



# Gender, IFIs and Food Insecurity Case Study: Kenya



## Gender, Food Insecurity and IFIs in Kenya

Approximately 10 percent of Kenya's population, or 3.8 million people, live in a chronic state of food insecurity (USDA, 2009), the most vulnerable of whom include women and children (Kimani-Murage, et al., 2011). Although women constitute 75 percent of Kenya's agricultural labor force, gender inequalities undermine their productivity, including limited access to essential resources (agricultural technologies, extension services and marketing facilities) and institutionalized barriers to credit and land ownership (Institute for Development Studies, 2006).

Today, Kenya is East Africa's largest importer of food and agricultural products (USDA, 2009) and faces an alarming rate of food insecurity in the wake of rising food prices. According to the World Food Program (WFP), the average Kenyan family spends almost half of household income on food (WFP, 2011). While several factors have contributed to Kenya's high rate of food insecurity, International Financial Institutions (IFIs), including the World Bank (WB) and African Development Bank (AfDB), have undermined agricultural development, contributed to the drastic rise in food prices and exacerbated rates of hunger and malnutrition. Starting with the WB and International Monetary Fund (IMF)'s Structural Adjustment Policies in the 1980s, Kenya experienced a crippling "absence of sustained investment, limited scope for expanding into new lands and mismanagement of agricultural institutions" (Gitau, et al., 2008). Kenya's agricultural GDP plummeted as the WB and IMF "free market" policies and programs promoted privatization and deregulation of commercial functions, as well as a reduction of trade barriers and exchange rate adjustments (Gitau, et al., 2008). WB and IMF-imposed agricultural market liberalization ultimately benefited "medium and large-scale commercial farmers, large-scale private traders, wholesalers and processors, and transporters and other providers of market services" (Baden, 1998), the majority of whom are men. Meanwhile, these policies devastated small-scale farmers engaged in processing and trading, the vast majority of whom are women (Baden, 1998; FAO, 2011).

## Gender Analysis Methodology and Findings

This case study assesses the extent to which three WB and two AfDB projects meet their commitments to address gender issues and promote gender equality in agriculture investments in Kenya. This qualitative assessment applies Gender Action's [Gender Toolkit for International Finance Watchers](#)—a user-friendly toolkit that helps civil society groups incorporate gender perspectives into their work on IFIs and other projects—especially its [Essential Gender Checklist](#). The case study demonstrates that overall, WB and AfDB agriculture projects in Kenya lack a women's rights perspective and pay inadequate attention to gender inequalities that hinder women and girls' ability to participate in and benefit from project activities. Commendably, one project promotes gender integration, collects sex-disaggregated data and facilitates women's participation throughout the project cycle.

## The WB's "Natural Resource Management Project (NRMP)," 2007 (US\$68.5 million loan)

The NRMP aims to enhance Kenya's institutional capacity to manage water and forest resources, reduce the incidence and severity of water shocks and improve the livelihoods of communities who "co-manage" water and forests (WB, 2007a). Despite women's major stake in these resources, gender issues are barely mentioned in the 187-page project appraisal document (PAD).

Although the PAD promises that beneficiaries will have equitable access to water as a "key water rights principle" (WB, 2007a), the project fundamentally violates Kenyans' human right to water by promoting water use charges. The project also calls the WB's treatment of Kenyans' land rights into question. While the PAD states that Kenya's National Land Policy will ensure vulnerable groups' and minority communities' "access to land and participation in decision making over land," the WB also supports the policy's "mechanisms for *extinction* of land rights in the interest of sustainable management of land-based natural resources" (WB, 2007b). Although the PAD promises "prompt and adequate compensation" for those whose land rights have been "extinguished," as well as resources for resettlement, conflict mitigation and assistance with alternative livelihoods (WB, 2007b), the project does not include any indicators to monitor whether these compensatory measures are adequately implemented (WB, 2011a).

Despite its aim to transfer forest management to the private sector (WB, 2011a), the PAD claims that the project will have "positive social impacts including increased empowerment and the improvement of livelihoods" and that water management and irrigation will provide "direct benefits to farming families and other natural resource users" (WB, 2007a). Yet the project neither explains how forest users, who are mostly women, will access privatized resources, nor explicitly promotes outcomes that benefit men and women equally. Given the project's lack of sex-disaggregated data, it is impossible to determine the project's differential impacts on men and women, boys and girls.

### UNICEF: Kenya Malnutrition and Food Security Indicators (2009)

Population	38,802,000
Life expectancy at birth for ages 15-59 (2008)	55
Percent of infants with low birth weight	8
Percent households that consume iodized salt	58
Percent households that have access to improved drinking water	98
Percent children who receive early breastfeeding	58
Percent children who are exclusively breastfed (< 6 months old)	32
Percent children <5 years old who are underweight	20
Percent children <5 years old who are stunted	35
Percent children <5 years old who are wasted	7

### Applying Gender Action's Essential Gender Analysis Checklist:

**Gender and Human Rights:** The project refers to its role in "ensuring equitable access to resources for all users" as "a key water rights principle." However, the project actually undermines the human rights of those it refers to as "encroachers" who seek access to forest land for their livelihoods.

**Gender In/equality:** Although the project appraisal document (PAD) indicates that its Indigenous People's Plan will be "gender inclusive," it only notes that "Kenya is a highly unequal society, with exclusion reflecting stratification by class, gender, and region." The project fails to explicitly promote gender equality.

**Gender Data:** The project includes only one sex-disaggregated indicator (see "Gender Input"). The project does not include any other sex-disaggregated indicators to measure gender participation outcomes or impacts (WB, 2011a).

**Gender in Context:** The PAD does not provide any context in which to understand gender relations with regard to natural resource management.

**Gender Access:** The project does not promote equal access to project activities and benefits for men and women, boys and girls.

**Gender Input:** Although the project measures the percentage of female "community/user groups" who collaborate with water and forest activities, it does not measure the extent of or explicitly promote women's participation throughout the project cycle.

**Gender Output:** The project does not promote or measure outputs that benefit men and women, boys and girls equally.

**Gender Impact:** The project appraisal does not examine its differential impacts on men and women, boys and girls. Since the project has limited sex-disaggregated data, it is impossible to measure the project's impact on women and men, boys and girls.

## The WB's Second Phase of the "Kenya Agricultural Productivity and Agribusiness Project (KAPAP)," 2009 (US\$82 million loan)

The KAPAP demonstrates how the WB can effectively "engender" its agriculture and rural development projects. The project aims to increase agricultural productivity and small-scale farmers' incomes by "improving the performance of agricultural technology systems, empowering stakeholders and promoting the development of agribusiness in the project area" (WB, 2009). Commendably, the PAD contains many references to gender, including a commitment to "strongly integrate gender concerns in Project planning, implementation and participation," which entails "a strong emphasis on sex-disaggregated monitoring and evaluation" (WB, 2009).

Project indicators reflect a "strong emphasis on sex-disaggregated monitoring and evaluation." Indicators measure men's and women's: 1) earnings from smallholder agricultural activities; 2) satisfaction with extension, empowerment and agribusiness services; 3) use of agricultural information resource centers; 4) adoption of agricultural technologies; and 5) increase in perception that their voice has been taken in account in decision-making (WB, 2011b). Since the monitoring framework provides sex-disaggregated baseline information, it is possible to assess the project's differential impact on men and women.

Although the PAD does not indicate that women and men would equally participate in project design stakeholder consultations, it states that the project supports "gender balanced elections, training and consultative meetings" at local, district and national levels during implementation. The PAD also promises to develop a gender policy "to ensure that women and men benefit equally from the project," and discusses implementing "safeguards" to ensure that women and men retain control of their income, and that women participate equally in skills training and higher-level decision-making (WB, 2009). The project's gender sensitivity could be even stronger if it promoted women's and men's equal human rights and presented context on gender roles in Kenyan agriculture.



### Applying Gender Action's Essential Gender Analysis Checklist:

**Gender and Human Rights:** The project appraisal document (PAD) does not approach agriculture from a human rights perspective.

**Gender In/equality:** The project acknowledges "women's capacity to accumulate resources, retain income, and have a voice in decision-making bodies needed to be strengthened" compared to the first phase of the project. The PAD for the second phase therefore emphasizes the WB's commitment to "gender mainstreaming" in order to guarantee women's equal access to project benefits.

**Gender Data:** The PAD includes several sex-disaggregated indicators and underscores the project's "strong emphasis on sex-disaggregated monitoring and evaluation."

**Gender in Context:** The project offers minimal context in which to understand gender relations in Kenyan agriculture.

**Gender Access:** The PAD claims that "special attention will be given to enable poor farmers, especially women...to innovate, access markets and share benefits." The PAD underscores that women and men "agribusiness promoters" will also have "fair access to funding."

**Gender Input:** The PAD does not indicate that women participated in initial project planning, but it states that safeguards will guarantee that women can participate equally in project interventions and higher-level decision making.

**Gender Output:** The project explicitly promotes equal outputs for male and female smallholder farmers.

**Gender Impact:** Since the project's indicators are sex-disaggregated and the project provides a sex-disaggregated baseline, it is possible to assess the project's differential impact on men and women, boys and girls.

## The WB's "Kenya Coastal Development Project (KCDP)," 2010 (US\$35 million loan; US\$5 million grant)

The WB's KCDP intends to strengthen the capacity of government and rural micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) to promote environmentally sustainable management of Kenya's coastal and marine resources. Although the PAD discusses property rights and "ensures that the development process fully respects the dignity, rights economies and cultures" of indigenous communities, the PAD fails to mention the rights of coastal communities' "disempowered women" (WB, 2010).

Despite its promise to "provide equitable access to project resources" and include "a strong participatory approach" throughout the project cycle, the PAD does not explicitly promote women's participation and equal access to project resources. For example, the project promotes private sector investment to supply improved production techniques, extension services and market access to rural MSMEs. The PAD claims that this model will improve MSMEs' "quality, quantity and reliability," which in turn will provide "more direct accesses to markets" (WB, 2010). However, the PAD fails to mention female MSME owners' need to access extension services and markets. The project, which also includes a "community village fund" that "empowers" communities to identify their own micro-projects (WB, 2010), does not mention women's involvement, particularly with regard to the disbursement of funds.

While the PAD states that "project committees at the local level will have at least 30 percent women representatives," project indicators do not measure whether this target is achieved (WB, 2011c). With the exception of the percent of female project beneficiaries, none of the project's other indicators are sex-disaggregated. Given the lack of sex-disaggregated data, it is impossible to hold the WB accountable for its claim that the project "should, over time, lead to improved livelihoods for coastal communities" and "should have many positive social impacts" (WB, 2010).



Photo by Mckaysavage

### Applying Gender Action's Essential Gender Analysis Checklist:

**Gender and Human Rights:** The project mentions women's property rights and indigenous people's rights within the project's indigenous people's policy framework. There is no other mention of human rights in the project appraisal document (PAD).

**Gender In/equality:** The PAD refers to "disempowered women" among Kenya's coastal communities, but fails to explicitly promote gender equality.

**Gender Data:** Although the project includes an indicator for "female beneficiaries," none of the project's other indicators are sex-disaggregated. While the PAD states that "project committees at the local level will have at least 30 percent women representatives," project indicators do not measure whether this target is achieved.

**Gender in Context:** The PAD does not give any context in which to understand gender relations and inequalities in the targeted communities.

**Gender Access:** The PAD does not promote equal access to project activities and benefits for men and women. For example, the project claims to empower communities to identify their own micro-projects but does not discuss women's involvement.

**Gender Input:** The PAD does not promote women and men's equal participation throughout the project cycle.

**Gender Output:** The PAD claims that the project "should, over time, lead to improved livelihoods for coastal communities," but does not explicitly promote outputs that equally benefit women and men, boys and girls.

**Gender Impact:** In the absence of sex-disaggregated data, it is impossible to determine the project's differential impact on men and women, boys and girls.

## The AfDB's "Small-Scale Horticulture Development Project," 2007 (approximately US\$26.9 million loan)

Although the AfDB claims that its Small-Scale Horticulture Project loan will "have a significant impact on food security and poverty alleviation," the project increases both Kenya's debt and the financial burden of beneficiaries who must contribute three percent of total project costs "towards their share of infrastructure maintenance and agro-processing equipment" (AfDB, 2007).

The PAD provides significant context in which to understand gender relations and acknowledges gender inequality in the Kenyan agricultural sector. For example, the PAD notes that "culture and traditions continue to support male inheritance of family land" and "lack of financial resources restricts [women's] entry into the land market" (AfDB, 2007). According to the AfDB, Kenya's agricultural production is challenged by several factors, including women's high workloads and low rates of participation in decision making processes (AfDB, 2007).

Although the PAD explicitly promises to promote gender equality and women's empowerment through women's project participation, the project itself actually *exacerbates* gender inequalities by failing to address restrictions to women's land ownership and confining women's economic activity to "income generating activity groups" that carry out traditionally female activities such as baking, spinning and weaving. Although Kenyan women are poorer than men and contribute up to 80 percent of agricultural labor (AfDB, 2007), the project fails to explicitly promote women's full and equal participation in project activities. While the PAD claims that 52 percent of the project's 4.4 million beneficiaries will be female, project indicators show that 800 men are targeted for "gender-sensitive" training compared to only 500 women. None of the project indicators measure the project's success in ensuring that women "will gain power and improve their position in the community" (AfDB, 2007).

### Gender Discrimination in Kenya's Horticulture Industry

Horticulture is the fastest-growing component of the Kenyan economy. While women constitute 75 percent the cut flower industry's labor, they face multiple forms of gender discrimination. Women's unequal treatment in the horticulture sector is "embedded in social norms that consider women more compliant and better suited to certain types of horticultural work (such as picking and packing), coupled with perceptions that women's income is supplementary, rather than central, to household well-being" (Smith, et al., 2004).

Despite Kenyan employers' legal obligation to promote temporary workers to permanent jobs, women in the horticulture industry are rarely offered permanent, stable employment (Smith, et al., 2004). They face the risk of dismissal if they get pregnant, which can lead women to hide or abort their pregnancies, both of which can have long-term negative health consequences (Dolan, Opondo & Smith, 2002). Women do not have legally protected benefits such as sick pay, medical care and childcare. As temporary workers, women are also more vulnerable to verbal and physical abuse, sexual harassment, corruption and wages being docked as a disciplinary measure. Fear of dismissal often stops women from complaining; since women are under-represented in trade unions and workers committees, avenues for addressing these fears are severely limited (Smith, et al., 2004).

### Applying Gender Action's Essential Gender Analysis Checklist:

**Gender and Human Rights:** The project appraisal document (PAD) does not approach horticulture from a human rights perspective (i.e. the right to land ownership and access to resources).

**Gender In/equality:** The PAD acknowledges several forms of gender inequality in Kenyan agriculture. However, the project does not seek to address these inequalities by guaranteeing men's and women's equal participation in all project activities, including "intensive training" and the organization of marketing cooperatives.

**Gender Data:** Project indicators reflect the project's reinforcement of the horticulture industry's gender inequality: for example, the PAD targets 800 men and only 500 women for "gender sensitive" farmer training, even though women constitute the majority of Kenya's horticultural workforce.

**Gender in Context:** The PAD provides significant context in which to understand gender relations and inequality in Kenya.

**Gender Access:** The PAD does not promote equal access to project activities and benefits. For example, only 30 percent of project irrigation rehabilitation activities target female-headed households.

**Gender Input:** There is no indication that women would participate equally with men in project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

**Gender Output:** The project does not promote outputs that benefit men and women equally.

**Gender Impact:** The PAD claims that women "will gain power and improve their position in the community," but does not include indicators to measure the project's success in this regard.

## The AfDB's "Restoration of Farm Infrastructure and Rural Livelihoods Project" (RFIRLP) 2009 (approximately US\$23.5 million loan)

The AfDB's RFIRLP loan aims to increase food security for 19,000 beneficiaries who were uprooted during Kenya's post-election violence in 2008. The project focuses on increasing maize production and sales through new farm infrastructure and agricultural input services. Although access to food is a human right, the PAD only emphasizes that this investment is necessary for "facilitating faster economic recovery" (AfDB, 2009).

Commendably, the project's benefits for women include safe water for cooking and increased water storage to cut down the time women and girls must spend walking to fetch water themselves (AfDB, 2009). Although the project planning included consultation with both men and women, the project itself ignores the barriers women face in regard to land ownership, access to agricultural inputs and extension services, and does not promote women and men's equal project participation. While the project invites "semi-skilled" beneficiaries to build and maintain new homes, it does not train women who are disadvantaged because they lack skills.

The PAD indicates that initial consultations included "interviews with beneficiary opinion leaders and randomly selected individuals (from a cross-section of gender, age and socioeconomic status) among the targeted communities," and claims that all were in favor of the project (AfDB, 2009). However, the project fails to explicitly promote outcomes that equally benefit women and men. Although the PAD claims that more than 10,000 beneficiaries (56 percent) will be women, project indicators do not measure this target. The PAD claims that the project will "contribute greatly to poverty reduction mainly as a result of enhanced income obtained from the increase in production and sale of maize" (AfDB, 2009). Since none of the project's indicators are sex-disaggregated (AfDB, 2009), it is impossible to determine the project's actual outcomes and impacts on women and men, boys and girls.



### Applying Gender Action's Essential Gender Analysis Checklist:

**Gender and Human Rights:** The project appraisal document (PAD) does not approach rural livelihoods from a human rights perspective.

**Gender In/equality:** The PAD does not acknowledge gender inequality, nor does it explicitly promote gender equality throughout the project cycle.

**Gender Data:** The PAD claims that female-headed households will comprise over half of project beneficiaries, but this target is not reflected in the project indicators. None of the project's indicators are sex-disaggregated.

**Gender in Context:** The PAD does not provide any context in which to understand gender relations within Kenyan agriculture.

**Gender Access:** The PAD claims that 56 percent of beneficiaries are women, including female-headed households, and that they will gain from agricultural inputs, training, improved access to clean water and sanitation, and increased opportunities to send their children to school.

**Gender Input:** The PAD states that both men and women were involved in the consultation process; both men and women were also involved in identifying the most vulnerable members of the community to benefit from the project.

**Gender Output:** The PAD claims that over half of beneficiaries will be women, but does not explicitly promote outputs that benefit both women and men.

**Gender Impact:** The PAD promises to positively impact the "living conditions and incomes of female headed households." Since none of the project indicators are sex-disaggregated, however, it is impossible to determine the project's differential gender impacts.

# Gender Action Recommendations

## IFIs Must:

- ✓Consistently approach agriculture and food security investments from human/women's rights perspectives
- ✓Provide grants—not loans—to support gender-sensitive, sustainable agricultural development in developing countries
- ✓Explicitly promote women's full and equal participation throughout food security project cycles, collect sex-disaggregated project data and promote project outcomes that increase food security, especially for the women and girls who comprise the majority of Kenya's poor
- ✓Implement their own policies to use sex-disaggregated indicators to measure projects' differential impacts on men and women, boys and girls

## Civil Society Organizations Can:

- ✓Use Gender Action resources to advocate for IFIs to increase food security investments that directly benefit women and girls
- ✓Pressure IFIs to strengthen and fully implement their gender policies with regard to agriculture and food security projects
- ✓Help those who are negatively impacted by IFI agriculture and food security projects to gather information about IFI policies and procedures and bring gender discrimination cases to IFI accountability mechanisms

### GENDER ACTION

1875 Connecticut Avenue Suite 500

Washington DC 20009

Tel: 202-949-5463

Web: [www.genderaction.org](http://www.genderaction.org)

Email: [info@genderaction.org](mailto:info@genderaction.org)

**Gender Action's mission is to promote women's rights and gender equality and ensure women and men equally participate in and benefit from International Financial Institution (IFI) investments in developing countries.**



### References

- AfDB, 2007. 'PAD: Small-Scale Horticulture Project.' <http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/KE-2007-065-EN-ADF-BD-WP-KENYA-AR-SMALL-SCALE-HORTICULTURE-DEVELOPMENT-PROJECT.PDF>
- AfDB, 2009. 'PAD: RFIRLP.' <http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/AR%20Kenya01%20En.pdf>
- Baden, S. 1998. 'Gender Issues in Agricultural Liberalization.' <http://www.bridge.ids.ac.uk/reports/re41c.pdf>
- Dolan, C., Opondo, M., Smith, S. 2002. 'Gender Rights and Participation in Kenya's Cut Flower Industry.' <http://www.nri.org/projects/nret/kenyareportfinal2.pdf>
- FAO, 2011. 'Food Insecurity in the Horn of Africa.' <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/003/X8530E/x8530e02.htm>
- Gitau, R. et al., 2008. 'Agricultural Policy Making in Sub-Saharan Africa: Kenya's Past Policies.' <http://www.tegemoo.org/documents/work/Wp34-Agricultural-Policy-Making-Africa-Kenya-Past-Policies.pdf>
- Institute for Development Studies, 2006. 'Agricultural Policy in Kenya: Issues and Processes.' [http://typo3.fao.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/fsn/docs/Ag\\_policy\\_Kenya.pdf](http://typo3.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/fsn/docs/Ag_policy_Kenya.pdf)
- Kimani-Murage, E.W., et al., 2011. 'Food Security and Nutritional Outcomes among Poor Urban Orphans in Nairobi.' <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20945109>
- Smith, S. et al., 2004. 'Ethical Trade in African Horticulture: gender, rights and participation, IDS Working Paper 223.' [http://www.genderandtrade.org/gtinformation/164419/164962/165007/kenyan\\_flower\\_production/](http://www.genderandtrade.org/gtinformation/164419/164962/165007/kenyan_flower_production/)
- UNICEF, 2009. 'Kenya Statistics.' [http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/kenya\\_statistics.html#81](http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/kenya_statistics.html#81)
- USDA, 2009. 'Food Security Analysis: Kenya.' <http://www.fas.usda.gov/ftp/Kenya/KenyaFoodSecurity09.pdf>
- WB, 2007a. 'PAD: NRMP.' [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/IB/2007/03/12/000020953\\_20070312104941/Rendered/PDF/37982.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/IB/2007/03/12/000020953_20070312104941/Rendered/PDF/37982.pdf)
- WB, 2007b. 'Resettlement Plan: NRMP.' [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/IB/2011/06/01/000333037\\_20110601043413/Rendered/PDF/RP5000v20P09500LIC00AFR0RPF0P095050.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/IB/2011/06/01/000333037_20110601043413/Rendered/PDF/RP5000v20P09500LIC00AFR0RPF0P095050.pdf)
- WB, 2009. 'PAD: KAPAP.' [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/IB/2009/05/27/000333038\\_20090527030850/Rendered/PDF/474940PAD0P109101Official0Use0Only1.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/IB/2009/05/27/000333038_20090527030850/Rendered/PDF/474940PAD0P109101Official0Use0Only1.pdf)
- WB, 2010. 'PAD: KCDP.' [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/IB/2010/07/08/000333038\\_20100708231240/Rendered/PDF/544860PAD0P094101Official0Use0Only1.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/IB/2010/07/08/000333038_20100708231240/Rendered/PDF/544860PAD0P094101Official0Use0Only1.pdf)
- WB, 2011a. 'Implementation Status and Results Report: NRMP.' [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/AFR/2011/07/20/708FBF4A867F9271852578D3007D9D7E/1\\_0/Rendered/PDF/P0950500ISR0Di020201101311202323394.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/AFR/2011/07/20/708FBF4A867F9271852578D3007D9D7E/1_0/Rendered/PDF/P0950500ISR0Di020201101311202323394.pdf)
- WB, 2011b. 'Implementation Status and Results Report: KAPAP.' [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/AFR/2011/08/27/540C6ACDDE14B76D852578FA001021D3/1\\_0/Rendered/PDF/P1096830ISR0Di027201101314500172421.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/AFR/2011/08/27/540C6ACDDE14B76D852578FA001021D3/1_0/Rendered/PDF/P1096830ISR0Di027201101314500172421.pdf)
- WB, 2011c. 'Implementation Status and Results Report: KCDP.' [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/AFR/2011/03/19/08F800FA599433DF852578580053E85A/1\\_0/Rendered/PDF/P0946920ISR0Di019201101300547789704.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDS/AFR/2011/03/19/08F800FA599433DF852578580053E85A/1_0/Rendered/PDF/P0946920ISR0Di019201101300547789704.pdf)
- WFP, 2011. 'The Food Price Rollercoaster.' <http://www.wfp.org/stories/rising-food-prices-infographic?gclid=CN2tscnp-aoCFPe4Aodn2q7WA>