

**Evaluation of  
“Pilot Decentralization of Agriculture and Food Security”  
Project**

By

A. Jalloh (Ph.D.)  
Institute of Agricultural Research, Njala  
PMB 540, Freetown

Submitted to UNDP  
Freetown, Sierra Leone

September 2006

## Table of Contents

	Page
Table of Contents.....	01
List of Tables.....	02
<b>1.0 Introduction .....</b>	<b>03</b>
<b>2.0 Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>04</b>
<b>3.0 Methodology of the Study.....</b>	<b>07</b>
<b>4.0 Findings, analysis, of policy/programme/capacity gaps and lessons learnt on the project.....</b>	<b>09</b>
4.1 Relevance of the objective, strategy, and approach/methodology in relation to the Sierra Leone Government’s PRSP and policies on food security and decentralization.....	09
4.2 Empowerment and developing institutional capacities and strengthening linkages/partnerships.....	11
4.3 Achievement of targets of the project and impact on productivity.....	12
4.4 Implications of community contributions and impact on local government revenue mobilization.....	16
4.5 Management of community contributions.....	20
4.6 Capacity development.....	21
<b>5.0 Project constraints and immediate corrective actions to resolve them for phase 2 of the project.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>6.0 Conclusions and recommendations.....</b>	<b>25</b>
6.1 Conclusions.....	25
6.2 Recommendations.....	25
<b>7.0 Draft project design for the second phase.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>8.0 Annexes.....</b>	<b>28</b>
8.1 Terms of reference.....	28
8.2 Questionnaire for farmers.....	36
8.3 Questionnaire for District Council member.....	37
8.4 List of stakeholders met and interviewed.....	38
8.5 Receipts; bank payment slips, and statements; and payment reports.....	40
<b>9.0 References.....</b>	<b>54</b>

<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table 1	List of ABUs visited and representative members interviewed .....08
Table 2	Analysis of rice distribution targets.....13
Table 3	Expected contributions per district council and percentage of expected contribution paid.....16
Table 4	Potential community contribution to Local Councils.....17
Table 5	Proportion of seeds allocated to the ABUs.....18
Table 6	National Revenue Authority tax rates for selected vocations/enterprises.....19
Table 7	Tax rate per chargeable income.....20

## 1.0 Introduction

UNDP has actively supported the Government of Sierra Leone and civil society in the development and implementation of a policy of decentralization of elected local government after a lapse of 32 years. In 2002 and 2003, UNDP with DFID supported a national Task Force to develop government policy on decentralization and draft the Local Government Act, creating the legal and institutional framework for local governance. Since the Local Government elections in May 2004, UNDP's focus has been on supporting the devolution of services from central to local government, on promoting local resource mobilization and on integrating the principles of Transparency, Accountability and Participation (TAP) in the delivery of local services. The Local Government Act mandates significant fiscal and functional decentralization of government services.

Pilot initiatives have been designed in key sectors to help “jump start” the institutional process of devolution, and to help create some early opportunities for citizen involvement in local governance. In October 2004, the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Security (MAFFS) (current Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security) in partnership with UNDP and Irish Aid launched a pilot activity on Decentralization of Agriculture and Achieving Food Security with **the Objective of mobilizing resources for the Local Councils**. The targets were to:

- Expand rice production by motivating 100,000 farmers to increase their cultivated land by one acre
- Motivate farmers to save a proportion (20%) of their additional output to invest in agriculture
- Mobilize resources for the Local Government by motivating farmers to contribute a proportion (20%) of their increased output to the new Local Councils

The programme was rolled out in 3 stages:

**Stage 1 – Sensitization:** 115 Master Trainers conducted a national sensitization programme motivating farmers to increase acreage, save 20 % of their additional output and also provide 20 % to their Local Councils as “Community Contribution”.

**Stage 2 – Agricultural Business Unit (ABU) Formation:** promote the formation of ABUs innovative new structures of approximately 400 farmers that will manage the savings and community contributions of members.

**Stage 3 – Support:** ensure that the ABUs have the capacity to manage members’ resources, and the members live up to their commitment to save and pay community contribution.

This evaluation exercise was commissioned to independently examine relevance of the objective, strategy, design and methodology adopted for the project; examine to what extent the objectives set for the project have been achieved in the current country context and the role that UNDP has played. The evaluation is also aimed at identifying policy/programme/capacity gaps, generate lessons learned and recommend actions and adjustments to improve performance in programming for the second phase of UNDP support for decentralization of agriculture and food security. These will feed into the formulation of future UNDP interventions supporting decentralization, good local governance, food security and poverty reduction.

## 2.0 Executive Summary

During the 2005 cropping season, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS) in partnership with UNDP launched a pilot activity on Decentralization of Agriculture and Achieving Food Security through the formation and support of Agricultural Business Units (ABUs) in all the 12 districts of Sierra Leone with **the Objective of mobilizing resources for the Local Councils**. The targets of the project were to expand rice production by motivating 100,000 farmers to increase their cultivated land by one acre, motivate these farmers to save a proportion (20%) of their additional output to invest in agriculture and also motivate them to contribute a proportion (20%) of their increased output to the new Local Councils

This evaluation exercise examined the relevance of the objective, strategy, design and methodology adopted for the project; as well as to what extent the objectives set for the project have been achieved and the role played by UNDP. The evaluation also aimed at identifying policy/programme/capacity gaps, in order to generate lessons learned and recommend actions and adjustments to improve performance in programming for the second phase of the project.

The evaluation involved visits to all the 12 districts in Sierra Leone. Prior to these visits, all the District Council Chairmen, and Chief Administrators together with the Chairmen of each of the ABUs in the country had been informed of the evaluation exercise and the consultant's itinerary. During the visit to each of the districts, 2 – 4 ABUs were randomly selected from the list of ABUs in that district. The chairman of each of the selected ABUs was then requested to assemble some of his members to be interviewed. In each district also, the Chairman and/or the Chief Administrator were interviewed. A total of 635 farmers comprising of 170 females and 465 males were interviewed.

The major objectives of the ABU programme, which aim at enabling farmers to improve food production and stimulate increased revenue mobilization for the Local Councils to improve service delivery to reduce poverty and impact positively on the welfare of farmers, are in line with the three pillars of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) of Sierra Leone and directly or indirectly related to the Millennium Development Goals.

The Master Trainers (MTs) were very successful in motivating ABU farmers to increase their rice farms by at least one acre. However, only 25 % (24,000 acres) of the targeted expansion (100,000 acres) of rice farmland area was achieved, mainly due to the inadequate seed rice provided by MAFS as loan and the delay in supplying the seeds. It was only in the North that all the districts received at least 50 % of seed rice expected. The South and East received only 18 % and 25 % of expected seed rice, respectively.

Also, late delivery, inappropriate varieties, and poor germination rate of the seed rice that was supplied resulted in very poor yields and consequently low production. The farmers reported an average of 5 bushels/acre, which is 30 % of national average yield/acre (16 bushels) and a total production of 120,000 bushels (3.0 mt). The national rice acreage in 2004 was 1,292,968 acres (517,187 ha) with an estimated production of 526,618 mt (21,064,720 bushels). The ABU acreage during the 2005 cropping season was 2 % of the national rice acreage during that season, while production was less than 1 % of the 2004 season production.

Based on the responses of the farmers interviewed, the MTs were also very successful in motivating the farmers to save part of their produce. However, the above mentioned reasons significantly undermined the ability of the farmers to do so. The motivation to contribute to the Local Councils is perhaps the greatest achievement of the sensitization exercise. Unfortunately, the expected additional acreage, which would have increased production and generated some surplus that would have provided the means for the farmers to contribute to the local councils, was not achieved. Nevertheless, in all the regions and districts visited, all the farmers expressed willingness to contribute to their local councils and were fully aware of the benefits of contributing to the councils.

The farmers are also aware of the fact that their contributions will enhance the capacity of the council to implement development activities. It was also perceived from the discussions that the farmers would continue contributing to the councils even when input supplies would have ceased. Such willingness to contribute voluntarily is a manifestation of *good citizenship*. Undoubtedly, the ABUs have brought farmers closer to work for a common purpose thereby fostering closer relationships among them and creating social capital at the grassroots level. It has also created a platform for interaction with other Associations.

The enthusiasm of the farmers to contribute to the local councils was, however, not reflected in the level of contribution to the various councils. Apart from the Kenema and Kono districts that collected 62 % and 57 % of the expected contributions, respectively, all the other districts collected less than 20 % of the expected contributions. The low rate of seed rice recovery and community contribution payment could be partly attributed to the inadequate commitment of most of the councils to collect the community contributions from the collection points in the wards.

It is, however, clear from projections of targeted community contributions that they could be potential sources of much needed revenue for the Local Councils, if they are properly harnessed. In all the districts of the Southern Province, the potential revenue from the ABUs would have been greater than own revenue and development grants provided by the government. Considering the fact that current membership of the ABUs is a very small percentage of the total number of farmers in the districts, additional membership by the vast number of farmers who have shown willingness to join the ABUs will result in contributions far greater than all present revenue of each of the district councils.

It is, however, hoped that eventually, all farmers will contribute willingly to the Councils thereby preventing the current situation wherein the ABU farmers are contributing to the councils to fund development projects and services that will be enjoyed by all farmers in that locality including farmers that benefited from the seed rice loan scheme of MAFS.

There was however, a clear need for reinforcing the philosophy of self-reliance for the bulk of the farmers particularly assuring them that with proper planning and management of their resources, they need not depend on outside support. There is an apparent desire by other farmers across the country to join the ABUs which are emerging as appropriate groups of farmers who can improve their lot by pooling their resources together and also provide a formidable voice to engage the local councils and other development partners.

Every effort should be made to extend the ABUs to all farmers in the country and strengthen them with the collaborative support of MAFS, the Local Councils and Traditional Rulers. The Extension wing of MAFS should be better oriented to provide technical advice for farmers, while the Local Councils and Traditional Rulers should appropriately link with the leadership of the ABUs to establish an effective channel for dialogue and collection of community contributions.

It is imperative that farmers are assisted to transform, expand and improve on their existing farming activities. A valuable foundation has been laid in the business like approach to farming through the ABUs, requiring farmers to make due consideration of costs and returns, be self-reliant and not to look forward to free inputs. However, farmers need an initial and targeted support particularly in the form of micro credit and appropriate mechanization, to enable them acquire basic inputs and reduce drudgery particularly on women thereby providing an opportunity for these resource poor farmers to adopt improved production practices, increase acreage and benefit from economics of scale.

### 3.0 Methodology of the Study

- 3.1 **Briefing and desk study:** The consultant met with a team from the governance unit of UNDP and was briefed on details of the assignment. He was provided with essential documents to enable him have adequate understanding of the operations of the project so that he can formulate an appropriate methodology to evaluate the project.
- 3.2 **Interviews with partners and stakeholders:** The following partners and stakeholders were interviewed:
- Local authorities – local council staff, councilors, paramount chiefs, ward development committees, district directors of agriculture, district agriculture office extension workers.
  - Master trainers (community animators), who served to form and support capacity building component
  - Members of Agricultural Business Units (groups of approximately 400 small scale farmers)
  - National authorities – Ministry of Agriculture and Food security, Ministry of Local Government and Community development
  - Farmers’ groups and associations – Farmers Field Schools, National Association of Farmers of Sierra Leone (NAFSL)
  - Citizens, CBOs and civil society in the covered districts
  - Development partners engaged in decentralization of agriculture and capacity building at the local level – FAO, UN Transition Team
  - Business community and traders
- 3.3 **Questionnaires:** Two sets of questionnaires were designed. One of the questionnaires was for farmers and the other for a local council member. Each of the questionnaires solicited both quantitative and qualitative responses related to targets of the project, their perception of the project and possible recommendations.
- 3.4 **Sampling:** There are ABUs in all the 12 districts in Sierra Leone. The number of ABUs vary from 11 in the Koinadugu district to 40 in the Kambia district. All the 12 districts were visited. In each of the districts, 2 – 4 ABUs depending on the number of ABUs in the district were selected at random from the list of ABUs in that district. Table 1 presents the list of ABUs visited.

The initial plan was for the questionnaire for farmers to be administered to 10 farmers of each selected ABU. In the field, it was realized that a focused group interview using the questionnaire as a guide was more appropriate to accommodate the realities on the ground for example some ABUs did not receive seed rice while only very few ABUs in the North received their full quota of seed rice. This strategy provided the opportunity to interact with more farmers and to build consensus. A total of 635 farmers, comprising of 170 females and 465 males were interviewed.

Table 1 List of ABUs visited and representative members interviewed

District	Chiefdom	Name of ABU	Sex		Total No. of farmers
			Females	Males	
<b>Bombali</b>	Mapaki	Wan Word	8	17	25
	Paki Masabang	Sabenti	3	19	22
	Bombali Sebor	Sapoben	13	15	28
		<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Kambia</b>	Mambolo	Rahim	2	2	4
	Magberma	Magbema Farmers	3	7	10
	Gbileh Dixon	Kokenyi	1	2	3
	Masungbala	KABU	1	2	3
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Koinadugu</b>	Wara Wara Bafodia	Husukoshunthy	2	6	8
		Mobohiyanday	5	6	11
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Portloko</b>	Bureh-Kasse-Maconteh	Sabenti	1	3	4
			5	15	20
			1	3	4
		<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Tonkolili</b>	Kholifa Rowalla	Aposake	8	17	25
	Kafe Simira	Masiyandae	1	6	7
	Taneh	Tayorkathena	1	15	16
		<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Bo</b>	Niawa Lenga	Ngbema	5	20	25
	Bumpe Ngao	Bondeya	3	17	20
	Jaiama Bonjor	Kama Baimba	3	12	15
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Bonth</b>	Tihun	Kargiva	1	4	5
	Kpandekemo	Sawama	1	11	15
		<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Moyamba</b>	Fakunya	Njagbahun	3	7	10
	Kori	Nyanigbeh	3	5	8
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Pujehun</b>	Kpanga Kabonde		5	15	20
	Yakemo Kpukumu Krim	Ngoyila	8	17	25
		<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Kailahun</b>	Kissi Tongi	Bendia Tongia	3	19	19
	Luawa	Jogima	3	7	10
		Amuloma	5	9	16
		<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Kenema</b>	Dama	Torkpumbu	22	58	80
	Dama	Amuloma	12	28	40
	Kandu Leppiama	Nengeh	8	35	43
		<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>Kono</b>	Kamara	Kongoebanda	21	21	42
		Kongoemanyi	2	13	15
	Nimikoro	Konkonmanye	5	19	24
	Gbane	Koardia	2	13	15
		<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>96</b>
		<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>635</b>

#### 4.0 Findings, analysis, of policy/programme/capacity gaps and lessons learnt on the project

The **objective** of the first phase ABU programme was *to stimulate increased revenue mobilization for the Local Councils*. The targets of the programme were:

1. Expand rice production by motivating 100,000 farmers to increase farm land by 1 (one) acre
2. Motivate farmers to save 20% of their additional output
3. Motivate farmers to contribute 20% of their additional output to their Local Councils

The programme was rolled out in three phases (pillars):

1. **Sensitization:** 115 Master Trainers to sensitize 50,000 citizens (ensuring equal participation of males and females) and motivate them to save 20% of their additional output and contribute same to Local councils.
2. **Agricultural Business Unit (ABU) Formation:** Promote the formation of ABUs each comprising of about 400 members who will be encouraged to pool resources to invest.
3. **Support:** Master Trainers to assist ABU members to elect a management Committee, and to build their capacity by delivering training on topics such as planning, leadership, record keeping and meeting management.

#### 4.1 Relevance of the objective, strategy, and approach/methodology in relation to the Sierra Leone Government's PRSP and policies on food security and decentralization.

The bulk of the population of Sierra Leone live in the rural areas and the majority are smallholder farmers who are producing at below subsistence level. The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) study revealed that 26 % of the population of Sierra Leone is food poor and cannot afford a basic diet, while 70 % live in poverty. Since the 1970s, Sierra Leone has not been able to produce adequate quantities of its staple food (rice) to meet local consumption demand. Currently, Sierra Leone imports about US \$ 50 million worth of rice annually. Against this background, one of the key challenges of the Government of Sierra Leone is to increase rice production to at least meet local consumption demand and save valuable foreign exchange.

The Sierra Leone Government's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) has three pillars, each with objectives closely tied to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). They are:

**Pillar 1:** Promoting good governance, security and peace;

**Pillar 2:** Pro-poor sustainable growth for food security and job creation; and

**Pillar 3:** Human development.

The major objectives of the ABU programme, which aim at enabling farmers to improve food production and stimulate increased revenue mobilization for the Local Councils to improve service delivery to reduce poverty and impact positively on the welfare of farmers, are in line with the three pillars of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) of Sierra Leone and directly or indirectly related to the Millennium Development Goals. Strategic activation of the agricultural sector is expected to provide an avenue to gainfully engage the bulk of the population, particularly the youths (Government of Sierra Leone, 2005). Increased agricultural production will improve farmers' income, attract youths back to the rural areas thereby decongesting the urban areas and stimulate the overall economy of the country and ultimately reduce poverty.

Currently, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS) is encouraging and providing support to increase farmers' productivity per unit area using improved seeds, fertilization and good management, while encouraging expansion in land area where possible. The lack of inputs including planting materials remains an important impediment to increased agricultural production in Sierra Leone. The overall objective of the ABUs, which is to increase rice production and mobilize resources for the District councils, is in concert with the government's drive towards improving the welfare of farmers through increased agricultural production and improving service delivery by strengthening the Local Councils to efficiently carry out devolved functions. Agriculture, education and health are in the forefront of decentralization to the local councils.

The agricultural sector is a major focus of the decentralization process since it employs the majority of the population, which will reflect the potential impact of the process and provide basis for extrapolation to other sectors and the rest of the population. It is imperative that decentralization in the agricultural sector leads to empowerment of farmers and enables them to contribute effectively in making decisions that will affect their lives. The ABUs provide an opportunity for farmers to express their right of freedom of association and also provide an organizational structure that enables farmers to have a collective voice, which they can use to advocate effectively for their rights. On the other hand, the organized groups of ABU members are convenient units of administration within the Local Councils. Eventually, it is hoped that all farmers will belong to one ABU or the other, thereby providing a convenient framework for administering within the Local Councils.

In addition to providing a framework for local governance, the ABUs are also a potential source of much needed funds for the running of the local councils and implementing development projects in the various regions. At the moment, Sierra Leone depends greatly on donor funds to run the country and implement development projects. The country will not continue to live on such good will for too long. The government is making every effort to revitalize the economy and generate sufficient funds to run the country. The on going decentralization exercise is part of the process of providing a framework and environment for the proper management of resources. In the meantime, the expected contribution of ABUs will go a long way in providing a sustainable source of income for the Local councils thereby ensuring their growth and enable them to provide an effective mechanism of governance that will ensure the rule of law and sustained economic growth.

The strategy to increase rice production by increasing acreage should be carefully considered alongside the resources of the farmers, for example, the availability of fertile land, labour and seeds. The scarcity of labour in the rural areas is a growing phenomenon while the inability of farmers to acquire basic inputs like seed rice and fertilizer is a well-known fact. It is against this background, that improving productivity per unit area is more practical, feasible and economical. The ABU approach particularly in the upland should initially emphasize the improvement of productivity on

existing land by promoting and providing essential inputs like improved seed rice and fertilizer using the existing limited labour. In the lowlands particularly the bolilands where tractors are available, the farmers can be encouraged to expand acreage and use fertilizers to maximize output.

#### **4.2 Empowerment and developing institutional capacities and strengthening linkages/partnerships**

Over the years, farmers have formed various associations to cater for their well being. Most of these associations have not stood the test of time because of ill motivated intentions, improper planning and incompatible membership. There appears to be a strong sense of ownership and self-reliance among ABU members, with a shared goal of improving their lot and emancipating themselves from poverty.

Against the background of the high level of illiteracy among Sierra Leoneans particularly the farmers, the training provided by the Master trainers has helped to enlighten farmers about the benefits of genuine associations and the need for proper management skills to foster a conducive atmosphere that will ensure progress among them. Having a strong and reliable association with a shared vision provides the basis for well-grounded linkages among members of the same association and with members of other associations. There is an apparent unprecedented bondage among ABU members that need to be fostered by supporting collective initiatives like pooling resources to undertake activities, which individuals cannot on their own, due to the lack of adequate resources.

Increased productivity expected to result from the synergies of association should increase farmers' wealth and open up more opportunities for them. Contributing collectively to the councils as ABU members fosters a concerted approach and voice. Community Contributions provide a crucial opportunity for farmers to have a stake in decision-making bound to influence their welfare. It is expected that in the very near future, the Local Councils would generate adequate funds to run the Councils and implement development projects. The gradual phasing out of government development support to the Local Councils will reveal the increasing dependence of the Local Councils on the contributions made by farmers. It should be noted that the current precepts from local taxation are inadequate to support the Local Councils. Contributing funds for the Local councils gives the farmers authority to suggest how such funds should be used. The farmers will therefore gradually have due influence on the course of developments in their communities and their own well being.

It is, however, interesting to note that as much as the ABUs have a strong intra ABU linkage, there does not appear to exist an effective link between the various ABUs in the district and much less a national linkage among the ABUs. There is also no structural and functional relationship with other Farmers Associations like Cooperatives and the National Association of farmers of Sierra Leone (NAFSL). It is necessary to have an acceptable national framework connecting all Farmers' groups including the ABUs. This should be viewed against the fact that it is farmers that make up the membership of these organizations. There may be need to strengthen the ABUs in numbers and its administration such that all farmers will eventually share the character of farming with a business like motive. A new look NAFSL can then be born with a new vision based on the ABU approach and administrative structure.

There is no strong operational relationship between the ABUs and MAFS. The link and involvement of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security with the ABU need strengthening. The ABU framework provides for organizing farmers and motivating them to come together and benefit from the pooling of scarce resources and then contribute to the Local Councils. The majority of farmers are resource poor and need assistance to acquire inputs and have access to extension services. The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security has been providing inputs particularly seed rice and tractor services, which the ABU members definitely need. These, inputs and services are provided for the entire farming community including the ABU farmers. There is every need to establish effective links with MAFS to ensure that ABU farmers benefit from these facilities provided by government. It is also crucial to ensure that these services are made available to the farmers at the right time. Obviously, the quality and adequacy of the supplies need to be assured.

The UNDP supported office of the Decentralization Specialist in the Ministry of Agriculture Office at Youyi building need to be fully integrated within MAFS with harmonized responsibilities set by both UNDP and the Director General of Agriculture to ensure effective support for the decentralization of designated functions to the Local Councils. At the moment, the office is viewed as a UNDP outfit with abundant resources to carry out a programme that will cease as soon as funding stops. There is undoubtedly need for such an office but a clear understanding, acceptance and support by MAFS is crucial. It is very evident that the farmers would need technical services that are provided by MAFS field staff.

The farmers should be shown that ABU has the support of a unified front of collaboration involving UNDP, MAFS, the Local Councils and Traditional Leaders. This collaboration should extend from registering farmers, distribution of inputs, provision of extension services and collection of community contributions.

### **4.3 Achievement of targets of the project and impact on productivity**

The overall target of ABU is to increase rice production thereby enabling the farmers to have surplus to contribute to the local councils.

#### ***1. Expand rice production by motivating 100,000 farmers to increase farm land by 1 (one) acre***

The Master Trainers did a very good job motivating the farmers to increase their farm lands by at least one acre. However, the increase in acreage, which was to provide the basis for increased production and subsequently some surplus, which would have encouraged the farmers to contribute to the local councils, was fraught with many difficulties.

i) In post war Sierra Leone, the lack of adequate seed rice remains a key impediment to increasing rice production. In the ABU programme, even though the farmers were willing to increase their acreage, the unavailability of adequate seed rice was an impediment. As indicated in Table 2 a total of 59,092 bu (41 % of target requirement) were provided for the ABU farmers. It was only in the North that all the districts received at least 50 % of seed rice required. The South and East received only 16 % and 25 % of expected seed rice, respectively.

Table 2 Analysis of rice distribution targets

District	Total No. of ABUs*	Total No. of Farmers*	Target supply of seed rice (bu)*	Quantity of seed rice supplied (bu)**	% of seed rice target supplied
<b>NORTH</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>54,400</b>	<b>54,400</b>	<b>41,424</b>	<b>76 %</b>
Bombali	24	9,600	9,600	7,200	75 %
Kambia	40	16,000	16,000	12,000	75 %
Koinadugu	11	4,400	4,400	2,190	50 %
Portloko	26	10,400	10,400	8,406	81 %
Tonkolili	35	14,000	14,000	11,628	83 %
<b>SOUTH</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>54,400</b>	<b>54,400</b>	<b>8,562</b>	<b>16 %</b>
Bo	32	12,800	12,800	3,353	26 %
Bonth	35	14,000	14,000	581	04 %
Moyamba	37	14,800	14,800	2,128	14 %
Pujehun	32	12,800	12,800	2,500	20 %
<b>EAST</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>36,000</b>	<b>36,000</b>	<b>9,106</b>	<b>25 %</b>
Kailahun	18	7,200	7,200	1,004	14 %
Kenema	32	12,800	12,800	2,361	18 %
Kono	40	16,000	16,000	5,741	36 %
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>144,800</b>	<b>144,800</b>	<b>59,092</b>	<b>41 %</b>

Sources: \* UNDP

\*\* District Agricultural Offices and UNDP

ii) The vast majority of farmers received less than one bushel of seed rice. It was only in the Bo district, Niawa Lenga Chiefdom that the Chairman of the Nengbema ABU decided to distribute the 100 bushels to only 100 farmers each having a bushel. All other ABU Chairmen distributed to their members half to one eighth of a bushel. It was therefore practically impossible for the individual farmers to expand their farms by one acre

iii) The seed rice was distributed late in all the districts. Most of the farmers particularly the upland farmers had already planted their rice and therefore were unable to prepare fresh sites to plant the rice.

iv) The farmers that were unable to plant the rice had a strong temptation to eat it. At least 40% of the farmers ate the rice given to them. It should be noted that the rice was supplied during the hunger period further heightening the temptation for consumption.

v) The rice varieties were also not targeted to the predominant ecologies in the various districts. A good number of upland farmers received lowland rice and vice versa. This was another temptation for the farmers to eat the rice.

vi) The germination percentage of some of the consignment was deplorable. Therefore even those farmers who planted the rice did not get the effective acreage due to poor germination.

Despite the rather low percentage (41 %) of seed rice supplied (59,092 bushels) to the ABUs, there was an opportunity for the farmers to expand rice acreage by about 60,000 acres during the 2005 cropping season with the 59,092 bushels of seed rice supplied. However, as a result of firstly, the late supply of seeds, it is estimated (based on the response of farmers) that not more than 40 % of the farmers actually planted the rice, therefore giving an estimated area of 24,000 acres planted. All the farmers who planted did so very late, which could have definitely affected productivity.

The recommended period for planting upland rice is during the first half of June. None of the farmers interviewed were supplied seed rice during the first half of June. Over 80 % of the farmers were supplied the seed rice in July with some farmers (about 8 %) receiving their supply in August. The *Husukoshunthy* ABU received their seed rice in September while *Amuloma* ABU in Kailahun district were supplied in October. All the lowland farmers received the seed rice after they had established their nurseries. Some lowland farmers (15 % of respondents) had to broadcast the seeds instead of transplanting, while a few farmers (less than 1 % of respondents) were able to exchange their seeds for seedlings. In addition to late and improper planting, 10 % of respondents who planted their seeds reported poor germination.

The farmers reported an average of 5 bushels/acre, which is 30 % of national average yield/acre (16 bushels). In effect, total production achieved was 120,000 bushels (3.0 mt). The national rice acreage in 2004 was 1,292,968 acres (517,187 ha) with an estimated production of 526,618 mt (21,064,720 bushels). In effect, the ABU acreage during the 2005 cropping season was 2 % of the national rice acreage during that season, while production was less than 1 % of the 2005 season production. Consequently late planting coupled with the above resulted in very poor yields and production, suggesting that there was no significant increase in acreage and production as a result of this intervention. Farmers need to be provided with good quality seeds at the right time to ensure high yields.

Considering only the labour input into the additional acreage being 74 mandays/acre for upland rice and 124 mandays/acre for swamp rice costing Le 185,000 and Le 310,000 309 for the upland and inland valley swamp, respectively, it is clear that there was a net loss in producing 5 bushels/acre that will give the farmer only Le 100,000/acre (Le 20,000/bu). There was evidently no gain in productivity.

There is definitely need to better organize the distribution of inputs to ensure optimum productivity and production that will improve farmers income and welfare. There is substantial room to increase domestic rice production to meet local consumption demand. Self sufficiency in rice production in Sierra Leone is currently at about 70 %. In addition to local demand, there is growing demand for rice in the sub region extending from Liberia to Ghana. There is therefore an avenue for farmers to expand production and increase their income. However, provision of seed rice is just part of the solution for farmers to increase production. Other inputs like fertilizer and appropriate mechanization particularly in land preparation coupled with good roads and other marketing infrastructure are crucial to achieving increased rice production in Sierra Leone.

## **2      *Motivate farmers to save 20% of their additional output***

The farmers were sufficiently motivated to save part of their produce. However, the above mentioned reasons significantly undermined the ability of the farmers to do so. There was an insignificant contribution of the ABUs rice land acreage with very low yields that made very little contribution to total rice production during the 2005/06 cropping season. Consequently, there was hardly additional yield that could have encouraged the farmers to save. In effect, most of the farmers who ate the rice had to use part of their meager harvest to repay the rice seed loans obtained from the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS).

The rice seed loan extended by MAFS was initiated to assist farmers to resettle in their communities after the war. Farmers are expected to repay the loan in kind for distribution to other farmers during the following cropping season. However, this scheme has been fraught with many difficulties resulting in the late distribution of inadequate and poor quality seeds to farmers. There is need to overhaul the scheme and if possible to encourage the Seed Multiplication Project to take over this scheme and run it without cumbersome bureaucracies and political interference.

Nevertheless, over 85 % of respondents expressed their willingness to save part of their harvest as seed for the next cropping season. Farmers need to be encouraged to develop the practice of saving seeds for the following cropping season so that they can plant the kind of seed they prefer at the right time. There is need to reinforce the need for saving not only seed rice for the next cropping season but also to save for a rainy day. However, it is only after farmers would have produced above subsistence level that they will have the opportunity to save.

## **3      *Motivate farmers to contribute 20% of their additional output to their Local Councils***

The motivation to contribute to the Local Councils is perhaps the greatest achievement of the sensitization exercise. In all the districts, all the farmers interviewed were apparently fully aware of the benefits of contributing to the councils. It is interesting to note that even with the very poor yields; the farmers were willing to contribute to the councils. Virtually all the farmers promised to continue contributing to the Local councils even without seed rice assistance in the future. In all the districts visited it was only in the Portloko district that some members of one ABU appeared not enthusiastic to repay their loans and contribute to the council. It must be emphasized that this was the only and isolated case.

The enthusiasm of the farmers to contribute to the local councils is, however, not reflected in the contributions shown in Table 3. Apart from the Kenema and Kono districts that collected 62 % and 57 % of the expected contributions, all the other districts collected less than 20 % of the expected contributions. The relatively high percentage of contribution collected in the Kenema and Kono districts could be attributed to the commitment of the Chairmen of their district councils who appeared to realize the potential of the community contributions together with a slightly more willingness on the part of the farmers which could probably be attributed to the more effective sensitization. The general, low rate of recovery of seed rice and contribution could be partly attributed to the lack of adequate commitment by the council members to collect contributions. In all the districts visited, except in the case of the ABU in Portloko, the farmers had collected the rice from their counterparts and stored the produce awaiting collection by the council.

A suitable mechanism with defined responsibilities should be put in place to collect the rice contributions. The ABUs should not be burdened to transport the rice to the district headquarters. It should be the responsibility of the council to collect the rice and contributions from the wards. There is very urgent need to sensitize the councils that they need to seriously consider and appreciate the contributions made by farmers. They need to know that in the very near future the bulk of their revenue will come from dues and contributions within their respective councils.

Table 3 Expected contribution per district council and percentage of expected contribution paid

Region/District	Total amount of seed rice supplied (bu)*	Expected contribution (Le)	Community Contribution	
			Amount contributed (Le)**	% of target
<b>NORTH</b>	<b>41,424</b>	<b>828,480,000</b>	<b>43,697,000</b>	<b>05.27 %</b>
Bombali	7,200	144,000,000	6,700,000	04.65 %
Kambia	12,000	240,000,000	23,000,000	09.58 %
Koinadugu	2,190	43,800,000	930,000	02.12 %
Portloko	8,406	168,120,000	2,600,000	01.55 %
Tonkolili	11,628	232,560,000	10,467,000	04.50 %
<b>SOUTH</b>	<b>8,562</b>	<b>171,240,000</b>	<b>23,140,000</b>	<b>13.51 %</b>
Bo	3,353	67,060,000	5,460,000	08.14 %
Bonth	581	11,620,000	650,000	05.59 %
Moyamba	2,128	42,560,000	7,370,000	17.32 %
Pujehun	2,500	50,000,000	9,660,000	19.32 %
<b>EAST</b>	<b>9,106</b>	<b>182,120,000</b>	<b>94,640,000</b>	<b>51.97 %</b>
Kailahun	1,004	20,080,000	0	00.00 %
Kenema	2,361	47,220,000	29,120,000	61.67 %
Kono	5,741	114,820,000	65,520,000	57.06 %
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>59,092</b>	<b>1,181,840,000</b>	<b>161,477,000</b>	<b>13.66 %</b>

Sources: \* District Agricultural Offices and UNDP

\*\* District Council Offices

#### 4.4 Implications of Community Contributions and impact on local government revenue mobilization

Table 4 clearly shows that community contributions are a potential source of much needed revenue for the Local Councils. A contribution of 3 bushels by each of the ABU members based on the memorandum of understanding would have been very significantly higher than all own revenue collected by all the district councils in the country. In the Southern Province, the potential revenue from the ABUs is greater than own revenue and development grants provided by the government. Considering the fact that the ABUs are a small percentage of the total number of farmers in the districts, the eventual adoption of voluntary community contributions by other farmers and the rest of the inhabitants in the district would result in contributions far greater than all present revenue of each of the district councils.

However, there is need to look at the rate of contribution with a view to ensuring sustained interest and willingness to contribute and in line with the rights of the farmers and other accepted principles of taxation. The contribution of 3 bushels to the council prescribed by UNDP seems disproportionately high for smallholder farmers who are mostly poor. It will be overgenerous if not a burden on farmers to contribute 3 bushels (20 %) of their expected yield of 15 bu from the additional acre considering the farmers' commitments. Voluntary contributions should not be prescribed; at most, suggestions can be made. It should be the prerogative and free will of the contributor to decide how much to contribute. In this regard, the respondents revealed that they would be happy to contribute 1 bushel of rice to their council. It is therefore recommended that Community Contribution should be revised to 1 bushel per farmer.

Table 4 Potential Community Contribution to local councils

District	Own revenue of local council☼	Potential ABU contribution		Grants☼	Total council Revenue
		1 bu per farmer*	3 bu per farmer		
<b>NORTH</b>					
Bombali	<b>36,583,756</b>	192,000,000	<b>576,000,000</b>	544,311,500	<b>580,895,256</b>
Kambia	<b>19,354,000</b>	320,000,000	<b>960,000,000</b>	455,197,324	<b>474,551,324</b>
Koinadugu	<b>30,934,000</b>	88,000,000	<b>264,000,000</b>	464,740,600	<b>495,674,600</b>
Portloko	<b>14,161,000</b>	208,000,000	<b>624,000,000</b>	833,620,000	<b>847,781,000</b>
Tonkolili	<b>26,620,837</b>	280,000,000	<b>840,000,000</b>	894,665,000	<b>921,285,837</b>
<b>SOUTH</b>					
Bo	<b>101,908,600</b>	256,000,000	<b>768,000,000</b>	660,834,600	<b>762,743,200</b>
Bonth	<b>108,816,122</b>	280,000,000	<b>840,000,000</b>	442,718,958	<b>551,535,080</b>
Moyamba	<b>108,569,500</b>	296,000,000	<b>888,000,000</b>	572,138,234	<b>680,707,734</b>
Pujehun	<b>42,042,457</b>	256,000,000	<b>768,000,000</b>	644,047,009	<b>686,089,466</b>
<b>EAST</b>					
Kailahun	<b>NA</b>	144,000,000	<b>432,000,000</b>	NA	<b>NA</b>
Kenema	<b>NA</b>	256,000,000	<b>768,000,000</b>	NA	<b>NA</b>
Kono	<b>409,064,705</b>	320,000,000	<b>960,000,000</b>	366,805,000	<b>775,869,705</b>

Source: ☼ Local Government Finance Department

\* 1 bushel per farmer priced at Le 20,000/bu; NA = Not available

Another issue is that the rice was made available to both ABU and non ABU members. Table 5 shows that less than 50 % of the rice was supplied to the ABUs by MAFS. This reveals that the non ABU farmers who received more than 50 % of the seed rice did not make contributions to the Council. Although there was no indication that the ABU farmers who had pledged to contribute to the council were unhappy that other farmers were not contributing, this may not be the case when the input supply loan scheme ceases in the future. There may also be the possibility that the ABU farmers are expecting benefits in the future as a result of their ABU membership and therefore don't mind that other farmers are not contributing to the council. I must stress that such expectation was not detected from the farmers interviewed.

It is, however, definitely unfair to motivate one set of people in the rural areas to make voluntary contributions to implement projects and provide services that the entire rural population will benefit from and enjoy. This is particularly true when one considers the fact that among all occupations in Sierra Leone, the farmers are the poorest. The appeal for voluntary contributions should therefore be extended to other residents in each of the district councils.

Table 5 Proportion of seeds allocated to the ABUs

District	Total Qt. of seed rice provided (bu.)*	Qt. allocated to ABUs**	Qt. allocated to other farmers*	% of total seed supplied to ABUs
<b>NORTH</b>	<b>76,264</b>	<b>41,424</b>	<b>34,840</b>	<b>54 %</b>
Bombali	24,712	7,200	17,512	33 %
Kambia	22,412	12,000	10,412	53 %
Koinadugu	2,190	1,554	636	71 %
Portloko	8,406	7,000	1,406	83 %
Tonkolili	18,544	11,628	6,916	63 %
<b>SOUTH</b>	<b>29,797</b>	<b>8,562</b>	<b>21,235</b>	<b>29 %</b>
Bo	10,542	3,353	7,189	32 %
Bonth	1,581	581	1,000	37 %
Moyamba	5,674	2,128	3,546	38 %
Pujehun	12,000	2,500	9,500	21 %
<b>EAST</b>	<b>22,599</b>	<b>9,106</b>	<b>13,493</b>	<b>40 %</b>
Kailahun	7,769	1,004	6,765	13 %
Kenema	4,560	2,361	2,199	52 %
Kono	10,270	5,741	4,529	56 %
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>128,660</b>	<b>59,092</b>	<b>69,568</b>	<b>46 %</b>

Sources: \* District Agriculture Office

\*\* District Agriculture Office and UNDP

In any case, voluntary contributions cannot be relied upon as a sustainable source of income for the district councils as long as they are only voluntary. There are all indications that the present development grants provided by the government for the district councils, which are mostly donor funds that will progressively dwindle, and dry up eventually. It is very unlikely that the actual voluntary contributions would be adequate to support the councils. Also, in the very near future, with increasing literacy rates and awareness of people's rights, the ABU type memorandum of understanding requiring farmers to contribute 20 % of their additional income will be inappropriate, against the background that contributions have to be voluntary and not binding.

Another crucial issue is the fact that some categories of rural people involved in certain vocations are being taxed; for example, tailors, blacksmiths, hawkers, etc (see Table 6), in addition to school teachers, and council employees who are paying income tax. Revenue from these taxes are part of the funds used to provide essential services and implement development projects in the country as a whole including the districts. Currently, there is no tax levied on farmers per se; while similar category of vocations earning less than the threshold of Le 1,500,000 per annum are of course not paying income tax but are paying annual tax as indicated in Table 6. Voluntary contributions, which are aimed at supporting development projects and providing essential services for the communities, are serving the same purpose for which taxes are collected. With the present enthusiasm of the farmers to willingly contribute to the councils, these community contributions will be a sustainable source of revenue for the foreseeable future. Consequently, these contributions will provide support for sustainable development in the various councils, which will reflect on the welfare of the people in those localities.

Table 6. National Revenue Authority (NRA) tax rates for selected vocations/enterprises

No.	Class or description of persons	Minimum tax payable by the standard assessment in the Western Area (Le)	Minimum tax payable by the standard assessment in the Provinces (Le)
<b>1</b>	<b>Blacksmiths, tinsmiths and persons in allied trades</b>	<b>36,000</b>	<b>24,000</b>
2	Moneylenders	30,000	24,000
3	Tailors	180,000	96,000
4	Cattle dealers	120,000	96,000
5	Shoemakers and repairers	36,000	24,000
6	Hawkers in general	18,000	12,000
7	Cafes and Cookery shops	24,000	12,000
8	Mill operators	36,000	24,000
9	Rice dealers	120,000	120,000
<b>10</b>	<b>Local fishermen using drawchain</b>	<b>24,000</b>	<b>24,000</b>
11	Petty traders with table or baffa	24,000	24,000

Source: SLG, The Income Tax Act 2000, Supplement to the Sierra Leone Gazette Vol. CXXXI, No 29 dated 15<sup>th</sup> June, 2000

At the moment, the key issue is the low productivity of both farmers and other rural dwellers needing substantial improvement in their productivity and scale of production in order to realize higher productivity gains. Such improvements will increase rural incomes and not only enable farmers to improve their welfare but to also earn sufficiently and be able to make higher voluntary contributions and pay taxes as a result of their increased incomes (Table 7).

Table 7 Tax rate per chargeable income

No	Chargeable income	Rate of Tax
1	Not over Le 1,500,000 per annum	Nil
2	Next Le 3,000,000 per annum	20 %
3	Next Le 3,000,000 per annum	25 %
4	Excess over Le 7,500,000 per annum	30 %

Source: National Revenue Authority, IT/NRA/27, 2005

It is therefore essential that farmers are assisted to transform, expand and improve on their existing farming activities. A valuable foundation has been laid in the business like approach to farming through the ABUs, requiring farmers to make due consideration of costs and returns, be self-reliant and not to look forward to free inputs. However, farmers need an initial and targeted support particularly in the form of micro credit and appropriate mechanization, to enable them acquire basic inputs and reduce drudgery particularly on women thereby providing an opportunity for these resource poor farmers to adopt improved production practices, increase acreage and benefit from economics of scale.

#### 4.5 Management of Community Contributions

It is absolutely necessary that every effort is made to assure farmers that their contributions are properly managed. Such a situation will go a long way in encouraging farmers to continue supporting the councils by making voluntary contributions and paying other dues. All of the ABUs have opened bank accounts to deposit their contributions and facilitate transfer of funds to the councils. All district councils have also opened separate bank accounts for community contributions.

At the time of the evaluation, all the councils had not initiated any project with the community contributions. With the exception of Kenema and Kono district councils, there still remain substantial amounts of community contributions to be collected by the district councils. I did not encounter any ABU that had individually or collectively presented a set of proposals for development. It is probably wise for the ABUs to make their proposals in relation to their contributions. However, it was made clear by all district councils that they will consult the farmers before embarking on any project using the community contributions. Accommodating the farmers' views will foster participation and encourage the farmers to continue contributing and supporting the local councils.

## 4.6 Capacity Development

To ensure that the ABUs have the capacity to manage members' resources, and that members live up to their commitment to save and pay community contribution, Master Trainers assisted ABU members to elect a management committee, and helped each ABU build its capacity, by delivering training on topics such as planning, leadership, record keeping and meeting management.

***Sensitization and Training:*** Feedback from the farmers suggests that the Master Trainers were largely successful in sensitizing the farmers to contribute to the councils. The overwhelming number of farmers interviewed are aware of the fact that they need to help the council in order for the council to effectively help them. Despite the low level of contribution to the councils, the fact remains that the farmers are willing to contribute to the councils even when input supplies would have ceased. Such willing contribution is an ingredient of ***good citizenship***. Undoubtedly, the ABU has brought farmers closer to work for a common purpose thereby fostering closer relationships among them and build social capital at the grassroots level. It has also created a platform for interaction with various bodies, especially local councils and Ward Development Committees.

There was a manifestation of appreciation for the training in ***crop and post harvest management***. The farmers were asked to recall the major aspects in which they received training and which aspect interested them most. The most notable issues were timely planting and harvesting to get good yields and prevent shattering respectively. These views were well articulated. The need for fertilizers to improve yields underscored the understanding of declining fertility and the role of fertilizers and need for higher yields.

There was an overwhelming recognition of the fact that the training made them aware of the mismanagement of their meager yields. The module on ***Surplus generation and savings*** appealed greatly to the farmers who seem to be getting more conscious about setting something aside for a rainy day. There is however, need to reinforce this message.

The greatest success of the ABU is the training component, which was very effective in sensitizing farmers firstly about the ABU concept and motivating them to contribute to the local councils an hitherto unprecedented practice. It is very interesting to note that even though the production component which was greatly affected by the late supply of seeds and other related factors resulted in poor yields and production, virtually all the farmers were willing to contribute to the local councils. The training component achieved all its set targets in terms of training sessions, and coverage of both area and people. The disengagement of the Mentors and Master Trainers (MTs) during the collection of contributions negatively impacted on the amount of contribution collected. The training and mentoring team would have ensured a very significant response from both the farmers and council members in the collection of community contributions. The motivation achieved by the Master Trainers is priceless. Indeed the MTs delivered "value for money".

However, there is need to support these core messages of ***good citizenship*** and ***self reliance*** with technical backstopping by Extension workers of the MAFS to ensure that farmers maximize their production. There is no direct coordinated and complimentary intervention in the field that involves the Master Trainers and the Extension workers. It should be stressed that the Extension people of MAFS are vital component in achieving the goals of ABUs through the provision of essential production packages. Further training including old and new ABU members should include both sensitization and technical aspects. There is an emerging collaboration between MAFS and ABUs at

the district level. The District Directors of Agriculture in Portloko and Bonth have provided office space for the ABU District Generalist in those two districts. Such an arrangement will foster the desired collaboration between ABU and MAFS. This link should incorporate the Chairperson of the Agricultural Committee in the District Council.

***ABU structure and linkages:*** The management committee of each ABU comprises of a Chairperson, Secretary and Treasurer with a membership of 400 and consisting of sub groups of 25 – 30 members. The committee membership and outlined functions are conducive for proper management. The total membership of 400 per ABU poses some logistical challenges particularly in remote areas where villages are far apart and the roads are bad. Some Chairpersons expressed concern over the difficulties involved in contacting the sub group members. It may be necessary to consider giving two options for membership (200 and 400 members/ABU) depending on the population density and condition of the roads. In the future, it may be necessary to budget for essential running costs like transportation from the contribution of members.

In each of the districts, there is a District Chairperson for all the ABUs in that district. There is no defined link between ABUs in the different districts. In effect, there is no overall national ABU structure that links the district ABUs. The National Association of Farmers of Sierra Leone (NAFSL) has chairpersons at the Chiefdom, District and Regional levels together with an overall national governing body with a secretariat in Freetown. However, NAFSL lacks substantial grass root membership and depends on Government grants to run the organization. It is very clear from all the farmers interviewed including the district councils that the ABUs are better organized than NAFSL.

There is definite need to harmonize the governance of farmers in Sierra Leone including the ABUs, NAFSL and the Farmer Field Schools since they all draw their membership from the farming community. All farmers with dual membership of ABU and NAFSL have more confidence in the ABUs than the latter. However, every conscious effort should be made to prevent conflict between the leadership of ABUs and that of NAFSL, which is recognized by the government of Sierra Leone. Despite its weaknesses, NAFSL is currently the official link between the government of Sierra Leone and farmers in the country. It will be conflicting to build a parallel national ABU structure. A practical way of solving this potential problem is to expand the ABUs to include more members in all parts of the country and to become a force to reckon with which will in turn be in a position to transform the national representation of NAFSL with a strong businesslike outfit and the philosophy of ABU. This can be effectively done by the ABUs encouraging more members to join and therefore embrace all farmers in the rural areas. With an enlarged and better organized membership, the ABU farmers will then be in a strong position to influence and dominate the forthcoming chiefdom, district, region and national elections of NAFSL in 2008.

***Record keeping:*** All ABUs visited have appropriate books for keeping records. Membership and contributions were well documented. Bank transactions documents were well kept. In all the ABUs visited, the secretaries had the basic competence to keep records. However, considering the high level of illiteracy among farmers including ABU members, it may be necessary to expose members to adult education classes so that the entire membership will have the ability to check the books and ascertain for themselves the financial status of their respective ABUs.

***Reinforcing core messages and promoting a culture of self help:*** The sensitization was remarkably effective in drumming up consent for farmers to support the local councils. There is need for this conviction to be buttressed by the proper and effective use of the contributions. This will convince farmers that it is worthwhile to make the contributions.

There was however, a clear need for reinforcing the philosophy of self reliance and that nothing is free. In almost all the ABUs visited, when farmers were asked what needed to be done for them, they catalogued the traditional shopping list - tools, food for work, store, drying floor, medicines, micro credit, pesticides, etc. There is a very strong need to reinforce the philosophy of **self reliance** which is a strong component of the ABUs. It should be made known to the farmers that with increased prosperity they would not need to ask government for these inputs, but be able to afford them with their increased income.

## 5.0 Project constraints and immediate corrective actions to resolve them for phase 2 of the project

- 5.1 **Ineffective control over allocation of seed rice:** Less than 50 % of the expected seed rice was allocated to the ABU farmers. This shortage in seed allocation had a direct effect on the key project objective of expanding acreage. Farmers definitely need assistance to acquire basic inputs like improved seed rice and fertilizer. Funds for approved assistance should be under the direct control of UNDP to effectively execute the project and provide required assistance.
- 5.2 **Late supply of seeds:** Inputs for farmers should be delivered on time. Late planting as a result of the late delivery of seed rice adversely affected the yield of rice in addition to predisposing the seeds to consumption by hungry farmers. Community savings and some of the contributions should be retained in the communities so that farmers can have easy and ready access to seed rice at the right time.
- 5.3 **Absence of Mentors and Trainers from field at the crucial time of collecting contributions:** The Farmers appeared to have considerable confidence in the Mentors and Trainers. Their absence in the field at the crucial time of collecting community contributions partly accounted for the low recovery rate. They would have encouraged the farmers to speedily pay their contributions and on the other hand urged the council members to collect the contributions from the various wards.
- 5.4 **Standardization of bushel unit with farmers:** There is an apparent discrepancy in the bushel unit of measurement. The farmers' version of the bushel is bigger than the conventional bushel used by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security. There is need to standardize the bushel unit of measurement. Standardization of measurement should be part of future trainings and sensitization.
- 5.5 **Council not very effective in collecting contributions:** In all the districts, there were contributions of rice awaiting collection by the council members. There is need to urge the council members to step up efforts in collecting community contributions.
- 5.6 **Ineffective link with partners – MAFFS, NAFSL, Local council, Traditional rulers:** Functional links should be established among the major stakeholders in decentralization and agricultural development. Planning and execution of activities should involve all the major stakeholders. Registering ABU members should involve the efforts of the designated staff of UNDP, Local Council, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS) and the National Association of Farmers of Sierra Leone. The mentors should visit the fields in the company of the extension staff of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security. Collection of community contributions should involve the efforts of all.

## **6.0 Conclusions and recommendations for phase 2 of the project**

### **6.1 Conclusions**

- 6.1.1 Training was effective in educating farmers about Local Councils
- 6.1.2 Training was very effective in motivating farmers to contribute to local councils
- 6.1.3 Contributions from farmers could be a significant source of revenue for development
- 6.1.4 ABUs have the potential to transform farmers from subsistence to production for market

### **6.2 Recommendations**

- 6.2.1 Refresher training to reinforce self reliance
- 6.2.2 Local councils should step up revenue collection
- 6.2.3 Extend membership of ABUs to all farmers
- 6.2.4 Encourage mechanized cultivation
- 6.2.5 Entire farming system to be targeted – major crops and animals
- 6.2.6 Rural banks to provide micro credit
- 6.2.7 Seed multiplication to supply seeds
- 6.2.8 Harmonize management of ABU with National Association of Farmers of Sierra Leone (NAFSL) and create a business oriented NAFSL

## 7.0 Draft project design for the second phase

### 7.1 Background

UNDP has actively supported the Government of Sierra Leone and civil society in the development and implementation of a policy of decentralization of elected local government after a lapse of 32 years. In 2002-2003, UNDP with DFID supported a national Task Force to develop government policy on decentralization and draft the Local Government Act, creating the legal and institutional framework for local governance

Since the Local Government elections in May 2004 UNDP's focus has been on supporting the devolution of services from central to local government, on promoting local resource mobilization and on integrating the principles of Transparency, Accountability and participation (TAP) into the local service delivery. The Local Government Act mandates significant fiscal and functional decentralization of government services.

In October 2004, the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Security (MAFFS) (current Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security) in partnership with UNDP and Irish Aid launched a pilot activity on Decentralization of Agriculture and Achieving Food Security with **the Objective of mobilizing resources for the Local Councils**. The targets were to:

- Expand rice production by motivating 100,000 farmers to increase their cultivated land by one acre
- Motivate farmers to save a proportion (20%) of their additional output to invest in agriculture
- Mobilize resources for the Local Government by motivation farmers to contribute a proportion (20%) of their increased output to the new Local Councils

The programme comprised: **Sensitization** in which 115 Master Trainers conducted a national sensitization programme motivating farmers to increase acreage, save 20 % of their additional output and also provide 20 % to their Local Councils as “Community Contribution”; **ABU Formation**: an innovative new structures of approximately 400 farmers that will manage the savings and community contributions of members. **Support**: was provided to ensure that the ABUs have the capacity to manage members' resources, and the members live up to their commitment to save and pay community contribution.

### 7.2 Justification

A total of 347 ABUs were formed in all the districts of Sierra Leone. All of the ABUs have opened bank accounts and there was significant contribution to the councils of Kenema, Kambia, and Kono districts. The majority of the farmers are willing and happy to contribute to the councils. The less than expected contribution to the councils was mainly due to the late delivery of seed rice, which resulted in failure and lateness in planting, and consequently low yields, coupled with the inability of the councils to collect rice stored in various parts of the district. There is need to expand the ABUs

to other farmers who are craving to become members. Also, there is need to strengthen the existing ABUs so that they can be better organized to effectively contribute to the councils and have a strong voice in advocating for their welfare.

Strengthening the ABUs will significantly help the farmers to produce surplus, cease relying on government for inputs and make voluntary contributions to the councils and pay other dues, which will be used to develop their areas. Moreover, the ABUs have the potential to streamline the National Association of Farmers of Sierra Leone, and provide sustainable governance for farmers in the country.

### **7.3 Coverage**

All the farmers in Sierra Leone should be given the opportunity to join the ABUs. The entire country will be covered.

**7.4 Strategy:** The major project strategy will be the formation of more ABUs, empowering them through access to basic inputs for intensive crop production and encouraging them to make voluntary contributions and pay other dues. In effect the farmers will have the opportunity and participate in making decisions that will affect their lives.

### **7.5 Schedule of activities 2006 - 2009**

**2006 – January, 2007:** Meeting of stakeholders, Formation of ABUs and Sensitization of farmers on the ABU philosophy, Election of ABU committees at district level

**January – May, 2007:** Distribution of inputs and ploughing of fields

**May – December, 2007:** Crop management and supervision

**December 2007 – January 2008:** Coordinating collection of dues/taxes

**January/February 2008 –** Election of national executive of ABU/Farmers of Sierra Leone.

### **7.6 Expected outputs and targets**

- ABUs formed in all districts involving all farmers in the country
- All farmers sensitized about farming for profit
- 25% of all farmers make voluntary contributions at the end of 2007 cropping season
- 50 % of all farmers make voluntary contributions at the end of 2008 cropping season
- A truly representative national executive of ABU/Farmers Association elected
- Sierra Leone self sufficient in rice at the end of the 2009 cropping season
- At least 90 % of all farmers make voluntary contributions and pay dues at the end of 2009 cropping season

- Farmers contributions and dues form major component of council revenue

## 8.0 Annexes

### Annex 8.1 Terms of Reference

#### Evaluation of “Pilot Decentralization of Agriculture and Food Security” Project

## BACHGROUND

### Decentralization Policy

UNDP has actively supported the Government of Sierra Leone and civil society in the development and implementation of a policy of decentralization of elected local government after a lapse of 32 years. In 2002-2003, UNDP with DFID supported a national Task Force to develop government policy on decentralization and draft the Local Government Act, creating the legal and institutional framework for local governance

Prior to the Local Government elections in May 2004, UNDP with Irish Aid supported 3 local NGOs to implement a nationwide civic capacity building programme, which reached a critical mass of 298,000 citizens (12 % of registered voters). One of the themes of this initial civic education (“You and Your Local Government”) was to link governance with service delivery for development and livelihood needs. Gender and youth issues were highlighted in the materials and in the participation.

Since the elections, UNDP’s focus has been on supporting the devolution of services from central to local government, on promoting local resource mobilization and on integrating the principles of Transparency, Accountability and participation (TAP) into the local service delivery. The Local Government Act mandates significant fiscal and functional decentralization of government services, including: primary health care, environmental sanitation, secondary health care, basic education (grades 1 – 9), adult literacy, vocational education, agricultural extension, support to forestry and fisheries activities; feeder roads, water and sanitation.

Pilot initiatives have been designed in key sectors to help “jump stat” the institutional process of devolution, and to help crate some early opportunities for c citizen involvement in local governance. In 2005, the most comprehensive activity in this area is to support the decentralization of agricultural services. Other pilot activities are being devolved in environmental health and adult/youth literacy.

As outlined in the Sierra Leone Poverty reduction Strategy paper (PRSP) agriculture represents roughly 32 % of total GDP (2000 – 2003) and employs almost 80 % of the total population. 73 % of Sierra Leone’s population is poor (living on less than US \$ 1 per day) and resides in rural areas. 79.4 % of farmers are poor and the intensity and severity of poverty for farmers is higher than any other occupational group.

## **About the project**

In October 2004, the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Security (MAFFS) (current Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security) in partnership with UNDP and Irish Aid launched a pilot activity on Decentralization of Agriculture and Achieving Food Security with **the Objective of mobilizing resources for the Local Councils**.

To do this, our targets were to:

- Expand rice production by motivating 100,000 farmers to increase their cultivated land by one acre
- Motivate farmers to save a proportion (20%) of their additional output to invest in agriculture
- Mobilize resources for the Local Government by motivation farmers to contribute a proportion (20%) of their increased output to the new Local Councils

These targets have become “3 pillars” for farmer sensitization described below.

The programme has been rolled out in 3 stages:

**Stage 1 – Sensitization:** 115 Master Trainers conducted a national sensitization programme motivating farmers to increase acreage, save 20 % of their additional output and also provide 20 % to their Local Councils as “Community Contribution”. The target was to sensitize 50,000 citizens. Clear targets were set to ensure both female and youth participation in the programme. Key stakeholders and opinion leaders, including Chiefs, religious leaders, Teachers and local Councilors were also targeted.

**Stage 2 – ABU Formation:** Given the small amount individual farmers can be expected to save in one year, it is clear that farmers need to pool their resources to invest. Therefore, the activity promotes the formation of ABUs, innovative new structures of approximately 400 farmers that will manage the savings and community contributions of members. Before joining an ABU, farmers are expected to sign Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) that commit them to increase acreage, save and pay a community contribution to their Local Council.

**Stage 3 – Support:** Once established it is necessary to ensure the ABUs have the capacity to manage members’ resources, and the members live up to their commitment to save and pay community contribution. To do this teams of Master Trainers assist ABU members to elect a management committee, and to help each ABU committee build its capacity, by delivering training on topics such as planning, leadership, record keeping and meeting management.

These Master Trainers also work with ABU members to reinforce core messages from Stage 1m and promote a culture of self help within the ABUs.

In addition, at the District level, teams of Master Trainers work to mobilize key stakeholders and opinion leaders, including the local Councils, Religious Leaders, Teachers and Chiefs, to support the ABUs and eventually monitor farmers’ commitment to increase acreage, save and pay a community contribution.

## **Progress of the Project to date**

Since October 2004, the programme has been rolled out in all 12 districts,

- Master Trainers have delivered 4,338 four hour training sessions across the country (as of June 2005)
- 368 ABUs have been formed
- 138,000 farmers have signed MoUs

Of the farmers that have signed MoUs 40 % are women, while 11 % of ABU committee members are women.

Since January 7, 2006, the roll out of Community Contribution collection and payment has been ongoing through 107 Master trainers, in participating with the District Agricultural Office, providing training sessions to ABUs to plan and implement the collection, sales, saving and payment of the Community Contribution to Local Councils. The target date for ABUs to complete the payment of the Community Contribution to local councils was end of February 2006.

## **OBJECTIVE S OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation exercise will independently examine relevance of the objective, strategy, design and approach/methodology adopted for the project. It will examine how and why the objectives set for the project have been or not achieved in the current country context and the role that UNDP has played. The evaluation will also help to identify policy/programme/capacity gaps, generate lessons learned and recommend actions and adjustments to improve performance in programming for the second phase of UNDP support for decentralization of agriculture and food security. These will feed into the formulation of future UNDP interventions supporting decentralization, good local governance, food security and poverty reduction.

### **Stakeholders of the evaluation:**

The stakeholders of the evaluation are the following:

- Local authorities – local council staff, councilors, paramount chiefs, ward development committees, district directors of agriculture, district agriculture office extension workers.
- Master trainers (community animators), who served to form and support capacity building component
- Members of Agricultural Business Units (groups of approximately 400 small scale farmers)
- National authorities – Ministry of Agriculture and Food security, Ministry of Local Government and Community development, Ministry of trade and Industry
- Farmers' groups and associations – e.g. Farmers Field Schools
- Citizens, CBOs and civil society in the covered districts
- Sierra Leone Teachers Unions, who were identified as strategic partner to do monitoring
- Donors and development partners engaged in decentralization of agriculture and capacity building at the local level – Irish Aid, FAO, JICA, UN Transition Team, World bank, UNIDO

- Business community and traders

***Why an independent evaluation is undertaken now:***

This pilot project has been rolled out since October 2004 in all districts. It has just completed the first harvest season this February, hence the first phase, and that allows us to assess whether the objective and strategy of mobilizing resources for local councils has been relevant or not, and has been achieved or not. It has been recognized that there is a need for an independent evaluation of this project that would serve as a guide for its second phase programming.

**SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation will extract findings, analysis of policy/programme/capacity gaps, lessons learned (positive and negative) and recommendation, by assessing the following:

- a) Relevance of the objective, strategy and approach (methodology) within the framework of the ongoing decentralization processes in the country
  - Coherence with national policies of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food security, Governments decentralization policy, PRSP and MDGs.
  - Developing sustainable capacities of local and national institutions to plan and perform their functions as “duty bearers” (e.g. MAFS, Local Councils, District Agriculture Offices)
  - Strengthening institutional linkages between policy and technical oversight functions of the Ministry and service delivery functions of the local Councils
  - Managing power relations (e.g. Ward Development Committees, Village Development Committees, farmer field schools, chiefdom councils , etc.)
  - Empowerment: Improving awareness, voice and capacity of small scale rural farmers(disaggregated by gender and youth/adult) to claim their rights, to authorities in charge (including upward pressure for accountability)
  - Food security (accessibility, availability, reliability to access, effective utilization of food consumed) among small scale farmers (disaggregated by gender and youth/adult)
  - Poverty reduction (including actual income increase among ABU members)
  - Sustainability (institutional, financial and human resources)
  - Forging partnerships with development partners
  
- b) Whether the targets set for the project (“3 pillars”) have been achieved and, if it has not, why it has not, and to what extent it has been achieved. Specifically, measure, quantity and verify the following, with date disaggregated by ABU, Ward, Chiefdom and District (data collection and analysis):
  - How much has land been cultivated for rice production (acre, baseline 2004)?
  - How much has productivity and outputs increased (mt, baseline 2004)?

- How much saving has been made both as husk rice and as saving in ABU bank accounts (mt and Leone)?
  - How much has the loan of seed rice (mt) been repaid to MAFFS?
  - How much have “Community contributions” been paid to the Local Councils (mt and Leone)?
- c) Scale of productivity gain: How much the increased rice production has been translated into increased income return among ABU members? (by ABU) (include analysis of demand constraints for agricultural produce from domestic and regional consumers, chain coordination distribution and markets and suggest actions).
- d) Impact of community Contributions in local Government revenue mobilization:
- Under what revenue category “Community Contributions” have been registered as local council revenue and reflected to the income of local councils (e.g. extra budgetary ) (by council)
  - What percentage of local government revenue has Community contributions constituted (by council)
  - Suggested strategy and actions
- e) Impact of community Contributions from poverty perspectives:
- Whether or not the project’s “Community Contributions” scheme, which is aimed for local council resource mobilization planned for local council public investments, which are more diffused than specific community activities for defined users and beneficiaries is “fair and equitable”
  - Whether or not, one sub-set of beneficiaries in a given district has been unfairly burdened with costs that should be borne by a broader set of beneficiaries
  - Whether or not, disproportionate burden of these contributions is borne by the poor and smallholder farmers
  - Suggested strategy and actions
- f) Management of “Community contributions”
- To what extent ABUs have actually participated in planning and tracking the use of the CC paid to the councils, and positively pressured the council for downward accountability
  - In what agricultural investment or public development investments the Community Contributions have been spent by the council? And to what extent do they reflect the ABUs proposals for the fund utilization?
  - Whether or not and/or to what extent, the Community Contributions collected and/or paid to the councils’ account may or has become a source of local discontent in rural areas.
  - Suggested actions to increase transparency, accountability and participation
- g) Adequacy, appropriateness and economies of the capacity development methodologies, including training, caching and sensitization, conducted by over 100

Master Trainers (MTs) for ABUs and farmers as vital to achieve the “3 pillars” and complemented by sensitization field missions by UNDP decentralization specialists:

- Number of hours, period, types (training, coaching, consulting, etc.) and contents
  - Performance of each Master Trainer in delivering the training package – in conduction training, delivering messages to ABUs, guiding ABUs, mobilizing strategic partners and motivating them as per the roll out plan.
  - Overall effectiveness of the whole series of training, especially:
    - ✓ Whether MTs have delivered “value for money”
    - ✓ Whether the training/sensitization by MTs to date has transformed the mindset and behaviors of farmers for 1) self help (versus dependence), 2) good citizenship (e.g. understanding the importance of paying “Community Contributions” for improved public service delivery, participating in local governance, positively pressuring local governments for downward accountability, etc.) and 3) developed institutional and individual capacity of ABUs as grassroots farmers’ organizations.
    - ✓ Whether and to what extent a number of sensitization field mission conducted by UNDP decentralization specialists and by the ministry staff have added value to complement Master Trainers’ efforts (assess each trip made since 2005)
- Suggested capacity development strategy
    - h) Assessment of capacity development and training needs of ABUs in terms of fulfilling the above mentions capacities of 1) self help, 2) good citizenship, 3) institutional building, and in addition 4) marketing and small scale business entrepreneurs towards increased agricultural “income”, enhanced internal accountability and increased voice in local development. (Suggested capacity development strategy).
    - i) Complementary roles played by Master Trainers and by District Agricultural Extension workers, analysis of capacity and coordination gaps and needs (Suggested strategy and actions)

### ***Geographic coverage of the evaluation:***

Evaluation will cover all ABUs in all 12 districts.

### **TIMEFRAME OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

June – July 2006 (1 month)

- Briefings of evaluators, Desk review, formulation of methodology (including questionnaire): 4 days
- Evaluation mission – Visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires: 15 days (3 days in Freetown, 12 days in upcountry including weekends)
- Drafting of the evaluation report ( including discussion with UNDP and stakeholders on the draft report): 4 days

- Debriefings and Preparation of the final report: 1 day

## **METHODOLOGY**

Based on a set of relevant quantifiable and qualitative indicators as outlined in the scope of the evaluation (section 8.1.3), a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods for collection and analysis of the data shall be used.

During the evaluation, the evaluator is expected to apply the following approaches:

- Desk review of relevant documents
- Discussions with the Senior Management and programme staff of UNDP Country Office
- Interviews with partners and all types of stakeholders (listed above in Section 8.1.2)
- Field visits to selected project sites
- Verification of existing data
- Consultation and debriefing meetings

The evaluator should liaise closely with the projects stakeholders and other partners. Questions should be formulated and posed by evaluators through interviews with framers, ABU management committee members, Master trainers, and other local institutions and groups. Likewise, such interviews should be held with stakeholders, including MAFS staff, MLGCD staff, MTI staff, local council staff, District Agriculture Office Director, Councilors of the wards where ABUs are formed, ward development Committees of the wards where ABUs are formed, Paramount Chiefs and other key stakeholders and partners.

## **EXPECTED PRODUCTS**

At the end of the evaluation exercise, the evaluator will have to produce an evaluation report which contains the following sections:

- Executive summary
- Description of the evaluation methodology
- Findings, analysis of policy/programme/capacity gaps and lessons learnt on the project, according to the scope of the evaluation
- Project constraints and immediate corrective actions to resolve them for the phase 2 of the project
- Conclusion
- Draft project design for the second phase, especially as to how support for the existing ABUs and expansion of ABUs should be done in order not only to increase their agricultural productivity and income but also to strengthen their “voice” in local governance (proposed strategy and actions to be taken, including capacity development strategy and plan for concerned actors)

- Annexes: Charts, survey/interview results, people interviewed, verification documents (e.g. a copy of bank slips for Community contributions, etc. documents reviewed, etc.)
- Discuss the draft report with UNDP and the parties involved so that final report reflects their comments
- Submit the final evaluation report to UNDP (in hard copy and electronic form) on the last day of the evaluation.

## **REQUIRED QUALIFICATION FOR AN EVALUATION CONSULTANT**

The evaluation will be independently undertaken by one consultant with the following profile:

At least 10 years of professional experience in at least 4 of the following areas: local governance, decentralization, community development, food security and rural finance. At least 5 years of experience in programme/project design management and evaluation, preferably with international organizations. Excellent analytical skills. Good command of written and spoken English, as well as computer word processing/typing skills.

## **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

UNDP Sierra Leone Governance Unit will be responsible for liaising with partners, backstopping and providing relevant documentation as well as coordinating technical feed back of the country Office to the evaluator

## Annex 8.2 Questionnaire for Farmers

District.....Name of ABU.....

1. Which crops do you usually grow.....
2. When did you start growing rice.....
3. What acreage did you cultivate in 2005.....
4. What quantity of seed rice did you use.....
5. Where did you get the seed rice from.....own.....ABU.....
6. What was your total yield: 2005.....2004.....
7. What quantity of rice did you save.....
8. Did you repay your seed rice loan...yes.....All.....%.....No
9. If No why.....
10. Are you happy to contribute to the Local council.....
11. If No why.....
12. Do you follow up on how your contribution is being used by the Council.....
13. Are you given the opportunity to suggest how your contribution should be used.....
14. Which of the following did you benefit from the training
  - a. Good citizenship
  - b. Better management of my farm/business
  - c. Self Reliance
  - d. Did not benefit anything from the training
15. Are you happy to continue with the ABU.....
16. What would you recommend to improve the efficiency of your ABU.....

**Annex 8.3 Questionnaire for District Council Representative**

Position of Member.....

1. Are you aware of all the ABUs in the District: Yes.....No.....
2. What relationship do you have with the ABUs.....
3. Are you involved in the repayment of seed rice loan.....
4. Are you aware of the amount to be contributed by ABU members to the Council fund.....
5. How much has been contributed: 2005.....2006.....
6. How much did you receive from the Central Government in:  
2005.....2006.....
7. Are the farmers willing and happy to contribute to the Council.....
8. If No why.....
9. Do farmers suggest how to use their contributions.....
10. What are the common complaints if any of farmers about the contribution.....
11. Are you receiving any complaints from local leaders about the contributions.....
12. Is there need to reduce or increase the amount contributed by farmers.....
13. Are you aware of the training of farmers.....
14. Which of the training modules have yielded benefits
  - a. Good citizenship
  - b. Self Reliance
  - c. Good business management
  - d. Non of the above
15. What additional benefit are you deriving from the ABUs.....
- 16.** What would you recommend to improve the efficiency of the ABUs.....

**Annex 8.4 LIST OF MAJOR STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED**

No	Name	Position and Address
<b>Traditional leaders and Local Council Members</b>		
1	Abdul R. Dumbuya	Chief Administrator, Kambia District Council
2	J.B. Amara	Chairman, Portloko District Council
3	Eric Dura Sesay	Chairman, Bombali district Council
4	Umaru S. Dura	Chief Administrator, Bombali District Council
5	P.C. Masapaki Kabombo II	Paramount Chief of Paki Masabong, Bombali District
6	Raymond K.M. Bindi	Chief Administrator, Koinadugu District Council
7	P.C. Alimamy Bangura 11	Paramount Chief, Kafesemiria Chiefdom, Tonkolili District
8	M.G. Kamara	Chief Administrator, Tonkolili District Council
9	Sahr Edison Tamba	Chairman, Kono District Council
10	Councillor Sahr Lebbie	Councilor Ward 1, Kono
11	Patrick Samu	Chairman, Kenema District Council
12	Councillor Fatmata Kamara	Councilor Ward Kenema district
13	Councillor Baidu dassama	Councilor Ward Kenema district
14	David J.B. Kobby	Chairman, Bo District Council
15	Nasiru-Deen Magona	Chairman Pujehun District Council
16	J.C. Zorokon	YKK chiefdom speaker, Pujehun District
17	P.C. Melrose Marie Forster Gberie	Paramount Chief Banda Kemoh Chiefdom, Bonth District
18	Joe Benya	Chairman, Bonth District Council
19	David S. Woobay	Chairman, Moyamba District Council
<b>National Authorities</b>		
1	Francis K. Ngebeh	Deputy Minister 1, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
2	M.A. Nallo	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
3	B.A. Massaquoi	Extension Coordinator, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
4	E.K. Alieu	Deputy Director General of Agriculture
5	B.S.Mansaray	District Director of Agriculture, Kambia District
6	Slingo O. kamara	District Director of Agriculture, Portloko District
7	B.A. Kanu	District Director of Agriculture, Koinadugu District
8	Alphonso K. Turay	District Director of Agriculture, Tonkolili District
9	Ishiaka S. Bockarie	District Crop Officer, Pujehun District
10	Saffa M. Kallon	District Director of Agriculture, Bo District
11	Alex H. walker	District Crop Officer, Bonth District
12	Teddy Kpanabom	District Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Pujehun District
13	A.J.P. Lebbie	Director of local government
14	Sheku A.F. Bangura	Director, Local Government Finance Department
15	Michael T.H. Dauda	Senior Local Government Finance Officer
<b>ABU Committee Members</b>		
1	J.M. Kamara	Chairman, .ABU, Lunsar Town
2	Charles Kamara	ABU District Chairman, Portloko District
3	John O. Fullah	ABU District Chairman, Tonkolili District
4	Sahr Sheku Sangba	ABU District Chairman, Kono District
5	Amadu Pascal Kamara	ABU District Chairman, Kailahun District
6	Ahmed S. Bah	Chairman, Ngohya ABU, Kpanda Kemoh Chiefdom, Bonth District
7	Janet Squire	Chairlady, Njagbahun ABU, fakunia Chiefdom, Moyamba District

<b>Regional Coordinators, Master Trainers and Mentors</b>		
1	Abubakar Jalloh	Regional Coordinator, Eastern region
2	Gibril Conteh	District Generalist, Kambia District
3	Joseph O. Dumbuya	Mentor, Kambia district
4	Ibrahim M. Kanu	District Generalist, Portloko District
5	Abubakar Konowa	District Generalist, Kenema District
6	Kadie Thomas	District Generalist, Kailahun District
<b>National Association of Farmers of Sierra Leone (NAFSL) and FAO</b>		
	Murray E.S. Lamin	National Secretary, National Association of Farmers of Sierra Leone
	Santigie Conteh	National Publicity Secretary, NAFSL
	Chief Yusuf Sankoh	National Administrative Secretary, NAFSL
	Mohamed B. Farah	F.A.O. Representative

**Annex 8.5 Receipts; bank payment slips, and statements; and payment summaries**

























## 9.0 References:

- Local Government Finance Department. 2006. Summary of Local Councils FY 2005 Financial Returns. Local Government Finance Department, Ministry of Finance, Freetown, Sierra Leone.
- National Revenue Authority (NRA). 2005. Rates of Tax applicable to individual resident in Sierra Leone as from 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2005. IT/NRA/27. NRA, Freetown, Sierra Leone.
- Sierra Leone Government (SLG). 2000. The Income Tax Act 2000, Supplement to the Sierra Leone Gazette Vol. CXXXI, No 29 dated 15<sup>th</sup> June, 2000. Ministry of Finance, Freetown, Sierra Leone.
- Sierra Leone Government (SLG). 2005. Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (SL-PRSP). A National Programme for Food Security, Job Creation and Good Governance (2005 – 2007). Ministry of Development, Freetown, Sierra Leone.