



# Broken Promises:

Gender Impacts of the World Bank-Financed  
West-African and Chad-Cameroon Pipelines



**Friends of  
the Earth  
International**

**Gender** Action

Supported by Oxfam Novib

Gender Action (GA) and Friends of the Earth International (FoEI) would like to thank the following people for their invaluable contributions to the GA-FoEI Pipelines Project and this report. We are grateful to: Betty Abah and the staff of FoE Nigeria for coordinating the field studies, leading advocacy activities in affected communities, sending summary reports for this publication, and taking abundant photographs of Friends of the Earth's field visits; Elorm Kokou Amegadze and the staff of FoE Togo for fieldwork and advocacy; Noble Wadzah and the staff of FoE Ghana for fieldwork and advocacy; Stepanie Nganang, former staff of FoE Cameroon, and her colleagues for fieldwork and advocacy; and to Erick Burke of FoEI for being a project champion and providing comments and edits to the publication.

GA and FoEI gratefully acknowledge Sonia Lowman of Gender Action for analyzing the data, drafting the publication, and coordinating with Friends of the Earth member groups.

Additional thanks goes to Elaine Zuckerman (GA), Elizabeth Arend (GA), Laura Bosco (GA) and Ellen Boneparth for their invaluable edits and comments to the publication; and Lisa Vitale for her tremendous support in project coordination, publication layout, and cover design.

GA and FoEI are enormously grateful for Oxfam Novib's financial support.

**Gender Action**

1875 Connecticut Street NW  
Suite 1012  
Washington DC  
20009 USA  
Tel: (202) 939-5463  
[www.genderaction.org](http://www.genderaction.org)

**Environmental Rights Action/  
Friends of the Earth Nigeria**

#214 Uselu Lagos Road  
Ugbowo  
Nigeria  
Tel: +234 52 880619

**Friends of the Earth International**

P.O. Box 19199  
1000 gd  
Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
Tel: +31 20 622 1369  
[Www.foei.org](http://www.foei.org)

**Photos:** Tony Onwuemene (Toner Photo Agency); Betty Abah (Friends of the Earth Nigeria)

**Cover:** Lisa Vitale (Gender Action)

© 2011 Gender Action

## FOREWORD

### **Broken Promises and the World Bank's Gender Equality and Development Report**

Gender Action and Friends of the Earth International (FOEI) share our new report, *Broken Promises: Gender Impacts of the World Bank-Financed West-African and Chad-Cameroon Pipelines*, one week after the Bank released its 426-page Gender Equality and Development Report (GEDR) with huge fanfare. GEDR is the first of the Bank's 33 World Development Reports (WDRs) to focus on gender issues. If only the GEDR would influence Bank staff to better identify and address gender issues in their work. The most valuable outcome of GEDR's awareness-raising would be contributing to realizing the Bank mission to reduce poverty and improve the livelihoods of the poor, the majority of whom are women.

But don't hold your breath. All WDRs, which are the Bank's flagship research reports, are beautifully written and presented. GEDR is no exception. However, WDRs rarely influence investments.

Gender Action exists precisely to bridge the persistent disconnect between the Bank's often stellar gender-focused research and rhetoric on the one hand, and harmful gender impacts of Bank investments on the other. Gender Action still has its work cut out for it.

*Broken Promises* and so many other Gender Action reports provide strong evidence that Bank investments deepen gender inequalities. Based on field surveys designed by Gender Action and conducted by FOE member groups in Cameroon, Ghana, Nigeria and Togo, *Broken Promises* demonstrates how Bank investments tragically harm women and other disadvantaged people. The Bank-financed West-African and Chad-Cameroon pipelines wrecked women's livelihoods in farming, fishing, handicrafts, and other industries on which tens of thousands of households surrounding the pipelines depended for survival. The Bank broke its promises that pipeline proceeds would improve poor people's livelihoods.

These broken Bank promises are not exceptional. Five years ago Gender Action, together with Central and Eastern Europe Bankwatch, published *Boom Time Blues: Big Oil's Gender Impacts in Azerbaijan, Georgia and Sakhalin (BTB)*. Based on fieldwork, BTB showed oil pipeline construction employed males but disproportionately harmed women who lost traditional farm income as pipelines appropriated farmland, drove women into sex work, and increased women's dependence on men, STDs - especially HIV/AIDS, violence against women, and stillbirths.

*Broken Promises'* tragic gender impacts replicate those of BTB. In reaction to BTB, the Bank established a gender and extractive industries unit and webpage. We hope that the arrival of *Broken Promises* will push the Bank to provide mandates to its voluntary gender policy, action plans and strategies to prevent Bank investment disasters that *Broken Promises* vividly portrays.

Gender Action shows similar catastrophic impacts from other Bank investments across sectors such as post-conflict reconstruction; reproductive health and HIV; and agriculture, rural development and food insecurity; as well as development policy/structural adjustment operations.

"We need coherence between rhetoric and action." This was the call of UN Undersecretary General Michelle Bachelet who heads UN Women, at a September 23, 2011 Bank GEDR and infrastructure session. *Broken Promises* underlines the urgency of achieving this coherence.

It is time for the World Bank to stop financing dirty oil and gas pipelines and other investments that benefit the world's largest oil companies but impoverish poor women, men, boys, and girls.

Elaine Zuckerman  
Gender Action President  
September 27, 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>PROJECT BACKGROUND</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>THE CHAD-CAMEROON OIL PIPELINE</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The World Bank and the Pipeline</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>The Pipeline's Gender Impacts</i>	<b>6</b>
<b>CAMEROON FIELD STUDY</b>	<b>7</b>
<i>Gender Impacts of the Pipeline in Cameroon</i>	<b>7</b>
<b>THE WEST AFRICAN GAS PIPELINES (WAGP)</b>	<b>12</b>
<i>The World Bank and the Pipeline</i>	<b>12</b>
<i>The Pipeline's Gender Impacts</i>	<b>13</b>
<b>NIGERIA FIELD STUDY</b>	<b>14</b>
<i>Gender Impacts of the Pipeline in Nigeria</i>	<b>15</b>
<b>TOGO FIELD STUDY</b>	<b>18</b>
<i>Gender Impacts of the Pipeline in Togo</i>	<b>18</b>
<b>GHANA FIELD STUDY</b>	<b>21</b>
<i>Gender Impacts of the Pipeline in Ghana</i>	<b>22</b>
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (IFIs)</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>27</b>

## ABBREVIATIONS

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
BTC	Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan
CLO	Community Liaison Officer
DOTCO	Cameroon Oil Transportation Company
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EI	Extractive industry
EIB	European Investment Bank
EIR	Extractive Industry Review
ERA	Environmental Rights Action (Nigeria)
FoE	Friends of the Earth Member Group
FoEI	Friends of the Earth International (Amsterdam Headquarters)
GA	Gender Action
HIV	Human immunodeficiency virus
IDA	International Development Association (of the World Bank Group)
IEG	Independent Evaluation Group (of the World Bank Group)
IFC	International Finance Corporation (of the World Bank Group)
IFIs	International Financial Institutions
IP	Inspection Panel (of the World Bank Group)
MIGA	Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (of the World Bank Group)
NGOs	Non-governmental organizations
RIAS	Regional Integration Assistance Strategy
STIs	Sexually Transmitted Infections
WAGP	West Africa Gas Pipelines
WAPCo	West African Pipeline Company's
WBG	World Bank Group

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2010, Gender Action and Friends of the Earth International (FoEI) partnered to conduct gender analyses of the Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipeline and the West Africa Gas Pipelines (WAGP). International Financial Institutions (IFIs)—namely the World Bank and European Investment Bank (EIB)—partially financed both pipelines, providing financial security to oil and gas multinational companies, which indicated that pipeline construction would not proceed without the World Bank Group’s (WBG) involvement.

Through desk research and fieldwork in four countries (Cameroon for the Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipeline, and Nigeria, Ghana and Togo for WAGP), GA and FoE regional member groups assessed the gender differential impacts of the pipelines on local women and men. Surveys, focus groups and testimonials revealed that women have suffered disproportionately from the pipelines in large part because project architects failed to take pervasive gender inequalities into account in project design. In all of the communities surveyed, women experience marginalization in income-generation, decision-making, and access to critical resources like education, land, credit and technology. IFIs reinforced this second-class status by sidelining women in consultation processes, discriminating against women in compensation schemes and employment opportunities, and undermining women’s critical livelihoods.

The two pipelines represent broken promises to affected communities and systemic gender discrimination. While the pipeline projects have undermined the rights and livelihoods of entire communities, they have doubly marginalized women. In the public relations campaigns leading up to pipeline construction, IFIs and multinational oil companies promised benefits to communities such as employment generation, infrastructural development and fair compensation. Instead, consultation processes aimed at enlisting community views largely excluded women’s participation, and led to defunct infrastructure development and insufficient compensation that went almost exclusively to men, who own the land on which African women work. Employment went mostly to individuals from outside the surveyed communities, causing a male influx of temporary expatriate workers that upset community gender dynamics. As women perform the majority of subsistence farming, land lost to pipeline routes meant that many women lost their precarious livelihoods with little or nothing left on which to depend. Similarly, offshore pipelines caused a significant decrease in fish yields, negatively impacting predominantly female fishing communities.

With the devastating loss of their livelihoods, women’s already limited influence in their communities further diminished. Surveyed women felt that their household decision-making power decreased, as their ability to earn income determines their degree of autonomy. Further, when men lost their jobs as a result of pipeline construction, women had to double their efforts to provide for their households. Field visits revealed that some women who could not find jobs to compensate for their husbands’ loss of employment turned to prostitution to make ends meet, sacrificing their reputations in the communities. Familial tensions that resulted from lost income have undermined communities’ social fabric and led some households to separate.

The IFIs’ Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipeline and WAGP investments demonstrate how these development institutions break their public commitments to reduce poverty and gender inequality. To genuinely live up to their stated promises, Gender Action and Friends of the Earth member groups recommend that IFIs comprehensively integrate gender into all investments at all project stages, including planning, implementation and evaluation. IFIs must conduct gender analyses of their projects to determine differential gender impacts, and collect and analyze sex-disaggregated data throughout the project in order to determine the project’s immediate outcomes on women and men. Community consultation should ensure the equal participation of women and men. Accountability measures must be strengthened to achieve redress and justice for human rights violations on the part of IFIs and multinational companies, and help communities receive sufficient compensation for losses. Finally, IFIs should not fund extractive industries projects if environmental, social, and gender assessments indicate unavoidable human rights violations, compromised livelihoods or environmental degradation.

---

*"The concentration of large numbers of migratory, mostly young, male workers around EI [extractive industry] developments can lead to an increase in prostitution and associated health and security risks, including HIV/AIDS and other STDs, as well as human trafficking. If local economies are disrupted, the traditional roles for both men and woman can be undermined, breaking down social relations and resulting in increasing domestic violence and sexual abuse—often as a result of domestic disputes over resources, changed lifestyle, alcoholism, drug use or gambling (and other forms of social pathology)."*

- United Nations Interagency Framework Team for Preventative Action, 2010

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

Gender-blind investments in extractive industries bring substantial negative consequences for women. Jobs in extractive industries, such as mining and energy production, go almost exclusively to men, which deepens women's vulnerability to poverty by depriving them of their already precarious livelihoods. Harmful environmental impacts undermine subsistence activities, largely performed by women, such as fishing and small-scale agriculture. Settlements spring up around temporary work sites, causing demographic changes in local communities and disrupting local economies. Prostitution often rises as increased poverty diminishes women's income-earning opportunities. The few women who do manage to get jobs in male-dominated extractive industries tend to experience sexual harassment and gender-based violence (Gender Action, 2011). Documented consequences of extractive projects include increased rates of sexually transmitted infections and stillbirths; general deterioration in health; ecological degradation and climate change; threats to food security; and political corruption—all of which have differential impacts on women and men (Breitkopf and Nguiffo, 2001; Gender Action & CEE Bankwatch, 2006).

International Financial Institutions' (IFIs) research highlights the negative impacts of extractive industries on vulnerable social groups, but their investments tend to neglect them. In 2003, the World Bank's in-house *Extractive Industries Review* advised that the institution immediately end all financing for coal and phase out oil investments by 2008. Instead, between 2007 and 2008, the World Bank Group (WBG) increased spending on coal by 256 percent and spending on coal, oil and gas collectively by 94 percent; the World Bank's private arm, the International Finance Corporation (IFC), increased its lending to extractive industries by 134 percent (Gender Action, 2009). At the same time, a June 2010 World Bank report on its gender mainstreaming strategy during FY2009 revealed that the overall percentage of Bank lending judged "gender-informed" declined from 45 percent to 38 percent (Bretton Woods Project, 2010). Energy and mining proved to be the weakest sector, with just nine percent of projects deemed "gender-informed"—a World Bank definition that does not contain particularly rigorous standards in the first place. Finally, the World Bank's US\$68 million gender plan ("road map") for 2011-2013 makes no reference to ongoing energy and trade strategy reviews (Bretton Woods Project, 2010).

The same IFIs that claim to reduce poverty and support women's empowerment in fact fund gender-blind extractive industry projects that increase poverty and undermine women's rights in developing countries. Throughout project plans, implementation, and evaluations, IFIs repeatedly fail to consider the gender dimensions of extractive activities. The consequences of such poorly implemented IFI "development" projects are devastating for gender justice, as gender-blind funding exacerbates existing inequalities between women and men. For example, a study on oil, Islam and women argues against the World Bank's assertion that economic

growth promotes gender equality, stating that “when growth is based on oil and mineral extraction, it discourages women from entering the labor force and tends to exaggerate gender inequalities” (Ross, 2008). As this quote demonstrates, IFIs cannot assume that women are automatic beneficiaries of national economic gains or multilateral development aid. IFIs must promote women’s human rights and equality as an aim in and of itself and all IFI investments must implement gender guidelines requiring them to reduce discrimination against and marginalization of women in project areas.

---

*"Oil production affects gender relations by reducing the presence of women in the labor force. The failure of women to join the nonagricultural labor force has profound social consequences: it leads to higher fertility rates, less education for girls, and less female influence within the family. It also has far-reaching political consequences: when fewer women work outside the home, they are less likely to exchange information and overcome collective action problems; less likely to mobilize politically, and to lobby for expanded rights; and less likely to gain representation in government."*  
-Michael Ross, 2008

---

This report demonstrates that the need to assess and redress the negative gender impacts of IFI projects in extractive industries is critical. We reach this conclusion by examining the gender impacts of the Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipeline and the West African Gas Pipeline (WAGP) in the following sections: background research on the Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipeline; results from FoE Cameroon’s field study; background research on the WAGP; results from FoE Nigeria’s, FoE Togo’s and FoE Ghana’s field studies; and conclusions and recommendations.

## **PROJECT BACKGROUND**

Gender Action and Friends of the Earth International (FoEI) partnered in 2010 to conduct a gender analysis of the Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipeline and the West African Gas Pipelines (WAGP). The initiative aimed to document, publicize and conduct advocacy to redress the harmful gender impacts of the pipelines, which were both financed in part by publicly-funded International Financial Institutions (IFIs)—the World Bank Group (WBG) and European Investment Bank (EIB). Previously, Gender Action’s 2006 publication “Boom Times Blues” documented the negative consequences of the IFI-financed Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) and Sakhalin II oil pipelines for women—including increased poverty and dependence on men, driven or forced prostitution, and increases in sexually transmitted infections and sexual harassment—in Azerbaijan, Georgia, Russia and Turkey (Gender Action & CEE Bankwatch, 2006). Observing similar negative gender outcomes from oil and gas pipelines traversing West Africa, local and global civil society groups urged Gender Action and FoEI to conduct gender analyses in Cameroon, Nigeria, Togo and Ghana.

## **METHODOLOGY**

Methodologies included desk research, capacity-building, fieldwork, community awareness meetings and advocacy. Between May and July 2010, a team from FoE’s Nigeria member group, Environmental Rights Action (ERA), made familiarization visits to communities in Nigeria, Ghana and Togo, immediately noting the disproportionate harmful impacts the pipelines had on women in these communities. The team also confronted examples of neglect in communities linked by the WAGP project, such as an abandoned school in the Gbetsogbe area of Togo—evidence of infrastructure promised by the WAGP consortium but inadequately maintained. Gender Action designed gender analysis tools for the field visits and conducted background research on the pipelines.





In July 2010, a Gender Action associate traveled to Cameroon, Nigeria, Ghana and Togo to train local FoE member groups on gender analysis, IFI-watcher tools and gender advocacy. Applying this training, FoE member groups made field visits between July and October 2010 in the following pipeline area communities: Ajido, Araromi, Tori-Lovi and Imeke in Nigeria; Gboetsogbe, Ktanga and Kangnikope in Togo; Badenvouri and

Nkometou in Cameroon; and Kpone, Abuese and Aboadze in Ghana. FoE member groups selected the communities based on their proximity to the pipelines, respective levels of displacement and observable consequences resulting from the pipelines' construction. Data collection tools included individual surveys and focus groups, which deliberately separated women, men and community leaders in order to define the pipelines' differential impacts on each group. The individual surveys covered five topic areas: family characteristics, livelihoods, environment, health and pipeline impacts. FoE member groups interviewed a total of 110 people, who live in households comprising 1,066 people.

FoE member groups subsequently held community awareness gatherings in the four target countries in order to gather individual testimonials. For most of the communities, these testimony sessions represented the first time that women could publicly voice their perspectives on the pipelines. Designed to be more free-flowing than the surveys and focus groups, many community representatives narrated their individual complaints about the pipelines, such as gender-based discrimination, inadequate compensation, labor exclusion and pollution. In addition, FoE Nigeria organized an October 2010 daylong interactive media session and well-publicized June 2011 protest against the West African Pipeline Company's (WAPCo) environmental and human rights abuses, drawing special attention to the plight of Badagry women. Community gatherings and advocacy activities portraying the gender impacts of the pipelines garnered media coverage in the other countries as well. Based on FoE member groups' visits to project areas, interviews, surveys, and community gatherings, Gender Action and FoEI estimate that the project reached 9,700 people, 73 percent of which were women.



### **THE CHAD-CAMEROON OIL PIPELINE:**

The 650-mile Chad-Cameroon oil pipeline transports crude oil from three fields in southwestern Chad to a floating shipping facility off Cameroon's coast. Eighty percent of the pipeline exists in Cameroon. With a price tag of over US\$4 billion, the Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipelines Project remains the single largest on-shore investment in Africa. An oil consortium comprised of Exxon/Mobil (40 percent), Petronas Malaysia (35 percent) and Chevron (25 percent) financed the project, supported by loans from the WBG and EIB for US\$337.6 million and US\$170 million respectively. Project architects anticipated US\$2 billion in revenue for Chad over the 25 year span of the project, and US\$500 million for Cameroon. The three year construction project was completed and first oil "achieved" in July 2003.



### ***The World Bank and the Pipeline***

The World Bank Group approved financial support for the pipeline project in June 2000, justifying its investment through international development aspirations. The IFI positioned the project as the "test case" for how developing countries could "beat the resource curse" and harness oil for poverty reduction (IEG, 2009). World Bank documents state the project objective for Chad as "achieving progress in governance and poverty reduction by means of the oil revenue," such that "the success of the program would be measured not in dollars but in how many Chadians it would lift out of poverty" (IEG, 2009). For Cameroon, the project aimed to "augment the financial resources available for development and pro-poor expenditure" (IEG, 2009).

At the time of project approval in 2000, the World Bank had sufficient evidence that extractive industries undermine poor women and men's livelihoods and are socially and economically disruptive to communities, ecosystems and even inter-state relations. The Niger Delta region provided a devastating example of how local communities have been historically denied their fair share of oil revenues and subjected to human rights violations under the watch of multinational oil companies, with women suffering detrimental health effects such as high rates of cancer, respiratory disease, infertility and still-births. The link between wealth in natural resources, bad governance and violent conflict had also been well-documented. The World Bank itself issued a report on the economic causes of conflict—embargoed until about one week after its approval of the Chad-Cameroon project—stating that a low-income country's dependence on exports of primary commodities represents the most serious risk for armed conflict over control of this most "lootable" of all economic activities. Unsurprisingly, violence continues today on the Chad-Sudan border, with the proliferation of armed rebels in the region linked to the fight over oil profits and the availability of oil money that has lured arms merchants to the area (Horta, Nguiffo, and Djiraibe, 2007).

Furthermore, the countries and companies involved in the project posed far from stable prospects in which to invest. Chad, one of the world's poorest countries, lacks infrastructural and legal capacity, and is rife with political instability, armed rebellions, and flagrant human rights abuses. Cameroon was twice listed by Transparency International as the most corrupt government in the world in the two years preceding the World Bank's approval of the project (1998 and 1999) (Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2008), and violence against women and discrimination

towards indigenous Pygmies pose serious problems. Civil society remains virtually voiceless in both countries. As for the oil companies, at the time of project approval, Chevron faced a human rights lawsuit in a United States federal court for providing the Nigerian military with arms and requesting that it quell civilian protests, actions that resulted in the deaths of unarmed Nigerian civilians who protested environmental damage by one of Chevron's subsidiaries (CIEL, website).

Many observers perceived early on what a troubling combination this would prove, and civil society and human rights groups appealed for a moratorium on the project. Ultimately, the project became one of the most controversial and risky projects ever considered by the Bank, which nonetheless failed to heed the abundant warnings. Under the World Bank's purview, the oil consortium negotiated agreements that put the project beyond the reach of both Chadian and Cameroonian national law and restricted government interference in order to protect the companies from liability (CIEL, website). According to human rights group Amnesty International, the investments' legal framework would encourage both governments to ignore their human rights violations (Amnesty International, 2005). The World Bank also charged Cameroon a 10 percent premium on its loan, which saddled the impoverished country with the kind of crushing debt that reduces public expenditure on which women and girls' survival depends.

According to the Bank's Inspection Panel (IP), the Bank failed to comply with its own policies on environmental assessment and forestry; it did not fully disclose all relevant documents; and its initial consultations were potentially biased since they were conducted in the presence of security personnel (IP, 2002). Further, neither of the WBG's minor International Development Association (IDA) credits for capacity-building (US\$41.2 million for Chad and US\$5.77 million for Cameroon) contained any gender components. This may be partially attributed to the World Bank's lack of a mandated gender policy and human rights considerations within mandatory environmental policies (World Bank, 2003). Neither the legal framework nor individual grievance procedures of IFI projects ensure fulfillment of beneficiaries' human rights; they lack the most basic protections like enforcement mechanisms for compensation (Amnesty International, 2005). This leaves little option for redress for negative gender or other human rights impacts.

In a 2009 Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) report, the WBG claimed that the pipeline would have been built with or without WBG involvement, suggesting that the consequences brought by the pipeline were somehow mitigated through WBG involvement, which assured that "environmental and social protections within the confines of the project [were] better than they would have been otherwise" (IEG 2009). However, this claim of inevitability is contradicted by the April 2000 Project Appraisal Document statement that, "Private sponsors have indicated that they would be unwilling to proceed with the project without the Bank Group's participation" (World Bank, 2000). In fact, the oil consortium made the project *contingent* on the World Bank, due to the risks associated with operating in politically volatile environments, with ExxonMobil publicly stating that it would not move forward with the project without the involvement of the WBG (CIEL, website). Consequently, though minor in terms of overall financing (at 9 percent), the WBG became the most important source of funding in the project by providing guarantees to oil financiers. This begs the question: who did the World Bank intervene to mitigate the risks for—poor Chadians and Cameroonians who stood to suffer from the project's negative impacts, or the private oil companies that stood to profit?

Despite World Bank commitments that Chad would devote oil revenue to social spending, the revenue management plan did little to safeguard use of profits by elites for military expenditure at the expense of citizens. Chad's president, Idriss Deby, used a US\$25 million "signing bonus" from the oil companies to rearm his military, and in 2006 amended a revenue management law to finance his security forces against civil unrest. Then President of the World Bank, Paul Wolfowitz, suspended lending in response, but subsequently agreed to reinstate lending when Chad threatened to halt oil production. Many of the royalties also serviced the country's foreign debt, including debt owed to the World Bank (EDF, 2001). In 2008, upon receipt of US\$65 million from the government of Chad (out of its approximately US\$1.4 billion in oil profits that year), the World Bank abruptly withdrew from the project, leaving a number of unfulfilled promises in its wake. The IFC remained quietly invested in the oil consortium with an investment of about US\$100 million, but the project's social and environmental goals were effectively abandoned (BIC, 2008a). Although the "fundamental development objective of reducing poverty and improving governance in Chad through the best possible use of oil revenues in an environmentally and socially sustainable manner was not achieved," the Bank deemed the pipeline itself a "physical, technical, and financial success" (IEG, 2009). In 2006, Exxon-Mobil posted the largest annual profit by any US company in history (BIC, 2007).

---

*"We will not proceed with this project unless we are satisfied that our policies are respected, that the objective of poverty reduction can be met, and that the interests of the people of Chad and Cameroon are adequately protected" (FoE Cameroon, 2002).*

*–World Bank, 1998*

---

### ***The Pipeline's Gender Impacts***

Ultimately, the pipeline further marginalized the women and men that the World Bank promised to empower, rendering the "model" project a failure with regard to poverty reduction and social protection. More than 100 communities live along the Chad-Cameroon pipeline; eleven years after the pipeline's construction, severe gender, socio-economic and environmental consequences persist. This has had the greatest negative impact on women, who shoulder responsibility for income-generation and care-giving, and whose marginalized status makes them particularly vulnerable to poverty.

The pipeline cuts through farmland, forests and territory inhabited by indigenous people in southern Cameroon. In Cameroon, 80 percent of the population farms; negative land impacts are particularly detrimental for women, who make up the majority of subsistence farmers (CAMSO, 2011). A 2007 World Bank study detailed the pipeline's negative impacts on land use and livelihoods in the oil-producing region, including: nearly 1,000 households lost land and the overall magnitude and severity of impacts on local communities was far greater than originally envisaged; reclaiming land after construction and returning it to local farmers proved a persistent problem; and livelihood restoration measures, such as agricultural training, were inadequate to restore local livelihoods (Group Tchad, 2010). For families dependent on the land for their livelihood, even the smallest loss can be dramatic and life-threatening, with women and children being the most at risk.

Women faced severe labor discrimination in the pipeline's development, either excluded entirely or receiving the most menial of tasks. The WBG positioned the project as the best bet for quick revenue and employment generation in Chad and Cameroon, and the oil consortium claimed that 7,000 people would be hired during construction in Cameroon alone. However, this quick-fix proved to be unsustainable and highly inequitable, as the WBG failed to provide a comprehensive strategy with regard to the nature of "boom industries." The project attracted hundreds of unskilled workers, almost exclusively male, to the project areas, but the promised job growth was short-term. During peak construction in 2002, an estimated 6,000 workers were employed in Cameroon; in 2007, the number was less than 1,000. Instead of creating regional economic development opportunities and long-term employment, the project contained near-term "urgent" measures limiting improvements in social infrastructure to make migration less attractive (EDF, 2001).

The influx of foreign male workers to remote project areas in the pipeline's construction posed high health risks to women. The Environmental Panel of Experts, commissioned for the World Bank's environmental assessment process, noted that the pipeline project represented an ideal opportunity for HIV and other STI transmission along the pipeline route and in the oil fields, and ranked minimizing and treating infection as a top priority (Horta, Nguiffo, and Djiraibe, 2007). Due to biology, unequal access to health care, gender-based violence and cultural factors, women are most vulnerable to HIV and other STIs. However, no effective measures were put in place to address this risk: the IEG observed that "various construction sites of the pipeline [were] established...without the authorities taking special measures concerning direct health education to local populations" (FoE Cameroon, 2002)—not to mention including any gender dimensions to this health education.

## **CAMEROON FIELD STUDY**

### *Badenvouri and Nkometou Communities*

FoE Cameroon carried out research in two indigenous communities in Cameroon: Badenvouri and Nkometou (Bantu). Indigenous Bagyéli Pygmies inhabit Bandevouri; Bantus, who are predominantly farmers, inhabit Nkometou. Both groups suffer social exclusion from the rest of Cameroon's population.

### *Gender Dynamics in the Communities*



The men that FoE Cameroon surveyed all consider themselves to be the "head" of their households, but none of the women do. Women have limited opportunities compared to men and do not have equal access to resources. Their education is generally limited to primary school, and they tend to lack vocational or technological training, as well as access to credit for business. Surveys and focus group discussions revealed that women do not have equal decision-making power. They may attend meetings with men, but their opinions are generally voiced through a representative and not given the same weight as men's.

In Cameroon, a customary land tenure system promotes "male hegemony over land" (Endeley, 2010). Land is the primary resource for rural livelihoods, a cornerstone for citizenship within

communities and for rural development, but women's land rights are precarious (Endeley, 2010). Farming and trading provide the main sources of household income, with each household containing at least one person who farms, generally female. Women spend an additional two to twelve hours per day on unpaid work such as childcare and household duties. Women and children also bear the responsibility of collecting water; sources are located within one kilometer from their homes and it generally takes them "less than one hour" to get to their water source. Men typically spend one to six hours per day on unpaid work.

### ***Gender Impacts of the Pipeline in Cameroon***

The Chad-Cameroon oil pipeline project has had negative impacts on local women and men along the pipeline route, who worry about unemployment, lack of compensation for land lost to the pipeline and environmental effects, including coastal erosion. Women specified that the pipeline worsened their decision-making power, access to resources, ability to meet daily needs, status in their communities, household and personal income, amount and quality of farmland, water quality, local habitat and harvests. They also reported an increase in domestic violence and "sexual subordination" to men. All survey respondents have had "a drop in income and an increase in poverty," and FoE Cameroon observed signs of desperation on the part of community residents. To FoE affiliates, many of the Pygmy children looked severely malnourished, and parents complained bitterly of acute food shortages.

*"We are not happy with this project... We are endangered because most of our medicinal plants have been destroyed and there are virtually no other alternatives. No other woman has ever participated in the consultation meetings of the pipelines company. I last met with them in 1999 and since then no one has consulted me... All this is happening because we don't have anybody to defend our rights."*

*–Pygmy tribe spokeswoman*

FoE Cameroon heard reports of prostitution rising as a result of male pipeline construction workers moving to town. One resident claimed, "They chased our girls and sometimes gave them only 200 francs (US\$5) after sexual intercourse." Most interviewees feel safe near the project site, but some do not "because the workers were strangers in the communities" who hung out in bars. In addition, pipeline male security officers increased as a result of the pipeline to "protect the installations" and "control traffic." The majority of respondents said that they did not feel afraid of the security officers, but one man reported that "the presence of the security prevents the young girls of Bagyeli from going to the pipeline site."

### ***Gender Impacts on Livelihoods and Employment***

Women, who constitute the majority (over 70 percent) of Cameroon's subsistence farmers, report the destruction of crops on which they depend for their livelihoods due to the loss of farmland and decrease in soil fertility caused by pipeline construction. Bagyeli hunters depend on the forest for livelihood and subsistence, but entire sections of the forest have been cut off because of the pipeline. Hunters must now travel further and spend more time to hunt and gather food. The noise of construction machines scares wildlife away. One male Pygmy farmer reported:

*"As hunters, both males and females lay traps for animals in the forests. Also, our men go very far into the forests to hunt. Now, when the pipelines construction*

*began, they carried out massive blasting of rocks and in the process, the animals fled far away from within reach. Also, they have restricted our movements in the forests and we can't go far to hunt or set traps anymore. And they never kept the promises of alternative sources of livelihoods they promised us. They have carried out the construction and gone and we are now vulnerable more than ever before... My impression of the pipelines? We are not happy about the pipelines at all. Our livelihoods are derived from the forests and right now, we no longer have access to forest resources."*

Jobs related to pipeline development overwhelmingly went to men over women, and mostly to men from outside the community. The pipeline created short-term, manual work in construction, digging and land clearing, but by the time of FoE Cameroon's field visit, most of the jobs no longer existed. The quarry, which had formerly provided sand extraction jobs to men, was closed because of the pipeline. Men in the community sought jobs cleaning oil containers for the project, but were unsuccessful. Women "worked" as food vendors for the pipelines workers during the construction period, or as domestic help, and were paid less than men. The only jobs that some women received during the period were that of sex work around the base camps for pipelines employees. One female community resident reported:



*"Not a single woman was employed by the company. In 2001, COTCO [Cameroon Oil Transportation Company} representatives came to call women to work as housekeepers at the workers' camp base. We thought we were to resume the next day but until today nobody was called to take up jobs; only men were called. [...] A lot of prostitution took place around the camp then. Women were trooping in from as far as Doula for sex work here."*

Because women bear responsibility for their families' food security and welfare, the loss of income-generating activities has forced women to double their efforts to make ends meet. Both women and men reported spending more time working now than they did five or ten years ago and that "business has become more difficult." Most survey respondents said that they are unable to meet their household priorities, as "there is less money than before the pipelines." Asked whether their income had changed since the start of the pipeline project, 20 people (of 26) reported a drop in income and "degraded" ability to pay for household needs. However, culture dictates that it is unacceptable for men to do work that has traditionally been relegated to women, such that even when men are unemployed they do not compensate by pitching in with household care (CAMSO, 2011).

#### *Gender Discrimination in Consultation and Compensation*

Women in the surveyed communities have minimal access to public information due to their low levels of education and a culture that undervalues women's role in society. The pipeline project reinforced this discrimination, as women were virtually absent in decision-making

processes related to the pipeline. Women did not have open access to project information, such as possible socioeconomic and environmental risks. All survey participants had heard of the pipeline, although very few people that FoE Cameroon spoke to had been consulted. Respondents estimated that 20 to 50 people attended government meetings on the pipeline, but believe that those who raised concerns made little impact on the project design. All respondents agreed that more men than women attended, and that men and women were not equally involved in consultations. One female Bantu farmer reported:

*"The pipeline hasn't changed out economic status for the better. We are still in the same state of poverty that we have always known. Yes, I attended a few of their meetings but that hasn't changed anything... They haven't fulfilled their promises."*



Women faced discrimination in compensation for lost crops, which was significantly smaller than men's compensation for larger cocoa crops: "the differences in global market prices for traditional export crops and local market prices for food crops explain the enormous differences in compensation" (Endeley, 2010). Compensation for lost land to pipeline construction went almost exclusively to men, amounts not equal to the value of the resources that were lost. One farmer, who had been farming since 1984 until the pipeline passed through his farm and destroyed his crops, showed FoE Cameroon affiliates papers with sums of promised compensation by the pipeline company that were never paid. In both Nkometou and Bandevouri, women said that they felt excluded since they were not involved in managing individual compensation. The exact amount of compensation received by husbands for their wives' farmland was not disclosed to women in most households. A Bantu woman from Nzingui explained:

*"I lost my one and half acre farm to the pipelines construction. That was in 2001. I have never seen the pipelines representatives. It was my husband they took to assess and cost the farm, and he negotiated with them and collected my compensation, which was 50, 000 CFA [approximately US\$101]. He collected the money on my behalf so I am not really sure of the exact amount they paid him. I have now relocated to another farm, though the pipelines company insists we must not plant economic trees. I now farm only cassava."*

A 56-year old Bantu mother of 3 similarly stated:

*"I am a farmer and I plant cassava, yams and had a small banana plantation. My farm was one of those affected during the construction of the pipelines. I waited to see if I could get any compensation, but I was never consulted; the pipelines company related only with the men in my village. One of those days, the pipelines people came and took only men to count the crops though women also had farms on their own. Thus, during compensation, only the men were compensated. I believe the pipelines project was considered as a man's project and that was why we were not consulted or carried along."*



### *Gender Impacts of Environmental Degradation*

When asked how the quality of the water has changed in the last five or ten years, several respondents indicated a negative change with respect to odor, cleanliness, taste, and the quality of standing water, and that local water sources have become "saltier." Respondents reported poor air quality in the community, as well as a foul smell coming from the project sites. They also expressed great concern about coastal erosion from the pipelines. This has a disproportionately negative impact on women, who are responsible for fetching water and caring for the health of their families. A 50 year old Bantu woman reported:

*"My house is located very close to the pipelines. Since the pipelines were brought here, we started seeing changes in our water. This started since around February or March 2002. The water in the two wells that we use for drinking, for our washing and other things became brownish in color. Now, we can't use it for drinking anymore except to wash clothes. After I noticed the brownish color, I went to the pipelines company to complain several times and they promised to dig another well for us, but they didn't do anything. It is very difficult to get water. Now we have to walk two kilometres to fetch water. I would have dug another one if I had money. I believe it is because they don't take us women seriously. For instance, since 2001 since they started the pipelines construction around my village, this [meeting with FoE Cameroon] is the first time that we have a meeting called for women of the area. Most of the meetings have been for the men."*



### *Broken Promises*

Project supporters promised compensation for land lost to the pipeline in the form of community infrastructure and monetary compensation, but failed to deliver. Community members reported that they were specifically promised small business loans for women, jobs, schools, medicinal dispensaries and a "fight against sea shore erosion." However, communities were not compensated for lost forest revenue. No operational wells or water sources were built, nor did community members receive any agricultural supplies or machinery. According to residents, infrastructure was not built "according to the rules." In one community, the classroom built still lacks lights and a sufficient number of teachers and the poorly constructed clinic has yet to become operational. In another community, no schools were built. The Bantu community asked for electricity as compensation for land lost, but was told that it would be too expensive. One male spokesperson for the Pygme tribe reported:

*"They promised to build schools, but as we speak, they have not built a single classroom here. The only school we have now was built by the government here last September (2010). ... [The pipeline company] used to give seedlings, but for a long time now we haven't been given anything. We asked for boreholes but they were never provided. They promised to give 50 roofing sheets to each of the eight Bagyeli families, but only two families got them; I and the chief. We asked them for pipe borne water but until now they refused to give it to us. We still use the water from the stream here for drinking and for everything."*

## THE WEST AFRICAN GAS PIPELINES (WAGP)

The WAGP is a 681 kilometer pipeline that transports natural gas for industrial and commercial use from the conflict-ridden Niger Delta region in Nigeria to Benin, Togo and Ghana. The first section of gas transport relies on the over 20 year old Lagos-Escravos pipeline, which was built without an Environmental Impact Assessment. WAPCo, the public-private partnership that owns the pipeline, consists of the four host governments and an oil consortium led by Chevron Texaco and Royal Dutch Shell, and supported by loans and grants from the WBG and EIB. Originally estimated to cost US\$590 million, the pipeline's final price exceeded US\$1 billion. Offshore construction was completed in December 2006, but instability in the Niger Delta region and pipeline leaks delayed gas flow until March 2008.



### *The World Bank and the Pipeline*

In 1991, the World Bank prepared a feasibility report for the project, entitled "Supplying Nigerian Gas in West African Market." The four host country governments signed a Heads of Agreement in 1995 and a Memorandum of Understanding in 1999, which established the WAGP's legal framework and named Chevron as the WAGP project manager. Rife with political uncertainties and questions about economic viability, the project took off slowly, but with the support of the World Bank, the countries "[came] up with a shared vision of the project" (All Africa, 2009). In 2004, the World Bank approved a loan of US\$125 million in guarantees to support the WAGP project. In addition, IDA financed a guarantee of US\$50 million over 22 years, and the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) provided political risk insurance for US\$75 million over 20 years. In 2006, the EIB provided an additional €75 million (approximately US\$94.5 million) loan to the Government of Ghana.

Approval for WAGP construction came on the heels of a 2003 Extractive Industry Review (EIR) initiated by the World Bank. The review recommended that the Bank place a moratorium on further funding of fossil fuel projects, noting such projects' negative impacts on gender equality, human rights, social development and state conflict. Instead of heeding the EIR recommendations, the World Bank's involvement in WAGP proved critical to moving the project forward, just as it had been with the Chad-Cameroon pipeline. The oil consortium indicated it would not implement the project without WBG assistance in mitigating the investment risks. The World Bank would therefore "provide comfort to all the stakeholders regarding project preparation and implementation standards" (World Bank, 2004).

The pipeline project aimed to improve the competitiveness of the energy sectors in Ghana, Benin, and Togo by promoting the use of cheaper and environmentally cleaner gas from Nigeria, supporting reforms to facilitate private sector participation in the energy sector, and fostering regional economic and political integration to spur economic growth (World Bank, 2004). Justifications for World Bank involvement included "ending Nigeria's harmful gas flaring" and "reducing the cost of energy" (World Bank, 2004). Meanwhile, the oil consortium sought to enter the WAGP into the emissions trading market by requesting "carbon credits" for any reduction in gas flares to boost its own profits, despite the fact that this would merely comply with existing Nigerian law, which states that gas flares grossly violate human rights in the Niger Delta region.

World Bank intervention would also allegedly “harmonize the regional, institutional, legal and regulatory frameworks in the participating western African countries in the context of the World Bank’s West Africa Regional Integration Assistance Strategy (RIAS)” (FoEI, 2006). However, regional integration has been undermined by tensions over resource ownership, such as the militarization and social upheaval of the Niger Delta region arising from conflicts over oil and gas wealth. In addition, though cited in project documents as a supporter and administrator of regional integration, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) had little to no role in the project’s development.

*“One of the most exciting aspects of this project is that it ties together people, economies and nations to benefit from the huge region of sub-Saharan Africa. It is our hope that the vision of unprecedented economic growth and enhanced stability resulting from the benefits created by this project can be realized” (All Africa, 2009).*  
-Chevron’s Overseas Petroleum President

### ***The Pipeline’s Gender Impacts***

The World Bank’s Project Appraisal Document for WAGP mentions no gender objectives or dimensions and gives no specific attention to women in communities impacted by pipeline development. The document only mentions women in a discussion about consultation, stating that Bank staff “actively sought inclusive participation in the meetings and ensured that women, fisherfolk, youth groups, traditional leaders, traditional council members, religious leaders, village chiefs and notables, community based organizations, local NGOs, land owners, local associations and business persons were present” (World Bank, 2004). The meeting attendance statistics disaggregate by gender, though the numbers reveal unequal gender consultation in favor of men.

As WAPCo took possession of lands in the Lagos and Ogun states, it displaced already impoverished Nigerian women and men, especially increasing women’s vulnerability by destroying their livelihoods, such as subsistence farming. The World Bank’s IP, in response to a claim filed by Nigerian NGOs, outlined a series of “mistakes” made in the WAGP, including that residents were paid just 10 percent of the established value of their land. FoE Nigeria states that “the compensation available to displaced community people in Nigeria is a mockery, as low as US\$20. This constitutes a gross violation of livelihood security” (BIC, 2005). According to the IP, the project “did not contain adequate information on the needs of vulnerable groups,” including women, and the project’s “analyses cannot be deemed adequate or defensible for an analysis of impoverishment or female vulnerability” (IP, 2006). The IP also determined that the Bank had refused to consider the pipeline’s impact on communities in the Niger Delta, the source of the gas, on the grounds that the multi-country pipeline was a distinct project from the wells and the older pipeline to Lagos that connect to the WAGP (BIC, 2008b).



## NIGERIA FIELD STUDY

With farmlands covered in oil, incessant poisonous gas flares and constant conflict surrounding them, women in the Niger Delta region suffer from some of the most severe socioeconomic and environmental degradation on the planet. The country produces an estimated US\$20 billion worth of oil per year, but Nigerian citizens have not seen the benefits of these economic rewards—92.4 percent of the population survives on less than US\$2 a day, with an income ratio (female /male) of 0.42 (Social Watch, 2009). Nigerian women and men have suffered displacement, severe impoverishment, human rights abuses, health consequences, and the loss of livelihood as a result of oil activities. The rates of infertility, stillbirths and deformed babies—especially devastating for women—as well as cancer, leukemia, bronchitis, asthma and other pollution-related ailments are unusually high in this region (Abah, 2009). Oil spills are frequent: between 1976 and 2001, the Nigerian government documented 6,817 spills—practically one every day for 25 years—but the actual rate could be up to ten times higher (Abah, 2009). At 13 percent of the global level, Nigeria is the world’s biggest gas “flarer,” which costs the country approximately US\$2.5 billion annually. The air pollution also causes acid rain, which damages crops, pollutes creeks and streams and corrodes housing structures.

### *Ajido, Araromi and Imeke Communities*

FoE Nigeria conducted field studies in three Nigerian communities: Ajido, Araromi, and Imeke, all in Badagry, Lagos. Badagry is a serene community tucked away from the bustling Lagos State to which it belongs. It is a border town between Nigeria and Benin, surrounded by a wide array of lagoons extending from the Atlantic Ocean, and known mostly for its fish, coconut trees, beaches and raffia palm weaving businesses, which are run by women. As host communities to the WAGP project, the Badagry communities of Ajido, Araromi and Imeke should have benefited from the promised development and social programs, but they have not.

### *Gender Dynamics in the Communities*

Men generally run the households in these communities and make decisions regarding household expenditure. Women express their opinions informally, but their opinions do not carry much weight in communal decision-making, as they are represented by their husbands and not allowed to sit at meetings with men. Women cannot claim land ownership, rendering death of a husband or divorce calamitous. Men have higher earning potential than women, as most women—in contrast with men—lack access to education, particularly higher education, credit and technology. Women constitute the majority of farmers, traders, raffia palm weavers and fishers, bearing the responsibility of providing subsistence for their families. They also spend two or more hours a day on unpaid work such as childcare, caring for the sick and elderly, fetching water, cooking, washing and gathering firewood.



Nigerian women try to organize for their rights, but face huge challenges. As one woman who attempted to attend a meeting with Shell representatives reported:

*"Instead of our men supporting us, some of them were discouraging us from going. Some even went as far as saying that if they had their way, they would ask Shell not to listen to us. Unfortunately, they meant it. By the time we had arrived at Shell's Kolo Creek Logistic Base at Imiringi, some of these [men] had spoken on the phone with their contacts in Shell to tell them not to attend to us... We were there with our bags of contaminated cassava, but they told us that the right person to see us was not around" (Abah, 2009).*

### **Gender Impacts of the Pipeline in Nigeria**



The WAGP project depreciated women's already marginalized purchasing power and influence in their communities. Women were more likely to be displaced by WAGP and did not get jobs through the project except for a very few low-paying jobs as washers and cooks. Their access to resources, ability to meet daily needs, household and personal income, and amount and quality of farmland have diminished. Women report that it now takes more time and effort to perform their work.

In general, FoE Nigeria noted that women and communities convey a sense of loss and negativity with regard to the pipeline. Since the WAGP project began, the communities appear to be under a military siege with the presence of armed personnel who guard the pipeline installations. When youths in Ajido led a peaceful protest against WAPCo's employment in 2009, the police responded violently. WAPCo deployed a battalion of policemen to Ajido, who severely beat up the youths and took them to the State Criminal Investigation Department detention camp in Panti, Lagos, where they were detained for several days. More specific WAGP gender impacts are described below.

#### *Gender Impacts on Livelihoods and Employment*

The alarming level of environmental degradation from the pipelines severely affects women's livelihoods. Underground pipes in the lagoons have disrupted aquatic life and introduced chemicals and heat to the water, drastically decreasing fish yields, which are a traditional source of livelihood for thousands of families. Community members report more hunger overall as a result. As one businesswoman said,

*"Many of the women are selling fish. Since they started this pipeline, there are no more fishes. The heat from their facilities is too much for our children. They are going to start flaring and we overheard that it is too dangerous."*



Women worry about raffia weaving, a trade passed down from their mothers, to sustain their families. Since WAPCo began gas flaring at facilities in Ajido, women have suffered from exceptionally low raffia palm crop yields. Palm trees slump lifelessly against each other with visibly yellow leaves. As these crops drop off drastically, women have little or nothing to fall back on. A resident of Ajido reported,

*"Our mat weaving business used to be very lucrative. That was what we were known for. It is the business of the village. But since the pipelines construction, things have never been the same again. The yields are very scanty now and that has greatly depreciated our business. There is no drinking water, and no electricity. Though they promised to give us drinking water, there is none. I spend as much as N4,000 (about US\$25) a month on buying drinking water. Now, we depend on the water vendor to survive."*

Residents reported that WAPCo reneged on its promise to employ qualified community members, and women were sidelined in employment opportunities. Most of the jobs, both in construction and subsequently in operations, went to non-indigenes of the communities. Locals received the most menial of jobs, which have now ceased to exist. Expatriate workers and those connected with WAPCo executives assumed the best paid positions, with salaries drastically higher than those offered to local workers. According to community members, WAPCo only employed four males from the communities surveyed by FoE Nigeria and not a single woman. As one female resident of Ajido reported:

*"People have been sent abroad to be trained as technicians to man the gas company, but there is no single Ajido indigene among them. People have been sent abroad to be trained as safety officer and security officers, but no single Ajido indigene among them. Yet, we have educated youths – graduates – and they are jobless. The gas flaring will destroy our farmland. What is supposed to be a blessing will very soon become a curse."*

A male former community representative similarly said:

*"Employment is an issue. We gave them four boys but only one was taken. We have stopped going to their meetings. No woman was employed from here or Ajido. Even at their compressor station, they have women and they are seen doing nothing. They brought people from Niger Delta to come and work here when there are people here, and when we talk too much, they will bring mobile policemen here to come and beat us. That is their plan."*

#### *Gender Discrimination in Consultation and Compensation*

FoE Nigeria could not find a single woman who was selected for community consultation in project planning or execution; the views of women were not represented at the community level or to pipelines company representatives. Surveys and interviews revealed that community members had limited information about the WAGP project overall; many people knew where the pipeline is located, but little else. Meaningful consultation in the communities did not take place before the project began. A few men were selected for consultation, taken to a WAGP office and made to sign a Memorandum of Understanding that they could not even comprehend.

Many women had their plantations, farmlands and ancestral lands taken by the WAGP. Because



women cannot own land, compensation for lost land went exclusively to men. Even so, many men were insufficiently compensated. A Badagry White-Cap chief reported:

*"A lot of our women have been pushed to one side. They are not involved in the process. There was no criteria for the compensation. When they were paying, some people received N3,000 (about US\$20), others received as little as N1,500 (about US\$10). When I even went to collect compensation for my land, they said it was not my name that is on the paper. I can say they didn't do anything for us."*

#### *Gender Impacts of Environmental Degradation*

Women bear the responsibility for providing water for their families, but the pipeline has limited their options. Chemical spills from WAGP facilities have polluted the river used for drinking; Ajido villagers complain of brown water. A 51-year-old trader reported, "This water here is so bad that it spoils even our plates. We know it is not good but we have no choice than to use it for drinking and everything else because we don't have any other alternative."

In addition, communities close to WAGP facilities reported cases of rashes and redness of eyes, more frequent coughs and higher rates of asthmas, which they believe are due to occasional nocturnal gas flaring. Environmental degradation also has detrimental reproductive health effects. One nurse reported,

*"Since the pipelines construction began, things have not been the same anymore. I had to treat several cases of asthma and rashes. The presence of the pipelines has brought about excessive heat yet they have not equipped the health centre with drugs. As a trained nurse, I know that when there is excessive heat, the fetus inside the woman finds it very difficult to breathe or move about."*

#### *Broken Promises*

Women in particular pointed to the deception on the part of WAPCo, which had promised to improve their lives. They say they were promised improved infrastructure and facilities, but these have not materialized. The roads, needed for mostly female farmers to transport products



to markets, are in worse condition now from WAPCo's heavy duty vehicles, undermining women's income potential. In Ajido, the one classroom built was shabbily executed, and the one clinic built is no longer functional, reducing access to education and healthcare, especially to women and girls who cannot afford the costs and insecurity of traveling outside the communities. Promised water facilities such as boreholes remain either non-functional or so badly constructed that the water is not drinkable, increasing dysentery and other illnesses mothers must manage.

## **TOGO FIELD STUDY**

According to FoE Togo, Togo's government has not demonstrated transparency in the management of natural resources and mining, or taken into account the interests of local populations, particularly women and girls, with regard to extractive resources. Togo's people thus have no assurance that their human, economic, and environmental rights will be met. Since 2003, FoE Togo has engaged in defending the rights of affected populations by visiting and engaging with local communities, advocating for implementation of recommendations from WAGP's environmental and social impact analyses and the adoption of international standards in the pipeline areas, and asking Togo's government to ensure accountability on the part of pipeline developers. The initiative detailed in this report has brought a critical gender dimension to FoE Togo's advocacy work.

### *Gbetsogbe, Katanga and Kangnikope Communities*

FoE Togo conducted field research in the Gbetsogbe, Katanga, and Kangnikope communities in Togo. Approximately 1,000 people live in Gbetsogbe, representing various ethnic groups that include people from Ewe (the majority), Kabyè, Benin, Hausa, Ibo (Nigeria) and Mali. Most inhabitants participate in the fishing industry. Katanga, a sub-district of Togo's capital, Lomé, is populated by just over 1,200 inhabitants, predominantly ethnic Ewe and Mina fishermen and women fish processors. Kangnikope is populated by more than 56,000 inhabitants, predominantly farmers who are ethnically Kabyè or nationals of neighboring countries.

### *Gender Dynamics in the Communities*

All of the men FoE Togo interviewed had attended school, but not all of the women had. Men in the communities have exclusive rights to own land, which provides them with a resource for income through the sale or lease of land and/or farming. Women, the majority of farmers, have only limited access to land, mostly through their spouses. Women also lack credit, mostly able to obtain it through their husbands or families.

Likewise, women depend on their families and husbands for access to education and technology. Women generally only exert decision-making power if they contribute financial resources to the household, and make decisions through discussions with their husbands. Prohibited from sitting with men in communal meetings, women are under-represented in public decision-making spheres.



As in many parts of the world, women's livelihood in these communities tends to revolve around unvalued work—child and household care. In Togo, women supplement this with income-generating activities such as farming, small businesses, gardening, fish processing and sale, sand and gravel extraction and sale. Women's unpaid work ranges from two to nine hours per day; men's, one to six hours per day. The most common paid jobs for men include fishing, driving, traditional medicine, farming and state service jobs. The communities generate income mostly through fishing and fish processing, civil service jobs, gravel and sand extraction and sale, and restaurants.

### ***Gender Impacts of the Pipeline in Togo***

FoE Togo noted that WAGP represents a deep malaise for Togolese women, who faced discrimination in consultation and hiring processes, and have lost income as a result of the



pipeline project. Women expressed fear that “what has happened to women in the Niger Delta region will happen to [them].” They also reported that they have lost confidence in themselves because of the threat of suffering, human rights abuses and being forced from the land on which they farm. Women said they feel “heavier” now, with poorer health and increased fragility.

Both women and men report their highest priorities to be earning income to provide daily food for their households, educating their children and covering health care costs. Since the pipelines’ construction, they cannot meet these needs. One woman said, “I cannot honor all the responsibilities that rely on me,” while another reported she has “difficulty to afford health expenses and social responsibilities.” One village elder now “spends more time listening to complaints from people” about their lost property. Two men said they have to devote more time to “activities that can make a better life for the family,” while another said, “my job no longer allows me to ensure properly expenditure that I face as a breadwinner.” Other concerns cited by community members as a result of pipeline activities include loss of subsistence; loss of land; unemployment; restrictions on fishing areas due to security measures; health problems; security problems; juvenile delinquency; coastal erosion, industrial pollution; and flooding.

Male migrant workers moved into the communities, which caused frustration, suspicion and insecurity. When not working, the men “wandered” or “moved about” according to respondents. For male community members, male migrant workers caused “mutual tension.” For some female community members, the male migrant workers were associated with “insecurity.”



The presence of security officers in the communities also increased after the pipeline was built, but this did not make residents feel secure because—all respondents agreed—the security officers were there “to protect their installations.”

#### *Gender Impacts on Livelihoods and Employment*

Both women and men from the communities reported losing income. According to fishers and fish processors, fishing has been prohibited in some areas of the sea, and the quantity of fish has dropped significantly. Women who run small sand and gravel extraction businesses reported that the pipeline project has also taken over shore land, which has either harmed their businesses or forced them to close altogether. In a place where land represents capital and subsistence, pipeline project sponsors expropriated much land for unfair prices and restricted inhabitants’ overall access to farmland, causing a decrease in crops and income. A fish seller and mother of nine children reported:

*“The project should have been something of good news but just that it has brought about restrictions for us. They took our land that we used for vegetable farming and restrict our husbands from fishing deep into the sea, and from getting gravels from the sea, so we are affected. We feel betrayed. The pipelines company breaks their own promises.”*

All respondents reported that men and women did not receive equal employment opportunities or equal pay. Ultimately, the pipeline consortium "hired its own people." Of the few jobs that were created, approximately 15-20 percent went to community members, while the rest went to people outside the affected communities. All respondents agreed that many more men than women received the limited jobs, which included short-term manual labor (construction, clearing the site, digging holes, etc). Almost all of the jobs had ended by the time of the FoE survey.

With the pipeline's negative impact on women's income generation, women feel their household decision-making power has decreased, as their ability to earn income determines their degree of autonomy. Further, when men lose their jobs, women have to double their efforts to provide for their households. According to survey respondents, some women who could not find jobs to compensate for their husbands' loss of employment turned to prostitution to make ends meet, sacrificing their reputations in the communities. Familial tensions that resulted from lost income have undermined communities' social fabric and led some households to separate. Some men and women have migrated in search of better opportunities.

*"I came to live here with my parents at age 15. We are basically fishermen and women. The going had been good and we were contented with our lives until the pipelines company came with their promises... They promised to build market stalls, clinic, cold room, good roads and electricity. If they do that we would be happy and it would definitely reduce poverty around here. After they asked us what we wanted and we told them we needed locked-up shops and a cold room to store our fishes. They returned and built open market. But that is not what we demanded. They also built a cold room facility and didn't equip it so it is now lying waste. We have no electricity. They built a road and the road stopped right at the company gate. It doesn't extend to our community. Because the cold room is not functional, our fish usually go bad and we record a lot of losses. We feel disappointed. We feel they are lying. They should fulfill their promises"*

-48 year old fisher seller community leader in

Gbetsogbe and mother of 11 children

#### *Gender Discrimination in Consultation and Compensation*

Both men and women stated that the project consultations sidelined women. More men than women engaged in consultations (about 70 percent male/ 30 percent female), with processes tailored toward those who could read and write (men). Further, the focus of the discussions tended toward land issues, an area seen as a male domain. The pipeline consortium did not adequately consult women in either the design or implementation stages of the project, only addressing them peripherally during "awareness-raising" by project promoters. Notably, the project failed to consider the concerns of women fish sellers, a group that organized to speak out about the effects of the project. All respondents agreed that the little compensation for received for lost land did not equal the value of the resources lost and that compensation went almost exclusively to males.

#### *Gender Impacts of Environmental Degradation*

Community residents reported that they become ill more often and their illnesses last longer since the pipeline project began. A traditional medicine practitioner confirmed that the frequency of illness had risen in the community. While he has seen more patients, they have not been able to pay for treatment since their incomes have drastically declined due to the pipelines. The communities have also become more industrial, which exposes the populations

to industrial pollution. Although no formal study on the pipelines' impact on local HIV prevalence has been conducted, two female respondents reported an increase in HIV in the communities. Others claimed that more people have become infected with STIs, to which women are more biologically vulnerable, as a result of the male influx of pipeline workers and prostitution around project sites. Residents also reported increases in waterborne illnesses such as diarrhea, cholera and typhoid. They stressed that they have to go to the doctor more often than they used to, and sicknesses that used to be easily treated are no longer so because people's bodies have become increasingly vulnerable.



### *Broken Promises*

According to survey respondents, project proponents promised infrastructure to the communities in the form of grants for women for small businesses, schools, jobs, dispensaries, road improvements, markets and a "fight against sea shore erosion." Respondents reported that the pipeline company built one classroom, but without teachers or adequate lighting, it remained unused. One 80 year old female fish seller reported, "They promised to give us loans, but I still haven't seen anything like that." The one clinic built through the project was deemed poorly constructed and currently stands empty.

The pipeline company did not build any wells or water sources, nor did it provide any agricultural supplies or machines. The respondents did not know of any social programs that had been established through the project, or any improvement in infrastructure.

## **GHANA FIELD STUDY**

Ghana has a relatively strong economy compared to other Sub-Saharan African countries, and its poverty level dropped from 52 percent in 1992 to 28.5 percent in 2006 (Walters, 2010). However, WAGP was not built in the interest of Ghana's people. Ghana's Energy Commission concluded that the WAGP would not be economically viable as it would provide only a slight comparative advantage to using oil for energy while locking Ghana into buying gas at a monopoly price set by WAGP for 20 years and ruling out future alternative energy choices. Furthermore, the majority of gas and oil will power large businesses, meaning "the ordinary Ghanaian citizen or small business will not be able to access this energy" (BIC, 2005).

### *Kpone, Abuesi and Aboadze Communities*

FoE Ghana conducted field research in the Kpone, Abuesi and Aboadze communities. Abuesi and Aboadze are located in the southwestern region of Accra, Ghana's capital city, while Kpone is located close to Tema, Ghana's premier harbor city southeast of Accra. The pipeline in the Tema Area of Ghana runs between Kpone and Tema New Town, both fishing communities. Approximately 11,230 people inhabit Kpone. Ethnically, Kpone is predominantly Ga-adangme, and is also home to Akan and Ewe-speaking tribes. Abuesi and Aboadze are home to about 9,000 people each. Ethnically composed of Fantis with some marginal Ewe populations, these semi-urban communities experience seasonal migration patterns; inhabitants mostly engage in trade, commerce and fishing. Lately, the communities have recorded rising poverty levels and decreasing fish stocks, which have been exacerbated by expanding industrial trawling in the area.

### *Gender Dynamics in the Communities*

Women's paid work in the communities includes fish processing and marketing, petty trading, farming and cassava processing. Men work in the fishing and steel industries, as well as in boat mechanics. Women's unpaid work includes child care, laundry, fetching firewood and water and mobilizing church members, and they spend more hours on unpaid work than men (an average of six to eight hours versus men's three to four hours). Every household surveyed has at least one farmer, usually female, who typically spends between three to six hours on the farm per day. However, men own the land on which women work. Respondents reported that productivity and crop yields have not significantly changed except in some locations where land has been overused, population and urbanization have increased, and land has been lost to development.

The majority of respondents, both male and female, have attended some school, which is accessible for free, though female completion rates are lower. Women do not have the same access to resources as men: they have minimal access to credit, no land ownership, and limited access to technology and vocational training. Women make decisions through discussions with their husbands, women's social groups and representatives, as well as through the "queen mother," the female chief. Women are represented in the community through appointments, and depending on the issue at hand, they sometimes attend meetings alongside men.

### ***Gender Impacts of the Pipeline in Ghana***

FoE Ghana did not obtain as much data on WAGP's impact compared to other affiliates because the pipeline reached Ghanaian communities last; in some areas, gas has yet to flow. However, FoE Ghana did collect information about negative gender impacts related to deteriorating livelihoods, inadequate consultation, unequal employment opportunities and compensation for land, and negative health impacts. Since the pipeline project began, respondents report fewer fish and marketing options. Income has dropped so low that families cannot afford necessities throughout the year, including energy, school expenses and health care. Women cited their main concerns to be their lack of skill and capacity to engage in the pipeline development or alternative industries; employment; pollution control; environmental integrity; health and education. Men reported their main concerns to be education, employment, the safety of Gao Lagoon, pollution and fisheries, and resource protection.

### *Gender Impacts on Livelihoods and Employment*

Women's livelihoods have been negatively impacted due to restricted land access and environmental degradation. Women reported that it now takes longer to reach their farmland. In addition, the pipeline and its associated infrastructure work severely undermine access to fish supplies, as pipelines in the sea beds produce heat, contributing to low fish yields. Women reported that fish are either dead or half-dead by the time people catch them. Although the pipeline has not fully taken off in Kpone, it has already affected fishing groups because lights during construction kept fish away from the fishing grounds. Since women contribute around 75 percent to fish value chain processes (labor, transformation of raw fish to finished product, and marketing and distribution input), the pipeline's impact on fishing has disproportionately harmed women. As a result of their lost livelihoods, some women "made relationships" with the workers who migrated from outside communities during pipeline construction.

Though the WAGP project created a few jobs, most went to men from outside the communities. Only a few community members found employment during the construction stage, and they have since been disbanded. Men worked in construction, pipe-welding, and truck driving, while women mostly worked as food vendors. Employment proved short-term, around one to two months, and unequal for men and women in terms of pay, labor and time. There was no indication after the project that WAPCo still employed any women; only one male respondent from the surveyed communities reported having been employed by WAPCo at all. As one fisherwoman reported:



*"The pipelines' representatives only employ people close to them, from outside. We have graduates here but they didn't employ them, not even as security workers. The pipeline is going to kill our fishing industry. I am pleading for (alternative) employment."*

A 50 year-old woman from Aboadze reported:

*"These pipelines have spoilt so many things, prominently, our fishing nets. Sometime ago, during the pipelines construction, our fishing nets were stuck in the pipes and got torn. Then we didn't know our rights. Only about three people were compensated with 500 Cedi (approximately US\$320) each, leaving the rest of us. And as I speak, the destruction of our nets still continues. We understand that our senator was given the compensation money to give out but some of us never received it."*

#### *Gender Discrimination in Consultation and Compensation*

According to survey respondents, consultation processes aimed at enlisting community views largely excluded women's participation overall. The WAGP project lacked in-depth community consultation during the design and implementation phases in general. All respondents had heard of the pipeline and knew where it was located, and project information was available to all. However, most respondents did not have an opportunity to provide direct input. Only two people interviewed (one man, one woman) attended the planning meetings, where they were asked about their views and expectations, but they felt their input held no weight. Similarly, compensation for lost land was either inadequate or not forthcoming; when dispersed, compensation was given almost exclusively to men.

#### *Gender Impacts of Environmental Degradation*

Many respondents complained of rashes and skin diseases, which they attributed to the pipelines and pollutants from gas leaks. In 2008, a gas leak occurred in Abuesi and Aboadze, causing illnesses in the surrounding communities. The leak affected the overall fish supply, and people who fed on the fish developed skin diseases and stomach disorders. One woman from Aboadze explained:

*"The pipeline has also brought us ill health. In 2008, there was an oil spill here and many people in my immediate community of Matse-Mankabi located very close to the Tema Plant fell sick. My three children, Ebenezer (8 years), Emmanuel (6*

*years) and Priscilla (4 years) also fell very sick. There were no drugs in the clinic here so I had to take them to the Volta Region Authority Hospital. I spent more than One Million Cedi, yet still nobody has come to compensate us for all the suffering. It was an ugly experience."*

#### *Broken Promises*

Pipeline proponents promised cheap gas, social support, infrastructure, community development, education, employment and school facilities. WAGP provided some new amenities, including a drainage system, a community hall, a new market, a teacher bungalow, a health clinic upgrade and a "Volta Region Authority Scholarship Scheme for Students," however it did not provide water sources or agriculture supplies. The "cheap gas" promised to community members has yet to materialize, as gas flow has been either erratic or non-existent.



*"The Pipelines have brought sickness and hunger to us. This is as a result of the pollution in the sea and the loss of jobs. We are not happy about it. It has also affected our health. People fall sick here more often than before. Our fishing business is jeopardized. Fishes die all the time so we don't get enough to catch. This has rendered us unemployed. It has affected our economy. I remember we used to get a lot of money from the fish business but all that is now history. Our social life is also now dead, boring and useless because we hardly do anything other than to sit and chat all day due to the situation. Things have gone worse in my community. It used to be peaceful here but now people are sad and confused. We women are hardly consulted. There was a meeting held at Aboadze which I attended, and I requested to be employed, but they haven't done that. They have hardly done anything for us. They promised to build school, public toilet and hospital, but they haven't fulfilled their promise. They have never called a women's meeting to get our views. We badly need educational and health facilities and also employment."*

*—40 year-old fish seller and mother of six, Abuesi community*

## CONCLUSIONS

IFIs publicly pledge poverty reduction and gender equality, but their investments undermine the precarious rights and livelihoods of poor women. The Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipeline and WAGP represent gender discrimination, broken promises, destroyed livelihoods and environmental degradation to the women that Gender Action and FoE member groups surveyed in Cameroon, Nigeria, Ghana and Togo. While the pipeline projects undermined the rights and livelihoods of entire communities, they doubly marginalized women.

Both projects exacerbated existing gender discriminations and inequalities by depriving women of their critical livelihoods and favoring men in consultation, hiring and compensation schemes. The land appropriation and economic dynamics accompanying pipeline construction deepened women's poverty without providing alternative income-generating options. This forces women to work harder for less pay in order to provide for their families or even turn to prostitution to survive, causing increases in HIV and other STI transmission. Oil spills and gas flares are life-threatening to women in project areas, and have been linked to stillbirths, infertility, cancer and other negative health impacts. Greenhouse gas emissions contribute to climate change, which disproportionately threatens women's subsistence-based livelihood and vulnerability to natural disasters. Contaminated water sources and soil degradation resulting from pipeline activities further undermine women's subsistence and health. Large concentrations of male migrant workers around pipeline sites and conflicts over resource profits lead to insecurity for women and susceptibility to gender-based violence.

Despite promising social development, the IFI-financed Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipeline and WAGP proved enormously profitable to multinational companies at the expense of vulnerable women along pipeline sights. Further, IFI financial support facilitated the very existence of both pipelines, as multinational companies stated publicly that they would not proceed without World Bank Group mitigation of investment risks. Once involved, the World Bank Group provided no gender analyses, objectives, safeguards or monitoring mechanisms—omissions that are compounded by the Bank's lack of a mandated gender policy and consequential absent accountability for the negative gender impacts of its investments. The African women whose rights, livelihoods and health are harmed by these pipelines thus have no hope for redress.

Rather than addressing the abundant evidence testifying to the severely harmful gender, social and environmental risks of extractive industries, as illustrated through these pipelines, IFIs continue to prop up sectors that are most detrimental to the people they claim to protect. IFI investments in extractive industries have soared in recent years. The Chad-Cameroon Oil Pipeline and WAGP are just two of many examples of IFI-supported socially-insensitive extractive industries projects. IFIs make investment decisions with governments behind closed doors, enabling private companies to use public funds to implement projects with unmitigated social risks. In light of their stark poverty, inequality and exposure to violence, African women have paid too high a price for the huge disconnect between IFI rhetoric and actions. To live up to their stated promises to reduce poverty and promote gender equality, IFIs must rigorously invest in women's rights—instead of the extractive industries that destroy them.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS (IFIs):

Based on this report's findings and conclusions, Gender Action and Friends of the Earth recommend that IFIs not fund pipelines or other extractive industries projects:

- If gender and environmental assessments indicate unavoidable human and women's rights violations or environmental degradation that will compromise women's livelihoods.
- That emit greenhouse gases, which contribute to climate change, negatively impact women's subsistence activities and increase women's disproportionate vulnerability to natural disasters.
- That pass through or near populated areas—putting residents' health at risk from oil spills and gas flares—or entail the appropriation of land, as women's land rights are precarious in many developing countries.

In projects that they *do* fund, IFIs must:

- Implement enforceable gender policies that mandate gender safeguards to ensure that women's rights are not violated in project implementation, with regard to livelihood, health, access to land, security and decision-making power.
- Adhere to international laws that recognize women's rights to ensure that IFI loan agreements do not undermine states' or companies' human rights obligations.
- Comprehensively integrate gender into all IFI investments and at all stages, including planning, implementation and evaluation, as every intervention affects women and men differently. Specifically, IFIs must:
  - ◇ Conduct gender assessments of relevant communities prior to project approval in order to determine gender dynamics and compensate for gender inequalities.
  - ◇ Ensure that women and men have equal access to project benefits, such as employment, compensation and infrastructure.
  - ◇ Comply with decades-old calls to collect and analyze sex-disaggregated data throughout the life of projects in order to measure the project's differential outcomes and impacts on women and men.
- Engage in *genuine* and equitable community consultation by involving stakeholders through transparent participatory processes, ensuring the equal representation of women and men in community, national and IFI-level decision-making that impacts project design and implementation.
- Strengthen accountability measures to ensure that communities are sufficiently compensated for IFI and company failures to comply with human rights and environmental standards, which disproportionately affects women's livelihoods. Specifically, IFIs must:
  - ◇ Make gender policies mandatory in order to facilitate submission of gender discrimination cases to accountability mechanisms such as the World Bank Inspection Panel.
  - ◇ Remove the legal immunity of companies, which prevents communities from obtaining justice in the form of legal redress for violations of their human rights.



## REFERENCES

- Abah, 2009. 'When Blessing Becomes a Curse in the Niger Delta.'  
[http://www.wunrn.com/news/2010/04\\_10/04\\_12\\_10/041210\\_niger.htm](http://www.wunrn.com/news/2010/04_10/04_12_10/041210_niger.htm)
- All Africa, 2009. 'Gains, Constraints of the \$1.8 Billion West Africa Gas Pipeline Project.'  
<http://allafrica.com/stories/200912020110.html>
- Amnesty International, 2005. 'Contracting Out of Human Rights: The Chad-Cameroon Pipeline Project.'  
<http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/POL34/012/2005/en/76f5b921-d4bf-11dd-8a23-d58a49c0d652/pol340122005en.pdf>
- Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2008, 'Cameroon Country Report.'  
<http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/pdfid/4d7f61612.pdf>
- BIC (Bank Information Center), 2005. 'New African Gas Pipeline Worries Civil Society.'  
<http://www.bicusa.org/en/Article.2327.aspx>
- BIC, 2007. 'Impact of Chad-Cameroon project on local population worse than expected.'  
<http://www.bicusa.org/en/Article.3261.aspx>
- BIC, 2008a. 'World Bank announces withdrawal from Chad-Cameroon Pipeline after early repayment.'  
<http://www.bicusa.org/en/Article.3892.aspx>
- BIC, 2008b. 'World Bank acknowledges serious flaws in West African Gas Pipeline.'  
<http://www.bicusa.org/en/Article.3864.aspx>
- Bretton Woods Project, 2010. 'Gender-blindness and conditionality cast shadow over record World Bank lending.'  
<http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/art-566643>
- Breitkopf, S. and Nguiffo, S., 2001. 'Broken Promises: The Chad Cameroon Oil and Pipeline Project; Profit at Any Cost?'  
[http://www.ciel.org/Publications/chadcam\\_broken\\_promises.PDF](http://www.ciel.org/Publications/chadcam_broken_promises.PDF)
- CAMSO (Cameroon Support Organization), 2011. 'An Overview of Cameroon.'  
[http://www.cameroonsupportorganization.org/overview\\_new.html](http://www.cameroonsupportorganization.org/overview_new.html)
- CIEL (Center for International Environmental Law), website. 'The Chad-Cameroon Pipeline Project: Summary of Concerns.'  
<http://www.ciel.org/Ifi/chadcamssummary.html>
- EDF (Environmental Defense Fund), 2001. 'The Chad Cameroon Oil and Pipeline Project: Putting People and the Environment at Risk.'  
[http://www.edf.org/documents/728\\_ChadCameroon\\_pipeline.pdf](http://www.edf.org/documents/728_ChadCameroon_pipeline.pdf)
- Endeley, 2010. Excerpt from 'Land Tenure, Gender, and Globalization.'  
<http://www.iadb.org/intal/intalcdi/PE/2011/07671.pdf>
- FoE Cameroon, 2002. 'Traversing People's Lives: How the World Bank Finances Community Disruption in Cameroon.'  
<http://www.FoEi.org/en/resources/publications/pdfs/2000-2007/traversing.pdf>
- FoEI, 2006. 'The Myths of the West African Gas Pipeline.'  
<http://www.FoEi.org/en/resources/publications/oil-mining-and-gas/2000-2007/wagp-inet.pdf>

Gender Action and CEE Bankwatch, 2006. 'Boom Time Blues: Big Oil's Gender Impacts in Azerbaijan, Georgia and Sakhalin.'

<http://genderaction.org/images/boomtimeblues.pdf>

Gender Action, 2009. 'Link: Gender, IFIs, and Extractive Industries.'

[http://genderaction.org/images/2009.02\\_GALink%20Extractive%20Industries\\_AR.pdf](http://genderaction.org/images/2009.02_GALink%20Extractive%20Industries_AR.pdf)

Gender Action, 2011 (forthcoming). 'The World Bank & Gender Based Violence Case Study: the Democratic Republic of Congo.'

Groupe Tchad, 2010. 'The logic was sound, but reality interfered: The World Bank Group and the Chad-Cameroon Oil & Pipeline project.'

[www.bicusa.org/en/Document.102151.aspx](http://www.bicusa.org/en/Document.102151.aspx)

Horta, K., Nguiffo, S., and Djiraibe, D., 2007. 'The Chad-Cameroon Oil and Pipeline Project: A Project Non-Completion Report.'

<http://www.forestpeoples.org/sites/fpp/files/publication/2010/08/chadcameroonprojreportapr07eng.pdf>

IEG (Independent Evaluation Group), 2009. 'Program Performance Assessment Report, No. 50315'

[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTOED/Resources/chad\\_cam\\_exec\\_summary.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTOED/Resources/chad_cam_exec_summary.pdf)

IP (Inspection Panel), 2002. 'Investigation Report: Chad-Cameroon Petroleum Pipeline Project.'

<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTINSPECTIONPANEL/Resources/ChadInvestigationReporFinal.pdf>

IP (Inspection Panel), 2006. 'Ghana/Nigeria: West African Gas Pipeline Project: Investigation Report.'

[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTINSPECTIONPANEL/Resources/Executive\\_Summary.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTINSPECTIONPANEL/Resources/Executive_Summary.pdf)

Ross, M., 2008. 'Oil, Islam and Women'

<http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/ross/Oil%20Islam%20and%20Women%20-%20apsr%20final.pdf>

Social Watch, 2009. 'Gender Equity Index.'

[http://www.wikigender.org/index.php/wikigender.org:Variables\\_Gender\\_Equity\\_Index](http://www.wikigender.org/index.php/wikigender.org:Variables_Gender_Equity_Index)

Walters, D. 2010. 'Ghana and the discovery of oil: Will Ghana escape the black gold curse?' [http://www.consultancyafrica.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=624:ghana-and-the-discovery-of-oil-will-ghana-escape-the-black-gold-curse&catid=82:african-industry-a-business&Itemid=266](http://www.consultancyafrica.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=624:ghana-and-the-discovery-of-oil-will-ghana-escape-the-black-gold-curse&catid=82:african-industry-a-business&Itemid=266)

World Bank, 2000. 'Chad-Cameroon: Petroleum Development and Pipeline Project, Project Appraisal Document'

[http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2000/10/21/000094946\\_00102111244720/Rendered/PDF/multi\\_page.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2000/10/21/000094946_00102111244720/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf)

World Bank, 2003. 'Accountability at the World Bank: The Inspection Panel 10 Years On.'

[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTINSPECTIONPANEL/Resources/TenYear8\\_07.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTINSPECTIONPANEL/Resources/TenYear8_07.pdf)

World Bank, 2004. 'Project Appraisal Document, West African Gas Pipeline.'

[http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2004/11/09/000090341\\_20041109105344/Rendered/PDF/303350AFR.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2004/11/09/000090341_20041109105344/Rendered/PDF/303350AFR.pdf)

UN Interagency Framework Team for Preventative Action, 2010. 'Extractive Industries and Conflict: Guidance Note for Practitioners.'

[http://www.unep.org/conflictsanddisasters/Portals/6/ECP/GN\\_Extractive\\_Consultation.pdf](http://www.unep.org/conflictsanddisasters/Portals/6/ECP/GN_Extractive_Consultation.pdf)