

HOW THE SELECTED INDICATOR WOMEN'S DIETARY DIVERSITY ASSESSMENT CAN BE INTERPRETED AND COMMUNICATED

Reaching Consensus on a Global Dietary Diversity Indicator for Women
Washington, DC, July 14–15, 2014

Gina Kennedy, Biodiversity

July 16, 2014



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

FANTA III
FOOD AND NUTRITION
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

fhi360
THE SCIENCE OF IMPROVING LIVES

Motivation

- Simple proxy indicator for nutrient adequacy from the diet
- Food-based indicators fill a niche in agriculture-nutrition advocacy
 - Provide more direct impact pathway from ag to nutrition than for example stunting
- Focus on quality of women's diet
 - Adolescent nutrition (15 y and older)
 - 1000 day framework

Interpretation

- Population-level assessment of women's dietary diversity
 - Prevalence of women in the population reaching minimum dietary diversity
 - groups/populations with a higher proportion at or above the cut-off are likely to have higher average micronutrient adequacy across the 11 micronutrients
 - Could be emphasized not hh level indicator
- DOES NOT MEAN the population at or above the cut-point has adequate intake of ALL 11 micronutrients in the MPA

Interpretation (cont.)

- IS NOT A dietary guideline
- Is NOT reflective of all aspects of diet quality
- Not the ONE and ONLY indicator
- Is not reflective of intake of fortified foods

Uses

- Assessment of dietary diversity at national, regional, project/program levels
- Monitoring indicator for projects with food-based interventions and plausible impact pathway for dietary diversification
- SHOULD NOT be used for individual level assessment OR Screening

Communication

- Dichotomous indicator can have more meaning than discussing population means
 - Mean DDS 3.0 compared to Prevalence above “minimum dietary diversity” of 5%
- Useful to analyze also individual food groups of interest
 - % consuming ASF
 - % consuming F/V

Cautions

- “Tracking” we do not know how sensitive the indicator is to change over time
 - If starting from a very low baseline for diversity, the proposed dichotomous indicator may not be very sensitive to change
 - There could be a “threshold” for diversification
- Seasonality of the food supply will be an important consideration for most countries
- Further disaggregation on the Questionnaire Tool could lead to less comparability of the DDS

Other issues

- Key Dietary Principles of Women
- International Dietary Guidelines
- Limitations of the MPA as a gold standard

Discussion questions

- What should the indicator be named?
 - IYCF uses “Minimum Dietary Diversity” the WDDP approach in developing this indicator has been similar
- Which messages/ uses most important to promote?
- Communication of changes to current users of FGI-9 (USAID, CGIAR, UN) (go back to motivations)
- Communication with future users



Funding for this meeting was provided by the European Union (EU) through the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations, and by the Office of Health, Infectious Diseases and Nutrition, Bureau for Global Health, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), under terms of Cooperative Agreement No. AID-OAA-A-12-00005, through the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA), managed by FHI 360.