

# Evaluation of Harmonization Workshop for Wheat and Maize Flour Fortification:

Nairobi, Kenya, 19-22 April 2010

## 1. Has this meeting helped you reach a decision on how to use the WHO recommendation in your country's fortification program?

- 1) Yes, They will be used as evidence for fortification and making future decision on fortification in our country (Malawi)
- 2) Yes, as we had used only the ECSA guideline when developing the maize meal fortification standards. Now we will look at the WHO Guidelines and the country statistics and then review the standards (Zambia)
- 3) Yes, number of presentation on science based studies (Zambia)
- 4) The WHO recommendations will be used in harmonization with ECSA and national standards on flour fortification (Zambia)
- 5) Yes, because show how to make advocacy with my high government (Mozambique)
- 6) The meeting afforded me full understanding of WHO recommendation on flour fortification. This will be disseminated to the other stakeholders of NFA for decision to be reached in Nigeria
- 7) Yes, the disparities between ECSA and WHO guidance will be reviewed as the standards in the country also mirror the ECSA. (Malawi)
- 8) Yes, the guidelines have to be developed as per country specific (Malawi)
- 9) Yes, the WHO recommendation are guidelines for setting the country's fortification standards which are based on science
- 10) While appreciating the WHO lead in the fortification programme, it is encouraging to observe that there is also recognition for national guidelines, all of which are dynamic (Kenya)
- 11) Yes, (Zimbabwe)
- 12) Not just WHO recommendations but in line with the ECSA ones (Zimbabwe)
- 13) Need to adjust on zinc (Zimbabwe)
- 14) Yes, the ability of each country to adapt and adjust for country needs was clearly articulated. EG., Zambia recommended by WHO was too high for Zimbabwe so will be adjusted down to meet needs. (Zimbabwe)
- 15) Unfortunately not. It has confused us further because some organizers do not acknowledge the ECSA Guidelines and that is what we know and how they were developed. (no name given)
- 16) Somalia is at the very preliminary stages of fortification. This meeting has been extremely useful in helping the country team gaps in understanding and possible options for fortification to investigate further.
- 17) The workshop discussions are definitely feeding into the country – level ongoing consultation process and will inform decision. But decision has not be made yet. (Somalia)
- 18) Yes, the WHO recommendations will be used for standards elaboration and adoption. (Cameroon)
- 19) Of course. Depending to the level of consumption of some vehicles you adjust the amount of micronutrient you need to add in this product (Cameroon)
- 20) Yes, Mozambique has no standards on flour fortification, so it is very useful to have the WHO standards with an understanding of what they are based on. (Mozambique)
- 21) Provided some guidance for our standards to be harmonized. (Zambia)
- 22) Tanzania group was caught whether WHO recommendations are for wheat flour or for both maize and wheat flour. The group express its wish to wait for WHO clarification / confirmation.
- 23) Yes, will go back and review levels that are currently lower. (RSA)
- 24) This meeting has facilitated sharing of emerging scientific info and therefore assisted in reviewing programme. (no name)

- 25) Yes (no name)
- 26) Regulation already in place. Can be used to compare and if deemed necessary for review (RSA)
- 27) Yes, it was observed that the support of all stakeholders are of vital importance and progress cannot be carried out without input from all stakeholders (Namibia)
- 28) It has contributed towards giving countries more confidence to move ahead even when they don't have all the evidence/data. (combined country response RSA, Kenya, Moz, Tanz)
- 29) Yes, WHO recommendations provided guidelines to develop our countrys standards for food fortification (Rwanda)
- 30) Yes, I will not say to use the WHO recommendations but to start with fortification. To get knowledge about the issue by getting experiences of other countries. (Moz)
- 31) The workshop has assisted our country to enable us to implement or strengthen the fortification program. The action plan will provide an insight of what is expected of the relevant bodies. (Namibia)
- 32) Yes, but we have to make assessment for the situation of our country in order to adapt the standards.

<b>Main objectives:</b>	<b>Average</b>
The Meeting helped to disseminate the new WHO endorsed recommendation on flour fortification among key stakeholders.	<b>4.0</b>
The meeting helped to clarify issues of implementation in the context of planned and ongoing flour fortification programmes, with a focus on standard setting and regulation.	<b>4.1</b>
The meeting helped to harmonize guideleines and standards for fortified flour and their premixes.	<b>3.2</b>

**Comments about the objectives:**

- 1) There is need to look at the WHO guidelines and the ECSA guidelines and then review the existing standards for fortified flours and the country statistics on food consumption. (Zambia)
- 2) The majority of the participants did not consent to the wholesome acceptance of the WHO recommendations as they are believed to be only on wheat and require extrapolation of maize flour. The standards seem not to have been harmonized due to lack of applicability of the wheat flour guidelines to maize flour which is the staple of the majority of the populations in the region. (Malawi)
- 3) According to the draft of consensus statement it seems that there are 2 points between WHO and ECSA. I think it is better to have one guideline and adjust it according to flour consumption within respective countries. (Cameroon)
- 4) Lack of clarity/agreement between organizers resulted in mixed messages to country teams regarding WHO vs. ECSA guidelines. (Rwanda)
- 5) The discussed points are very interesting and we thank you very much for the opportunity of continued assistance of WHO and ECSA in an advisory role. (Rwanda)
- 6) Workshop was well prepared and implemented. (no name)

---

**Individual Presentations:**

Intro to FF in Africa	4.2
intro to the new WHO recommendations	4.1
results of efficacy and effectiveness studies on FF in Africa	4.2
Flour Fortification in the region and an overview of ECSA	4.2
Harmonizing existing standards and WHO guidelines	3.8
The west Africa Experience	4.2
Millers Panel	3.9
Premix manufacturers panel	3.9
Considerations in calculating flour consumption in a country	4.0
consumption considerations in formulating existing standards ECSA example	3.9
Principals of monitoring and conducting impact evaluations in flour fortification programmes	4.0
QA/QC at the mill	4.5
Fortifying African flour products	3.7
Gain Premix Facility	3.9

---

Total responses: 44 of potential 91 country team participants

10 responses with out names,

5 Malawi,

1 Uganda,

4 Zambia,

3 Mozambique,

1 Nigeria,

1 Kenya,

4 Zimbabwe,

3 Somalia,

2 Cameroon,

2 Tanzania,

2 South Africa,

2 Namibia, 3

Rwanda,

1 combined (RSA, Kenya, Moz, Tanzania)

---

### **Any additional Comments on the presentations/sessions:**

- 1) The sessions were very informative and very useful for our country decision making for future fortification programme (Malawi)
- 2) Countries mapping of FF status was useful (Uganda)
- 3) There was need to have a practical example of the application of the WHO/ECSA Guidelines (Zambia)
- 4) The setting of M&E for fortification programme needs to be emphasized, generally the session was more technical (Malawi)
- 5) All the presentation were essential and delivered to the participants with excellent expertise and they will build upon the understanding as well as streamline the fortification programmes (Malawi)
- 6) Due to population misconceptions on the use of additives (eg., vitamins etc) greater emphasis must be given in public awareness campaign (Kenya)
- 7) Excellent work from the facilitating team (ZIM)
- 8) It is a pity that quite some time was spent on the perceived differences between ECSA and WHO standards. Also, time for group work could have been more. (Mozambique)
- 9) Very informative. More scientific info needs to be gathers on FF in the region (no name)
- 10) Help countries access examples of frameworks developed for implementing the FF programme (no name)
- 11) Taste test of breads was great! (Rwanda)
- 12) We need to be well prepared next time. This session could not do anything in harmonising standards. (Malawi)
- 13) More time for actual country experiences would be useful (combined countries as above)
- 14) The sessions were very fruitful and we need advice to enforce on our country mobilisation , education and increase in capacity building for all concerned groups in fortification (Rwanda)
- 15) The experiences of Malawi on small scale fortification was very useful (Rwanda)

### **3. Were there any areas not covered that you would've liked to have heard about?**

- 1) No (no name)
- 2) (Malawi)
- 3) Implications for standards in voluntary vs mandatory settings (Uganda)
- 4) More country experiences in fortification like the Malawi presentation (Zambia)
- 5) Food control experiences in countries (Zambia)
- 6) None (Zambia)
- 7) Small scale fortification (flour, maize) (Mozambique)
- 8) No (Malawi)
- 9) All important aspects of flour fortification were tackled (Malawi)
- 10) Need for a list of accredited suppliers of nutrients/vitamins to guard against profit making companies (Kenya)
- 11) How to deal with a lot of imports into the country some of which are OVER fortified (ZIM)
- 12) Microfeeder/equipment suppliers as partners (Zim)
- 13) Partners should have also provided what they will do in 100 days to support countries needs (no name)
- 14) How can a particular country implement a global programme of fortification (Cameroon)
- 15) The social marketing of fortified food (Cameroon)
- 16) More on small scale millers fortification (Zambia)
- 17) Principals/Procedures in premix formulation using pure vitamins/minerals at Mill level (Tanzania)
- 18) QA/QC in detail, monitoring and evaluation; formulation and implementation of FF plans and other countries experiences (no name)
- 19) How to develop a FF plan instead of being given the Tanzania copy (no name)

- 20) More about resource mobilization to support countries. Share databases of expertise to support countries (no name)
- 21) More about QC and more about efficacy studies (no name)
- 22) Benefits of harmonization on regional trade and path forward for national standards with common minimum levels. (Rwanda)
- 23) Enrichment or fortification (Namibia)
- 24) Maize flour fortification; harmonizing fortification standards in Africa (Malawi)
- 25) Flour fortification equipments (Rwanda)
- 26) Food safety; inspections and its tools (Namibia)
- 27) Emphasize on regional harmonization (No name)
- 28) A visit to a food industry fortifying (Rwanda)

#### **4. What are your next steps in developing or revising national fortification standards and strategies?**

- 1) We need to bring all the partners and stakeholders on board so they can buy in fortification activities including monitoring and evaluation (Malawi)
- 2) 100 days plan (Uganda)
- 3) Study the WHO guidelines and ECSA guidelines, then study the existing standards on fortified maize meal and wheat flour, make recommendations for review (Zambia)
- 4) Consensus building on voluntary standards into mandatory
- 5) I will have the harmonization for wheat and maize flour fortification with WHO recommendations (Moz)
- 6) Carry the message to all stakeholders in the NFA, Influence the needed review of existing standards which is in pipeline, use the information on WHO guidelines in new standards anticipated after review. (Nigeria)
- 7) Assist the government and regulatory bodies in enforcing the standards which are already mandatory but still at voluntary level; assist in the food fortification advocacy which is low now (Malawi)
- 8) Calling for NFA meeting to have a workplan (Malawi)
- 9) All the flour standards will be revised based on what the WHO guidelines outline (Malawi)
- 10) To continue liaising with the government in all aspects of implementation of the action plan (Kenya)
- 11) Desk review of inventory; development of standards (Zim)
- 12) Info gathering for standards development (Zim)
- 13) We think we will continue using our standards until ECSA revises since this is already underway (No name)
- 14) Somalia is at very preliminary stages of fortification. Next steps are establishing data gaps and addressing these and researching the most feasible options for intervention...food aid, small scale, locally produced or imported products (Somalia)
- 15) Elaboration and adoption of standards in premix and flour (Cameroon)
- 16) Meetings to review flour and refined oil standards and premix, including administrations, industries, consumer associations (Cameroon)
- 17) Feed info back to fortification working group; set up an NFA; obtain consumption data and start the drafting of standards. (Mozambique)
- 18) Receiving the fortification programme including which level advocacy (Zambia)
- 19) Revising by incorporating public comments (Tanzania)
- 20) Agreed at national level to move on while standards are being perfected (No name)
- 21) Adoption of flour fortification standards and driving the process of turning it into a technical regulation, through the ministry of health (no name)
- 22) Implementation of the 100 days action plan; regional feedback meeting is to be held to track progress (no name)

- 23) Strengthen micronutrient alliance which is currently in existence to include other stakeholders such as Industry Standards Authority and consumers (no name)
- 24) Resuscitating stakeholders (no name)
- 25) Stakeholders meeting will be arranged with view to revise and extend comment on monitoring program of implementation of flour fortification (RSA)
- 26) Develop recommended levels for other products (oil, sugar); review of proposed levels by NFA; submission to RBS for incorporation as official food standards (Rwanda)
- 27) Stakeholders and initiative (Namibia)
- 28) Continue pushing government for mandatory fortification and hope for the best (No name)
- 29) Circulate draft regulations and in future to develop standards (Namibia)
- 30) Work closely with NFA and BOS to quicken the process (no name)

#### 5. Any additional comments?

- 1) There is a need to critically look at maize flour fortification in African perspective. (Malawi)
- 2) The meeting was an excellent forum for players in fortification to meet and level the playing field for taking off the program to fill the continent. (Malawi)
- 3) There is need for networking between countries to share experiences in fortification (Zambia)
- 4) Make support for partners on food control (Zambia)
- 5) Extend invitation to many in future deliberation – three people were invited from Nigeria but only one was able to attend (miller) (Nigeria)
- 6) This workshop has been a success as a total effort to fortify flour in Africa and has provided the national programmes a platform to set the pace for improvement of micronutrient malnutrition through flour fortification (Malawi)
- 7) I sincerely thank the WHO and other international organization for their active role in supporting the whole initiative for fortification of flour. Thank you for affording our Cereal Millers Association and Pembe Flour Mills Ltd. (Kenya)
- 8) Good workshop that offered relevant info (Zim)
- 9) The workshop was very important for our country and Cameroon give thanks to organizers.
- 10) Thanks to FFI for the organization and flexibility! (Mozambique)
- 11) Useful workshop (Zambia)
- 12) Need for fortification acknowledged by all. For success of programme public-private partnership required and relevant capacity build measures including further research, training. (no name)
- 13) For a person with very limited knowledge/experiences on FF, this meeting has been very useful, informative, learning experience., thank you. (Tanzania)
- 14) The public private partnership will take the FF agenda to the next level (No name)
- 15) Very useful, but I think its important again to take the fortification agenda to higher levels. (RSA)
- 16) Thank you for a well organized workshop (RSA)
- 17) Joint country working groups were less productive than single country time (Rwanda)
- 18) There is great need for very regular forums (no name)
- 19) It would probably help to have more discussions/workshop between ECSA or other regional bodies and WHO/FAO tech committees especially when some disagreements or differences are expected and come to clear resolutions and unified messages and then consider workshops with multiple countries (Combined country response)
- 20) Congratulations to the very fruitful sessions/information provided in this workshop and look forward to informing you our fortification improvement in our country. All the best!
- 21) To put up mechanism for implementing resolutions and recommendations of the workshop (Rwanda)