

Erratum

In the article “The HANCI Donor Index 2012 Measuring Donors’ Political Commitment to Reduce Hunger and Undernutrition in Developing Countries” by Dolf J.H. te Lintelo, Lawrence J. Haddad and Rajith Lakshman, IDS Evidence Report No. 26.

p.x

Just beating Canada and Denmark, the UK owes its high score in particular to its strong performance on policy, programme and legal indicators.

Should have been:

Just beating Denmark, the UK owes its high score in particular to its strong performance on policy, programme and legal indicators.

p.x

Paragraph on Denmark:

Denmark scores well for spending indicators. It gives a solid performance in terms of supporting nutrition (second highest of all countries), and this support is stable and enduring. It also invests well in climate change adaptation and mitigation. However, spending support for climate change is not entirely coherent with policy action. Denmark is leading on the development of domestic climate change adaptation strategies and plans and this is needed in order to improve weak delivery on greenhouse gas emission reduction pledges. As a European Union (EU) member state, Denmark’s biofuel mandates are high. Denmark is a member of the SUN movement and does fairly well in terms of its relatively low protection of domestic agricultural markets (within the group of 23 countries) and support for biodiversity agreements.

Should have appeared before the paragraph on Canada:

Canada does well on policies, programmes and legal indicators. It supports the SUN movement, does well in terms of low protection of agricultural markets, sets relatively low biofuel blending mandates, and is among the top performers in terms of delivering on its greenhouse gas emission reduction pledges. Its performance on spending indicators is variable. Canada leads in terms of its enduringly stable financial support for agriculture and food security over the past decade. It also does fairly well on this for nutrition. However, Canada also shows weak spending performance on social protection and climate change adaptation and mitigation.

p.x

Germany and **Ireland** complete the group of countries leading on commitment. Germany performs strongly on most policy, programme and legal framework indicators, somewhat contrasting with its scores on spending indicators.

Should have been:

Germany, Sweden and **Ireland** complete the group of countries leading on commitment. Germany performs strongly on most policy, programme and legal framework indicators,

somewhat contrasting with its scores on spending indicators. Sweden gains especially strong scores on ODA to climate change adaptation and mitigation, on disbursing financial assistance to nutrition, on spending with gender policy objectives, and Sweden also endorses SUN.

Page xi

	Hunger and Nutrition Commitment Index Score	Hunger Reduction Commitment Score	Nutrition Commitment Score	Hunger and Nutrition Commitment Index Rank	Hunger Reduction Commitment Rank	Nutrition Commitment Rank
United Kingdom	78	34	44	1	4	1
Canada	74	36	38	2	2	3
Denmark	73	32	41	3	6	2
Germany	65	29	36	4	9	5
Ireland	61	31	30	5	7	8
Sweden	59	21	38	6	14	3
Belgium	58	27	31	7	11	6
Spain	57	35	22	8	3	13
Luxembourg	53	26	27	9	12	9
Finland	52	37	15	10	1	20
Norway	51	28	23	11	10	11
France	50	25	25	12	13	10
Australia	50	34	16	12	4	18
Switzerland	48	30	18	14	8	15
Japan	47	16	31	15	18	6
Netherlands	43	20	23	16	16	11
New Zealand	37	21	16	17	14	18
Italy	29	10	19	18	21	14
United States of America	29	12	17	18	20	17
Greece	23	5	18	20	23	15
Portugal	23	10	13	20	21	21
Austria	23	17	6	20	17	22
South Korea	22	16	6	23	18	22

Green = leading on commitment (top 1/3rd)
 Orange = moderate commitment (middle 1/3rd)
 Red = relatively low commitment (bottom 1/3rd)

Should have been:

country	Hunger and Nutrition Commitment Index Score	Hunger Reduction Commitment Score	Nutrition Commitment Score	Hunger and Nutrition Commitment Index Ranks	Hunger Reduction Commitment Ranks	Nutrition Commitment Ranks
United Kingdom	77	34	43	1	4	2
Denmark	68	32	36	2	6	4
Canada	67	36	31	3	2	9
Germany	66	29	37	4	9	3
Sweden	65	21	44	5	14	1
Ireland	63	31	32	6	7	6
Belgium	59	27	32	7	11	6
France	58	25	33	8	13	5
Luxembourg	56	26	30	9	12	10
Spain	53	35	18	10	3	13
Finland	52	37	15	11	1	20
Netherlands	52	20	32	11	16	6
Australia	50	34	16	13	4	18
Norway	48	28	20	14	10	11
Switzerland	48	30	18	14	8	13
New Zealand	37	21	16	16	14	18
Japan	35	16	19	17	18	12
United States of America	30	12	18	18	20	13
Austria	29	17	12	19	17	22
Italy	27	10	17	20	21	17
Portugal	24	10	14	21	21	21
Greece	23	5	18	22	23	13
South Korea	18	16	2	23	18	23

Green= leading on commitment (top 1/3rd)

Orange= moderate commitment (middle 1/3rd)

Red = relatively low commitment (bottom 1/3rd)

p.xi

For instance, Australia ranks 4th on the Hunger Reduction Commitment Index (HRCI) but 18th on the Nutrition Commitment Index (NCI); Finland is 1st on the HRCI but 20th on the NCI; while Sweden and Japan do much better on the NCI (3rd and 6th respectively) than on HRCI (14th and 18th).

Should have been:

For instance, Australia ranks 4th on the Hunger Reduction Commitment Index (HRCI) but 18th on the Nutrition Commitment Index (NCI); Finland is 1st on the HRCI but 20th on the NCI; while Sweden does much better on the NCI (1st) than on HRCI (14th).

p.xii

South Korea, Portugal, Greece and Austria rank lowest on the HANCI Donor Index

Should have been

South Korea, Greece, Portugal, Italy and Austria rank lowest on the HANCI Donor Index

p.xii

This also suggests that countries that have a relatively good track record on international development like France, Norway, the Netherlands and Switzerland, who are not in the top ten HANCI rankings, could do more for hunger and nutrition.

Should have been:

This also suggests that countries that have a relatively good track record on international development like Norway, the Netherlands and Switzerland, who are not in the top ten HANCI rankings, could do more for hunger and nutrition.