1.0  Introduction
The Rural and Private Sector Development Project (RPSDP) was approved by the Executive Directors of the World Bank on May 22, 2007. An IDA grant amount of US$30 million was allocated to finance this project, which was restructured on August 5, 2009. The original project specific objective (“to provide rural based small scale farmers increased access to domestic markets by strengthening linkages between producers, agro-processors and rural market intermediaries”) and components have remained unchanged. The project development objective of the restructured project is to increase production of selected agricultural commodities by 20% and sales by 10% through improvement in efficiencies along the value chain of target beneficiaries.
The Environmental Assessment category assigned this project was Category B (Partial), predicated on the fact that the introduction of improved agricultural technologies, rehabilitation of feeder roads, construction of rural markets and storage infrastructure, and provision of rural agro-based processing facilities could result in potential adverse environmental impacts and social risks. Hence, two (2) World Bank Safeguard Policies (including the Disclosure Policy) namely OP/BP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment) and OP/BP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement OP) were triggered and the Client prepared an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) and Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) in a broader consultative manner. These documents were disclosed through various media in-country and at the Bank’s InfoShop. During the preparation of the original safeguard documents the capacity of the client to exercise due diligence on the safeguard recommendations was assessed to be satisfactory, albeit with specific recommendations for improvement. The Environmental Unit of the Ministry of Transport was recommended to take up the responsibility for monitoring environmental and safeguard. This responsibility shifted to the Sierra Leone Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) after its establishment in 2008.

2.0 Project Development Objectives
The original project development objective (PDO) was to improve efficiencies along the value chain of agricultural commodities with higher benefits flowing to producers. The restructuring team revised and reformulated the PDO as follows: to increase production of selected agricultural commodities by 20 percent and sales by 10 percent through improvements in efficiencies along the value chain of targeted beneficiaries.

The key outcome indicators under the original project are as follows: (i) Efficiency of agricultural value chains in food crops, as reflected in farm level value addition and (ii) Efficiency of agricultural value chains in export crops as reflected in quality premiums. Under the additional financing the key development outcomes are: (i) increased value addition along the value chain in order to increase producer prices of the commodities (ii) increase output, income and employment of small scale farmers; (iii) improved access to markets; (iv) improved enabling environment for private sector development.

The project will support initiatives to improve quality of produce for domestic/export markets, assist in strengthening marketing organizations at the producer level as well as private trade engaged in domestic marketing and export, support value addition, and provide limited support for filling critical gaps in infrastructure along the value chain, in conjunction with initiatives supported by Government/other donors.
3.0 Project Description

The project has four components with an indicative outlay of US$34.54 million (IDA financing: US$30 million):

Component 1: Domestic market improvement. The project has supported the domestic supply chain consolidation for specific crops and products. The main sub-components include: (i) rehabilitation of critical feeder road links; (ii) provision of matching grants for rural market infrastructure improvements to address critical infrastructure needs for selected products; and (iii) knowledge management and technical assistance to improve access to market information. Under the feeder roads sub-component, a total of 468 km of feeder roads is being rehabilitated and constructed in all the 13 districts. Reports from independent monitoring teams from MAFFS, the President’s Office and the Ministry of Finance have all expressed satisfaction with the pace and quality of work. This intervention created jobs for 4,000 youths, and injected money in the local economy as most of the contractors are from within the community. Indirect benefits include about 400 women food and water vendors serving the laborers; 400 community members providing sand and stones to the contractors; (iii) and petty traders selling various items to the workers. The sub-component on matching grants has supported 75 farmer-based organizations (FBOs) with a total membership of 4,737 (2,337 females, and 2,460 males) with the provision of storage facilities and processing equipment. The project is presently in the process of supporting an additional 200 FBOs with similar facilities. Under the knowledge management sub-component, the project has supported the establishment of Market Information System (MIS) focusing on internal marketing of agricultural commodities; the production of marketing and processing manuals for 5 crops; and the creation of market linkages between trader groups and FBOs.

Component 2: Agricultural export promotion is also satisfactory. Through this component, the project has interventions which create the enabling environment for export of agricultural commodities. The Sierra Leone Standards Board (SLSB) in collaboration with Njala University (NU) have developed standards for about 66 commodities and drafted the Standards Bill, Food safety and phytosanitary policies for parliamentary approval. The project has provided support to the Sierra Leone Investment and Export Promotion Agency (SLIEPA) to carry out a regional market survey with the objective of gaining better knowledge of market conditions, particularly within the West Africa sub-region, as well as the potential sources of supply of selected commodities in Sierra Leone. SLIEPA has also established a trade information centre that provides information to potential exporters. Other efforts to promote the marketing of agricultural produce include linking rice and cocoa producers to buyers with substantial number of producers signing MOUs with the buyers. A comprehensive sub-sector study of the Sierra Leone Cocoa Industry, with the objective of improving the supply and export of the commodity, has been carried out. The implementation of the findings of the study has led to the establishment of three cocoa cooperatives with a total membership of 12,688 (Male, 10,256; Female, 2,432). A total of 140.2 tons of Grade 1 cocoa was exported during the first year of operation of the newly established cocoa cooperatives An Export Supply Chain study to identify non-traditional export (NTE)
and market opportunities has been carried out under this component. The findings of the study revealed the state of readiness of the sector to embark upon the development of NTE commodities.

Component 3: Support to farmer-based Organizations and technology Improvement. This component has two sub-components: (a) matching grants to strengthen legally registered FBOs and their unions; and (b) support to carry out studies to promote agricultural research and export promotion. Under sub-component 1 the project commissioned a study on the strengthening of the initial 75 FBOs under the matching grants scheme of the project. These FBOs are all legally registered with the local councils and the Ministry of Social Welfare. All the initial 75 FBOs have now completed their storage and drying facilities and have processing equipment to improve quality, enhance value and reduce post harvest losses. In addition, a cocoa-FBO Study has also been carried out leading to the setting up of three cocoa cooperatives, which have been legally registered and are now operating fully. The project also supported SLARI to collaborate with farmers in 11 districts to conduct on-farm adaptive trials/participatory variety selection and multiplication of improved varieties in cassava and rice. A total of 275 farmers also received training in best agronomic practices for cassava cultivation and have been provided with improved planting materials for cocoa, rice and cassava.

Component 4: Policy, Regulations, Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation. Despite receiving unsatisfactory rating at effectiveness, project management has consistently been rated satisfactory or better since restructuring. The management of the project has been realigned with the provisions of the restructuring document. The Minister for MAFFS now chairs the reconstituted National Steering Committee (NSC) with the deputy ministers for MTI and MIALGRD as deputy co-chairpersons. The Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) has been granted greater autonomy and is now able to implement annual work plans; although, some clearances are still required by the MAFFS, which sometimes cause delay in processing.

4.0 Project Components: Additional Financing
The additional Financing has 3 main components and support to Project management and M&E as the fourth component

Component 1: Improve access to markets through rehabilitation and maintenance of feeder roads. The project has financed the rehabilitation of 468km of feeder roads. This figure represents approximately 11 percent of a total 4,152 kilometers of feeder roads out of which the condition of close to 70 percent are classified as fair or poor. The additional financing of US$15 million will support the rehabilitation of additional 1,000km of feeder roads in 9 out of the 13 districts. The remaining 4 districts will be supported by IFAD.

Component 2: Support to Cocoa Production and Marketing. The project has supported the establishment of three district cocoa cooperatives (coops) with a total membership of 12,688 (Male, 10,256; Female, 2,432). The total area cultivated by the members is approximately 26,000 acres. The coops exported approximately 127 Mt of Grade one cocoa beans between August and December 2010 (first year of operation). Better prices
(70 percent of world price) paid by the coops has prompted other buyers to increase their prices giving cocoa farmers a much better income. This will be given additional support under the additional financing.

**Component 3: Strengthening Farmer-Based Organizations (FBOs).** The Project supports farmer-based organizations with improved planting materials and through the matching grants with processing equipment, storage facilities and capacity strengthening. Recommendations from a study on rice marketing currently being undertaken in collaboration with the IFC will be supported. This study is focusing on assessing the current processing, marketing and distribution mechanisms and proposes technically and economically feasible mechanisms to improve them. To minimize the incidence of “elite capture”, the FBOs would further be strengthening through the development of an FBO specific benefit guidelines. Currently majority of the FBOs has business plans, but do not have benefit-sharing mechanisms. The project will support the development of such mechanism and the National Association of Farmers of Sierra Leone (NAFSL).

**Component 4: Policy, Regulations, Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation.** This component will focus attention on policy and regulatory issues, project management and monitoring and evaluation.

### 5.0 Institutional Arrangements for Implementing the Additional Financing

Prior to effectiveness, the project was rated as risky due to lack of procurement and financial management capacities in the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS) and Ministry of Trade and Industry (MTI), the two joint-implementing ministries. Consequently, the project was restructured in April 2009. The restructuring focused primarily on strengthening the institutional arrangements by dropping the joint management function and allowing the MAFFS to take full responsibility of overall management of the project. The MAFFS was also given strategic and oversight responsibilities as the chair of the National Steering Committee (NSC) with Deputy Ministers for MTI and MIALGRD as deputy co-chairs.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security will continue to host the Project. The Ministry of Works and Infrastructure (MoWI) will exercise direct responsibility over SLRA in the design and supervision of the civil works whilst the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development will ensure effective management of the contract signed between the LCs and contractors. As is the case under the on-going project, the pre-selection of the feeder roads will be done by SLRA and the district councils based on (i) the updated district road master plan and (ii) priorities identified by the communities and their commitment to participate in the rehabilitation and maintenance. The criteria for selection will be the same as that of the on-going project (ie, agricultural potential, population and market accessibility). Sierra Leone Roads Authority (SLRA) will continue to provide technical support in the form of design and supervision of the feeder roads and will second an engineer to the PCU as well as engage a competent and experienced feeder roads engineer on retainer basis from within the West African sub-region. The engineer should have considerable
experience in feeder roads design and construction, use of labor-based methods, community based and demand driven management of feeder roads. The selected applicant will be responsible for quality assurance in the design and construction, assist LCs in the preparation of bids and monitor the construction of the roads. The LCs will take the final decision on the selection of feeder roads in line with guidelines provided under the original project.

6.0 Status of implementation of Safeguards under the Original Project

The safeguards status of the original project is satisfactory. Activity implementation has not led to the need for preparation of resettlement action plans (RAPs) or site specific environmental and social impact assessment (ESIA). During the feeder roads rehabilitation, 3 of the 13 districts had some minor issues with communities. These bothered on a few trees being affected by the rehabilitation works, small portions of cassava farms belonging to some community members. These were amicably resolved by the District Councils, community elders, contractors and the affected persons. These discussions were documented by the District Councils and copies given to the PCU. There has been no land acquisition by any of the project activities so far. Lands used for sub-projects like storage facilities by FBOs are community or individual donations, which are all properly documented. The evidence for proper land acquisition or voluntary donation is a requirement for FBOs qualification. This arrangement will continue under the additional financing.

The RPF and the ESMF have been used as guide by the PCU to advise District Councils and contractors in undertaking activities that could have implications for safeguards due diligence. For instance, the Government did not prepare ESMPs for the feeder roads rehabilitation due to the negligible nature of the impacts and the works that were done mainly using labour-based techniques and relying on the community for the labour. As the works were minor, implementation was guided by national and local laws and regulations. During implementation of the AF, the project will conduct screening of all feeder roads site and will again be guided by national and local laws and regulations or, where necessary, for larger works, appropriate instruments (Environmental Management Plans) will be prepared.

Copies of the revised safeguards documents will be shared with all key stakeholders to support the capacity building and sensitization activities to ensure compliance. Due to the experience above, the expanded scope for feeder roads rehabilitation, institutional changes and review of the original safeguards documents, it was noted that a revision would help to effectively address any concerns that may come up during implementation of additional financing activities and other activities under the original project.

7.0 Rationale for the Addendum RPF
The restructured project has been under implementation for about two years now. Progress of work has been satisfactory and there have been no major issues regarding environmental and social impacts. Feeder road rehabilitation raised a few concerns in a couple of districts which have been amicably resolved by the different parties involved—communities, district councils, and contractors. Based on this experience and a review of the existing safeguards instruments, it was noted that some important aspects of the RPF needed to be strengthened which would apply to the ESIA as well. These areas were the institutional arrangements for implementing and monitoring safeguards compliance and the grievance redress system.

In addition, the project is seeking for additional financing to support on-going activities. This additional financing will focus on three key areas which include feeder roads rehabilitation, support to FBOs and support to the cocoa sector. As part of the process for preparation of this additional financing there is the need to review the safeguards instruments and how they were applied. This review is also important given the fact that most of the additional financing will go into feeder roads rehabilitation which also coincides with other sub-project activity implementation that may have potential for social and environmental impacts. Discussions with relevant stakeholders: The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS), EPA, the PCU, the Human Rights Commission, the Local Councils and some NGOs concluded the need for a revision to strengthen these two areas. The Addendum RPF looks at the following key 4 areas: (1) the Procedures for Resettlement and Compensation including eligible project affected people (PAPs); (2) Institutional Arrangements for Implementation of RPF and (3) Grievance Redress Mechanism and (4) Consultations and Methods for Compensation and Resettlement and other issues.

**8.0 PROCEDURES FOR RESETTLEMENT AND COMPENSATION**

The entitlement matrix in the original RPF is applicable under the additional financing. The process for resettlement and compensation payment is strengthened in this section.

**8.1 Procedures**

The RPF guidelines apply to all eligible projects activities under the additional financing whether or not they are directly funded in whole or in part by the additional financing for the Rural Private Sector Development Project. The RPF applies to activities in sub-projects (or components) affecting those who may be physically displaced or who would lose some or all access to resources, and regardless of the total number affected, the severity of impact, and their legal status (e.g. the RPF guidelines apply also to those with ill-defined or no title to the land).

The RPF provides special attention to the needs of vulnerable groups among the Project Affected Persons (PAPs), especially households with incomes below the national poverty line, including the landless, elderly and disabled, women and children, indigenous groups and ethnic minorities, and other historically disadvantaged persons.
8.2 Description of Additional financing activities with potential for Compensation and Resettlement
The activities in the additional financing that are expected to have some land acquisition or restriction of access include the following: Rehabilitation of feeder roads, construction of sub projects like processing and marketing centres, office space and demonstration farms and other civil works related activities.

8.3 Project Affected Persons (PAPs)
They are individuals whose assets may be lost, including land, property, other assets, and/or access to economic resources restricted as a result of activities related to sub-project(s).

8.4 Project Affected Households
Are groups of PAPs in one household and where one or more of its members are directly affected by the additional financing activities. These include members like the head of household, male, and female members, dependent relatives, tenants, etc.

8.5 Vulnerable Groups of People
From these households the additional financing will separately identify the vulnerable members, such as those who are too old or too ill; children; those stricken with HIV/AIDS; women; unemployed youth; etc. Households headed by women that depend on sons, brothers, and others for support is especially vulnerable. Similarly, households with elderly or seriously ill persons are eligible for additional support.

8.6 Eligibility of PAPs
The PAPs may be eligible for compensation and resettlement assistance if:

- They have formal legal rights to land (including customary and traditional rights recognized under the Lands Act).
- They do not have formal legal rights to land at the time the census begins but have a recognizable legal right or claim to such land or assets.
- They have no recognizable legal right or claim to the land they are occupying i.e. squatters, ownerships under dispute etc.

The above PAPs eligibility criteria are according to the World Bank Involuntary Resettlement Policy, OP 4.12. Resettlement Action Plans or abbreviated resettlement
action plans may be required in instances where PAPs have been identified. In such cases, a number of actions will be required by the implementing agency responsible for safeguards implementation. These would include the following: screening and identification of PAPs as follows:

### 8.6.1 Screening and Identification of PAPs

The purpose of the screening process is to determine whether sub-projects are likely to have potential negative environmental and social impacts; to determine appropriate mitigation measures for activities with adverse impacts; to incorporate mitigation measures into the sub-projects design; to review and approve sub-projects proposals and to monitor environmental parameters during implementation. The extent of environmental and social work that might be required for the sub-projects prior to implementation will depend on the outcome of the screening process. This process should include screening for possible resettlement impacts.

During implementation of project activities a social assessment will be carried out to identify the areas or sites resettlement impacts may occur due to land acquisition or restriction of access to resources. At that stage, OP 4.12 calls for the preparation of separate stand-alone Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) or Abbreviated resettlement action Plans (ARAPs) consistent with the guidelines provided in this RPF. The following procedural guidelines will apply when it is determined that a RAP/ARAP would be developed.

- All potential PAPs should be identified (through a scoping exercise) and informed about their options and rights pertaining to compensation for land and assets to be acquired by the sub-project(s);
- PAPs must be consulted about land acquisition and compensation and offered technical and financial options, including the most economically feasible alternatives; and
- PAPs should receive reasonable compensation at full replacement cost for losses of assets and access attributable to the sub-project.

### 9.0 Comparison of Sierra Leonean Regulations with World Bank Policies

In general the Sierra Leonean laws and regulations make provision for resettlement framework, including land acquisition and compensation matters. There are however some differences between the World Bank guidelines and the Sierra Leonean laws as indicated in Table 1 below. This RPF combines the World Bank Safeguard Policy on involuntary resettlement (OP 4.12) and the national laws. However, where there is discrepancy between Sierra Leone
law and the Bank Operational policy, OP 4.12, the more stringent requirement will prevail. As indicated in Table I below, in order that the project complies with the Bank policy requirement, most of the compensation measures will follow the requirement of the OP 4.12.

**Table 1: Comparison of Sierra Leonean Regulations with World Bank Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Sierra Leone legislation requirement</th>
<th>WB policy requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timing of compensation payment</td>
<td>Prompt</td>
<td>Prior to displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation of compensation</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Full replacement cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squatters</td>
<td>No provision. Are deemed not to be eligible</td>
<td>Are to be provided resettlement assistance (but no compensation for land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement</td>
<td>Any amount of compensation to which the displaced person is entitled.</td>
<td>Affected people who are physically displaced are to be provided with residential housing, or housing sites, or, as required, agricultural sites at least equivalent to the old site. Preference to be given to land-based resettlement for displaced persons whose livelihoods are land-based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement assistance</td>
<td>No specific provision with respect to additional assistance and monitoring.</td>
<td>Affected people are to be offered support after displacement, for a transition period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable groups</td>
<td>No specific provision</td>
<td>Particular attention to be paid to vulnerable groups, especially those below the poverty line, the landless, the elderly, women and children, indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and consultation</td>
<td>The owner/occupier of the land must be formally notified in advance of the intent to enter.</td>
<td>Displaced persons and their communities are provided timely and relevant information, consulted on resettlement options, and offered opportunities to participate in planning, implementing, and monitoring resettlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td>Access to Court of Law or other impartial and independent Authority</td>
<td>Appropriate and accessible grievance mechanisms to be established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.0 INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING

10.1 Background
At the time of preparation of the original project and the restructuring, the Government of SL had not effectively established the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The statutory functions of the EPA were therefore assumed by other bodies with the mandate to perform those functions. These bodies were the National Commission for Environment and Forestry (NaCEF) created in 2005 and the environmental unit of the Ministry of Transport. In 2008, the EPA was formally established by the Environmental Protection Act, No 11, September 2008 with the overall responsibility of ensuring compliance with environmental standards as per GoSL regulations, policies and legislation. However, full complement of staff has only recently been in place giving the Agency the authority to commence its legal functions. Given this major institutional change and the increasing momentum of the project with implementation of sub-project activities, the imperative for engaging EPA and other partners on an effective and participatory basis has become stronger.

10.2 Institutional Changes
The newly established Environmental Protection Agency is the public agency responsible for the sustainable management of the environment in the country. It is mandated to regulate the country’s environment and to ensure that sustainable pathways are adopted in the country’s socio-economic development, setting standards and enforcing compliance of environmental, social and health safeguards. It has offices at the sub-national levels that work in close collaboration with the district administrations to enforce and monitor compliance. Although relatively new as a national body, it draws capacity from staff of the previous Departments of Environment and Forestry. The EPA therefore will assist by providing technical assistance to the Project and monitor implementation of the ESMF and RPF including the grievance redress mechanism. In accordance with its legal mandate, the EPA will approve all specific environmental and social impact studies and resettlement action plans (RAPs) that may be done under the additional financing. The national and sub-national EPAs will take the lead in project safeguard monitoring.

For the purpose of implementation, monitoring and reporting, the following arrangements are outlined:

10.3 Roles and Responsibilities
The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Food Security (MAFFS), as the chair of the Steering Committee and the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD) will have overall oversight regarding safeguards compliance status. The PCU in collaboration with the EPA will ensure that all safeguards/environmental requirements of the World Bank and GoSL are adhered to and reported on accordingly
by all implementing agencies including district councils, FBOs, SLRA and all contractors. Reports submitted by any implementing agency on activities that have safeguards or environmental implications or imperatives must include sections on actions taken or not and reasons for the later. From the PCU, all reports submitted to the Bank should include safeguards implementation status for all activities to which the instruments apply. See Annex 1: Matrix of Institutions and Responsibilities.

10.4 Training, Sensitization and Capacity Enhancement

In-country capacity for environmental and social monitoring has improved through the implementation of donor supported projects and initiatives. In spite of this, there is still the need for further capacity improvement given the attention on safeguards implementation as a sustainability factor for projects. Furthermore, the project intends to mainstream the implementation and monitoring of safeguards into project activities from the chiefdom to district to national level. This will require further training and sensitization on the World Bank safeguards policies, GoSL policies and requirements on environmental permits and regulations, the functioning of the grievance redress mechanism and institutional arrangements for implementing and monitoring safeguards activities. Specific training program will be developed and implemented to address these and other critical issues as part of this capacity enhancement plan.

11.0 GRIEVANCE REDRESS PROCEDURE AND MECHANISM

A grievance redress mechanism is a system by which queries or clarifications about a project are responded to, problems that arise out of implementation are resolved and grievances are addressed efficiently and effectively. An effective and efficient GRM should have multiple avenues or channels for lodging complaints, there should be transparency, prompt and timeliness in responses and clear procedures. It must also be sensitive to certain contextual situations like special cultural practices and belief systems that could either enhance or impede the effectiveness of the mechanisms and the procedures. Particular attention should also be paid to vulnerable groups in society. The discussion of the grievance redress mechanism in the RPF and the ESIA lacks details. As part of ensuring effective implementation and monitoring of safeguards issues, the Project collaborated with the EPA and other institution to develop and strengthen Grievance Redress Mechanisms that will help to identify and address any safeguards issues for further attention at the chiefdom, district and national level, including regular discussion of safeguards issues as part of the communication strategy for the project and training in safeguards for relevant stakeholders as part of the due diligence.
The MAFFS and PCU in collaboration with the EPA agreed on specific actions regarding the establishment of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), including dissemination in the local language of the GRM and other relevant information about the project safeguards issues, training key stakeholders like contractors, FBOs, District Councils etc on monitoring and compliance issues. Some of the required actions include establishing a grievance redress committee and outlining clear procedures.

The PCU has discussed with the EPA and agreed on specific actions regarding the establishment of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), the local language disclosure of the GRM and other relevant information about the project safeguards issues, training key stakeholders like contractors, FBOs, Councils etc on monitoring and compliance issues. Some of the required actions include establishing a grievance redress committee and outlining clear procedures.

At the district level, these were largely endorsed by participants from all chiefdoms making up the districts. Variations were in terms of composition and duration for addressing grievances.

11.1 Goal
To create an avenue to prevent and address potential adverse environmental and social impacts emanating from project activities.

11.2 Definition of Grievance
Any query, call for clarification, problems, concerns raised by individuals or groups related to activities undertaken or processes applied by the project. These when addressed are expected to ensure support, results and sustainability of project activities.

11.3 Objectives
- To amicably resolve grievances raised by Aggrieved Parties (APs) during project implementation
- To ensure successful and timely completion of projects, without creating adverse environmental, social and health conditions on the community.

11.4 Scope
The grievance mechanism applies to all project activities to be financed by the original project activities and the additional financing activities. It includes issues related to environmental, involuntary resettlement and social issues in that come up during project implementation.

11.5 The Grievance Redress Committee
Based on consultations with National level institutions and district councils and their representatives, the following arrangements were agreed for the levels of grievance
committees and the procedures to be followed. There shall be a grievance redress committee at the chiefdom, district and national levels as follows:

**Chiefdom level**

- Paramount Chief, Ward Councilor, Chiefdom Youth Leader, Chiefdom Women’s Leader (mammy queen), Town Chief of affected community, CSO within the chiefdom = 6 members
- RPSDP project staff to be part of the committee as ex-officio members
- Complainant(s) or representative(s) to witness meeting discussing his/her complaints

**District level**

- Chairman of Council, Council Engineer, District Officer (DO), DIC Chairman, Civil Society rep., Office of National Security, District Agriculture Officer = 7 members
- RPSDP project staff to be part of the committee as ex-officio members.

**National level**

- Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Sierra Leone Roads Authority (SLRA) Ministry of Works, Housing and Infrastructure (MWHI), Project Coordinating Unit (PCU), Ministry of Lands MLCPE, Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD) and, Civil Society representative = 7 members

This framework for the constitution of grievance committees may be adapted to suit particular chiefdoms/districts especially where there are local committees that may be dealing with land and related issues and which are competent enough to handle disputes related to project issues. Example of such district is Koinadugu. In addition members as proposed here may change due to district and chiefdom peculiarities. For
instance At Kambia, suggestion to replace Town Chief with Sectional Chief and adding religious leaders as members are all acceptable changes that can be introduced. Once constituted, each committee should appoint/designate a registrar to handle the processing of complaints as detailed below.

11.6 Grievance Redress Procedure

Generally, affected people can lodge complaints at the district council which should properly receive and document for onward action. In order to streamline the process, the following structure is proposed:

i. Chiefdom Level: Complaints may be submitted to any member of the community level reps which will be recorded/filed and discussed at an agreed date for possible resolution within 7-14 days upon receipt of such complaints (see Annex 2 for a sample format). The community reps will meet at the community level- convened by the council rep to investigate and address issues and complainant informed of outcome of resolution.

ii. The Council rep informs the District Level Committee members, the complainant on outcome of meeting and status of complaint within max 14 days of receipt of complaints.

iii. If complaint is not resolved then it is elevated to the level of the District Council. The District Council Officer in charge of environmental and social issues convenes a meeting with all representatives to address complaint or resolve the issue. At this level, it is recommended that a representative of an NGO/CBO working in the community and in good standing should be invited as an independent witness. Maximum time for resolution should not exceed 21 days.

iv. If issue is not resolved, then Council informs PCU who will inform the national committee for a final resolution which could take any time between 2-3 months.

The duration for receiving and addressing grievances can change depending on the nature of the grievance submitted. The days suggested are only indicative and all grievances at the different levels should not go beyond the stipulated number of days; they can be disposed off earlier.

12.0 CONSULTATIONS AND DISCLOSURE

There will be continuous consultations on safeguards issues as part of implementation activities and arrangements. This started with the preparation of the draft Addendum on the institutional arrangements and the grievance redress mechanisms and procedures. The consultations were held with participation from key stakeholders. At the national level involving key Ministries including MAFFS, MLGRD, EPA, and Human Rights Commission. There were also district council representatives from 11 of the 13 districts. The consultations and discussions of the draft Addendum to the RPF
led to changes in the proposed membership of the grievance redress committees at the different levels. Other critical issues raised and considered by the Addendum include the goal of the GRM, what could be considered as a grievance and the scope of what grievances can be accommodated. The meeting also emphasized the need for ownership and commitment by government that should go beyond the consultations so as to ensure that where required, GoSL will release the necessary funds to pay off compensations.

The meeting also emphasized the need to prevent grievances through strong sensitization and information dissemination on project activities. The consultation also emphasized the need to give legitimacy to the GRM through a Cabinet Paper from the Minister of Agriculture, in consultation with the Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Lands, Ministry of Works, and EPA. The Cabinet Paper should clearly outline the authorities and powers vested in the GRM. However, the meeting acknowledged that this will require time. It recommended that a legal opinion might be needed in the process of developing the Cabinet Paper and the GRM. The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security will take up this responsibility. However, the GRM as would be established for the purpose of the project implementation will be recognized as having the mandate to function as such (Annex 3 for details of the national level consultations report). District Council representatives were to inform their constituents.

Consultations were also held at the district and chiefdom levels as part of the disclosure activities. This involved all 13 districts and representatives of between 25 and 30 people from paramount chiefs, ward councilors, chiefdom youth leaders, farmers representative, representative from office of National Security and council representatives over a one week period. Issues raised bothered on membership of the grievance redress committees, duration for addressing grievances, further sensitization and radio discussion of project activities and the GRM. Other issues raised by the participants at the chiefdom level include payment of minimum compensation where there will be resettlement, commitment of community to ensure success of project, and development of simple ToR for the members of the different grievance committee members to avoid abuse. Another interesting outcome of the consultations was that, the GRM would be adopted to address any other disputes within the communities which affect especially farmers like fires, cattle rustling.

The original RPF was disclosed in country and at the World Bank’s infoshop in January 2007. The addendum RPF was disclosed in country after the required clearances from the World Bank and the GoSL through the media and Public Notices at the District and Chiefdom levels and at the World Bank’s infoshop after the in-country disclosure. The consultations took place at two levels: At the national level and at the chiefdom levels involving community representatives and facilitated by the District Councils, the EPA and the PCU. Issues raised during the consultations and the disclosure meetings have been included in the final report. As an overall plan, sensitization on these safeguards instruments and implementation arrangements for all stakeholders shall be integrated
into the communication plan for the project and through workshops and local media as well.

13.0 PROCEDURES FOR DELIVERY OF ENTITLEMENTS
Entitlements for Project Affected People (PAP) would range from cash payments and/or building materials to the provision of new land, new homes and non-cash compensation for other lost properties in accordance with the identification of the impact on their property.

Subject to the final decision on the exact position of the site and its dimensions, the approved entitlements or amounts would be communicated to the implementing agency or unit for delivery or payment to the beneficiaries. Compensation would be paid before the owners/occupiers are made to vacate their properties for commencement of construction or works. The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS) and the Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) will ensure that no construction begins until PAPs have been resettled if physical relocation is necessary and/or received their compensations (according to World Bank Operational Policies OP 4.12). All compensation, whether cash payments and/or alternative land and house provisions, would be given to the PAPs prior to any request for vacation of land/property and before commencement of construction. Compensation and resettlement will be funded by the GoSL.

The compensation process should incorporate the following:

13.1 Agreement on Compensation and Preparation of Contracts
All types of compensation should be clearly explained to the individual or household. A listing of all property and land being surrendered, and the types of compensation (cash and/or in-kind) selected. A person selecting in-kind compensation has an order form, which is signed and witnessed. The compensation contract should be read aloud in the presence of the affected party and other stakeholders prior to signing.

13.2 Compensation Payments
All compensation payments will be made by GoSL through MAFFS in the presence of the affected party and representatives of the Grievance redress Committees with an NGO as a witness. The MAFFS/PCU will ensure that due process has been followed in preparing and paying of the appropriate compensation.
13.3 Identification of Vulnerable groups

Vulnerable groups are those at risk of becoming more vulnerable due to the displacement, compensation, and resettlement process. Vulnerable people include, but not limited to:

- Disabled persons, whether mentally or physically;
- The elderly, usually above 60 years;
- Widows;
- Children; and
- Female heads of households.

13.4 Assistance to vulnerable people

Assistance to vulnerable people may include the following:

- Identification of vulnerable people and identification of the cause and impacts of their vulnerability through direct interviews. This step is critical because often vulnerable people do not participate in community meetings (because most often they are shielded by the society and fronted by other individuals), and their disability/vulnerability may remain unknown.
- Identification of required assistance at the various stages of the process: negotiation, compensation, moving;
- Implementation of the measures necessary to assist the vulnerable person; and
- Monitoring and continuation of assistance after resettlement and/or compensation, if required.

Assistance may take the following forms, depending upon vulnerable persons’ requests and needs:

- Assistance in the compensation payment procedures (e.g., going to the bank with the person to cash the compensation cheque);
- Assistance in the post payment period to secure the compensation money and reduce risks of misuse/robbery;
- Assistance in moving: providing vehicle, driver and assistance at the moving stage;
- Assistance in building: providing materials, workforce, or building houses; and
- Health care if required at critical periods: moving and transition period.
14.0 TIME FRAME
Taking cognizance of the potentially low scale and scope of resettlement issues that could arise; the processing of compensation application for payment by Government should be expedited over an average maximum period of one month. Some additional one month could be allowed for exceptional circumstances where there could be some complexities or challenges. No construction will begin until PAPs have been resettled if physical relocation is necessary and/or received their full compensation (according to World Bank Policy OP 4.12). Additionally, the property owners must be given adequate notice of not less than one month after payment of compensation to vacate affected assets and relocate depending on the nature of relocation or resettlement.

15.0 ESTIMATED BUDGET
Table 2 below gives the estimated budget for the RPF implementation

Table 2: RPF Implementation Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (USD$)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Capacity Building for Stakeholders at national, district and chiefdom levels</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>$20,000/District (including 149 chiefdoms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Sensitization at district and chiefdom levels</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>$15,000/District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Translation of summarized versions of key safeguards issues into local language</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$10,000/each of 5 major local languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Printing of GRM document for circulation</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Estimate for about 2000 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Establishment and operation of Grievance Redress Mechanism</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Set up and operations costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Includes support to EPA-SL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Review of the operations of the GRM with a view to making necessary amendments</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>To be done after 1 year of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>770,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.0 MONITORING ARRANGEMENTS AND INDICATORS
The monitoring programme will provide a continuous feedback on the application of the RPF. Where necessary, monitoring teams deemed will be constituted and will report regularly to the PCU/MAFFS. The team will include SLEPA and appropriate departments under the Ministry of Lands and Country Planning. The scope of monitoring will comprise social and economic considerations as well as technical components. The monitoring indicators should cover areas such as:
(1) Screening done and cases identified for further actions- RAP/ARAP;
(2) Actions taken as a result of screening and levels of affected persons’ satisfaction determined by number of grievances registered and settled, and
(3) Effectiveness of resettlement actions taken.
### Annex 1: Institutional Environmental and Social Safeguards Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security and Project Steering Committee (MAFFS and PSC), Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD), Ministry of Works, Housing and Infrastructure (MWHI) and the Ministry of Lands, Country Planning and the Environment (MLCPE), Human Rights Commission</td>
<td>Overall responsibility for ensuring overall compliance by all, facilitating release of GoSL funds for purposes of paying compensation, should this become necessary,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</td>
<td>Overall responsibility for monitoring compliance to GoSL /WB guidelines, policy and legal requirements, facilitating training, disclosures, consultations where required. Ensure EPA presence at the districts to oversee environmental and social management and resettlement issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Project Coordinating Unit (PCU)</td>
<td>Overall responsibility for ensuring compliance by implementing agencies on their respective responsibilities, sensitizing, reporting on safeguards issues from implementing agencies including DCs to EPA, MAFFS and WB for actions where necessary. Facilitate training, disclosures, consultations in collaboration with EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> District Councils (DCs)</td>
<td>Overall responsibility for ensuring contractors comply with environmental and social clauses in bid and contract documents, facilitate dispute resolutions through established mechanisms and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
documenting and report on same issues to PCU. Support training, disclosures and consultations in collaboration with the PCU and EPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Implementing Agencies (IAs): Farmer-Based Organizations (FBOs), Sierra Leone Roads Authority (SLRA), Contractors, Private sector and government implementing agencies, Overall responsibility for ensuring adherence to social and environmental consideration for sub-project activity implementation –feeder roads and other civil work s- eg, securing proper permits from EPA, proper land acquisition and documentation, use of grievance redress mechanisms to address disputes. Collaborate with the above institutions in carrying out defined responsibilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Sample Grievance and Resolution Form (Can be used for Complaint Recording or for Resolution)

Name (Filer of Complaint): ____________________________ (PAPs ID number)
ID Number: ____________________________ (PAPs ID number)
Contact Information : ____________________________ (Village ; mobile phone)
Nature of Grievance or Complaint: ____________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Individuals Contacted</th>
<th>Summary of Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature_______________________ Date: ____________

Signed (Filer of Complaint): ____________________________
Name of Person Filing Complaint :________________________( if different from Filer)
Position or Relationship to Filer: ________________________

**Review/Resolution**

Date of Conciliation Session: ____________________________
Was Filer Present? : Yes  No
Was field verification of complaint conducted? Yes  No

Findings of field investigation:

__________________________

__________________________

**Summary of Conciliation Session Discussion:**

__________________________

__________________________

Issues _______________ -

Was agreement reached on the issues? Yes  No

If agreement was reached, detail the agreement below:

If agreement was not reached, specify the points of disagreement below and proposed next steps:

__________________________

Signed (Conciliator): ___________________________ Signed (Filer): ___________________________

Signed: ___________________________ Independent Observer

Date: ___________________________
1.0 OBJECTIVE

To give major stakeholders an opportunity to review and comment on the draft Grievance Redress Mechanism and the institutional arrangements for implementation, monitoring and reporting safeguards compliance.

2.0 SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Design of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)

2. Policy Requirement

- There is need to give legitimacy to the GRM through a Cabinet Paper from the Minister of Agriculture, in consultation with the Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Lands, Ministry of Works, and EPA.

- The Cabinet Paper should clearly outline the authorities and powers vested in the GRM.
• A legal opinion might need to be sought in the process of developing the Cabinet Paper and the GRM.

3. Set Goals, Objectives and Scope

• There is the need to clearly define the specific Goal, Objectives and Scope of the GRM

• There is a need to more explicitly define what is considered “GRIEVANCE” in this context:

**Goal (proposal):** to create an avenue to prevent and address potential adverse environmental and social impacts emanating from project activities

**Objectives:**
• To amicably resolve grievances raised by Aggrieved Parties (APs) during project implementation

• To ensure successful and timely completion of projects, without creating adverse environmental, social and health conditions on the community.

**Scope:**
• The scope of grievances entertained/addressed by the mechanism needs to be clearly spelt out in the document

• To more clearly highlight environmental, pest management and involuntary resettlement/social issues in the scope

4. Location of GRM
5. Channels of Access to GRM

Aggrieved persons may submit complaints to any member of the chiefdom level committee.

6. Committee Members

Chiefdom level

- Paramount Chief, Ward Councilor, Chiefdom Youth Leader, Chiefdom Women’s Leader (mammy queen), Town Chief of affected community, CSO within the chiefdom = 6 members
- RPSDP project staff to be part of the committee as ex-officio members
- Complainant to witness meeting discussing his/her complaints

District level

- Chairman of Council, Council Engineer, District Officer (DO), DIC Chairman, Civil Society rep., Office of National Security, District Agriculture Officer = 7 members
- RPSDP project staff to be part of the committee as ex-officio members.

National level

MAFFS, EPA, SLRA/MWHI, PCU, MLCPE, MLGRD, Civil Society rep = 7 members

7. Processing Procedures

Once constituted, each committee should appoint/designate a registrar to handle the processing of complaints;
8. There is need to separate Grievance/Complaint Form from the Resolution Form. The **Complaint Form** should be accompanied with a record/statement of complaint, and the **Resolution Form** should be accompanied with a report/minute (including findings and recommendations) of the committee’s discussion and final conclusions.

9. **Other Key Issues**
   - Attention needs to be paid also on issues of grievance prevention.
   - Issues of financial resources to support the operationalization of the mechanism should be addressed.
   - The need for community input into the draft GRM is emphasized as crucial for ownership

B. **Institutional Arrangements for Implementation, Monitoring and Reporting**

1. The Ministry of Works, Housing and Infrastructure and the Ministry of Lands, Country Planning and the Environment are key line ministries whose roles should be prominent in this process.

2. EPA to consider recruiting/posting personnel to all districts to oversee environmental and social management issues.

**NOTE:** Government should show ownership by taking responsibility of the provision of compensation to APs, should this issue arise.

3.0 **Institutions Represented**

1. Smallholder Commercialization Programme (SCP)/MAFFS
2. Forestry Division, MAFFS
3. Environmental Protection Agency
4. District Councils (11 out of 13 districts represented)
5. Human Rights Commission
6. The Project Coordination Unit

List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>DESIGNATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diana Konomany</td>
<td>Kono District Council</td>
<td>Chair-Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rugiatu N. Turay</td>
<td>Port Loko District Council</td>
<td>Deputy Chair-Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peter B. Konteh</td>
<td>Koinadugu District Council</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Al-hassan Cole</td>
<td>Western Area Rural District</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nelson M. Lahai</td>
<td>Kailahun District Council</td>
<td>Deputy Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Moses K. Fofana</td>
<td>Pujehun District Council</td>
<td>Deputy Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sylvester Boima</td>
<td>Bonthe District Council</td>
<td>Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Arthur Allieu</td>
<td>Tonkolili District Council</td>
<td>Development Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Magens Sannoh</td>
<td>Kenema District Council</td>
<td>Representative for the Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Peter A. Koroma</td>
<td>Moyamba District Council</td>
<td>Representative for the Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>John T. Jigbo</td>
<td>Bo District Council</td>
<td>Clerk of Works, Representative for the Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sahr A. Musa</td>
<td>Human Rights Commission – Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Representative for the Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Victor F.O. Sawyerr</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dr. Ibrahim Yillah</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>HOD Chemical Control &amp; Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sheku A. Mansaray</td>
<td>Forestry Division -</td>
<td>Acting Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAFFS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Alusine Jah</td>
<td>SCP - MAFFS</td>
<td>M &amp; E Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kalie I. Bangura</td>
<td>Forestry Division -</td>
<td>Senior Game Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAFFS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sorie Sulaiman Sesay</td>
<td>RPSDP</td>
<td>Grants Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Thekeka Moses Conteh</td>
<td>RPSDP</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation/MIS Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Abdul Bakarr Salim</td>
<td>RPSDP</td>
<td>Marketing Information Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 4:

#### STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION AT CHIEFDOM LEVEL

**APRIL 8-15, 2011**

#### DISTRICT CONSULTATIONS SUMMARY REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Meeting Date and Location</th>
<th>Location of GRM</th>
<th>Membership of Committees</th>
<th>Channels of Access to GRM</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Disclosure</th>
<th>Redress Expected</th>
<th>Other Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kambia   | April 8, 2011; Resource Centre, Kambia Town | Proposed three levels adopted | **Chiefdom**  
   a) Replace Town Chief with Section Chief  
   b) Add Religious leaders bcoz of their social standing  
   c) Add Block Extension Supervisor bcoz of their technical knowledge in agriculture (esp. for plantations)  
   d) Farmers’ representative at the c/dom level.  
   e) Replace Council engineer with SLRA engineer  
   f) Replace Council Chairman with | Proposal in the draft adopted | Too long. Complaints to be addressed between 1 – 7 days | | Public disclosure of GRM not to be limited to community radios only |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Meeting Date and Location</th>
<th>Location of GRM</th>
<th>Membership of Committees</th>
<th>Channels of Access to GRM</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Disclosure</th>
<th>Redress Expected</th>
<th>Other Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenema</td>
<td>April 8, 2011</td>
<td>Proposed three levels (chiefdom, district, and national) adopted</td>
<td><strong>Chiefdom</strong>&lt;br&gt;a) Add councilors in multi-ward&lt;br&gt;b) Add Section Chief overseeing affected community</td>
<td>Upheld as proposed</td>
<td>Upheld as proposed</td>
<td>a) Develop a jingle in local languages for broadcast via the radio&lt;br&gt;b) Discuss GRM in community meetings</td>
<td>a) Where expedient, compensation could be made based on the type of environmental and social impact</td>
<td>a) There should be clear provisions for the Chief Administrator, as Chairman should not be member of a sub-committee&lt;br&gt;g) Add farmers’ representative&lt;br&gt;h) Add Works committee chairperson of council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Loko</td>
<td>April 9, 2011; Council Conference Hall, Port Loko</td>
<td>Proposed three levels adopted</td>
<td><strong>Chiefdom</strong>&lt;br&gt;a) Add Religious leaders (2)&lt;br&gt;b) Add Block Extension Supervisor&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>District</strong></td>
<td>Upheld as proposed</td>
<td>Upheld as proposed</td>
<td>c) Radio discussions&lt;br&gt;d) Chiefdom level meetings&lt;br&gt;e) Key stakeholder</td>
<td>b) Where resettlement is involved, minimal financial compensat</td>
<td>b) There is need for intensive and adequate sensitization on existence of the GRM and its workings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Meeting Date and Location</td>
<td>Location of GRM</td>
<td>Membership of Committees</td>
<td>Channels of Access to GRM</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>Redress Expected</td>
<td>Other Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailahun</td>
<td>April 9, 2011; Kailahun Town</td>
<td>Proposed levels adopted</td>
<td>Chiefdom a) Add Religious leaders in the chiefdoms</td>
<td>Complaints should be made by AP to the</td>
<td>Upheld as proposed</td>
<td>a) Community radio b) Use Community radio</td>
<td>a) Depends on the level of the effect</td>
<td>a) RPSDP should make available some logistical support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues/Responses:

- a) Replace Council Chairperson with Chief Administrator, as Chairpersons are political authorities (with clear political leanings) whose actions can be misunderstood along political lines.
- b) Add Inter-religious Council representative in the district.
- c) Add District Youth Leader.
- **National**
  - a) Add Inter-religious Council.
  - rs (Chiefs, religious leaders, etc) to be challenged to disclose information in their separate fora.
  - ion is expected for manufactured materials like CI sheets.
  - c) Beneficiary community should take it as a responsibility to relocate.
  - d) In the case of plantation, Chiefdom Committees should take it as a priority to pacify AP.
- c) There is need for clear TORs to be developed for each of the committees.
- d) There is need for active consultation with communities before commencement of project activities within communities, as a way of minimizing/eliminating grievances.

Kailahun: Proposed levels adopted

Chiefdom: a) Add Religious leaders in the chiefdoms

Complaints should be made by AP to the

Upheld as proposed

a) Community radio
b) Use Community radio

a) Depends on the level of the effect

a) RPSDP should make available some logistical support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Meeting Date and Location</th>
<th>Location of GRM</th>
<th>Membership of Committees</th>
<th>Channels of Access to GRM</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Disclosure</th>
<th>Redress Expected</th>
<th>Other Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koinadugu</td>
<td>April 11, 2011; Kabala Community Center</td>
<td>Proposed levels adopted</td>
<td><strong>Chiefdom</strong>&lt;br&gt;a) Each chiefdom has a functional Chiefdom Committee in place with responsibilities for handling governance and development issues in the district.&lt;br&gt;b) Add Chief Administrator in council, due to the position’s influence and non-political nature</td>
<td>Town Chief who should then inform the chairperson of the committee</td>
<td>Adopted as proposed</td>
<td>Adopted as proposed</td>
<td>c) Radio discussion on GRM</td>
<td>b) Some financial compensation&lt;br&gt;c) Respect (amicable resolution)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Add Section chiefs District<br>a) Chairman of Environmental and Social issues in the councils<br>b) Add Chief Administrator in council, due to the position’s influence and non-political nature
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Meeting Date and Location</th>
<th>Location of GRM</th>
<th>Membership of Committees</th>
<th>Channels of Access to GRM</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Disclosure</th>
<th>Redress Expected</th>
<th>Other Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>thus be used as the Chiefdom-level Committee, as they already have experience in grievance handling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) To add a farmers’ representative and a Civil Society representative in the existing Chiefdom Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Add Chairman, Council of Paramount Chiefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Add Chairman, District Youth Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Add Chairperson, Inter-religious Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>d) Add Provincial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Meeting Date and Location</td>
<td>Location of GRM</td>
<td>Membership of Committees</td>
<td>Channels of Access to GRM</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>Redress Expected</td>
<td>Other Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Pujehun  | April 11, 2011; Pujeahun Town | Adopted as proposed | **Chiefdom**  
a) Add religious leaders in the chiefdoms  
b) The Paramount chief should be the chairman of the committee  
c) Judiciary personnel should not be members of the committees | Complaints should be made to the town chief of the affected community who shall then inform the chairman of the chiefdom committee to convene a meeting. | Upheld as proposed | a) Community radio  
b) Council meetings and Ward committee meetings can be a convenient for a for sensitization about the GRM | Where necessary, compensation can be paid |  |
| Bombali  | April 12, 2011; Conference Hall, MAFFS, | Adopted as proposed | **Chiefdom**  
a) Add Chiefdom Chief Imam and Chiefdom Pastor  
b) Add Treasury | Adopted as proposed | Adopted as proposed | c) Radio discussion not enough  
d) Community | Respect | a) This mechanism could be used to address other grievances with communities |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Meeting Date and Location</th>
<th>Location of GRM</th>
<th>Membership of Committees</th>
<th>Channels of Access to GRM</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Disclosure</th>
<th>Redress Expected</th>
<th>Other Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makeni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerks as Secretary to the committee (as they are trained personnel in writing a recording of minutes and paid staff of chiefdoms with similar responsibilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Add representative of Farmers’ Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Inter-religious Council representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Add Chairman, Council of Paramount Chiefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) Replace Council Engineer with SLRA Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g) Add Farmers’ Federation rep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Issues**

- a) Need for community involvement and sensitization before commencement of construction works in communities, as a preventive measure.
- b) There is need for community involvement and sensitization before commencement of construction works in communities, as a preventive measure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Meeting Date and Location</th>
<th>Location of GRM</th>
<th>Membership of Committees</th>
<th>Channels of Access to GRM</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Disclosure</th>
<th>Redress Expected</th>
<th>Other Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bo</td>
<td>April 12, 2011; Bo Town</td>
<td>Adopted as proposed</td>
<td><strong>Chiefdom</strong> a) Add Section chiefs b) Add Religious leaders for their high esteem and respect with communities c) Add the head of traditional/secret societies to help solve problems with cultural and societal issues <strong>District</strong> a) Add Religious leaders b) Add Chief Administrator of council</td>
<td>Chiefdom a) Complain ts should be made to the Town chief in the affected community b) Complaints from chiefdom committees to the District Committees</td>
<td>Upheld as proposed</td>
<td>a) Use of community radio b) Council meetings c) Religious gathering</td>
<td>RPSDP and GOSL should determine compensatio n package for affected persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Meeting Date and Location</td>
<td>Location of GRM</td>
<td>Membership of Committees</td>
<td>Channels of Access to GRM</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>Redress Expected</td>
<td>Other Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonkolili</td>
<td>April 13, 2011; Conference Hall, Tonkolili District Council, Magburaka</td>
<td>Adopted as proposed</td>
<td><strong>Chiefdom</strong>&lt;br&gt;a) Replace Town Chief with Section Chief&lt;br&gt;b) Add religious leaders</td>
<td>Grievances can be channeled to any committee member, but also to a designated REGISTRAR (preferably the the</td>
<td>Upheld as proposed</td>
<td>Community radio, with preference to the following local languages: temne, limba, creole and kuranko</td>
<td>a) Amicable resolution, which can be reached if APs are approached with respect. b) In the case of resettlement,</td>
<td>Logistics support for the smooth functioning of the redress structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Meeting Date and Location</td>
<td>Location of GRM</td>
<td>Membership of Committees</td>
<td>Channels of Access to GRM</td>
<td>Timeframe Disclosure</td>
<td>Redress Expected</td>
<td>Other Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonthe</td>
<td>April 13, 2011; Mattru Town</td>
<td>Adopted as proposed</td>
<td><strong>Chiefdom</strong>&lt;br&gt;a) Add the Chiefdom Coordinator for ONS&lt;br&gt;b) Add religious leaders&lt;br&gt;c) Add district engineer&lt;br&gt;d) Add section chief&lt;br&gt;<strong>District</strong>&lt;br&gt;a) Add district engineer and religious leaders&lt;br&gt;<strong>National</strong>&lt;br&gt;a) Add ONS coordinator</td>
<td>Chiefdom&lt;br&gt;b) APs to channel complaints through town chief who will then inform the chairman of the chiefdom committee&lt;br&gt;<strong>District</strong>&lt;br&gt;a) Add district engineer and religious leaders</td>
<td>Upheld as proposed</td>
<td>a) Community Radio&lt;br&gt;b) In the mosque and church&lt;br&gt;c) Women's meetings&lt;br&gt;d) Council meetings</td>
<td>Compensatio, if the need arises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Meeting Date and Location</td>
<td>Location of GRM</td>
<td>Membership of Committees</td>
<td>Channels of Access to GRM</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>Redress Expected</td>
<td>Other Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) forward to the district committee through the district Civil Society Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) GR issues from the district committee should not be taken to the PCU directly rather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Meeting Date and Location</td>
<td>Location of GRM</td>
<td>Membership of Committees</td>
<td>Channels of Access to GRM</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>Redress Expected</td>
<td>Other Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kono     | April 14, 2011; District Council Conference Hall, Kono | Recomm ended only two levels – chiefdom and district committees. **REASONS:** Different land tenure systems across districts; A national | District | a) Replace ONS with DISEC  
b) Add Chairman, Council of Paramount Chiefs  
c) Add District Youth Leader  
d) Add Chief Administrator of council | Upheld as proposed. However, Chief Administrator should be the focal person at the district level | Upheld as proposed | a) Radio  
b) Chiefdom meetings  
c) Sectional meetings | Logistics support for the functioning of GRM structures. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Meeting Date and Location</th>
<th>Location of GRM</th>
<th>Membership of Committees</th>
<th>Channels of Access to GRM</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Disclosure</th>
<th>Redress Expected</th>
<th>Other Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moyamba</td>
<td>April 14, 2011; Moyamba Town</td>
<td>Adopted as proposed Chiefdom</td>
<td>a) Add religious leaders b) Add MAFFS Block Extension Staff, because of their leading role in farming activities in the chiefdoms National a) Add ONS rep A representative of the chiefdom/district committee should</td>
<td>Upheld as proposed</td>
<td>a) Community radio b) Community meetings c) Drama play for local communities</td>
<td>a) Amicable resolution b) Minimal compensation, where necessary</td>
<td>a) It was recommended that the committee can proceed with deliberation on there is 2/3 majority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Meeting Date and Location</td>
<td>Location of GRM</td>
<td>Membership of Committees</td>
<td>Channels of Access to GRM</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>Redress Expected</td>
<td>Other Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Area Rural District</td>
<td>April 15, 2011; District Council Hall, Waterloo</td>
<td>Adopted as proposed</td>
<td><strong>Chiefdom</strong></td>
<td>At village level, complaint should be channeled through the village headman to the chiefdom/Ward committee</td>
<td>Adopted as proposed</td>
<td>a) Radio b) Community meetings</td>
<td>Compensatio, where expedient</td>
<td>The peculiarity of governance structure in the western area need to be given attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Add religious leaders and farmers’ rep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Paramount Chief position does not apply in the case of western area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Replace Council Chairman with Chief Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Add farmers’ rep and District Youth Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Add Chairman, Council of Headmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants
The following participants were targeted for each district, selected across all chiefdoms within a particular district:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category of Participant</th>
<th>No. of Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paramount Chiefs/Chiefdom Speakers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ward Councilors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chiefdom Youth Leader</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chiefdom Women’s Leader</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section Chief</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Council Engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DIC Chairman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Office of National Security</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>District Agriculture Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SLRA District Engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Religious Leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chief Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Farmers Representative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL (No. of Participants)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: OUTLINE OF A RESESETLEMENT ACTION PLAN (RAP)/ABBREVIATED RESETTLEMENT ACTION PLAN (ARAP)

Outline for a RAP (For PAPs 200+)

- Introduction
- Project Description.
- Effort made to Minimizing Resettlement
- Census and Socioeconomic Surveys
- Legal and Institutional Framework
- Description of compensation and other resettlement assistance to be provided;
- Institutional arrangements and consultations with affected people about acceptable alternatives;
- Existing legal and policy framework for land acquisition
- Institutional responsibility for implementation and procedures for grievance redress;
- Arrangements for monitoring and implementation;
- Grievance redress System
- A Timetable and budget.
- Monitoring Plans and Indicators
- Prepare entitlement matrix for Resettlement Sites

Outline ARAP (For PAPs less than 200)

This covers the following elements:

- A census survey of displaced persons and valuation of assets; (dates)
- Description of compensation and other resettlement assistance to be provided;
- Institutional arrangements and consultations with affected people about acceptable alternatives;
• Existing legal and policy framework for land acquisition

• Institutional responsibility for implementation and procedures for grievance redress;

• Arrangements for monitoring and implementation; and

• A timetable and budget.