Hunger and Nutrition Commitment Index Africa (HACNI-Africa) - 2017

Key data for Botswana

HANCI-Africa compares 45 African countries for their performance on 22 indicators of political commitment to reduce hunger and undernutrition. Country scores are calculated in relation to the political commitment of the other countries in the index.

**Strong Performance**
- The Government of Botswana has ensured tenure security for rural populations. Land titling is common and land markets function well. Policy promotes equitable access to common property resources.
- Policymakers in Botswana benefit from regular nutrition surveys that are statistically representative at national level. The last survey was published in 2015-2016.
- The Government has fully enshrined the International Code of Marketing of Breastmilk Substitutes into domestic law.
- The Government of Botswana promotes complementary feeding practices.
- 96.8% of the population of Botswana in 2015 has access to an improved drinking water source.
- In Botswana 94.1% of women aged 15-49 were visited at least once during pregnancy by skilled health personnel in 2007.
- Botswana’s social safety nets are well developed, but do not cover all risks for all of the population.

**Areas for improvement**
- Spending on agriculture (3% of public spending in 2016), does not meet government commitments set out in the African Union’s Maputo Declaration (10% of public spending).
- Botswana’s spending in its health sector (8.8% of public spending in 2015) does not fully meet (15%) commitments set out in the Abuja Declaration.
- Extension services are the preserve of government and poor farmers have no say in setting policy priorities. The agricultural research and extension system is not properly reaching out to poor farmers. There is no policy promoting gender equity in access to extension services.
- In Botswana, the law gives women and men equal economic rights and equal legal access to agricultural land. However, these laws are not effectively enforced and discriminatory practices against women continue, increasing their vulnerability to hunger and undernutrition.
- Botswana does not have a separate budget line for nutrition; this prevents transparency and accountability for spending.
- Botswana does not yet have a National Nutrition Policy/Strategy.
- Botswana has not introduced a multisectoral and multistakeholder policy coordination mechanism to support delivery of the National Nutrition Policy/Strategy.
- The Government of Botswana has achieved two high doses of vitamin A supplementation for only 57% of children in 2015.
- Weak access to improved sanitation facilities (60% in 2015) obstructs better hunger and nutrition outcomes.
- In Botswana, constitutional protection of the right to social security is weak.

Existing rates of: **Wasting:** 7.2%  **Stunting:** 31.4%  **Proportion of population underweight:** 11.2%

(Source: Government of Botswana (BFHS IV, 2007-08))
### Hunger Reduction Commitment Index (HRCI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public spending</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>HRCI Rank of 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public spending on agriculture as share of total public spending</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Joint 34th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public spending on health as share of total public spending</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>15th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Policies

- **Access to land (security of tenure)***<sup>3</sup>  
  - Score: Strong  
  - Year: 2016  
  - HRCI Rank: Joint 4th

- **Access to agricultural research and extension services***<sup>3</sup>  
  - Score: Weak  
  - Year: 2007  
  - HRCI Rank: Joint 42nd

- **Civil registration system — coverage of live births**  
  - Score: 76.6%  
  - Year: 2012  
  - HRCI Rank: 18th

- **Functioning of social protection systems***<sup>1</sup>  
  - Score: Strong  
  - Year: 2016  
  - HRCI Rank: Joint 1st

#### Laws

- **Level of constitutional protection of the right to food***<sup>3</sup>  
  - Score: Moderate  
  - Year: 2017  
  - HRCI Rank: Joint 8th

- **Equality of women’s access to agricultural land (property rights)***<sup>4</sup>  
  - Score: In Law, not in Practice  
  - Year: 2014  
  - HRCI Rank: Joint 1st

- **Equality of women’s economic rights***<sup>4</sup>  
  - Score: In Law, not in Practice  
  - Year: 2014  
  - HRCI Rank: Joint 1st

- **Constitutional right to social security (yes/no)**  
  - Score: No  
  - Year: 2017  
  - HRCI Rank: Joint 29th

### Nutrition Commitment Index (NCI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public spending</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NCI Rank of 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate budget for nutrition (No/Sectoral only/Yes)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Joint 33rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Policies

- **Vitamin A supplementation coverage for children**  
  - Score: 57%  
  - Year: 2015  
  - NCI Rank: 32nd

- **Government promotes complementary feeding (yes/no)**  
  - Score: Yes  
  - Year: 2010  
  - NCI Rank: Joint 1st

- **Population with access to an improved water source**  
  - Score: 96.8%  
  - Year: 2015  
  - NCI Rank: 4th

- **Population with access to improved sanitation**  
  - Score: 60%  
  - Year: 2015  
  - NCI Rank: 9th

- **Health care visits for pregnant women**  
  - Score: 94.1%  
  - Year: 2007  
  - NCI Rank: 16th

- **Nutrition features in national development policy***<sup>1</sup>  
  - Score: Moderate  
  - Year: 2017-2023  
  - NCI Rank: 29th

- **National nutrition policy/strategy (yes/no)**  
  - Score: No  
  - Year: 2017  
  - NCI Rank: Joint 40th

- **Multisector and multistakeholder policy coordination (yes/no)**  
  - Score: No  
  - Year: 2017  
  - NCI Rank: Joint 35th

- **Time bound nutrition targets (yes/no)**  
  - Score: Yes  
  - Year: 2017  
  - NCI Rank: Joint 1st

- **National nutrition survey in last 3 years (yes/no)**  
  - Score: Yes  
  - Year: 2015-2016  
  - NCI Rank: Joint 1st

#### Laws

- **ICMBS**<sup>5</sup> Enshrined in domestic law  
  - Score: Fully Enshrined  
  - Year: 2016  
  - NCI Rank: Joint 1st

---

1. Possible scores are: Very Weak/Weak, Moderate, Strong/Very Strong (Note: Performance relative to other countries).
2. Possible scores are: Not Enshrined in Law, Few/Many Aspects Enshrined, Fully enshrined.
3. Possible scores are: <75% of agri. spending pledges (AU commitments set out in the Maputo Declaration), >=75% & <100%, >=100%
4. Possible scores are: <75% of health spending pledges (AU commitments set out in the Abuja Declaration), >=75% & <100%, >=100%
5. Possible scores are: Not in Law, In Law Not in Practice, In Law & Practice in Law