www.voices-of-the-south.ipseurope.org

IPS

VOICES OF THE SOUTH ON GLOBALIZATION

No. 10 | 2009

WALK THE DEVELOPMENT TALK

In this issue

DISCLAIMER: The views expressed in this newsletter are not necessarily those of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung or of IPS Europe.

Voices of the South on Globalization is a monthly newsletter intended to inspire a meaningful North-South Dialogue by raising awareness for global interdependences and by offering a forum for voices from the South in the globalization debate. Each edition will present short analyses or commentaries from a Southern perspective on one particular issue of the globalization process.

Voices of the South on Globalization is published by IPS Europe with financial support from the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

For further information please contact:
IPS-Inter Press Service Europe,
Ramesh Jaura, Marienstr. 19/20, 10117 Berlin
Tel.: ++49-(0)30-28 48 23 60
Fax: ++49-(0)30-28 48 2369
rjaura@ipseuropa.org

'FAIR TO MIDDLING'

While the appointment of new minister for economic cooperation and development is being hotly debated, a new report finds that Germany's overall commitment to development is fair to middling. Europe's economic powerhouse ranks 12th among the 22 'donor nations' in the Commitment to Development Index (CDI) 2009, authored by the Washington-based 'Center for Global Development'.

The Index, which has become increasingly influential in the international aid community since it was first published by Foreign Policy magazine in 2003, is designed to encourage donor countries to adopt policies that are more likely to promote development across a broad range of issues, which define their relationships with poor countries.

It assesses donor-country performance according to seven criteria -- aid flows, trade, investment, migration, environment, security and peacekeeping, and technology -- that have a major impact on the welfare of poor countries.

The score for the "aid" criterion, for example, is determined not only by a donor's total official development assistance (ODA) as a percentage of its gross domestic product (GDP), but also by how much of its ODA is "tied" to purchases of its own goods and services. The ranking also takes into account what kinds of bureaucratic burdens ODA imposes on the beneficiary country to account for the aid; how it encourages its citizens to contribute to private charities active in developing countries; and whether the aid recipient is likely to put the assistance to good use.

The Index points to Germany's "low net aid volume as a share of the economy" -- 0.26 percent of the gross national income -- that makes it rank 14. Because of a "large share of tied or partially tied aid" -- 28 percent of total -- it scores 18. In terms of the "large share of aid to less poor and relatively less democratic governments", Germany ranks sixteenth. However "large amount of private charitable giving attributable to tax policies", make Germany rank ninth by share of GDP.

In the policy area trade, the Index points to Germany's high tariffs on agricultural products -- 38.7 percent of the value of imports – and high agricultural subsidies equivalent to 14.6 percent tariff. In regard to investment, the Index points to Germany's strength which lies in: providing insurance against political risk for both domestic and foreign firms,; employing tax-sparing arrangements to prevent double taxation of corporate profits earned abroad; and being particularly active in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) as well as in the G-8 Anti-Corruption and Transparency Action Plan.

Negligence in identifying bribery and corrupt practices on the part of home country firms abroad; and lack of support for outflows of portfolio investment are listed as weaknesses.

Germany scores well in migration: It bears large share of the burden of refugees during humanitarian crises and scores five. 79 percent of foreign students come from developing countries, and they do not have pay any tuition fees. This ensures the country ninth rank. Some 200 million people today -- one in 33 -- do not live in the country where they were born.

Because of low fishing subsidies, Germany ranks fourth. It ranks third because of compliance with mandatory reporting requirements under multilateral environmental agreements relating to biodiversity. However, it scores the lowest marks for its "contribution to the creation and dissemination of innovations that could raise living standards in poor countries". ☑

SCANDINAVIA LEADS IN PRO-POOR POLICIES

Scandinavian countries pursue policies that are most effective in promoting development in poor nations, according to the latest edition of the annual Commitment to Development Index released by the Washington-based Centre for Global Development (CGD).

Sweden topped this year's Index, which rates the performance of 22 donor countries in seven key policy areas. Sweden displaced the Netherlands, which had been ranked number one by the CGD for four of the past five years, but which this year tied with Norway for third place. Denmark ranked number two, while Finland, the fourth Scandinavian nation on the list, came in tenth.

Of the larger aid donors that make up the Group of Seven (G7) nations, Canada scored the highest, in 11th place overall, followed by Britain, Germany, and France, which all were tied in 12th place. The United States, as it has in the past, ranked toward the bottom of the list, at 17, followed by Italy (18) and Japan (21), the other two members of the G7.

The dramatic differences between countries in raw aid quantity heavily influence the overall aid scores. The Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands take the top four slots on aid, while Japan and the United States place near the bottom. But quality matters too. Norway edges out Sweden for first place on sheer aid quantity as a share of GDP, but falls to third in the aid component for funding smaller projects and being less selective. And the United States would score higher if it did not tie some 26 percent of its aid and gave less to corrupt or undemocratic governments in Iraq, Jordan, Pakistan, and elsewhere.

Collectively, according to CGD, the G7 countries did best in promoting development through investment and trade policies. With a couple of exceptions, their policies on aid and migration, on the other hand, were among the worst. Other poor performers included Greece (which tied with Italy in 18th place), Switzerland (20), and South Korea (22), which was added to the Index for the first time last year.

On aid policies, Sweden gained the highest score, followed by Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands and Ireland. At the other end of the scale, Japan and South Korea earned the lowest scores, followed by Greece, Italy and the U.S.

On trade, CGD considered how open donor countries are to poor-country imports and how much they subsidise their own producers. Australia and New Zealand (which ranked seventh and fifth, respectively, overall), earned the highest scores in this category, followed by the U.S. and Canada. The worst performers were Switzerland and South Korea, followed by Norway and Japan.

In the investment category, CGD considers whether and how donor countries encourage their citizens and companies to invest in poor countries in ways that best promote sustainable development.

Germany, Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Spain topped that list in part due to their efforts to ensure that their companies' investment did not contribute to corruption. Worst performers included Austria, Ireland and Switzerland, due to their restrictions on investment or failure to offer investment incentives, such as political-risk insurance.

On migration policies, the CGD assessed such factors as the net inflow of people from poor countries to wealthy ones, the aid provided by host governments to refugees and asylum seekers, and the openness to students from poor countries. Austria, Sweden, and Spain performed best in this category. South Korea and Japan, on the other hand, were the two worst performers.

Scores for environmental policies were based on what donor countries are doing to reduce their disproportionate exploitation of the global commons, by, for example, reducing their greenhouse-gas emissions or ending subsidies of their fishing fleets.

The best performer in this category was Norway, which, of all 22 donor countries, had the lowest per capita greenhouse emissions and the highest taxes on gasoline. Other strong performers included Finland, Denmark, France, and Britain. South Korea scored the lowest, followed by Canada, the U.S., Japan and Australia.

On security, CGD assessed each country's contribution to peacekeeping operations and UN- or NATO-approved humanitarian operations and to securing international sea lanes. At the same time, it penalised countries for exporting arms to undemocratic or repressive governments.

In this category, Australia and New Zealand earned the highest scores, notably for Australia's U.N.-sanctioned role in ending Indonesia's occupation of East Timor, while Norway rated third for its contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations. South Korea, Japan, Spain, and Belgium, on the other hand, scored lowest in this category.

Despite its status as the world's biggest supplier of weapons to developing countries, the U.S. scored above average due to its Navy's role as the de facto protector of the world's major sea lanes.

On technology, CGD used a variety of criteria - including the enforcement of intellectual property rights (IPR) on pharmaceuticals and other important products; and subsidies for non-military research and development (R&D) - to assess each country's contribution to the creation and dissemination of innovations that could raise living standards in poor countries.

Spain, South Korea, and Japan scored highest in this category, while Ireland, Italy, Germany and Britain received the lowest marks. Over the seven years that the Index has been published, Spain (which ranks 7, along with Australia, in its overall score), Greece (18), Sweden (1), and Ireland (6) have made the greatest improvements in policies that promote development in poor countries, says CGD. **– Jim Lobe** ☑

AID 'DARLINGS' AND 'ORPHANS'

The pattern of aid distribution across countries is insufficiently co-ordinated. This pattern generates inefficiencies and inequities. Actual aid allocations are still driven mostly by factors other than need and merit. These are the highlights of a 'development brief' by the OECD Development Cooperation Directorate released in October. Titled 'Aid Orphans: Whose Responsibility?' the brief by Andrew Rogerson and Suzanne Steensen regrets that there is no definition of 'aid orphans'. But they attempt to provide one.

Insufficient coordination is underscored by the fact that individual donors (public and private) decide separately which country programmes to assist and to what extent, based on their unique set of values, goals and criteria, shaped by specific contexts and historical relationships.

"The absence of timely information on other donors' forward intentions impedes everyone's ability to adjust their own plans accordingly," says the paper. "Furthermore, accountability to taxpayers or boards is seldom focused on correcting the actions of others, predictable or not: each donor has its own priorities and incentive framework."

The resulting geographical gaps and overlaps, commonly called "aid darlings" and "aid orphans", can entail considerable global costs, to the extent that the aid community as a whole fails to invest systematically where aid is expected to have the most impact.

However, "darlings" are not fully symmetric with "orphans", Rogerson and Steensen say. They may remain under-aided in absolute terms, or in important areas, yet involve large numbers of small donors, entailing high fragmentation costs. This asymmetry is recognised in the Accra Agenda for Action, where donors have committed to "start a dialogue on international division of labour across countries and work to address the issue of countries that receive in-sufficient aid".

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

As the authors of the paper point out, there is a large body of literature on the empirical determinants of foreign aid, which tries to disentangle the influence of geopolitical ties and donor self-interest from that of recipient needs and their ability to make use of aid.

It overwhelmingly concludes that the former two factors outweigh the latter, though responsiveness to need has also been seen as growing since the end of the Cold War. A recent study using DAC bilateral data finds that almost half of the predicted value of aid is determined by donor-specific factors, one-third by needs, a sixth by self-interest and only 2 percent by performance.

The brief further notes that there is no single agreed definition of aid orphans because underlying approaches differ. To pinpoint where aid is insufficient and by how much requires selecting one of several normative benchmarks for apportioning aid across countries, against which actual aid can be tallied. Options range from simply assuming equal per capita aid to all low-income countries, to increasingly sophisticated formulae using alternative indicators of need and of ability to use aid, weighted appropriately. IDA, most regional banks, the EC, and a few bilaterals use variants of the latter approach. Behind these benchmarks lies an ongoing debate about the significance of past country performance ratings as a valid predictor of future poverty outcomes and it is now widely accepted that this relationship is not straightforward.

UNDER-FUNDED

For example, in the case of fragile states, low institutional capacity in the recovery phase can be seen more as a leveraging opportunity than as a deterrent. Such calculations also invoke implicit or explicit value judgments on the relative importance of need as against ability to use aid judgments which in various forms underlie every philanthropic enterprise, argue Rogerson and Steensen.

"Variations in aid are not just supply-driven of course. They also reflect multiple unquantified assessments of the effective demand – the relative merits or difficulties of investing in given country contexts," the authors state adding: "The shortfalls are probably large in terms of aid redeployable from elsewhere."

Subject to such caveats, the World Bank has recently re-estimated the hypothetical amounts needed to bring all under-aided countries up to various benchmarks. This includes the so-called "poverty-efficient" or Collier-dollar allocation method, factoring in rapid recent poverty reduction in India and elsewhere.

Almost all the 25 remaining orphans according to this benchmark are in Africa, and they are collectively under-aided to the order of about USD 12 billion per year. Using IDA's performance-based aid allocation formula would identify under-funding of about USD 3.3 billion. These are big gaps. To help set these numbers in context, they represent roughly between 7 percent and 25 percent of all country programmable aid (CPA) outside of Africa, totalling USD 47 billion at the latest count.

WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT?

The authors plead for acknowledging the collective action problem. The issue as described is not tractable just through greater awareness. The obstacles go beyond the inertia of donor-specific priorities. Under the Accra Agenda for Action, and given domestic fiscal pressures, bilateral donors are actively urged to concentrate on fewer countries and sectors. It is a real challenge to reconcile this message with any global balancing role, unless co-ordinated allocation principles are adopted and monitored across the whole donor community. ☑

'KEEP AID POLICY OUTSIDE OF EU DIPLOMATIC SERVICE'

A network of autonomous European non-governmental development organizations has in an assessment, commissioned by the European Parliament's research department, tabled five compelling reasons why the EU's development policy needs to remain outside the Europe's diplomatic service. The Brussels-based Eurostep says:

1. The roles of development policy and diplomacy are different. They should be complementary but each needs to be pursued according to its own logic.

The EU's Development Policy is defined in the Lisbon Treaty (Art. 208) as a distinct external policy area for which the principal objective is the eradication of poverty. The Treaty gives the Commission competence for development policy, shared with the Member States. The overall purpose of the EU's Development Policy is to promote the sustainable and equitable development of developing countries, in which the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals is a key part. **As such the Treaty established the EU's Development Policy as the principal framework for the EU's cooperation with developing countries.**

The character of the European External Action Service (EEAS) will be that of a diplomatic service. Its role will be to strengthen the EU's representation for its common political external policies and priorities that are primarily derived from protecting the EU's own interests in the world.

Each of the EU's external policy areas is defined in the Lisbon Treaty, with equal standing. To ensure that none of the policy areas is effectively subordinated from another it is important that each policy area has its own dedicated administrative capacity that has equal status in the overall institutional structures of the EU.

2. EU Development Policy aims to promote the interests of developing countries

Development Policy seeks to promote development in developing countries. Its primary orientation is towards promoting the interests of developing countries and their people.

The current development policy framework established at the level of the international community, which the EU and its Member States have endorsed, seeks to operate on the principal that development strategies are owned by the developing country concerned, and are pursued in a partnership between the EU and developing countries.

This means that development policy should be responsive to the interests expressed by developing countries. **In contrast, a primary function of the EU's Foreign Policy is to promote and protect the interests of the EU and its citizens**. At times it can be expected that the two policies may have conflicting interests. Mechanisms need to be put in place to ensure that the resolution to such conflicts does not compromise the overall effectiveness of either policy. This is more likely to be the case if the implementation structures of the two policies are distinct and established around their own distinct policy logic.

3. Democratic scrutiny needs to be strengthened

The role of democratically elected parliaments is essential to ensure accountability of policies and their implementation. The European Parliament should have a central role in overseeing the evolution and implementation of all of the EU's external policies. This should be both in the overall context of Europe's principles and values as set out in the Treaty, as well as in relation to the specific objectives of the different external policy objectives.

While the Parliament as a whole has the role to ensure that there is consistency in its approaches towards the different external policy areas, its ability to do so depends on its own capacity to effectively scrutinise the different policy areas according to their specific purpose and objectives. In this context the differentiated roles of the Parliament's Committees with an external focus of specific policy areas is important – Development, External Relations, and International Trade in particular.

Parliament's ability to do so will be impaired if there is no clarity in the management of the different policies, both inside the parliament itself as well as within the other institutions of the EU. For the implementation of development policy the role of democratically elected parliaments in developing countries is also critical. Democratic accountability of national development strategies is a fundamental requirement for ownership by countries of their own strategies.

4. Financial resources provided for development must support development objectives

The EU collectively accounts for 59% of global official development aid (ODA). The development aid budget managed by the European Commission constitutes around a fifth of the EU's aid. This resource is provided to promote the achievement of the EU's development policy objectives.

While the Lisbon Treaty makes provision for the personnel of the EEAS to be financed from the EU's administrative budget there is no extra provision for the financing of common foreign policy actions envisaged in the Treaty from within existing EU budgets. Member States are expected to contribute additional funds for this purpose. However, it is clear that most Member States would prefer to reduce their existing commitments, rather than increase them.

In these circumstances the substantial EU development budget can be seen as a potential source of finance for activities that are not primarily focused on development. Therefore the inclusion of development policy within the EAS could jeopardise the effective use of the development budget.

5. A development administration with high degree of independence is optimal

According to assessments that compare the different models of Member State institutional structures for managing its development policy, **the most effective are those with a dedicated service established within the overall official structure of the country concerned, but with a high degree of independence**. Headed by a development minister or secretary of State such administrations are more able to effectively pursue the policies development objectives without undue interference from other external policies being pursued by the government. ☑

WHO IS AFRAID OF 'HUNGER REPORTS'?

Hunger is far from 'sexy' -- and yet it is the central theme of two new reports published two days ahead of the World Food Day Oct. 16 when conforming to the "same procedure as every year" the well-fed of planet earth juggle statistics as if these were crystal balls predicting ways toward a hunger-free world.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has been seeking ways out of a hungry world -- comprising 1002 million this year -- at what has been described as a High Level Expert Forum Oct. 12-13.

The Forum is part of its 'How to Feed the World in 2050' exercise done about four weeks in advance of the World Summit on Food Security Nov. 16-18 in Rome.

FAO has in fact published its "annual hunger report" -- an expression that conveys the impression that hunger is after all as normal as a road accident in a civilized and globalized world. The report states what sounds like a 'sensational revelation' that economic crisis is devastating for the world's hungry.

"The combination of food and economic crises has pushed the number of hungry people worldwide to historic levels -- more than one billion people are undernourished," according to FAO estimates.

The report then springs another surprise when it points out that nearly all the world's undernourished live in developing countries. In Asia and the Pacific, an estimated 642 million people are suffering from chronic hunger; in Sub-Saharan Africa 265 million; in Latin America and the Caribbean 53 million; in the Near East and North Africa 42 million -- and in developed countries 15 million, according to FAO's "annual hunger report" published in conjunction with the World Food Programme (WFP).

The report goes on to say that even before the recent crises, the number of undernourished people in the world had been increasing slowly but steadily for the past decade. "Good progress had been made in the 1980s and early 1990s in reducing chronic hunger, largely due to increased investment in agriculture following the global food crisis of the early 1970s," maintains the report.

But between 1995-1997 and 2004-2006, when the world's rich and well-fed sharply curtailed official development assistance (ODA) devoted to agriculture, the number of hungry people increased in all regions except Latin America and the Caribbean. Gains in hunger reduction were later reversed in this region as well, as a result of the food and economic crises, notes the report.

"The rise in the number of hungry people during both periods of low prices and economic prosperity and the very sharp rises in periods of price spikes and economic downturns shows the weakness of the global food security governance system," FAO notes in yet another revelation.
A second report also published Oct. 14, but far more in-depth than FAO's, points out that twenty-nine countries around the world have alarming or extremely alarming levels of hunger, and thirteen countries have actually seen increases in their hunger levels since 1990.

The 2009 Global Hunger Index report by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) finds out that the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) scored the worst, followed by Burundi, Eritrea, Sierra Leone, Chad, and Ethiopia.

GENDER INEQUALITIES

New this year in IFPRI report is that it also points out that high rates of hunger are strongly linked to gender inequalities, especially in terms of literacy and access to education. It also highlights which countries are most vulnerable to the global economic downturn.

"Low-income countries are being hurt by the food and financial crises," explains Klaus von Grebmer, lead author of the report and communications director at IFPRI. "The crises have significantly reduced purchasing power and income-earning opportunities for poor people, who spend up to 70 percent of their income on food, while food prices in many countries are still higher than several years ago."

The Global Hunger Index has been released in advance of World Food Day for the fourth year by IFPRI, Germany's Welthungerhilfe, and Concern Worldwide. The Index ranks countries on three leading indicators -- prevalence of child malnutrition, rates of child mortality, and the proportion of people who are calorie deficient -- and combines them into one score.

"Data used in the Index come from 2007 and earlier years (the most recent available), and thus rankings only partially account for the impact of the food crisis, and do not reflect the effects of the financial crisis," says the report. However, the report does compare Index rankings with International Monetary Fund (IMF) indicators of vulnerability to the crises.

Countries that suffer from alarming levels of hunger are also very vulnerable to the global recession -- Burundi and DRC being prime examples. The areas of vulnerability are trade, foreign direct investment, international aid, and remittances.

Overall, the 2009 Index candidly illustrates that despite regional differences, progress in reducing hunger remains slow. Since 1990, the global score has declined by less than 25 percent. Most of this progress has been made in Southeast Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean, which have lowered their Index scores by more than 40 percent over the past two decades.

Global Hunger Index scores, however, remain "distressingly high" throughout much of Sub-Saharan Africa, which has made the least progress in combating hunger, with only a 13 percent decline in its score since 1990. *(Continued on page 6)*

LAND GRABS UNDER FIRE

A move by governments and rich investors to raise food crops on farmland purchased in some of the world's poorer countries is coming under fire.

"The purchase of vast tracts of land from poor, developing countries by wealthier, food-insecure nations and private investors have become a widespread phenomenon," says a new study by the Oakland Institute, an independent policy think tank based in San Francisco.

The sudden rush for these "land grabs" - prompted primarily by the global food crisis - is threatening food security and the livelihoods of some 1.5 billion small farmers worldwide, according to the study titled "The Great Land Grab", released early this week.

Between 2006 and mid-2009, some 37 million to 49 million acres of farmland have changed hands or are under negotiation. A number of rich investors in countries such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, South Korea, China and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) have either been buying land or negotiating to buy land in Sudan, Pakistan, Madagascar, Cambodia, Ethiopia and the Democratic Republic of Congo to raise food crops in an attempt to beat future food shortages in their own home countries.

In an editorial titled "Cornering Foreign Fields", the London Economist said last May that as much as 20 million hectares of farmland worth some 20 to 30 billion dollars has been quietly handed over to capital-exporting countries such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and China. For a start, the Economist said, most deals are shrouded in mystery - "rarely a good sign, especially in countries riddled with corruption".

Asked if there is any possibility of regulating these deals by an international organisation, Shepard Daniel, the main author of the Oakland Institute report, told IPS that both the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) have on several occasions called for a code of conduct, or some form of guidelines, to protect local people and farmers from land acquisitions that could threaten their livelihoods.

However, the basic assertion from these two U.N. agencies was that cross-border farmland deals could be mutually beneficial, by both helping to boost global food security and by providing urgently-needed investments in agriculture in developing countries, and helping to raise farm production, exports and provide jobs, he added.

"This implies no intention of regulating the land deals, but rather, a suggestion or hope they be mutually beneficial," said Daniel, a fellow at the Oakland Institute.

Ernest Corea, a former senior consultant with the Washington-based Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), told IPS the surrender of nationally-owned farm land and land rights to foreign interests - whether individuals, the corporate sector or governments - amounts to an erosion of sovereignty.

"The Oakland Institute has done developing countries a service in raising red flags about this practice," he said.

Having said that, however, it must also be noted that few developing countries can progress without external resources, Corea pointed out. At a time of uncertainty concerning Official Development Assistance (ODA), foreign direct investment can therefore be an important asset, provided it is received within the sovereignty of the country concerned.

Food insecurity continues to be a major human problem whose resolution requires the mobilisation of multiple resources, he said. Perhaps U.S. President [John F.] Kennedy was right when he said that the world has the capacity but not the will to end hunger," Corea said. **– IPS** ☑

WHO IS AFRAID OF 'HUNGER REPORTS'?

Continued from page 5

Of the ten countries that have seen the largest increase in their Index scores, nine are in Sub-Saharan Africa, and DRC's score has increased by an appalling 53 percent. Africa is also home to the highest proportion of undernourished people (76 and 68 percent of the population, respectively, in the DRC and Eritrea) and the world's highest child mortality rate, which stands at 26 percent in Sierra Leone.

Despite some progress over the past 20 years, the situation is also alarming in South Asia, which actually scored worse than Sub-Saharan Africa on the 2009 Global Hunger Index, largely because of widespread child malnutrition. In Bangladesh and India, more than 40 percent of children are underweight. Sri Lanka, which has been committed to universal education and reproductive health care, has been successful at reducing hunger, and stands out as an important exception in the region.

"Women's educational level and status or power relative to men's in households and communities significantly affect children's nutrition," says Agnes Quisumbing, report co-author and IFPRI senior research fellow. "In South Asia, women's low social status and limited access to schooling have dire consequences for the nutrition, health, and wellbeing of both mothers and their children." To better assess the links between hunger and gender inequality, IFPRI compared the 2009 Global Hunger Index rankings to the World Economic Forum's 2008 Global Gender Gap Index, which measures the wellbeing of women relative to men.

Countries with the most severe hunger problems also had high levels of gender inequality. The situation is especially serious in Chad, which ranks fifth worst on the Global Hunger Index, second in terms of gender inequality, and has a shockingly low female literacy rate of 13 percent, compared to 41 percent for men. This negative trend, however, can be reversed. IFPRI research shows that equalizing men's and women's status would reduce the number of malnourished children by 13.4 million in South Asia and by 1.7 million in Sub-Saharan Africa.

"Knowing that hunger and gender inequality go hand-in-hand, an important step to ending world hunger is empowering women and eradicating gender disparities in education, health, economic participation, and political opportunities," says Joachim von Braun, IFPRI director general. "After decades of slow progress in the fight against hunger," he adds, "child malnourishment is now on the rise due to recent economic developments. It is imperative that commitments made at the G20 and other global policy meetings are swiftly transformed into real action in cooperation with developing countries."

- IDN-InDepthNews ☑