indonesia
- Revision of standards
- Reinstating legislation during COVID-19

Strive to support design and delivery of sustainable in-country programs - open market and social protection platforms:
- Supporting enabling environment with government and fortification alliances
- Working with mills/industry partners

In 2020, Nutrition International reached 250M additional people with adequately fortified staples and 460M with adequately iodized salt.
Critical next steps…

- Greater accountability
- Enhanced governance
- Ensuring sustainability
- Assessing complementarity with other interventions
Thanks a lot!