

Document: EB 2010/99/R.12
Agenda: 8(d)
Date: 19 March 2010
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Enabling poor rural people
to overcome poverty

Sierra Leone

Country strategic opportunities programme

Executive Board — Ninety-ninth Session
Rome, 21-22 April 2010

For: **Review**

Note to Executive Board Members

This document is submitted for review by the Executive Board.

To make the best use of time available at Executive Board sessions, Representatives are invited to contact the following focal point with any technical questions about this document before the session:

Hubert Boirard

Country Portfolio Manager
telephone: +39 06 5459 2298
e-mail: h.boirard@ifad.org

Queries regarding the dispatch of documentation for this session should be addressed to:

Deirdre McGrenra

Governing Bodies Officer
telephone: +39 06 5459 2374
e-mail: d.mcgrenra@ifad.org

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	ii
Map of IFAD operations in the country	iii
Summary of country strategy	iv
I. Introduction	1
II. Country context	1
A. Economic, agricultural and rural poverty context	1
B. Policy, strategy and institutional context	3
III. Lessons from IFAD's experience in the country	5
A. Past results, impact and performance	5
B. Lessons learned	6
IV. IFAD country strategic framework	7
A. IFAD's comparative advantage at the country level	7
B. Strategic objectives	7
C. Opportunities for innovation	9
D. Targeting strategy	9
E. Policy linkages	10
V. Programme management	11
A. COSOP monitoring	11
B. Country programme management	12
C. Partnerships	12
D. Knowledge management and communication	13
E. PBAS financing framework	14
F. Risks and risk management	15
Appendices	
I. COSOP consultation process	1
II. Country economic background	3
III. COSOP results management framework	4
IV. Lessons learned from country programme implementation	7
V. Project pipeline during the COSOP period	10
Key files	
Key file 1: Rural poverty and agricultural/rural sector issues	13
Key file 2: Organizations matrix (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats [SWOT] analysis)	16
Key file 3: Complementary donor initiative/partnership potential	21
Key file 4: Target group identification, priority issues and potential response	24

Abbreviations and acronyms

AfDB	African Development Bank
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
COSOP	country strategic opportunities programme
CPMT	country programme management team
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FSA	financial services association
GTZ	German Agency for Technical Cooperation
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (German Government-owned development bank)
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MAFFS	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security
NPCU	national programme coordination unit
NSADP	National Sustainable Agriculture Development Plan
PBAS	performance-based allocation system
PRSP	poverty reduction strategy paper
RCPRP	Rehabilitation and Community-based Poverty Reduction Project
RFCIP	Rural Finance and Community Improvement Programme
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WFP	World Food Programme

Map of IFAD operations in the country

Sierra Leone

IFAD-funded ongoing operations



27-1-2010



The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this map do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IFAD concerning the delimitation of the frontiers or boundaries, or the authorities thereof.

Map compiled by IFAD

Summary of country strategy

1. The country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP) for Sierra Leone for 2010-2015 will continue to support the Government's rural poverty reduction goals, which are closely aligned with the Millennium Development Goals and foster agriculture as the 'engine' of socio-economic growth. This COSOP incorporates findings, lessons, conclusions, issues and recommendations that emerged from the baseline poverty analysis, the agricultural and rural development analysis, and the 2009 IFAD country programme review exercise conducted with the country programme management team (CPMT).
2. The COSOP preparation process (appendix I) started in 2009 and was highly consultative and interactive. During the preparatory phase, a desk study of key documents was undertaken, a stakeholders' workshop was organized and additional data and reports were collected. In November 2009, an in-country presentation of the draft was organized under the leadership of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security, and attended by members of the CPMT, which comprises representatives of United Nations organizations, donors, NGOs, agricultural research, farmers' organizations, the Bank of Sierra Leone, commercial banks and the IFAD national programme coordination unit. Several formal exchanges, observations and comments from the in-country and in-house CPMT were subsequently integrated.
3. Sierra Leone belongs to the group of least developed countries (and is ranked 180 out of 182 countries on the human development index). About 26 per cent of the people are food-insecure and cannot afford a basic diet, while 70 per cent live below the poverty line. Poverty is directly linked to the problems faced by agricultural production and commercialization. There is widespread regional disparity in the incidence of poverty within the rural areas, where two thirds of the population lives. Geographically, the eastern part of Sierra Leone is more severely affected than other parts of the country.
4. IFAD's country programme for Sierra Leone covering the six-year period 2010-2015 hinges on three strategic objectives: (i) support to agriculture –smallholder farmers' access to irrigation, technical skills and market is improved; (ii) support to rural finance – the rural poor have access to reliable and sustainable financial services (savings, credit, transfers, remittances); (iii) support to local development – the rural poor increase their level of participation in the management of local decentralized institutions. These objectives are consistent with the IFAD Strategic Framework 2007-2010 and with the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme of the New Partnership for Africa's Development, national policies and strategies for sustainable agricultural development, economic growth and poverty reduction; Millennium Development Goal targets for reducing poverty and hunger. This COSOP is also fully aligned with the second poverty reduction strategy paper and the new National Sustainable Agricultural Development Plan 2010-2030 launched in October 2009.
5. Key cross-cutting issues are to be addressed across the three strategic objectives. They include: (i) environmental soundness and natural resource management; (ii) gender mainstreaming as one of the key aspects of IFAD's involvement; (iii) the pursuit of innovation; and (iv) knowledge management.
6. Sierra Leone has huge potential for agricultural development, which will greatly contribute to food security, coherence of communities, stability and peace. The key challenges to the successful implementation of the COSOP are limited institutional capacity within the central and decentralized administration and a generally weak support system for agricultural development.

7. The COSOP responds to this by initially investing the new financing in scaling up ongoing interventions in Kono and Kailahun, to allow full coverage of these districts and have a massive impact in the rural communities, and then by extending these activities to Koinadugu and Kenema districts. Only the rural finance strategic objectives will be progressively extended on a national scale.

Sierra Leone

Country strategic opportunities programme

I. Introduction

1. The first country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP) for Sierra Leone was approved in 2003. This COSOP is the second one and the first results-based COSOP. Based on the IFAD Strategic Framework 2007-2010, it reflects IFAD's shift from a project to a programme approach, emphasizes the need to align the IFAD portfolio more closely with national policies and priorities, seeks complementarity with other donor interventions and incorporates a performance management system to allow the evaluation of overall programme effectiveness and impact. It builds on lessons learned in the past and on IFAD's comparative advantages as the United Nations organization with a specific mandate to assist smallholder farmers and the rural poor.
2. Eight years after the end of the war in Sierra Leone, the country is still considered to be a fragile state despite enormous advances made in building democratic institutions at the central and decentralized levels, developing policies and strategies for all strategically important sectors, making progress towards securing macroeconomic stability, fighting corruption and increasing funding for priority sectors such as power and agriculture. Weaknesses remain, which are, among others: low implementation capacity, inadequate monitoring and evaluation (M&E) capacity, weak public services, high dependency on donors and insufficient investments.
3. This results-based COSOP was developed in an iterative consultative process in close partnership with the Government of Sierra Leone through the Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security, the Minister for Finance and Economic Development, and the country programme management team (CPMT), which comprises representatives of government, professional and civil society groups, and other stakeholders at the central and decentralized levels.

II. Country context

A. Economic, agricultural and rural poverty context

Country economic background

4. **General context.** Sierra Leone is located in Western Africa, bordered by the Atlantic Ocean, Guinea and Liberia, and covers a land area of 71,740 km². Its population is estimated at approximately 6 million (2008), and, given an average annual growth rate of 2.1 per cent, is projected to double by 2050. About 42 per cent of the population is under 15 years of age and almost 75 per cent is under 35 years of age. While the human resource base represents a huge potential for development, it is estimated that at present 60 per cent of 'young people' (ranging from non-school-going 15-year-olds to 35-year-old adults) are either unemployed or underemployed.
5. Sierra Leone belongs to the group of least developed countries and has qualified for the Debt Initiative for Heavily Indebted Poor Countries. The country meets criteria established by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) for classification as a low-income food deficit country. The United Nations Development Programme's Human Development Report for 2009 (based on 2007 data) ranks Sierra Leone 180 out of 182 countries on the human development index. The total adult literacy rate is 38.1 per cent, while the female literacy rate is 26.8 per cent. Life expectancy at birth is 41.8 years.

6. **Economy.** Agriculture – including fisheries and forestry – is the mainstay of the economy, contributing about 46 per cent of GDP and providing employment for about 70 per cent of the population. The other sectors are mining, complemented by services and, to a lesser extent, manufacturing. Sierra Leone has a negative trade balance due to the overall low productivity of all sectors, the narrow manufacturing base and unfavourable terms of trade. Until recently, the exchange rate of the leone to the United States dollar had remained stable. The inflation rate stood at 11.7 per cent in 2008/2009. Real GDP grew by 7.3 per cent, 7.4 per cent, 6.8 per cent and 6.4 per cent in 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008, respectively.

Agriculture and rural poverty

7. **Agriculture.** The crops subsector dominates, having increased its share of GDP between 2001 and 2008 from 25 per cent to 32 per cent, followed by fisheries and livestock with a stagnant 8 per cent and 3 per cent, respectively, and forestry with a decline from 6 per cent to 3 per cent. The agricultural growth rate is 4.2 per cent per year. In order to achieve the first Millennium Development Goal (eradicate extreme poverty and hunger), and depending on the performance of the rest of the economy, agriculture has to grow at least by 5.5-7.1 per cent per year.
8. About 5.4 million hectares (ha), or 74 per cent of the total land area, is considered suitable for cultivation. The total area of arable land in the uplands is estimated at 4.3 million ha, while about 1.1 million ha of the lowland area is considered arable. Lowland inland valley swamps have a huge potential to increase rice production and support a second crop such as vegetables, but at present less than 15 per cent of the area is cultivated.
9. There are an estimated 300,000 smallholder farmers in Sierra Leone. During the 2004/2005 cropping season, 56 per cent of farming households cultivated less than 1 ha. Rice field area per household ranged from 0.25 ha to 5.5 ha with an average of 1 ha.
10. Although private investments by larger-scale farmers and enterprises are still low, interest in Sierra Leone in investing in agriculture and agribusiness, including in biofuel production, is increasing.
11. In the past, Sierra Leone was a net exporter of a number of agricultural commodities, including cocoa, coffee, ginger, palm kernels, rubber and rice. The country is now a net importer of rice and some other food crops, largely as a result of failed policies, unfavourable economic conditions, infrastructure destruction during conflict and structural adjustments.
12. Challenges to the growth of agriculture are many. Sierra Leone is facing an expertise crisis, which could become more severe in 3-5 years when the present generation of professionals retires. Before and during the war, many highly skilled experts left the country, and national universities, colleges and polytechnics have not been able to train enough people since.
13. The technology level of agriculture is generally low. Subsistence agriculture, practising shifting cultivation, is the dominant farming system in the uplands. The absence of agricultural inputs to enhance production limits agricultural productivity. Fewer than 5 per cent of households have access to chemical fertilizers, insecticides, herbicides and motorized farm equipment. Improved seeds, including the New Rice for Africa (NERICA) varieties, essential to increase productivity, are in short supply and many varieties are outdated. Available seed is often mixed and of substandard quality. Farmers report high losses caused by pests and diseases that they are unable to control.
14. Agricultural credit and microfinance for investments are often not available. The number of financial institutions in the formal and semi-formal sectors is small, their outreach to rural areas is extremely limited, and their services are generally rudimentary. Commercial banks have a near-zero outreach to rural areas. The

services of community banks are more accessible, but these banks are few in number (six in 2009). Microfinance institutions are relatively small organizations, with only a few of them serving more than 500 clients. The total value of loans granted by formal financial institutions is at a very low level.

15. One reason for the lack of economic activity in the rural areas is the limited investment in infrastructure as it relates to agriculture. Rice mills, feed mills, processing facilities in general, rural roads, transportation, markets, irrigation systems, sea and inland ports and landing sites for fisheries are lacking, which has undoubtedly inhibited agricultural growth. The consequence of poor roads and transport services is that transport costs are high or transport is not possible altogether. Less than 2 per cent of arable land is irrigated, despite the fact that irrigation permits higher value-added crop production (especially during the six-month-long dry season), reduces vulnerability to drought and climate change, and generally increases productivity. Use of technologies for water conservation or drainage is low. The potential for irrigation remains largely unexploited.
16. Consequently, crop yields remain low at 0.72 and 1.23 metric tons (mt)/ha for upland and lowland rice respectively; 2.2 mt/ha for maize; 5.5 mt/ha for cassava; 6 mt/ha for sweet potatoes; 1.8 mt/ha for groundnuts; 100-200 kg/ha for cocoa; and 4 t/ha for oil palm. Birth rates for cattle are also low at 45 per cent, while mortality is high and offtake is only 7 per cent because of parasites, disease and feed deficiencies.
17. **Rural poverty** in Sierra Leone is widespread and deep. About 26 per cent of the people are food-poor and cannot afford a basic diet, while 70 per cent live below the poverty line. Poverty is directly linked to the problems faced by agricultural production and commercialization. Food insecurity is more pronounced in households headed by women than in those headed by men. At the same time, there is widespread regional disparity in the incidence of poverty, with rural areas, where two thirds of the population lives, being the hardest hit. Geographically, the eastern part of Sierra Leone is more severely affected than other parts of the country. The poverty profile shows that the main indicators of poverty are food insufficiency, poor housing and poor health, coupled with high infant and maternal mortality, high illiteracy, limited access to clean water and very low incomes.

B. Policy, strategy and institutional context

National institutional context

18. **The Ministry of Finance and Economic Development** is the signatory to the loan/grant agreements between IFAD and the Government. It is responsible for government negotiations with donors, management of loans and grants, allocation of counterpart funds and supervision of loan/grant disbursements. In addition, it is instrumental in policy development concerning the banking sector and in the development of microfinance institutions. The Ministry has qualified staff, and procedures are in place.
19. The independent **Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC)** has been established to support the Government's efforts to improve governance at all levels. The new Government has increased the independence and assertiveness of the ACC, for example in relation to governance reviews of key ministries, and has shown greater willingness to prosecute offenders. In 2009, the ACC recovered more than US\$1 million. Good governance and the fight against corruption are high priorities for this Government, which links these results to its resource mobilization strategy. In 2009, Sierra Leone rose 12 places in the Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index.
20. **The National Public Procurement Authority (NPPA)** is the regulatory and oversight body advising the Government on all issues pertaining to public procurement in Sierra Leone. It also works to build capacity in the procuring

entities, such as those of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS) and the national programme coordination unit (NPCU). The legislative and regulatory framework meets international standards. However, compliance and performance still need to be improved.

21. **The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS)** is the central government institution responsible for promoting the development of agriculture in Sierra Leone, particularly through implementing policies, development programmes and investment schemes in support of the sector's objectives as specified in the poverty reduction strategy paper (PRSP).
22. MAFFS is the executing agency for IFAD interventions. The Ministry has recently concluded the formulation of the National Sustainable Agriculture Development Plan 2010–2030 (NSADP)/Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) with the participation of a broad spectrum of stakeholders. The NSADP has been adopted as the binding document for the Ministry and the Government as a whole for agricultural development. Together with other policy and strategy documents, this gives MAFFS a solid vision, policy and strategy. Bottlenecks exist in the implementation of projects and programmes (expertise crisis, insufficient operating budget, low salaries, low mobility, lack of management skills, insufficient training opportunities). There are only a few women extension officers in government service, who could often address gender issues more effectively.
23. Within the context of decentralization, the district directors of agriculture and the local councils share responsibilities for the implementation of donor interventions in the sector. Decentralization is firmly established and politically supported, but still in a learning mode. The successful local elections in 2009 brought new people into office. Considerable progress has been made, but capacities and skills are yet to be fully developed.
24. Traditional authorities and land-owning families have great influence in their communities as the custodians of the land, have traditional jurisdiction, play an important role in conflict resolution and are important catalysts of development in their chiefdoms. There is a lingering conflict between local councils and the traditional authorities over power, budget allocations and approaches.
25. Implementing partners for IFAD-funded interventions are farmers' organizations, beneficiaries' associations, private local and national enterprises, government departments, NGOs, and consultants according to the task at hand and to their respective specialization. Qualified organizations and contractors are available, but performance monitoring is essential to ensure the timely and efficient delivery of quality outputs. Regional experts and international implementing partners are encouraged to form partnerships with local organizations to make use of local know-how and contribute to capacity development.
26. The National Federation of Farmers of Sierra Leone and the Chamber of Agriculture were both established recently, and are expected to gain importance as promoters and lobbyists for improvements in agriculture and the commercialization of agriculture. They are still institutionally weak and have to find their role and ways to carry forward their mandates.
27. The private sector and the Sierra Leone Investment and Export Promotion Agency (established in 2007) will play an ever-greater role in attracting private investments and in increasing value addition and agricultural (and other) exports. It is important that the Government ensures the equitable spread of the benefits of these investments while preventing and mitigating negative effects, especially of non-food and biofuel production schemes, on food security and social standards in the country. A land use policy for large-scale foreign investments and a biofuel policy have yet to be established.

National rural poverty reduction strategy

28. The country's second PRSP, covering 2008-2012, was launched in 2008 as the "agenda for change" of the present Government. It focuses on four priorities: energy, transportation, agriculture and human development. It is built on a problems-and-needs analysis and takes account of the progress made and lessons learned during implementation of the previous PRSP.
29. After the inauguration of the Bumbuna hydroelectric power plant and the initiation and continuation of several road construction and rehabilitation projects, agriculture has taken centre stage. Given its economic importance, agriculture is envisaged to be the engine of economic growth in the country. The budget allocation for agriculture has steadily increased over the past three years and is expected to reach 10 per cent (without salaries) in 2010. The new NSADP/CAADP specifies the strategies to improve productivity and production, increase value addition and marketing of primary and processed agricultural produce on domestic and international markets, and sets out the related targets. This requires the commercialization of agriculture at the smallholder, medium- and large-scale producer levels and the involvement of the private sector both upstream and downstream in the commodity chains.

Harmonization and alignment

30. The Government has improved the coordination mechanism in the sector. It has established the Presidential Task Force on Agriculture (PTFag) as the highest-level policymaking body for the coordination and management of the NSADP. It is chaired by the President, with MAFFS as Secretary. MAFFS has improved the coordination mechanisms by establishing various forums: the Agribusiness Forum, bringing together government and business to improve the investment climate in agriculture; the Agriculture Advisory Group, bringing together government, private sector, parastatals, and research and development partners to discuss both policy and technical issues; the National Agriculture Coordination Unit of MAFFS, which serves as a technical committee for the PTFag and the agricultural technical team, and is responsible for the day-to-day coordination of the various interventions in the sector. A group of NGOs working in agriculture and rural development meet regularly in a livelihood and food security forum. At the district level the local councils have established agricultural forums, where all governmental and non-governmental development partners in the sector meet once a month. IFAD is an active partner, striving to make these forums results-oriented and effective in exchanging experiences.
31. IFAD, represented by the country programme manager at the political level and by the national programme coordinator at the technical level, is, as part of the United Nations system and sharing its "joint vision for Sierra Leone", an accepted and reliable partner. In this capacity, IFAD fosters synergies particularly in cooperation and the implementation of concrete actions in the field with FAO, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and World Food Programme (WFP), and engages in dialogue and cooperation with other donor agencies.

III. Lessons from IFAD's experience in the country

A. Past results, impact and performance

32. In the 1980s and early 1990s, IFAD funded three integrated agricultural development projects, the Magbosi Integrated Agricultural Development Project, the Northern Integrated Agricultural Development Project II, and the North-central Agricultural Development Project. As far as agriculture is concerned, these projects were largely production-oriented and had some degree of impact in this respect. The difficult situation at the beginning of the 1990s – with the downturn in the world economy, structural adjustment programmes and the outbreak of civil conflict – prevented project objectives from being achieved. Any progress made was then rendered obsolete by the war.

33. The COSOP 2003-2009 had a projected funding of approximately US\$20 million, split between two projects. The Rehabilitation and Community-based Poverty Reduction Project (RCPRP) was launched in March 2006. The grant for the Rural Finance and Community Improvement Programme (RFCIP) became effective in May 2008. The African Development Bank (AfDB) was appointed cooperating institution, and the RCPRP and RFCIP were managed in conjunction with the AfDB-funded Agricultural Sector Rehabilitation Project (ASREP) through a joint NPCU.
34. Progress in implementation and in disbursement of the project and programme was very slow during the first three years of implementation (2006-2008). From January 2009 onwards, IFAD direct supervision facilitated the restructuring and implementation of the whole portfolio to better respond to the needs of beneficiaries. Considerable progress was observed after few months. Reasons for this include direct involvement in policy dialogue to overcome bottlenecks, permanent field offices in the project districts, pragmatic decision-making to accelerate implementation, strong implementation support, and a new dynamic in the NPCU.

B. Lessons learned

35. During implementation of the previous COSOP valuable lessons were learned, from which the following recommendations can be made:
- Concentrate efforts thematically and geographically.
 - Keep the design simple, limit the number of interventions but scale them up to increase impact.
 - Implement with strong ownership by the target groups, their immediate representatives at the ward and district levels, and local enterprises.
 - Reinforce donor coordination at the national and district levels and forge complementarity and synergies.
 - Involve the private sector in the commodity value chains to bring about change in productive capacity at the farm level through support to input supply, production, storage, processing and marketing.
 - Take into account the new policies as developed in the NSADP/CAADP, and areas where IFAD could add significant value, such as in support to local development decentralization, rural finance, greater involvement of the private sector and rural infrastructure.
 - Do much more to promote gender equity with a much more aggressive approach to bring about the much-needed changes in the rural livelihood systems to ensure that women are more involved in the implementation of all aspects of the programme.

Policy dialogue and partnership

- Assist the Government and the commercial sector in establishing a viable rural banking sector, and making the required changes to the current government policy, regulatory and legal framework.
- Increase facilitation of strategic partnerships to improve programme management, policy dialogue and replication of investments.
- Ensure that the whole partnership and consultation process is inclusive for all entities; a greater involvement of civil society and the private sector will be important to move agricultural development forward.
- Maintain the IFAD NPCU and IFAD presence in the field.

Portfolio performance

- Generating higher impact and addressing issues of efficiency and sustainability requires specialization of project interventions, greater leverage of cofinancing resources and reliance on alternative delivery systems and on public extension services: in all of this the private sector should play a role and IFAD should actively facilitate its involvement.

IV. IFAD country strategic framework

A. IFAD's comparative advantage at the country level

36. IFAD supports the Government in reducing poverty and food insecurity in rural areas. The Fund's main comparative advantages in Sierra Leone are: (a) IFAD is decentralized in the field with one office in Kono and one in Kailahun; (b) IFAD activities are at the village level and respond to the first priorities of the rural poor (including youth and women); (c) IFAD works closely with partners in these areas to ensure efficient use of funds and implementation of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness; and (d) capacity-building, accountability and transparency in procurement are developed at the local level to foster ownership and sustainability. Field models implemented are systematically analyzed with key stakeholders and the Government, improved with regional best practices and expertise, and then formalized through shared documentation.
37. IFAD has a broad base of local and corporate knowledge of concepts, tools and methods. Innovations are fully used to promote adaptation, adoption and scaling up of successful models worldwide, such as the financial services associations (FSAs).
38. In Sierra Leone IFAD has set up one IFAD programme managed by the same NPCU (efficiency of funds and of coordination). IFAD has developed a results-based approach in the country, which is translated, with the support of MAFFS, in the NPCU staff performance evaluation system. The direct supervision and implementation support that commenced in 2009 has led to better efficiency and a more proactive and flexible approach to the implementation of IFAD financing.

B. Strategic objectives

39. IFAD's country strategy will continue to support the Government's rural poverty reduction goals, which are closely aligned with the Millennium Development Goals. Within the overarching goal of empowering poor rural women and men in the rural areas of Sierra Leone to achieve higher incomes and improved food security, the Sierra Leone results-based COSOP will have the following strategic objectives:
 - **Strategic objective 1: Support to agriculture – smallholder farmers' access to irrigation, technical skills and market is improved.** This strategic objective is designed to directly increase the incomes and food security of target groups and will focus action on three components: (a) agriculture: comprehensive capacity-building of farmers and farmers' organizations to improve group management, increase negotiating power, create a mutual learning environment, facilitate better access to inputs and finance, accelerate the sustainable intensification and diversification of agricultural production and value addition. This also includes livelihood skills; (b) rural infrastructure: Rehabilitation of tree crop plantations (cocoa, coffee and palm oil) and inland valley swamps, abandoned and overgrown during the war; building and rehabilitation of drying floors, stores and small-scale irrigation facilities including harnessing underground water (pumps, wells). Spot rehabilitation of feeder and trunk roads to enable transport of agricultural produce and other goods to markets, reduce costs and stimulate economic activities in general; and (c) private sector support: Strengthening of existing or new agroservice suppliers to deliver inputs and extension services at the district level and to improve processing and marketing of agricultural produce. Component (a) mainly supports subprogramme 1

(commodity commercialization) of the NSADP, while component (b) contributes to subprogrammes 1 and 2 (commodity commercialization and infrastructure), and component (c) to subprogrammes 1 and 3 (commodity commercialization and private sector development).

The project(s) under this COSOP will not normally cover entire value chains. Value chain activities aim to optimize specific links of a particular value chain, such as improving production (input supply, agricultural good practices), the quality of the produce (e.g. de-stoning, packaging of rice, processing of cocoa) or marketing (linking farmers with traders or processors).

- **Strategic objective 2: Support to rural finance – the rural poor have access to reliable and sustainable financial services (savings, credit, transfers, remittances, etc.).** The aim is to empower rural people to operate and use village and community-based rural financial institutions, extend access to finance to enable them to engage in economic on- and off-farm activities and increase sustainability by linking village-based institutions to the commercial banking sector. The following components will be implemented: (a) FSAs: sensitization of rural communities about the potential of rural financial services and training in their use, institutional development, such as capacity-building of staff and provision of infrastructure and material to establish and run FSAs; (b) community banks: institutional development, such as capacity-building and provision of infrastructure and material to establish community banks in selected locations, especially where commercial banks are not operating and to consolidate existing community banks set up by the Bank of Sierra Leone; (c) refinancing facility: operation of the refinancing facility to increase the initial capital of FSAs and community banks for lending; and (d) regulation: support to government for regulatory issues, supervision and sustainability, including the establishment of an apex technical assistance facility for the community banks and FSAs. Strategic objective 2 will be progressively implemented at the national level and will contribute to achieving the objectives of the new Financial Sector Development Plan. Strategic objective 2 will also be coordinated with the second Microfinance Investment and Technical Assistance Facility currently under design. Because microfinance is one of the necessary preconditions for increased economic activities in the rural areas, this objective contributes to subprogramme 1 of the NSADP (commodity commercialization) and, to a lesser extent, to subprogrammes 2 (infrastructure) and 3 (private sector development).
- **Strategic objective 3: Support to local development – the rural poor increase their level of participation in the management of local decentralized institutions.** The aim is to strengthen the capacities of both the rural poor and the constitutional decentralized authorities at the district and ward levels to perform their duties, to guide and manage development in their constituencies, and to increase ownership, efficiency and transparency. The following components will be implemented: (a) sensitization of the population on their rights and duties, and facilitation of their participation in the planning and development process; (b) capacity-building and coaching of district council and ward development committee staff in economic planning, regulatory issues, administration and financial management; (c) strengthening of donor coordination in the districts; and (d) setting up and operating a community development fund for demand-driven community development projects. By increasing the efficiency of joint planning, implementation and supervision, strategic objective 3 supports all NSADP subprogrammes, particularly

subprogrammes 1 (commodity commercialization) and 4 (sector coordination and management).

40. Key cross-cutting issues are to be addressed across the three strategic objectives. They include: (a) environmental soundness and natural resource management ("do no harm!"); (b) gender mainstreaming as one of the key aspects of IFAD's involvement; (c) the pursuit of innovation; and (d) knowledge management.
41. The three strategic objectives will be implemented as an integrated programme in the targeted areas. Community banks will also be established in other areas in order to consolidate the existing community-based system. All new community banks or FSAs are set up after business plans have been drawn up and the identified new microfinance institutions have been confirmed as profitable and sustainable.
42. The data provided in this COSOP should be updated with data as they become available (see chapter on COSOP monitoring).

C. Opportunities for innovation

43. In the context of Sierra Leone, there is significant potential for innovation and scaling up. In agriculture, innovations will be developed through the inland valley swamp and tree crop rehabilitation programmes where: (a) special youth programmes will be developed to support district youth groups in becoming local enterprises that can develop, rehabilitate or maintain this infrastructure or these plantations; (b) a revolving fund will be created in order to foster a dynamic in terms of intensification for rice or tree crop production/marketing; and (c) a link will be sought with the IFAD Africa Rice Project in order to scale up the intensified package developed by this financing and facilitate rural poor farmers' access to improved seed (NERICA in particular).
44. In rural finance, innovation will be developed with new rural and agricultural financial products that will be tested and delivered by the FSAs and community banks (adaptation of experience with mutual credit schemes in Guinea and in other countries of West and Central Africa). Another innovation that will also be tested and scaled up is a smallholder farmer credit channel constituted from MAFFS funds to reach smallholder farmers through the local FSAs and community banks.
45. On a local scale, innovations will also be developed through results-based contracts with the municipalities in order to ensure that the cost and the organization of infrastructure maintenance is foreseen in the annual budget of the district. Moreover, IFAD will progressively hand over responsibilities to the district councils and ward development committees for every step of the process, from planning to implementation and evaluation.

D. Targeting strategy

46. The IFAD target group consists of smallholder farmers and landless rural households ready to abandon subsistence agriculture with the support provided by the programme. Special attention will be paid to ensure that the needs and priorities of more vulnerable groups such as woman-headed households and landless young people are taken into account.
47. Smallholder farmers, typically cultivating farms of less than 1.5 ha, will be supported by facilitating access to know-how, land, inputs, finance and markets.
48. Women face both poverty and social exclusion. Their socio-economic roles deserve priority attention. Gender inequalities are grave. A major need experienced by women is that of increased recognition and participation in both community and economic activities. In terms of community life, the programme will ensure that women participate actively in, and benefit from, project activities, particularly those related to organizational capacities, support to production systems, and access to markets and commercial (value-adding) opportunities. Women are the main actors

in agricultural production as well as in small trade locally. These roles will be recognized and reinforced by the programme, providing women with knowledge, advocacy support, organizational skills and linkages with rural entrepreneurs. Increased representation by women in community groups and farmers' and producers' organizations will be encouraged. Capacity-building will be targeted to men and women according to gender-specific activities. Literacy and numeracy classes will be predominantly directed to women and young people. Women's groups will be given preferential treatment in obtaining loans from the FSA, and they will at least equally benefit from business training. To achieve this, social targeting of households and groups within communities is critical. The implementing partners and group promoters will follow a transparent participatory approach with the communities, based on jointly agreed criteria including vulnerability and gender.

49. Young people, both men and women, are of particular concern for various reasons. They constitute the largest part of the population; they were actively involved in the war; they are among the displaced; and, due to the war, they have a low level of education. The exploitation of young people by their elders and their limited access to land and resources is seen as a major cause for the 10-year-long conflict.
50. Targeting will concentrate on three aspects: (a) creating employment opportunities; (b) fostering entrepreneurial spirit and skills among selected young people; and (c) supporting youth organizations, particularly those with social, productive and advocacy roles. Targeted interventions will include temporary measures, such as food or cash for work involving the rehabilitation of tree crop plantations, inland valley swamps and roads. More important are long-term measures supporting youth groups in agricultural activities, in particular cash crop farming and value-adding activities. Efforts will be made to link youth groups to agribusinesses in outgrower schemes and public-private partnerships, and to programmes such as WFP's Purchase for Progress initiative.
51. Another important target group is constituted by local microentrepreneurs and small-scale business operators. They are part of the rural poor, and their distinctiveness is an eagerness to engage in economic initiatives. They may operate in groups or individually, often in processing, transport and trading activities. Their main problems are lack of access to capital and financial services, and weak entrepreneurial capacities. However, their vision and efforts to advance an entrepreneurial activity make them valuable actors in the rural milieu, capable of stimulating the local economy and bringing in new ideas. Priority will be given to local enterprises.
52. In addition, resources will be provided for capacity-building of governmental and non-governmental service providers giving support to IFAD target groups.
53. Geographically, the selection criteria of degree of poverty for Kailahun and the degree of destruction during the war of Kono and Kailahun are still valid. Consequently, the programme will focus on these two districts where ongoing activities, as described in the specific objectives, will be scaled up in order to increase impact. This is the part of the country where the conflict erupted in 1990. Within these two districts the interventions will be gradually expanded to all chiefdoms and wards. Only after careful consideration should IFAD spread its activities to districts in Sierra Leone other than these two. This issue will be re-assessed during the mid-term review.

E. Policy linkages

54. Since the end of the war in 2002, the Government has developed policies and strategies for all priority areas identified in its PRSP 2008-2012, which was launched in 2008 as the Government's "Agenda for Change".

55. The strategic objectives of this COSOP are fully aligned with current policies, strategies and plans. They support three of the four priority areas of the PRSP: agriculture, transportation and human development. The focus of IFAD's involvement is agriculture and rural development, but IFAD will also contribute significantly to the improvement of transportation in rural areas (through rehabilitation of feeder and trunk roads) and to human development (through capacity-building programmes at the institutional, service provider and target group levels). IFAD interventions promote MAFFS' vision to "make agriculture the 'engine' for socio-economic growth of the country through commercialization and private-sector participation". They also fit into the new NSADP/CAADP, supporting all four subprogrammes under this plan: smallholder commercialization, infrastructure development, private-sector development and sector coordination. They are geared to support the decentralization policy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Local Government and Rural Development (Decentralization Act 2004); the Financial Sector Development Plan of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development and the Bank of Sierra Leone (2009); the Private Sector Development Strategy of the Ministry of Trade and Industries (2009); and the Government's National Policy Framework for Social Protection (2009 draft).
56. Within the political dialogue with the Government, IFAD will engage in three policy areas with the aim of further developing policies, strategies and procedures: (a) land tenure to secure long-term leases for smallholder farmers through a pilot project. Evidence based on this pilot will provide elements for policy dialogue in this domain; (b) rural finance to better anchor village and community-based financial institutions in the financial system; and (c) decentralization to increase the capacities and efficiency of decentralized authorities.

V. Programme management

A. COSOP monitoring

57. The basis for monitoring of the COSOP is the results management framework, which specifies the strategic objectives and the indicators to measure the performance of the IFAD portfolio in Sierra Leone. The COSOP indicators are largely aggregated project/programme indicators of all IFAD interventions in the country. The basis for reporting on COSOP performance, therefore, is the reporting of IFAD's Results and Impact Management System (RIMS) by national project/programme coordinators, periodically verified by supervision and evaluation missions.
58. Strong M&E capacity will be established or strengthened at four levels for monitoring COSOP implementation:
- **Country programme management team:** The CPMT has access to all relevant project documents including M&E reports. Members of the CPMT, preferably with an M&E background, will be trained and invited to take part in all major events for monitoring COSOP performance. They will report back to the CPMT. The CPMT will assess COSOP performance and give an independent opinion.
 - **National programme coordination unit:** A senior M&E officer within the NPCU will be responsible for internal M&E, and will also train and supervise district-level M&E staff, and coordinate activities and harmonize approaches with the Planning, Evaluation, Monitoring and Statistics Division of MAFFS;
 - **The Planning, Evaluation, Monitoring and Statistics Division** will play a lead role in the M&E of NSADP. More specifically, it will be in charge of establishing and maintaining a comprehensive database on donor and MAFFS interventions; harmonizing M&E approaches; logical frameworks; reporting and formats; and carrying out M&E and national surveys;

- M&E capacity to monitor interventions in the districts will be at the district project/programme coordinating unit, within the offices of the district directors of agriculture and at the local council level.
59. A baseline survey is being undertaken for the IFAD programme and will generate data relevant to the target groups that can be used for outcome and impact monitoring. This baseline survey will be fine-tuned and updated in 2010 by: (a) the vulnerability assessment mapping conducted by WFP and MAFFS; and (b) the baseline agricultural statistics survey by Statistics Sierra Leone and MAFFS, to be completed by April 2010. These surveys will produce comprehensive up-to-date data on the economy, agriculture, food security, nutrition, and employment disaggregated by sex, age and location.
60. Specific events are foreseen to formalize COSOP monitoring and prepare progress reports: annual COSOP implementation progress review meetings, regular IFAD programme/project supervision and monitoring missions, mid-term review of the COSOP, which will be linked to the completion review of RCPRP, COSOP completion review. The COSOP mid-term review also coincides with the end of the first three-year performance-based allocation system (PBAS) cycle and will be conducted in 2012. The COSOP completion mission is planned for 2015. Both reviews will build on yearly consultative district workshops, which will be the main occasions for self-evaluation, learning, and exchange of experiences and ideas. Inputs will be made by a broad range of stakeholders.

B. Country programme management

61. The aim of COSOP management is to ensure the relevance, focus, quality, efficiency and impact of IFAD's portfolio in Sierra Leone. The CPMT has been newly established in the process of developing this COSOP and comprises representatives of Government, local councils, the Bank of Sierra Leone, IFAD project coordinators, farmers' representatives, other donors and representatives of civil society organizations. Its main tasks are to supervise programme performance; support implementation; monitor and evaluate programme results, impacts and sustainability; and assist in shaping the IFAD portfolio. The CPMT has contributed to COSOP formulation but requires more support in fulfilling its mandate of monitoring impact and advising IFAD in the further development of the portfolio.
62. The following institutions have specific tasks in COSOP management:
- The Ministry of Finance and Economic Development, as the loan/grant management institution, to negotiate with IFAD on behalf of the Government, manage, disburse and supervise the judicious use of the funds;
 - MAFFS, as the executing agency, to negotiate with IFAD on behalf of the Government, to make necessary arrangements for implementation, to support and supervise NPCU, and to evaluate progress;
 - Local councils and MAFFS district offices, to supervise implementation;
 - The NPCU in Freetown and the two district project/programme coordinating units in the present IFAD intervention districts of Kono and Kailahun, to manage day-to-day implementation of the portfolio, support the local councils and implementing partners, and report according to RIMS.
 - The IFAD country programme manager, to monitor COSOP implementation, engage in policy dialogue and evaluate progress.
63. COSOP management, M&E and reporting will be adapted and aligned with the coordination mechanism of NSADP.

C. Partnerships

64. Based on the activities described under harmonization and alignment (section II, B), existing collaboration will be strengthened and/or extended with a number of

government departments and organizations in the following areas: MAFFS, Africa Rice Center (AfricaRice), in staple and cash crops production; Sierra Leone Roads Authority and districts, in roads rehabilitation and maintenance; Land and Water Development Division of MAFFS and youth groups – inland valley swamp rehabilitation, water management; “Operation Feed the Nation” – farmer field and life schools implementation; the Ministry of Works, Housing and Infrastructure and districts – rural infrastructure and maintenance; FAO – farmer field and life schools, policies; WFP – Purchase for Progress initiative, food for work for rehabilitation activities; United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)/United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)/UNDP – health, education, decentralization, youth; Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW) (and United Nations Capital Development Fund [UNCDF]/UNDP/Cordaid) through the Microfinance Investment and Technical Assistance Facility – microfinance; German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) – support to decentralization and public-private partnerships; Bank of Sierra Leone and commercial banks – training of FSA and community bank personnel, regulations; NGOs – implementing partners; Illinois University and Njala University Sierra Leone – M&E, agricultural cooperatives, local and national private-sector tree crop rehabilitation, input supply, processing, and marketing of cash crops. This list is indicative and partnerships may shift according to the evolving context. Arrangements will differ from case to case and will take the form of contracts, memorandums of agreement, cofinancing or parallel funding of certain activities.

65. IFAD is supporting four of the five priorities of the “Joint Vision of the United Nations Family for Sierra Leone” (2009): consolidation of peace; integration of rural areas into the national economy; economic and social integration of the youth; and accessible and credible public services.

D. Knowledge management and communication

66. One of IFAD’s key principles is to “transform experience into knowledge and share knowledge with partners”. To that effect, IFAD has developed two closely linked strategies – the Strategy for Knowledge Management and the Innovation Strategy will be generated through the evaluation of data on the outcome of COSOP interventions, and/or through specialized and thematic networks (such as SaloneFAB, FIDAFRIQUE). A knowledge-sharing and learning culture within the programme and with all stakeholders will be encouraged, and special events will be conducted: portfolio reviews; capacity development workshops and seminars; yearly consultative district meetings with all stakeholders; joint planning workshops with stakeholders; national and international conferences and workshops; exchange visits to sister projects in the region and successful projects of other donors; and participation in fairs, the World Food Day and similar events.
67. Knowledge gained will be translated into messages, manuals, concepts and strategies, and disseminated to the various target groups, including the general public, using appropriate means of communication. Priority will be given to areas where IFAD interventions are recognized as exemplary and are expected to have greatest impact, such as microfinance and support to local development. Best practices and proven concepts will be fed into the MAFFS and IFAD knowledge management systems. A country programme website will be designed for Sierra Leone and contributions made to the FIDAFRIQUE (www.fidafrique.org) and other relevant websites and publications. Likewise, the country team will draw from these sources relevant concepts and models for adaptation in Sierra Leone.
68. The communication specialist already employed will design a knowledge-sharing and communication strategy to promote knowledge dissemination, scouting for innovations and cross-learning to enhance portfolio performance and operational efficiency. The existing bimonthly newsletter “Inside De Farm” will carry on and will be supported by other communication media such as video, CD ROM music or technical/capitalization books.

E. PBAS financing framework

69. This COSOP will span two three-year PBAS cycles (2010-2012, 2013-2015). Allocation of IFAD funds is tied to the performance of the portfolio. Annual ratings are calculated on the basis of 12 groups of parameters. Table 1 shows the current 2008 rating, giving a funding of the COSOP of US\$6.22 million for 2009 and a total of US\$21.45 million for the first PBAS cycle (2010-2012). A total of US\$21.00 million is expected for the second PBAS cycle (2013-2015). Table 2 shows examples of how changes in the rating may reduce (in this case by 19 per cent) or increase (in this case by 20 per cent) the allocations for subsequent years.

Table 1
PBAS calculation for COSOP year 1

<i>Indicators</i>		<i>COSOP year 1</i>
Rural sector scores		
A (i)	Policy and legal framework for rural organizations	4.0
A (ii)	Dialogue between government and rural organizations	3.9
B (i)	Access to land	3.1
B (ii)	Access to water for agriculture	3.0
B (iii)	Access to agricultural research and extension services	4.0
C (i)	Enabling conditions for rural financial services development	3.8
C (ii)	Investment climate for rural businesses	4.3
C (iii)	Access to agricultural input and produce markets	4.0
D (i)	Access to education in rural areas	3.5
D (ii)	Representation	3.7
E (i)	Allocation and management of public resources for rural development	3.8
E (ii)	Accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas	3.8
	Sum of combined scores	44.8
	Average of combined scores	3.7
	Project-at-risk (PAR) rating (2008)	4
	IDA resource allocation Index (2007)	3.09
	Rural sector performance (2008)	3.64
	Country performance score (2008)	3.52
	Annual country allocation (US\$: 2009)	6 220 486

Note: IDA= International Development Association

Table 2
Relationship between performance indicators and country score

<i>Financing scenario</i>	<i>PAR rating (+/- 1)</i>	<i>Rural sector performance score (+/- 0.3)</i>	<i>Percentage change in PBAS country score from base scenario</i>
Hypothetical low case	3	3.34	-19
Base case	4	3.64	-
Hypothetical high case	5	3.94	20

F. Risks and risk management

70. There are a number of risks that will have to be monitored. None of them is expected to endanger the implementation of the COSOP but may slow down progress and the extent of the impact at the end of the COSOP period.
- (a) **Corruption and poor governance.** Non-transparent management of public resources is rife. Corruption could increase programme costs and compromise the expected impact on communities. The Government has established an independent corrupt practice commission to address this issue. This risk will be mitigated by complementing the initiatives of the Government through: (i) the use of IFAD's decentralized procurement approach at the district level, in line with the Sierra Leone Public Procurement Act; (ii) training provided by IFAD to improve transparency and competency throughout the procurement and implementation process; and (iii) IFAD supervision. Moreover, proactive dialogue with appropriate authorities would be pursued and institutional capacity strengthened to avoid delays in policy implementation and to promote sustainability.
 - (b) **Social and political conflicts.** Stability and security prevail in the country and any social tension can be contained. Underlying causes of unrest may be economic, ethnic, generational and political, coupled with poverty and a high rate of illiteracy. IFAD interventions will be strictly neutral in all aspects. Young people, when marginalized, can easily be manipulated and are seen as a potential risk factor. As described, the IFAD programme will specifically target the youth. Peacebuilding will be part of the training for decentralized authorities and target groups.
71. **Gender targeting.** Gender mainstreaming is taken seriously. This is one of the cornerstones of IFAD interventions. Experience shows, however, that, in practice, often more men are trained than women even in women-dominated activities, e.g. vegetable growing and grain storage. Specific targeted activities will be developed for women, and M&E will pay particular attention to this aspect.

COSOP consultation process

The formulation of the COSOP followed standard procedure, as outlined by IFAD in its guidance procedures. The following steps were carried out in Sierra Leone:

- Preparatory studies – includes baseline poverty analysis, portfolio analysis, institutional capacity, sectoral overviews, preliminary dialogue with stakeholders (end October 2009).
- Main COSOP design mission –further collection of secondary data, COSOP design workshop and stakeholder dialogue (November 2009).
- Preparation of draft COSOP report – this includes results management framework, key files and appendices (November 2009).

During the preparatory studies a desk study of key documents was made, stakeholders were consulted, additional data and reports collected, and a stakeholder workshop was conducted with key stakeholders and the CPMT (19 October 2009). Subsequent to this, draft support documents for the COSOP were prepared (Key Files, appendices of the COSOP and analyses).

The stakeholder workshop was attended by participants of the CPMT and from the Ministry of Agriculture, United Nations organizations, donors, NGOs, agricultural research, farmers' representatives, the Bank of Sierra Leone and commercial banks and the IFAD NPCU.

A number of issues were raised and clarification was sought on past experiences of IFAD in Sierra Leone and lessons learned, sustainability, the involvement of NGOs, the necessary alignment of the COSOP with current policies and district development plans, particularly in terms of the commercialization of agriculture, infrastructure and private sector development, the efficiency of community banks and why some function better than others, consolidation of IFAD interventions in the present districts versus expanding to other districts (Bonthe, Pujehun, Tonkolili), civil society involvement in M&E, the involvement of the Bank of Sierra Leone in the supervision of community banks, the need for IFAD to closely cooperate with WFP for food for work programmes to enhance rural infrastructure, the importance of livestock in the programme, capacity development of communities, the involvement of youths in the programme, and the involvement of communities in the development of projects.

Recommendations were:

- Continue and scale up the work on microfinance and Community Banks
- Ensure alignment with current policies, including commercialization, infrastructure and private sector development
- Consider expansion to other districts, but ensure consolidation of ongoing interventions
- Ensure the involvement of communities, and especially their youth, in all steps to ensure sustainability
- Enhance infrastructure development in collaboration with WFP
- Ensure M&E especially of contractors

The design mission took place in November 2009. Further information was gathered, the latest available data were incorporated into the draft documents and further consultations were held with various stakeholders. A draft Results Management Framework was elaborated and presented at another stakeholder workshop held in November 2009.

The workshop was attended by the CPMT comprising Government, LC, BoSL, IFAD project coordinators, farmers' representatives, other donors, and civil society organizations. The three strategic objectives presented were endorsed.

The recommendations, which partly confirmed the previous recommendations, were:

- Sustainability of FSAs and community banks should be achieved within the shortest period of time possible in order to instil confidence and be useful for the beneficiaries.
- All future interventions in the sector must be aligned with the NSADP/CAADP agenda, which emphasizes value addition and commercialization.
- IFAD should consider scaling up its activities and expanding beyond its operational 2 plus 2 districts. The diversified crop approach, which has the potential for value addition and commercialization, should guide the geographic spread.
- In the next COSOP, areas such as biodiversity protection, non-timber forest products (rattan, bamboo, etc), farm management, harnessing underground water, filling council capacity-building gaps, were proposed for consideration.
- More funds should be allocated to agriculture and rural finance than to decentralization.
- Strengthen the collaboration with, and coordination of, other development partners, especially with Decentralization Secretariat (DEC SEC) and Councils.

In parallel, the country programme manager held discussions with the key ministries, during which the ongoing projects were reviewed and conclusions were reached about the way forward. It was agreed that, before expanding to other areas, ongoing activities should be scaled up and consolidated in the project areas.

The process was appreciated by the various stakeholders involved. The interest in IFAD involvement in rural development in Sierra Leone is evident. All strategic objectives are considered to be important; however, the development of rural and community-based financial services features very high on the agenda of most stakeholders.

The CPMT has been reconstituted only recently after it has met before on the occasion of review and supervision missions. Member organizations have not yet nominated permanent representatives of their organizations, which does not allow for continuity. Training and support should be provided to CPMT members to ensure good management and monitoring of the IFAD portfolio in Sierra Leone.

Country economic background

Land area (km2 thousand), 2008 1/	72	GNI per capita (USD), 2008 1/	320
Total population (million), 2008 1/	5.56	GDP per capita growth (annual %), 2008 1/	5.1
Population density (people per km2), 2008 1/	77	Inflation, consumer prices (annual %), 2008 1/	11.7
Local currency	Leone(SLL)	Exchange rate: USD 1 =	SLL 3800
<hr/>			
Social Indicators		Economic Indicators	
Population (average annual population growth rate), 1995-2008 1/	2.5	GDP (USD million), 2008 1/	1950
Crude birth rate (per thousand people), 2007 1/	40	Average annual rate of growth of GDP 1/ 1981-1991	0.4
Crude death rate (per thousand people), 2007 1/	16	1991-2007	-0.3
Infant mortality rate (per thousand live births), 2007 1/	155	Sectoral distribution of GDP, 2008 1/	
Life expectancy at birth (years), 2008 1/	41.8	% agriculture	43
Number of rural poor (million) (approx) 2004 1/	3.9 a/	% industry	24
Poor as % of total rural population 1/	79.0 a/	% services	33
Total labour force (million), 2007 1/	2.04	Consumption 2008 1/	
Female labour force as % of total, 2007 1/	51	General government final consumption expenditure (as % of GDP)	13
Education		Household final consumption expenditure, etc. (as % of GDP)	80
School enrolment, combined (% gross), 2007 2/	45 a/	Gross domestic savings (as % of GDP)	7
Adult illiteracy rate (% age 15 and above), 2007 2/	38.1	Balance of Payments (USD million)	
Nutrition		Merchandise exports, 2008 1/	220
Daily calorie supply per capita, 2004 2/	2 122	Merchandise imports, 2008 1/	560
Malnutrition prevalence, height for age (% of children under 5), 2005 1/	47	Balance of merchandise trade	-340
Malnutrition prevalence, weight for age (% of children under 5), 2005 1/	28	Current account balances (USD million)	
Health		before official transfers, 2007 1/	181
Health expenditure, total (as % of GDP), 2007 1/	4 a/	after official transfers, 2007 1/	213
Physicians (per thousand people), 2007 1/	0 a/	Foreign direct investment net, 2006 1/	24.1
Population using improved water sources (%), 2006 2/	53	Government Finance	
Population with access to essential drugs (%), 2005 2/	40	Overall budget deficit (including grants) (as % of GDP), 2007 1/	-8 a
Population using adequate sanitation facilities (%), 2005 2/	11	Total expenditure (% of GDP), 2007 1/	21 a/
Agriculture and Food		Total external debt (USD million), 2008 1/	599
Food imports (% of merchandise imports), 2008 1/	n/a	Present value of debt (as % of GNI), 2007 1/	10
Fertilizer consumption (hundreds of grams per ha of arable land), 2005 1/	3.1	Total debt service (% of exports of goods and services), 2007 1/	3
Food production index (1989-91=100), 2005 1/	114	Lending interest rate (%), 2008 1/	24
Cereal yield (kg per ha), 2007 1/	1 014	Deposit interest rate (%), 2008 1/	10
Land Use			
Arable land as % of land area, 2005 1/	40.5		
Forest area as % of total land area, 2005 1/	38.0		
Irrigated land as % of cropland, 2000 1/	5		

a/ Data are for years or periods other than those specified.

1/ World Bank, *World Development Indicators* database CD ROM 2008

2/ UNDP, *Human Development Report*, 2009

3/ WHO/UNICEF JMP, 2006

COSOP results management framework

Column 1 - Country strategy alignment	Columns 2 – 4 - Key Results for COSOP			Column 5 – COSOP Institutional/Policy objectives
Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) targets based on National Sustainable Agricultural Development Plan 2010-2030	COSOP Strategic Objectives with baseline data ¹	COSOP Impact and Outcome Indicators	COSOP Milestone Indicators	Policy and institutional issues to be addressed
<p>Overall goal: Economic growth through rural and agricultural development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in the agriculture sector growth from its current estimate of 4% to 6% per annum by 2015 Increased incomes and food security status of producers Percentage increase in total exports/sales of selected commodities (Percentages not provided) 	<p>Overall goal : COSOP interventions have contributed to empower the rural poor to increase their food security and livelihoods in the project districts</p>	<p>By end of and in the intervention zones of the COSOP</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 25% of households report improvements in their household assets ownership index 20% reduction in the prevalence of child malnutrition, by gender (h/a, w/a, w/h) 25% of households report an improvement of food security (measured by duration and frequency of hungry season) 	<p>Outreach target: 80,000 households</p>	
	<p>Strategic Objective 1:</p> <p>Smallholder farmers' access to (i) irrigation,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40% of supported farmers/ farmer groups have access to sufficient water when required for better production 40% of supported farmers/farmer groups are implementing improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15,000 smallholder farmers trained in improved cultivation techniques (2012: 8,000) 9,000ha additional tree crops (cocoa, coffee, oil palm) rehabilitated (2012: 4,500) 	<p>There is need to develop the land tenure system in order to secure long term leases or even ownership for smallholder farmers, especially for capital intensive cropping systems</p>

¹ Baseline data for the COSOP will be (i) the VAM 2010 and (ii) the baseline agricultural statistics survey (SSL and MAFFS – April 2010)

	(ii) technical skills, and (iii) market is improved	<p>production technology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80 % of improved roads are passable year around <p>50 % of the beneficiaries are youth or women</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3,000ha additional In Valley Swamps rehabilitated or developed (2012: 1,500) 80 pumps/wells (2012: 50) installed for irrigation 1,000km (2012: 600) of feeder and trunk roads, connecting production areas and markets rehabilitated 4 private agro service suppliers delivering inputs and extension services 40 000 households targeted in 2015 (aggregate number of beneficiaries by gender and age group for SO1) 	<p>such as tree crops and Inland Valley Swamp and other small scale irrigation schemes</p> <p>There is need to develop effective feeder road maintenance models and financing mechanisms.</p>
	<p>Strategic Objective 2:</p> <p>The rural poor have access to reliable and sustainable financial services (savings, credit, transfers, remittances, etc)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% of shareholders are Smallholder farmers. 70 % of shareholders have a saving account 50 % of Smallholder farmers have benefited at least of one loan <p>60 % of the beneficiaries are youth or women</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100 FSA operational (2012: 50) 20 new Community Banks operational (2012: 10) Portfolio at risk of FSA and CB is below 5% 80 000 shareholders targeted in 2015 (aggregate number of beneficiaries by gender and age group for SO2) 	<p>Regulatory framework for village based microfinance organisations and Community Banks has to be strengthened. A Technical Assistance Agency, later to be developed into an apex body for CB and a refinance facility will be part of the COSOP, but has to be aligned and negotiated with the BoSL and MOFED. Banking regulations and products have to be further developed and adapted.</p>
	<p>Strategic Objective 3:</p> <p>Rural poor have their participation increased in management of local decentralized institutions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 % of Districts have adopted a development plan elaborated through a participatory process involving rural poor. (2012: 40) 60% of rural poor are aware of the first three priorities of the district plan 50 % of rural poor are aware of the activities financed through the district annual budget 70% of the district budget is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10% of the communities have been involved in the establishment of the Ward Plans 70 % of the procurement for IFAD interventions used in the districts is done by the District Councils 20,000 (2012: 15,000) rural poor targeted in 2015 (aggregate number of beneficiaries by gender and age group for SO3) 	<p>Decentralisation is still young in SL. IFAD will be involved in developing and improving mechanisms to increase efficiency. This will be fed into policy development and procedures manuals.</p>

		<p>dedicated to the local development investment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 % of Districts report annually on budget expenditures at ward and community levels • Local decentralised institution are managed by at least 20 % of youth or women 		
--	--	--	--	--

Lessons learned from country programme implementation

	STATUS AT COSOP DESIGN	STATUS AT COMPLETION	LESSONS LEARNED
<p>A. Country Strategic Goals: PRSP I (2004-2009). The PRSP has three pillars, each with objectives closely tied to the MDGs. They are: Pillar One: Promoting good governance, security and peace; Pillar Two: Pro-poor sustainable growth for food security and job creation; and Pillar Three: Human development.</p>	<p>Economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GDP 749 (USD million 2001) • GDP growth rate: -4.3 % (1991-2001) • External debt USD 1188 million or 158.6% of GDP • Contribution of agriculture to GDP 50% (2001) • GNI per capita income USD 140 in 2001 <p>Poverty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extreme poverty, rural 76% (2001) • Life expectancy at birth 37 yrs • Female labour force as % of total 37% 	<p>Economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GDP 1950 (USD million 2008) • GDP growth rate: -0.3 % (1991-2007) • External debt USD 599 million or 30.7% of GDP • Contribution of agriculture to GDP 43% (2008) • GNI per capita income USD 320 in 2008 <p>Poverty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extreme poverty, rural 79% (2008) • Life expectancy at birth 48 yrs • Female labour force as % of total 51% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite sustained GDP growth and improvement in the overall fiscal situation, there has been no noticeable decrease in the poverty incidence; in fact it has increased slightly. • Also, the HDI index increased by 3% only reflecting limited change in the social indicators (health, education, drinking water and sanitation), and the share of agriculture in the total GDP has decreased. • Over the period there has been a significant increase in revenues from non-agriculture sectors, with encouraging signs that private sector development is positive and growing.
<p>B. COSOP Strategic Objectives</p> <p>Goal: To reduce poverty and household food insecurity</p> <p>Approach: (a) To develop sustainable rural infrastructure and services (b) Agricultural production, natural resource systems and off-farm rural enterprises in Sierra Leone</p>	<p>The indicators which were presented in the logframe were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of community-based subprojects implemented • Sustained increases in farm and off-farm per capita rural production • Number of employment opportunities generated for rural women and youth • Number of viable community based institutions, management and maintenance structures established 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owing to the very slow implementation of the portfolio during the period of the COSOP only a start has been made on satisfying the four indicators. • The most notable achievement to date has been the establishment of a number of community based institutions, particularly those involved in the rural finance sub-sector; the FSA's and CB's. • Rehabilitation of rural infrastructures, particularly IVS and feed roads have started to show benefits after their completion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of a detailed baseline agro-socio-economic survey has seriously hampered the management and monitoring of programme activities. • Financial gains can be built upon in the new COSOP to enable poor households to shift from subsistence to commercial smallholder agriculture, in this respect the involvement of the private sector and rural financial institutions is seen as key. • Agriculture development leads to income increase. However significant income gains can also be achieved through improvement in off-farm and non agricultural employment. • Resources were at least in the early years too thinly spread to trigger self-sustaining process for change. • An appropriate balance needs to be struck between the resources/ population outreach of the projects/ and change anticipated in livelihoods to empower the rural poor to overcome poverty. This would require a new way of planning interventions starting from the households' livelihoods and the additional income

	STATUS AT COSOP DESIGN	STATUS AT COMPLETION	LESSONS LEARNED
			and resources needed to bring about change.
Strategic Objective 1 Productive capacity (on- and off-farm) sustainability increased	The indicator set for this output in the COSOP is the same for all four strategic objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of the population in targeted rural areas that has adopted integrated approaches to management of agricultural and natural resources within strengthened institutional framework at the local, district, province levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The slow start of the portfolio particularly RCPRP has meant that no substantive comment can be made as to how sustainable the interventions have been. If properly managed the activities within the rural finance sector, especially with regard to the FSA's and CB's could show with time a sustainable outcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to measure the changes to productive capacity, IFAD needs to instigate a comprehensive M&E system, and the newly prepared PIM should be utilised as soon as possible. Greater involvement of the private sector in the commodity value chains will be central to bringing about change in productive capacity at the farm level through support to input supply, production, post-production, processing and marketing.
Strategic Objective 2 Communities and rural institutions developed and accessible to the rural poor	See Strategic Objective 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This has been a key aspect of the interventions within the COSOP and positive changes have started to become apparent; this however is still work in progress and a lot more needs to be done to consolidate the establishment of viable local councils, and farmer organisations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The involvement of the other stakeholders, particularly the NGO's and CBO's is central to the success of this objective; however, it will be important to ensure that these rural institutions become viable and able to manage their own affairs in the longer term without the assistance from other entities. The greater involvement by the civil society organisations, particularly those with the mandate to support the rural farming communities, will be important for long term sustainability.
Strategic Objective 3 Agriculture and rural development policy reforms incorporated into the policy dialogue	See Strategic Objective 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is an area which during the COSOP has gained some importance, particularly with regards to the policy reforms required in the rural finance sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next COSOP 2010-2015 will need to take into account the new policies as developed in the CAADP/NSADP, and where IFAD's strategic niche could add significant value to implementing the planned Plan with support to decentralisation, rural finance, greater involvement of the private sector and rural infrastructure.
Strategic Objective 4 Gender database disaggregated for incidence of rural poverty and household food security	See Strategic Objective 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a general but important objective which has been taken into account in the current two projects being implemented; however more effort needs to be placed on providing greater empowerment to women in the project districts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COSOP 2010-2015 will need to do much more that focus on a database for gender, much greater onus is now required for a much more aggressive approach to bring about the much needed changes in the rural livelihood systems to ensure that women and youths have much greater voice at community level and are more involved in the implementation of all aspects within the commodity chains.
C. IFAD Performance			
Policy dialogue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main focus for IFAD was the improvement in programme management issues, including financial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantive improvements have been achieved in how The Government manages its projects and programmes, however still 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PBAS could be strategically used for enhancing the interest of Government to engage in dialogue on policy issues that influence the allocation of IFAD financial resources. This is

	STATUS AT COSOP DESIGN	STATUS AT COMPLETION	LESSONS LEARNED
	<p>management, as an important prerequisite for policy dialogue leading to effective implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to PRSP process and to decentralization policy. • Support also to rural finance sector and its policy needs. 	<p>more needs to be done especially in financial and procurement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IFAD strategic programme objectives were always closely aligned to those of the PRPS 1 pillars particularly Pillar 2. • With the new PRSP II Agenda for Change and the CAADP/NSADP IFAD is well placed to further support development in Sierra Leone through its initiatives in rural finance and decentralisation and as well as greater involvement in assisting in policy support for private sector. 	<p>particularly timely in view of the weak rural sector performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy dialogue and policy reform need to be based on careful stakeholder analysis. Proposed institutional changes should foster equality of agency and accountability. In view of this, policy dialogue and reform needs to be supported by significant investments and close monitoring by Government, civil society and IFAD. • IFAD through its strong presence in the country should assist The Government and the commercial sector in the establishment of a viable rural banking sector, and for this to happen changes to current government policy and legal framework need to be made.
Partnerships and consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the past IFAD had funding partnerships with World Bank, IDA and OPS. • A cofinancing agreement was made with AfDB for RCPRP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cofinancing and combined management of the IFAD portfolio with AfDB was terminated in March 2009, due to poor and very slow project implementation; IFAD now manages its own projects through the NPCU. • IFAD has over the years established partnerships both formal and informal with all the major donors and NGOs, more particularly World Bank, EU, GTZ, KfW, DFID, Italian Cooperation and WFP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitation of strategic partnerships is key to programme management, policy dialogue and replication of investments. • The whole partnership and consultation process must be inclusive for all entities both government and non-government; the greater involvement of civil society and private sector will be central to moving agriculture development forward towards a more viable and sustainable outcome. • For its own progress against its objectives and for ease of management, it is important that IFAD at this present time should maintain its own NPCU.
Portfolio performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At COSOP design stage in 2003 IFAD had only one project which terminated in early 2004; performance of this project – North Central Agriculture Development Project period 1993-2004 was greatly hampered by the effects of war and post war problems. • Two further projects the RCPRP and RFCIP were implemented in 2006 and 2008 respectively; the former was twinned with the AfDB ASREP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up until mid-2008 the IFAD portfolio particularly RCPRP had performed very poorly, this being due to a number of political, management and financial constraints. • To remedy the poor implementation status IFAD established its own NPCU and now manages its own projects through this Unit; the AfDB now manages its ASREP separately. • Improvements in projects management systems are now in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generating higher impact and addressing issues of efficiency and sustainability would likely require specialization of project interventions, greater leverage of co-financing resources and reliance on alternative delivery systems in addition to public extension services; in all of this the private sector should play a leading role and in this IFAD should actively facilitate. • Main areas of innovation proposed are in the areas of project management to facilitate effective start up and implementation, technological innovations and scaling up the successful institutional innovations tested in the programme to date.

Project Pipeline during the COSOP period

1. The Sierra Leone COSOP 2010-2015 spans over two cycles of IFAD's performance-based allocation system (PBAS), the 2010-2012 cycle and the 2013-2015 cycle. Total planned allocation will be around USD 42 million, USD 21 million from 2010 – 2012, and approximately USD 21 million from 2013 – 2015.
2. IFAD is currently involved in 4 main areas – market-oriented agriculture, rural finance, rural infrastructure and decentralisation, all of which are in line with both IFAD's and The Government strategic objectives. The two ongoing IFAD projects/programmes are:
3. The **Rehabilitation and Community Based Poverty Reduction Project** (RCPRP) focuses on community development, agricultural development and rural infrastructure rehabilitation. It has a financing of USD 10.7 million for a 5 year period from 2006-2011.
4. The **Rural Finance and Community Improvement Programme** (RFCIP) focuses on the support of rural micro-finance services. It has a financing of USD 11 million for a 6 year period from 2008-2014.

Justification and Rationale

5. In order to develop a meaningful and focused COSOP 2010-2015 it is important to take into account the learning's from the previous COSOP, and the factors as regards both the scope of the programme and the geographical coverage need to be addressed.
6. Based on project reviews and the Country Portfolio Evaluation the following conclusions were drawn:

Scope of IFAD's Involvement in Sierra Leone

7. It is essential that IFAD builds on its strategic niche in the country and consolidates its gains as its projects progress. It is therefore not recommended that IFAD embarks for the most part into other intervention areas which it is not already involved in as this will only dilute its impact in the medium term. This is reflected in the three Strategic Objectives supporting agriculture and rural infrastructure (SO1), rural finance (SO2) and decentralisation (SO3). More specifically, RCPRP will focus on SO1 (irrigation, technical skills and market access) and SO3 (better participation of smallholders in management of local decentralised institutions). RFCIP will focus mainly on SO2 (better access to reliable and sustainable financial services).

Geographical Coverage

8. IFAD is currently working mainly in the two Districts of Kono and Kailahun, with some peripheral involvement in a number of other districts (more particularly in Kenema and Koinadugu) mainly through the CBs. It is recommended that in order not to spread its development efforts too thinly, it maintains a substantive presence in these two districts; failure to do so would have serious implications for the overall impact of the portfolio.
9. IFAD's geographical focus will be in those Districts in the country which have been identified as the poorest and most affected by the war; however great care and thought needs to go into any plan for expansion into other Districts. IFAD should ensure that its actions are not duplicating or overlapping with other donor projects in the same location, and close links with MAFFS and other donors and NGO's is essential in this respect.

Target group

10. Target groups are poor rural households, smallholder farmers and small scale entrepreneurs. Specific attention will be allotted to develop targeted interventions for women and youths.

Key Project Objectives

11. Following the approach of upscaling, the existing objectives will be reinforced.
12. **Overall goal:** COSOP interventions contribute to empower the rural poor to increase their incomes and food security.
13. The following objectives will be pursued to achieve this:
- Smallholder farmers intensify and diversify agricultural production.
 - The rural poor operate and use reliable and sustainable financial services (savings, credit, transfers, etc).
 - Local councils, Ward Development Committees and traditional authorities perform their duties efficiently and in a transparent manner

Ownership, Harmonization and Alignment

14. The COSOP 2010-2015 takes into account the priorities as outlined in the NSADP/ CAADP funding requirements, which gives some guidance, especially in its Sub-Programme 1 – Commodity Commercialisation – Smallholder Commercialisation Scheme, Sub-Programme 2 – Infrastructure Development – Rehabilitation of feeder roads, sub programme 3 – Private sector development and sub-programme 4 – sector coordination and management. IFAD needs to be fully involved in the furtherance of NSADP objectives. Strategic Objective 1 and 2 are supporting sub-programmes 1 and 3, Strategic Objective 3 is supporting sub-programme 4.

Components and Activities

15. The components and activities, which will be up-scaled, are:

RCPRP:

- **SO1** – tree crop and inland valley swamp rehabilitation, capacity building of smallholder farmers, capacity building of women and youths, feeder road rehabilitation; agricultural input supply on a cost sharing basis, support to processing and marketing
- **SO3:** - Capacity building of decentralised institutions, augmenting the volume of the community development fund

RFCIP

- **SO2:** - Establishment and support of Financial Services Associations, establishment and support of Community Banks, augmentation of the refinance facility, establishment of an apex organisation for the Community Banks.

16. Other activities include the policy dialogue between IFAD and The Government in order to provide an enabling environment for the target groups to achieve their aspirations and objectives. This includes topics such as land tenure, the development of the rural finance sector, decentralisation and issues hindering the implementation of policies, strategies and plans.

Costs and Financing

17. The proposed allocation of the new funding under this COSOP to the three strategic objectives is as follows: approx. 50% for SO1; (b) approx. 35% for SO2; and approx. 15% for SO3.
18. It is estimated that approx. 60% of the new funding will be allocated to RCPRP and approx. 40% to RFCIP.

Organization and Management

19. The projects and in fact the whole COSOP will be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security. The management of the portfolio will be the responsibility of the already existing National Programme Coordination Unit and District Project Coordination Units. The Local Councils and Ward Development Committees will be strengthened to take full ownership and to support and supervise the projects in their Districts and Wards.
20. The two projects are complementary to each other. The management of both of them by one NPCU emphasises the programme character of IFAD's interventions in Sierra Leone.

Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators

21. Indicators at the outcome and output levels include the total number of beneficiaries receiving goods and services from the projects, the quantities in ha, km or numbers of rehabilitated Inland valley swamps, tree crop plantations and roads, type of training courses and people trained, established FSA and CB, types of productive and post-harvest agricultural inputs and equipment provided, the volume of the community fund. Other indicators will validate the efficient and sustainable use of the goods and services provided. At the impact level, increased incomes and food security will be measured using asset ownership and child malnutrition as indicators. At a higher aggregate level the trends and developments of the economic parameters will be analysed.

Risks

22. Risk factors include: The disenfranchisement of the youth which could threaten stability and security in the country, the low implementation capacity in the country, adverse effects of the world economy, political interference at the local level, administrative delays in disbursement and procurement.

Timing

23. The timing of the new financing will depend on the performance of the ongoing projects, the capacity of MAFFS and implementing partners and the speed of implementation and disbursement. New funding may be required for specific activities as early as the second half of 2010 or 2011.

Key file 1: Rural poverty and agricultural/rural sector issues

Priority areas	Affected groups	Main issues	Actions needed
Social Services and Economic Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural households Entities involved in commodity value chains (inputs supply, post-harvest operations, marketing, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social and economic infrastructure has been severely damaged by the civil war across the rural areas, including shelter Historic neglect and bias against provision of social and economic infrastructure in rural areas Health services and education enrolment rates are drastically down, maternal and child health indicators are among the lowest in Africa HIV/AIDS is spread across the rural areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rehabilitation of economic and social infrastructure in the rural areas, and shelter rehabilitation Encourage participatory local areas development plans to set the priorities and engage the population in the rehabilitation efforts Provide funding on a matching grant basis to fund priority subprojects identified by the communities Rehabilitation of schools and health centres to resume servicing the community's needs Provide support to national HIV/AIDS programme in the rural areas.
Food Production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor farming households in rural areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmers across the country were severely decapitalized during the decade of civil war (loss of tools, livestock, and shelters) Limited access to agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, tools, machinery) Investments in inputs under present conditions are rarely profitable The prevailing cropping system - shifting cultivation - is over-cropping the available suitable land Agricultural research institutions are not functioning properly due to severe destruction in their physical facilities and disruptions in their research programmes Average yield is very low Lowlands under-utilized with potential for irrigation development High post-harvest losses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote private sector investment in the rural areas through enterprises development for processing and marketing Reinvigorate service delivery systems by public and private sectors Promote sedentary cropping system which have a higher yield level for a diversified cropping pattern and shorter fallow periods Introduce auxiliary plants for soil fertility improvement Promote other food crops production (e.g. cassava) to diversify the rice-based diets Promote food processing to increase the shelf life of produce and add value to the production Rehabilitate and restore the research facilities, and restart and finance the research programmes Promote improved quality seeds and new technologies Develop irrigation and IVS rehabilitation Promote appropriate harvesting and storage methods.
Export Crop Production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmers involved in cash crop production Private sector entities involved in export crop production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree crops such as coffee, cacao, oil palm, cashew nuts, rubber, have been neglected during the civil war, and prior to that due to unfavourable terms of trade and poor marketing system. Low yield due to improper maintenance Limited exporter capture the whole market. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote private sector investments in the renovation of old trees, and rehabilitation of existing plantations to increase productivity Promote the development of processing facilities to add value, and to improve product quality and marketability Encourage the production of horticultural products and tropical fruits for the export market

Priority areas	Affected groups	Main issues	Actions needed
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide long term credit facilities for tree crop rehabilitation. • Promote proper care and maintenance of the crop • Availability of the fund to the farmers and encourage to involve new exporter
Marketing of Agricultural Produce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural HH involved in both subsistence food & cash crop production emphasis on women • Private sector marketing entities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although markets have been liberalized in Sierra Leone, through the elimination of marketing boards, the private sector has yet to be effectively organized, and private sector marketing agents remain underdeveloped • The majority of farmers is not organized in producers groups and lacks the support of institutions that can provide access to information and strengthen the farmers' unequal bargaining power vis-à-vis the traders • The National Farmers Association of Sierra Leone (NAFSL) has not provided the much needed leadership to protect the interest of the farmers and does not sufficiently address the needs of women farmers • Transport cost is very high due to the poor status of the road network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to farmers marketing organizations • Rehabilitate and repair the feeder roads network, which will generate employment of the youth and unemployed IDPs and ex-combatants, and reduce marketing costs • Provide training to farmers groups, provision of market information • Promote the development of small and micro enterprises (SME) for processing and packaging, and other post-harvest activities • Encourage the emergence of other farmers groups, especially ones that would cater for women farmers.
Rural Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor households particularly female headed households 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a result of a decade of civil war rural banks were closed and their premises destroyed • Farmers have no access to financial services, except a few community banks, MFIs and the informal sector arrangements • Commercial banks are not interested to serve rural areas, where lending is not profitable • Inadequate regulatory framework and policies by the Bank of Sierra Leone (Central Bank). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote the development of decentralized micro financial services institutions • Promote the development of an institutional framework for rural financing that can provide support to micro credit and savings operations and induce the sustainability of the network of financial services institutions • Strengthen community banks • Provide training to staff and farmers groups • Assist the Bank of Sierra Leone to further develop appropriate policies and regulatory framework for rural finance.
Artisanal Fisheries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Households involved in fishing in coastal regions of Sierra Leone men involved in fish capture & women in post-capture processing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack and / or inappropriate extension services to fisher folks • Material and fishing gear completely destroyed by the civil war • Lack of appropriate financial services to the sub-sector • Lack of appropriate processing and storage facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support training for extension services • Assistance for the rehabilitation of material and equipment through an appropriate and adapted micro credit scheme • Support to marketing system through the improvement of existing traditional channels • Support the rehabilitation of the landing jetties in the

Priority areas	Affected groups	Main issues	Actions needed
			rural areas.
Decentralization of services and decision making regarding revenue collection and budget allocations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decentralised government entities, at the District, Chiefdom and Ward levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government services are highly centralized in Freetown Unwillingness of some MDAs to devolve functions as prescribed in the Local Government Act, 2004 Poor budgetary allocations to the rural areas and to the agriculture and rural development sectors Weak capacity of public services in the rural areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote decentralized planning and implementation of development efforts by the village communities Take advantage of the opportunities afforded by Central Government reforms of local governments to promote popular participation and transparent decision making process Promote contractual arrangements with service providers, and public and private sector agencies to promote accountability.
Public Agricultural Sector Institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MAFFS at all levels both at central and district levels, and including government entities and personnel involved in research and development, & extension activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MAFFS as well as MLGCD, have very poor implementation capacities MAFFS' technical expertise requested by many NGOs at district level Public research and extension services systems are not functioning Limited budgetary support available to the sector through the national allocations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote restructuring of the Ministries involved in agriculture and rural development Participate with other donors who are planning support to restructuring and capacity building of institutions servicing the sector Promote the development of appropriate strategies and support the decentralization of their services.
Gender Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Women, especially those in rural poor HH's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Persistent marginalization of women in the rural areas would hinder development The war exposed women to both physical and psychological abuses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take into account the specific needs of women when promoting the development of decentralized micro financial services institutions Encourage the participation of women in the development committees at both the village and ward levels, so that their special needs are taken into consideration.
Youth Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Youth's, especially those in rural poor HH's & affected by war 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the causes cited for the war is the marginalization of the rural youth The war took away the productive youth from the rural areas and brought back the war wounded and psychologically disturbed young men. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage the membership of the youth in the development committees at both the village and ward levels, so that their special needs are taken into consideration Provide special skills training to equip the youth with necessary capacity to earn a living Provide soft loans to the youth through the Community Banks and the FSAs.

Key file 2: Organizations matrix (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats [SWOT] analysis)

Institution	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities/Threats
Small scale agricultural producers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional and local know-how • Medium to long term interests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of capital • Partly lack of knowhow • Low degree of organisation • Often very limited or no business and marketing capacity • Low level of literacy and numeracy • Women often marginalised • Youths have difficulties to access land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building (Farmer Field and Live Schools) • Support to organising farmers in Farmer Based Organisations • Support to microcredit and input supply
Farmer Based Organisations (FBO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional and local know-how • Medium to long term interests • Improved organisation (leaders are elected periodically) • Increased negotiation power • Improved access to credits and inputs • Improved post-harvest activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Often over-dominating leadership (few literate leaders resulting in limited rotation of leadership) • Still weak structure and capacities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At district and chiefdom levels they offer a good potential for reaching target beneficiaries
Medium and large scale agricultural producers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispose of capital • Mostly good level of know-how • Medium to long term interests • Mostly strong management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partly lack of information on markets, institutions and procedures • Sometimes difficulties to access capital • Lack of knowledge of export markets and exporting • Often difficulty to comply with export quality standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building: agriculture and business scales • Capacity building in regulatory issues and quality standards and control • Fostering partnerships between smallholder producers and medium and large scale producers
Government of Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRSP II widely approved and supported • Power and Agriculture are the top priorities • Budget allocation to agriculture has steadily increased over the past 7 years and is expected to reach 10% in 2010 (without salaries) • Independent Anticorruption Commission installed and active • Decentralisation initialised and politically wanted and supported • Democratic credentials through successful parliamentary, presidential and local elections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation capacities are limited • Capacity of decentralised authorities still weak and under funded • Conflict between decentralised system and traditional authorities • Corruption is still an issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of implementation of PRSP II • Support to decentralisation • Support of anticorruption drive • Policy dialogue and support to policy development

Institution	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities/Threats
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive field presence • Continuity – follow through from pre-war to post-war • The major source of technical know-how at district level • New vision (“make agriculture the engine of growth in SL”) • National Sustainable Agricultural Development Plan 2010-2030 developed within NEPAD’s CAADP process and adopted by Government • Focus on intensification, diversification and commercialisation of agriculture and involvement of the private sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional civil-service mindset • Lack of in-service training • Poorly resourced (limited mobility for field staff and basic office equipment e.g. computers not available in any field office) • Limited operating budget, project and incentive dependent • Limited management capacity • Qualified staff drain to NGO sector • Infrastructure (offices, stores etc.) severely affected by the war and communication system weak • Inadequate knowledge of commercialisation and costs/benefits of agricultural production. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building through in-service training of District and field staff to update competencies and reinforce participatory approach and support the commercialisation of agriculture • Policy changes (e.g. on TA, financial management and organisation) • Recruiting new and qualified staff to replace the retired staff in the future • Integrating staff from the diaspora through appropriate programmes • Development of a biofuel policy
Ministry of Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loan/grant management • Budget planning • Support of commercial banks, community banks and micro finance institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disbursement procedures cumbersome (delays) • Banking supervision weak 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future financing negotiations
Ministry of Trade and Industry (MoTI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New vision for private sector development • Sierra Leone Investment and Export Promotion Agency (SLIEPA) formed and promoted • Coverage in Freetown and three Regional headquarters (Bo, Kenema and Makeni) • Established economic growth centres in Bo, Pujehun, Binkolo and Kpandebu and soon in Kabala, Mambolo, Rotifink 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional civil-service mindset • Lack of in service training • Poorly resourced (limited mobility for field staff) • Limited operating budget, project and incentive dependent • Limited management capacity • Qualified staff drain to NGO sector and donors • Infrastructure (offices, stores etc) severely affected by the war and communication system weak • Current staff is aging 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building through in-service training of District and field staff to update competencies and reinforce participatory approach • Recruiting new and qualified staff to replace the retired staff in the future.
Department of Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualified professional staff • Activities are based on the Environmental Act and Plan of Action • Can do environmental assessments and monitoring • The set up of the Forestry Commission in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of logistics • Lack of Incentives • Limited Operational Budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental monitoring of project interventions

Institution	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities/Threats
	2005 brought into focus the pressing environmental issues		
Other ministries (works & infrastructure, lands, marine resources, local government)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declared support to National Sustainable Agriculture Development Plan 2010-2030 (NSADP) • Declared support to decentralisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination among ministries weak 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership with specific Ministries, departments and services important for rural development
Sierra Leone Agricultural Research Institute (SLARI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past links with regional and international research centres • Dedicated core staff • Support from FARAH and IITA • Past good reputation for rice breeding and agricultural research; formerly home of AfricaRice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLARI just been formed, still institutionally weak • The two existing institutes(Njala Agricultural Research Station, Rokupr Rice Research Station) still not fully rehabilitated and functional • Lack of operating funds • Current staff is aging 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research programme oriented to present needs • Setting up a research fund to finance demand and results oriented contract research • Intensified partnerships with foreign universities and research institutes and the Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) • Development of new rice and cassava varieties for dissemination • Training of additional staff abroad
National Commission for Social Action (NaCSA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successor to the National Commission for Reconstruction, Resettlement and Rehabilitation • Multi-sectoral implementer supported by major donors • Ready technical, management and delivery capacity • Established, documented implementation procedures • Financial management contracted to private accounting company 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not operate directly in the agricultural sector • Utilising funds from a number of bi-lateral and international donors, capacity constraints • Mandate until 2008 – no long-term sustainability. • Maintenance of established infrastructure not secured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established implementation systems • Rapid project mobilisation • Procedures acceptable to major donors • Project identity may be obscured • Assuming responsibility for own financial management in 2006 • Portfolio of large projects (up to USD42 million per project)
Co-operatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Movement established in 1949 • Extensive coverage through 9 area offices • 1795 local societies, 41 of which registered since Sept 2002 • Linked to Co-op Bank which has 80 credit groups in districts • Women's groups more successful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exact number of post-war active local societies unknown • Registration for society costs Le 30,000 plus Le 30,000 documentation fee under Section 8 of Co-op Act 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for market channels • Movement widely known and understood • Need for small scale-credit in rural areas
National Farmers Federation of Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federation was founded in 2009 of 4 organisations, including the National 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few services provided to members by the organisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organized structure at all levels and extensive network (national, regional,

Institution	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities/Threats
(NaFFSL)	Association of Farmers of Sierra Leone (NAFSL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mandate to represent Sierra Leonean farmers • Long established, started in Bo in 1987 • Strong government support • Sole lobby for mobilizing government support for farmers • Can undertake advocacy for Chiefdom level Associations • Only government-supported organisation which is running a micro credit programme for farmers • Management Committees (national, regional, district and chiefdom levels) are democratically elected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of clear vision and action plan • Great dependency to government support • Linkages with community level Farmers Associations are weak • High costs of registration • Current data on member associations is incomplete • Poor monitoring and supervision capacity at various levels • Management committees at the regional/district levels are dominated by politicians (parliament members). • Political organisation, pressure group: neither technical orientation nor expertise in line with the limited possibilities of the masses of smallholders 	district and chiefdom level) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updating of data-base
Chamber of Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby for farming community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still young (formed in 2009) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fostering partnerships between smallholder farmers and large scale farmers and agribusiness
International NGO (CARE, CRS, Christian Aid, Welthungerhilfe, COOPI, Africare, World Vision, ...)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known capacity in the field of rural development • Speedy response to emergencies • Most have successfully moved from relief to development in Sierra Leone • Backstopping by HQ in home country • Access to bilateral funding • Innovative and profit from corporate knowledge management systems • Sometimes work in partnership with local NGO/CBO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High rate of international staff turn over • Predominant religious affiliation • Overheads are high • Sometimes direct implementation of activities which is not in favour to capacity building • Not always provide necessary services following training programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further expansion of activities • Involve in training and skill development activities • Expand advisory role to Government and private sector institutions and companies • Experience in market information systems
National NGO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known capacity • Ability to reach remote areas • Local knowhow • Low overhead costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak resource base (funds and human) • Established as emergency relief organisations with lack of development orientation • Limited number of permanent staff • Lack of well trained staff • Often established on a opportunistic basis to capture funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of activities • Involve in training and skill development activities • Could be good partners in projects implementation

Institution	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities/Threats
Community Based Organisations (CBOs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct link with communities. Local knowhow • Experience in implementing activities at the grassroots level on behalf of NGOs and NaCSA • Remain in the community after project assistance has ended • Registered with MLGCD Department of Rural Development and MAFS NGO/CBO Coordination Unit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weaker leadership and group management skills • Not self reliant and often unstable (compared to NGOs) • Weak structure • Inadequate staffing • lack of resources. • Sometimes not dedicated to their mandate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need of external support to build their capacity to operate and to train the management staff • Opportunity: capacity built will remain in community and contribute to longer term benefits
Bank of Sierra Leone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong mandate in the banking sector • Policy development • Supports community banks • Strong support of commercial banking sector including expansion to rural areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weakness in regulations and banking supervision • Little experience in microfinance • Existing community banks not profitable yet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can play pivotal role in creating enabling environment for micro- rural finance, expansion of village based microfinance organisations
Local Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Councils and Ward Development Committees constituted in 2004 and now firmly established • Increasingly self-confident and taking leadership in development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing competition between line ministries and local councils for management of projects • Capacities still weak, especially after new personnel was elected into office in 2008 • Donor coordination in districts fairly weak 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening of LC and WDC • Strengthening of devolved agricultural staff • Strengthening of economic base (rehabilitation of public and rural infrastructure: roads, stores, markets, tree crop areas, Inland Valley Swamps)
Paramount Chiefs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accepted traditional authority • Strong influence on rural development issues • Custodians of traditions and land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulties to adapt to the new political paradigm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconciliation of conflicts between traditional and decentralised authorities • Resolution of conflicts over access to land (long term leases, ownership)
Private sector in support of agriculture and rural development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investments in agriculture on the increase but still low • Growing interest of agribusiness in agriculture in Sierra Leone including biofuel • Commercial banking sector has expanded considerably 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investments are still limited • Weak in input supply • Lack of quality philosophy for agricultural products • Geographical coverage of commercial banks in the districts is low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve policies • Strengthening of input and financial services • Supervise and regulate agribusiness • Monitor social and environmental impact and impact on food security of agribusiness; promote benefits and mitigate any negative effects

Key file 3: Complementary donor initiative/partnership potential

Donor/Agency	Nature of Project/Programme	Project/Programme Coverage	Status	Complementarity/Synergy Potential
African Development Bank (AfDB)	Agricultural Sector Rehabilitation Project	5 districts – Port Loko, Kambia, Moyamba, Pujehun, Kenema	Ongoing Project	Complementary with RCPRP and RADEP
	Fisheries Development Project	Western and Southern Region	Ongoing project	Potential for complementarity with RCPRP
	Peri-urban Agricultural Development Project	Countrywide	Under preparation	The project emphasises production of vegetables and marketing of agricultural produce, it is complementary to RFCIP
	Enhancing smallholder access to NERICA seed for alleviating rural poverty in Western and Central Africa	Countrywide (Sierra Leone being one of three countries supported)	Start in 2008	Complementarity with RCPRP/RADEP.
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	OFTN / FFS	Countrywide	Ongoing	Complementarity with RCPRP/RADEP.
	Development of a Sustainable Seed Sector (German funding)	Countrywide	Ongoing	Complementarity with RCPRP/RADEP.
	Food Security through Commercialisation of Agriculture (FSCA) Project (Italian Cooperation)	Koinadugu and Kono Districts	Start in 2008	Capacity building of FBOs: use of trainers trained by the project, modules, etc..
	Irish Aid: Commercialisation of agriculture	Two districts	Planned	
	EU-Food Security Facility			
	FMPP			
World Bank (WB)	Sierra Leone HIV/AIDS Response Programme (SHARP)	Countrywide	Ongoing	Rural finance (RFCIP) activities will complement SHARP
	National Social Action Project (NSAP)	Countrywide	Ongoing	RFCIP will complement NSAP Rural Finance Programme activities.
	Health Sector Project	Countrywide	Under preparation	RCPRO & RADEP will link with their operations.
	Rehabilitation of Basic Education Project (REBEP)	Countrywide	Under preparation	RADEP could link with their operations.
	Transport Rehabilitation Programme	Countrywide	Under preparation	RCPRO link with their operations
	Wildlife Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Project	Countrywide	Under preparation	RADEP will link with their operations.
	Rural and Private Sector Development Project (RPSDP)	Countrywide	Start in 2008	Project will complement RCPRP in areas such as rural market infrastructure and information, supply chain development, and strengthening of public and private rural advisory services. Also with RFCIP in rural finance.
European Union (EU)	Sierra Leone Resettlement and Rehabilitation Programme – Phase II	Countrywide	Ongoing	The Project can learn from this project and operational linkages will be established. GTZ is implementing partner

Donor/Agency	Nature of Project/Programme	Project/Programme Coverage	Status	Complementarity/Synergy Potential
EU Common Fund for Commodities	Spot Improvement and Maintenance Programme	Countrywide	Ongoing	Complementarity with RCPRP
	STABEX Programme in support of production, processing and marketing of basic food commodities and export crops		Ongoing	Complementarity with RCPRP (value chain analysis, capacity building).
	Food security projects (=> NGOs: WHH, Concern, Christian Aid, COOPI, CARE, FAO)	Countrywide	Ongoing	Complementary with RCPRP
	West Africa Sorghum Value Chain Supply Project (implemented by Community Biodiversity Action Network in partnership with Sierra Leone Brewery Limited,) 50% EU funded	Kambia and Porto Loko	Ongoing (since 2005 for 5 years)	Value chain development methodology & RCPRP.
GTZ	Employment Promotion Project Resettlement component	Kono, Kailahun, Koinadugu, Kenema	Ongoing	Project offering tools and guidelines for post-conflict context. Complementary with RCPRP.
KfW	Microfinance Investment and Technical Assistance Facility (MITAF)	Countrywide	Ongoing	Support of the BoSL in banking supervision. Complementary with RFCIP; cooperation with KfW (UNCDF/UNDP/Cordaid) in the microfinance sector
	Peace Consolidation Project (GPC)	Countrywide	Ongoing	Rehabilitation and building infrastructure in rural areas incl. schools, roads, stores, etc.
Islamic Development Bank (IDB)	Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP)	Countrywide	Ongoing	The programme provides for the rehabilitation of rural infrastructure and distribution of tools and inputs. ASREP will link for synergy and complementarity.
	Diversified Food Crop Production Project	Bombali, Bo and Tonkolili	Ongoing	
	Capacity for oil Palm Production Processing and Marketing	Bonthe – Matru Jong	Ongoing	
UNIDO	Post-conflict SME support programme for industrial development and poverty alleviation	Bo, Pujehun, Binkolo, Kpandebu, Kabala, Mambolo, Rotifink	Ongoing	RCPRP will make use of the 4 growth centres that were rehabilitated after the civil war.
	Agri-enterprise development for stimulating rural economies in Africa Initiative	Regional (11 countries including Sierra Leone)	Ongoing	Backstopping, training modules, prototypes of equipment, networking, business models
World Food Programme (WFP)	Targeted Food Assistance for Relief and Recovery Project (Country Programme)	Countrywide	Ongoing	Possible partnership will be considered in the future
	Food Assistance for Development Projects	Selected districts	Under preparation	Complementary with RCPRP
	Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) - Food Assistance to refugees and returnees; assistance to	6 Districts (Kono, Kenema, Kailahun, Bo Bonthe and Pujehun)	Ongoing since July 2007 (for 2 years)	Complementary with RCPRP

Donor/Agency	Nature of Project/Programme	Project/Programme Coverage	Status	Complementarity/Synergy Potential
	rehabilitation of feeder roads.			
United Nation Development Programme (UNDP)	Microfinance capacity building project (with UNCDF and KfW)	Countrywide	Ongoing	Partial overlap with RFCIP as regards support to community banks and creation of a favourable environment for rural and micro finance Potential for collaboration, mutual reinforcing and achievement of results. Link RFCIP
	Support to 'Agricultural Business Units'	Countrywide	Ongoing	Training by application of 'human techniques' needs to be backed by technical expertise to avoid frustrations with the farmers
	Kenema District Economic Recovery Programme (KDERP) with UNCDF	Kenema District	Ongoing (2007-2012)	The KDERP is a pilot project and RFCIP will cooperate with KDERP in Kenema district.
CORAD (CARE, CRS, WVI, ARC)	Promoting Linkages for Livelihood Security and Economic Development (LINKS)	National	Ongoing (since 2007)	Market information system, value chain analyses, provision of specialised services (training, modules)
Welthungerhilfe	Organic cocoa value chain development (financed by EU-STABEX).	Two districts	Ongoing until late 2008	Technology packages to improve quality of cocoa Value chain development methodology
Concern	Livelihood Security MAPS Programme	Two districts	Ongoing	Complementarity with RADEP as Programme targets vulnerable farm families and community groups. Link to RCPRP
JICA	Agricultural Development Project	Kambia	Ongoing	Development of technical packages for rice and vegetable production. Link to RCPRP
USAID	PAGE	Kono, Koinadugu, Kenema, Kailahun	Ongoing	
	Promoting linkages for livelihood security and economic development (Links)		Ongoing	
	Livelihood Expansion for Asset Development (LEAD)		Ongoing	
DFID	Research into Use (RIU)	Countrywide	Ongoing	
Irish Aid	Commercialisation of agriculture	Two districts	Planned	
Italian Cooperation	Food Security through Commercialisation of Agriculture (FSCA)	Kono, Koinadugu	Ongoing	Implemented by FAO (see above)
Private Sector	Several medium and large scale investments in rice, oil palm, sugar cane, fruit pulp and others, partly for biofuel production	Countrywide	On-going and planned	Outgrower schemes

Key file 4: Target group identification, priority issues and potential response

Typology	Poverty Level and Causes	Coping Actions	Priority Needs	Support from Other Initiatives	COSOP Response
Small-scale farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of access to inputs and support services; • Limited profitable investment opportunities; • Lack of funds and knowledge to diversify production and to increase soil fertility for sustainable higher yield level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional farming practices, including slash and burn; • Borrowing from friends and neighbours; • Participation in the informal financial sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved seed and planting materials and other farm inputs (e.g. fertilizer); • Short- and medium-term loans for annual farming and investments in technology; • Technical training; • Knowledge on financial farm management and group management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiatives from MAFFS through range of projects & programmes (OFTN, etc.) funded by AfDB, EU, WB, GTZ, DFID, FAO (particular focus on FFS) • Wide range of International NGO's and local CBO's involved in agriculture development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting sustainable availability of farm inputs (RCPRP); • Supporting production and dissemination of improved seed and planting materials; • Promoting sustainable extension services (FFS, innovative technology transfer); • Promoting improved cropping practise towards higher and sustainable yields; • Supporting post-harvest management, value addition and marketing; • Investment support (link to financial service providers; swamp development).
Micro-and small-scale entrepreneurs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of funds to acquire tools and machinery and for working capital; • Lack of access to formal financial services; • Inadequate services by the informal financial sector; • Lack of appropriate technology for rural food processing; • Lack of entrepreneurship skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Borrowing from friends and neighbours; • Participation in informal financial sector; • Use traditional, manual unhygienic processing activities; • People are engaged in petty trade activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-and medium-term loans and overdraft facilities for working capital requirements, tools and machinery; • Knowledge on financial management; simple business plans and loan procedures. • Provision of simple appropriate technology at affordable price; • Tailor made training to start productive businesses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiatives from MAFFS through range of projects & programmes funded by AfDB, EU, WB, GTZ, DFID, UNDP • Wide range of International NGO's and local CBO's involved in rural finance • BoSL, MITAF, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting the development of demand-driven and decentralized rural microfinance services (under RFCIP); • Assisting Community Banks in identifying creditworthy groups of small-scale entrepreneurs (under RFCIP); • Training on business development and management; • Produce prototype equipment for application in the rural areas.
Women	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of funds for trading, food processing and other micro enterprise activities; • Lack of access to formal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive participation in informal financial sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term loans for trading, food processing and other businesses; • Flexible repayment schedules in order to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiatives from MAFFS, MLG&CD, NaCSA through range of projects & 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assisting Community Banks in identifying creditworthy women groups (under RFCIP); • Assisting Community Banks design appropriate financial products and collateral substitutes; • Assisting women groups to mobilize savings and

Typology	Poverty Level and Causes	Coping Actions	Priority Needs	Support from Other Initiatives	COSOP Response
	financial services; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few deposit facilities outside the informal financial sector; • Insufficient collateral for bank loans. 		benefit from price increases; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased capital formation; • Quick loan processing; • Knowledge on financial management and loan applications. 	programmes funded by AfDB, EU, WB, GTZ, DFID, UNDP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide range of International NGO's and local CBO's involved in GAD issues 	negotiate with Community Banks for continuous business partnerships . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring that women constitute half of the members in community deliberative and planning processes, to freely express their specific concerns and perspectives; • Encouraging female animators to join the programmes projects in order to better instil a gender approach in development activities; • Advocacy and training on gender mainstreaming for the population, for authorities such as chiefs, local councillors and district staff; • Supporting the emergence of women leaders in community/farmer organisations and agri; • Providing leadership skills training to women engaged in community planning and community activities, as well as financing the creation of networks of women leaders; • Supporting initiatives of youth groups on gender awareness, using the potential of the youth as activists for gender equality and mainstreaming; • Recruiting women as technical staff for the Country Programme Coordination Office and District Coordination Offices; • Including gender indicators in the programmes M&E System, at output, outcome and impact level.
Youth (including ex-combatants and sexually abused young women/single mothers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of opportunities (before the war); • Social exclusion; • Limited or no access to land / resources; • Low literacy levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Settling in cities to ensure anonymity (Freetown); • Begging, prostitution in cities; • Getting involved in petty crimes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As for women above plus: • Social inclusion and acceptance in host communities; • Skills training. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both concerned The Government and NGO's involved in assisting youth through range of projects & programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeting job opportunities in rural areas towards youth (food for work, promotion of agri-businesses) • Skills training for youth • Promoting appropriate off-farm opportunities for youth, such as carpentry, blacksmith, sewing, cloth dying, processing, soap making, petty trade. • Fostering entrepreneurial skills in selected youth; • Supporting youth organizations, particularly those with social, productive and advocacy roles.