



---

# STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE SIERRA LEONE RICE SPECIAL AGRO- PROCESSING ZONE (SAPZ) PROJECT

---

The Ministry of Agriculture & Food Security

July 2025



# CONTENTS

---

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT .....	8
1.1.1 <i>Project Components and Main Activities</i> .....	8
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN (SEP) .....	9
1.3 REGULATORY AND POLICY FRAMEWORK .....	9
1.4 SEP DEVELOPMENT PROCESS .....	10
1.5 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE SEP .....	10
1.5.1 <i>Scope</i> .....	10
1.5.2 <i>Inclusion and Accessibility</i> .....	10
1.5.3 <i>Limitations</i> .....	10
<b>2 ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RISKS REQUIRING STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT .....</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 PROJECT CATEGORIZATION .....	11
2.2 PRIORITY ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RISKS .....	11
2.2.1 <i>Land Access, Tenure, and Use</i> .....	11
2.2.2 <i>Pesticide and Agrochemical Use</i> .....	11
2.2.3 <i>Gender-Based Violence (GBV), Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA), and Child Labour</i> 12	12
2.2.4 <i>Employment and Livelihoods</i> .....	12
2.2.5 <i>Water Use and Resource Competition</i> .....	12
2.2.6 <i>Occupational and Community Health and Safety</i> .....	12
2.2.7 <i>Environmental Degradation</i> .....	12
2.2.8 <i>Grievance Redress and Accountability</i> .....	12
2.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT .....	12
<b>3 STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION AND MAPPING .....</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1 STAKEHOLDER CATEGORIES AND TYPOLOGIES .....	14
3.2 STAKEHOLDER MAPPING BY ROLES, LIFECYCLE PHASE, AND EXPECTED BENEFITS .....	14
3.3 STAKEHOLDER INFLUENCE ACROSS THE PROJECT LIFECYCLE .....	16
3.4 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT AND PERIODIC REVIEW .....	16
<b>4 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1 OBJECTIVES AND ENGAGEMENT PRINCIPLES .....	17
4.2 ENGAGEMENT METHODS AND CHANNELS .....	17
4.3 ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES BY PROJECT PHASE .....	18
4.4 COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION TIMELINE .....	20
<b>5 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>23</b>
5.1 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK .....	23
5.2 SEP MONITORING AND REPORTING .....	23
5.3 CAPACITY BUILDING FOR SEP DELIVERY .....	24
5.4 INTEGRATION WITH PROJECT MANAGEMENT .....	24
<b>6 GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM (SUMMARY) .....</b>	<b>25</b>
6.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE GRM .....	25
6.2 SCOPE OF THE GRM .....	25
6.3 GRM STRUCTURE AND PROCESS .....	25
6.4 STEPS IN THE GRM PROCESS .....	26
6.5 INTEGRATION WITH STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT .....	26
6.6 SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR GBV / SEA / SH COMPLAINTS .....	26
6.7 MONITORING AND REPORTING .....	26
<b>7 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT DURING SEP PREPARATION .....</b>	<b>28</b>

7.1	CONSULTATION OBJECTIVES.....	28
7.2	METHODS USED .....	28
7.3	SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED .....	28
7.4	KEY ISSUES RAISED BY STAKEHOLDERS.....	29
7.5	LESSONS FOR SEP IMPLEMENTATION.....	29
<b>8</b>	<b>MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING.....</b>	<b>30</b>
8.1	MONITORING OBJECTIVES .....	30
8.2	MONITORING INDICATORS.....	30
8.3	METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION .....	30
8.4	REPORTING FRAMEWORK.....	31
8.5	SEP REVIEW AND REVISION .....	31
<b>9</b>	<b>BUDGET .....</b>	<b>31</b>
9.1	BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS.....	31
9.2	SUMMARY BUDGET TABLE (INDICATIVE) .....	32
9.3	FINANCING AND MANAGEMENT .....	32
<b>ANNEX1: STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS (COMMUNITY): KAMBIA AND PORT LOKO DISTRICTS..</b>		<b>33</b>

### Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full Meaning
<b>AfDB</b>	African Development Bank
<b>AIH</b>	Agro-Industrial Hub
<b>ATC</b>	Agricultural Transformation Centre
<b>CGRC</b>	Community Grievance Redress Committee
<b>CoC</b>	Code of Conduct
<b>CBO</b>	Community-Based Organization
<b>CSO</b>	Civil Society Organization
<b>DAO</b>	District Agricultural Office / Officer
<b>EPA-SL</b>	Environment Protection Agency – Sierra Leone
<b>ESIA</b>	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
<b>ESMP</b>	Environmental and Social Management Plan
<b>E&amp;S</b>	Environmental and Social
<b>FGD</b>	Focus Group Discussion
<b>FPIC</b>	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
<b>GBV</b>	Gender-Based Violence
<b>GAP</b>	Good Agricultural Practices
<b>GRM</b>	Grievance Redress Mechanism
<b>GRC</b>	Grievance Redress Committee
<b>IPM</b>	Integrated Pest Management
<b>ISS</b>	Integrated Safeguards System (AfDB)

<b>KII</b>	Key Informant Interview
<b>MAFS</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
<b>MLCP</b>	Ministry of Lands and Country Planning
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organization
<b>OIP</b>	Other Interested Party
<b>OS10</b>	Operational Safeguard 10 (Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure)
<b>PAP</b>	Project-Affected Person
<b>PIU</b>	Project Implementation Unit
<b>PMP</b>	Pest Management Plan
<b>PWD</b>	Person with Disability
<b>SAPZ</b>	Special Agro-Industrial Processing Zone
<b>SEA</b>	Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
<b>SEP</b>	Stakeholder Engagement Plan
<b>SH</b>	Sexual Harassment
<b>SME</b>	Small and Medium Enterprise

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The Sierra Leone Rice Special Agro-Industrial Processing Zone (SAPZ) Project represents a flagship initiative of the Government of Sierra Leone, led by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), with financial and technical support from the African Development Bank (AfDB). The SAPZ aims to accelerate agricultural transformation and food security by revitalizing the rice sector through the creation of Agro-Industrial Hubs (AIHs) and Agricultural Transformation Centres (ATCs) in Kambia and Port Loko Districts. The project's objectives are directly aligned with the Feed Salone Strategy (2023–2028), National Agricultural Transformation Programme, and the country's broader aspirations under the Medium-Term National Development Plan.

As a Category 1 (High Risk) operation under the AfDB's Integrated Safeguards System (ISS, 2023), the SAPZ project requires a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP). This document serves as the blueprint for systematic, inclusive, and meaningful engagement with project stakeholders throughout the four project phases: preconstruction, construction, operations and maintenance, and demolition and restoration.

### **Purpose and Scope of the SEP**

The SEP has been developed to guide the project's stakeholder engagement in line with Operational Safeguard 10 (OS10) of the AfDB ISS and national legislation. It sets out the principles, strategies, and institutional arrangements required to ensure that all relevant stakeholders, especially project-affected persons (PAPs), vulnerable groups, and civil society have access to timely information, opportunities to participate in decision-making, and channels to express concerns or grievances. The SEP applies to all project activities in Kambia and Port Loko, including site development, infrastructure construction, farmer support, pest management, and the operation of agro-industrial facilities.

### **Stakeholder Mapping and Risk Context**

The SEP identifies and categorizes stakeholders into Project-Affected Parties (PAPs) such as landowners, tenant farmers, youth, women, and communities near project sites and Other Interested Parties (OIPs) including ministries, regulatory bodies, district councils, traditional authorities, civil society organizations, and private sector actors. Each group's role, level of influence, and expected contribution to the project are clearly mapped across the lifecycle phases.

Stakeholder engagement is particularly critical in managing key environmental and social risks identified in the SAPZ ESIA for Kambia and Port Loko, the Pest Management Plan (PMP), and the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). These include:

- Land access procedures under the Customary Land Rights Act, 2022;
- Risks associated with agrochemical use and pest control, including health and environmental concerns;
- Gender-based violence (GBV) and risks of exclusion of women, youth, and persons with disabilities;
- Labour influx, employment disputes, and occupational safety hazards;
- Water resource competition and local conflict over access and usage;
- The need for a transparent and accessible grievance mechanism at all levels.

A comprehensive stakeholder map was developed as part of the process.

Stakeholder Group	Interest in SAPZ Project	Influence Level	Key Role	Priority Risks / Expectations	Influence
<b>Tenant Farmers and Land Users</b>	Continued access to farmland and livelihoods	Low–Medium	Provide input during consultations; represent land users without ownership	Risk of exclusion from benefits or displacement	High
<b>Smallholder Rice Farmers</b>	Access to inputs, training, markets	Medium	Adopt improved practices; participate in farmer support programs	Timely delivery of inputs; market linkages	High
<b>Women's Groups</b>	Access to land, jobs, protection from GBV	Medium	Engage in gender-focused consultations; monitor GBV/SEA risks	Gender inclusion; GBV safeguards	Medium
<b>Youth Associations</b>	Employment and entrepreneurship opportunities	Medium	Participate in consultations and capacity-building programs	Local hiring and training opportunities	Medium
<b>Communities near Project Sites</b>	Experience direct environmental and social impacts	Medium	Participate in monitoring and grievance processes	Noise, dust, chemical exposure; job expectations	Low
<b>Vulnerable Groups (e.g., elderly, PWDs)</b>	Inclusion in benefits and decision-making	Low	Engage through tailored outreach and support mechanisms	Physical and social barriers to participation	Medium
<b>District Agricultural Offices (DAOs)</b>	Technical service delivery	High	Coordinate extension services, IPM, and input distribution	Capacity to meet demand; coordination with PIU	High
<b>District Councils</b>	Local governance and development oversight	High	Lead district-level coordination and stakeholder forums	Political alignment; integration into district plans	Low
<b>Traditional Authorities</b>	Legitimacy in land and local governance	Medium–High	Support FPIC, dispute resolution, and community mobilization	Preserving neutrality; mediating grievances	Medium
<b>MAFS and PIU</b>	National policy and project execution	High	Lead SEP and safeguard	Timely implementation;	High

			implementation; coordinate actors	compliance with AfDB ISS	
<b>EPA-SL</b>	Environmental oversight and compliance	High	Approve ESIAs/ESMPs; conduct site inspections	Pollution prevention; legal enforcement	Medium
<b>Private Sector Actors (processors, input suppliers)</b>	Business growth and value chain linkages	Medium–High	Operate within AIHs/ATCs; support contract farming	Facility access; reliable supply chains	Medium
<b>CSOs and NGOs</b>	Social accountability and advocacy	Medium	Support outreach, capacity building, and inclusion monitoring	Effective collaboration with PIU; safeguarding marginalized voices	Medium

### Engagement Strategy and Program

The SEP lays out a phased engagement strategy tailored to each stage of the project. Engagement activities are designed to be culturally appropriate, inclusive, and participatory. Methods include:

- Community meetings, focus group discussions, and key informant interviews;
- Radio broadcasts and visual communication materials in Krio and local languages;
- Grievance redress forums, feedback sessions, and mobile outreach;
- Special provisions for engagement with vulnerable groups, including women, youth, elderly persons, and people with disabilities.

Engagements will be coordinated by the PIU in collaboration with District Councils, traditional authorities, CSOs, and sector agencies.

### Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)

A dedicated Grievance Redress Mechanism has been developed and costed as a standalone instrument. It operates through a four-tier system (community, chiefdom, district, and project/national level) to ensure timely resolution of complaints. The GRM allows stakeholders to report issues related to land access, social impacts, labour grievances, and environmental concerns. GBV/SEA/SH cases are handled through a confidential referral protocol, ensuring survivor-centred resolution.

### Monitoring, Reporting, and Adaptation

Monitoring and evaluation of SEP implementation will be carried out using a detailed framework of qualitative and quantitative indicators, disaggregated by gender, location, and stakeholder type. Monitoring tools include stakeholder logbooks, meeting trackers, grievance registers, and feedback forms. As a high-risk (Category 1) project, monthly Environmental and Social (E&S) implementation reports will be submitted to the AfDB and MAFS, alongside quarterly stakeholder coordination briefs at the district level.

Participatory methods such as community reflection meetings and informal field audits will be used to assess the effectiveness of the SEP and to refine approaches based on feedback. The SEP is treated as a living document, subject to revisions based on changes in project scope, emerging risks, or stakeholder dynamics.

### SEP Preparation and Budget

The SEP was informed by extensive consultations held between February and May 2025 with stakeholders across Kambia and Port Loko. These included farmers, landowners, traditional leaders, youth groups, women's organizations, government officials, and civil society actors. Key concerns raised included the need for timely delivery of inputs, clarity on land agreements, transparent hiring practices, inclusive decision-making, and a trusted grievance process.

The SEP is supported by an indicative implementation budget of USD 210,800, covering consultations, information dissemination, grievance handling, training, monitoring, and contingency. This is managed by the PIU and embedded in the overall project safeguard framework.

Budget Category	Estimated Cost (USD)	Description
<b>Stakeholder Consultations</b>	60,000	Community meetings, FGDs, local workshops during all phases
<b>Information Disclosure</b>	25,000	Flyers, posters, radio broadcasts, public notice boards
<b>Translation and Interpretation</b>	8,000	Materials translated into Krio and local languages; real-time interpretation at meetings
<b>Training and Capacity Building</b>	30,000	SEP orientation for PIU, traditional authorities, facilitators, CSOs
<b>GRM Operations</b>	See GRM	GRC formation, training, grievance documentation tools, referral mechanisms
<b>Field Facilitation and Logistics</b>	35,000	Transportation, per diem, venue hire, refreshments for field teams and participants
<b>Monitoring, Documentation, and Reporting</b>	20,000	SEP logbooks, feedback forms, monitoring visits, monthly E&S reporting support
<b>Participatory Evaluation and SEP Revision</b>	10,000	Midterm stakeholder review sessions and SEP updates
<b>Contingency (10%)</b>	22,800	Buffer for emerging engagement needs or underbudgeted activities
<b>Total Estimated Cost</b>	<b>210,800</b>	

### Conclusion

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan is a critical safeguard instrument for ensuring that the SAPZ Project is implemented in a way that is inclusive, transparent, and socially accountable. It recognizes that long-term success depends on the ownership, trust, and participation of the people it aims to serve. Through structured engagement, open dialogue, and responsive grievance management, the SEP will help mitigate risks, build local partnerships, and strengthen the sustainability and equity of project outcomes.



# 1 INTRODUCTION

---

## 1.1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Government of Sierra Leone, through the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), is implementing the Sierra Leone Rice Special Agro-Industrial Processing Zone (SAPZ) Project with financial support from the African Development Bank (AfDB). The SAPZ Project is a flagship national initiative designed to catalyse transformation in the rice value chain through a cluster-based approach to agro-industrial development. Core interventions include the establishment of Agro-Industrial Hubs (AIHs), Agricultural Transformation Centres (ATCs), feeder road rehabilitation, irrigation infrastructure, and rice processing facilities across selected sites in Kambia and Port Loko Districts.

The project is aligned with Sierra Leone's Feed Salone Strategy (2023–2028), National Agricultural Transformation Programme (NAT 2023), and broader national development goals. It complies with both domestic legal requirements and the AfDB's 2023 Integrated Safeguards System (ISS), including Operational Safeguard 10 (OS10) on Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure.

### 1.1.1 Project Components and Main Activities

The SAPZ Project is structured around four interrelated components:

#### **Component 1: Enhancement of Agricultural Productivity and Production Systems**

- Introduction of climate-resilient rice varieties and improved farming practices;
- Distribution of certified seeds, fertilizers, and mechanization support;
- Irrigation development and training on good agricultural practices (GAP).

#### **Component 2: Development of Agro-Industrial Hubs and Agricultural Transformation Centres**

- Construction of AIHs (e.g., in Mambolo) and ATCs (e.g., in Samu and Loko Masama);
- Development of energy supply, water systems, waste management;
- Support for private-sector agro-processing and value addition.

#### **Component 3: Market Development and Capacity Building**

- Support for branding, certification, and market linkages for local rice;
- Training for farmers, SMEs, youth, and women's groups;
- Institutional strengthening of extension services and regulatory agencies.

#### **Component 4: Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation**

- Centralized coordination through the PIU;
- Environmental and social safeguards oversight;
- Results-based monitoring systems.

## 1.2 PURPOSE OF THE STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN (SEP)

This SEP defines the principles, processes, and responsibilities for stakeholder engagement throughout the project lifecycle. It ensures that stakeholders, especially affected people, vulnerable groups, and civil society actors have timely access to information, meaningful opportunities for participation, and a mechanism to raise concerns or complaints. The SEP also enables adaptive management and safeguards compliance by creating channels for feedback, learning, and corrective action.

## 1.3 REGULATORY AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

This SEP is developed in accordance with the following regulatory and policy instruments:

### **AfDB Integrated Safeguards System (ISS, 2023)**

The ISS sets out ten Operational Safeguards, including OS10 on *Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure*. It requires project proponents to identify, consult, and collaborate with affected and interested stakeholders from the earliest stages of project development through completion. OS10 also mandates a documented SEP, culturally appropriate disclosure mechanisms, and functioning grievance procedures.

### **Environment Protection Agency Act, 2022 (Sierra Leone)**

This Act provides the legal foundation for environmental impact assessment in Sierra Leone. It mandates public participation, transparency in environmental licensing, and stakeholder consultation as part of EIA approval. The Act lists agricultural transformation, agro-processing, and land conversion as project types requiring full environmental licensing and stakeholder disclosure.

### **EPA (Agricultural and Agro-Based Industrial Activities) Regulations, 2023**

These regulations expand on the EPA Act by introducing specific EIA requirements for agriculture and agro-industry. They define thresholds for EIA categorization, timelines for public notices, and obligations for participatory planning. They also address agrochemical use, runoff prevention, and biodiversity risks relevant to SAPZ implementation.

### **Customary Land Rights Act, 2022**

This Act guarantees Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) for land transactions in customary areas. It provides for equal access to land by women and youth, mandates the inclusion of community land committees in land negotiations, and offers clear pathways for grievance redress. It is critical for SAPZ land identification and dispute resolution.

### **Local Government Act (2004, amended 2017 and 2022)**

This law empowers District Councils to coordinate local development, resolve conflicts, and oversee public engagement processes. It recognizes councils as the highest political authority in the locality and places them at the centre of decentralized service delivery and grievance management, particularly in projects like SAPZ.

### **Gender Empowerment and Women's Empowerment Act, 2022**

This legislation affirms the rights of women to participate in political and economic decision-making processes, including equal representation in local land management, employment, and development activities. It requires projects to promote equitable access to resources, opportunities, and benefits.

## 1.4 SEP DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

This SEP was developed through an iterative process drawing on:

- Community consultations conducted during the Kambia and Port Loko ESIA's;
- Feedback received through the design of the SAPZ Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM);
- Findings from household surveys, focus group discussions, and institutional interviews during the Pest Management Plan (PMP) and socio-economic baselines;
- Input from Paramount Chiefs, women's leaders, youth representatives, and district institutions;
- Review of relevant AfDB safeguards guidance and Sierra Leonean stakeholder engagement practices.

## 1.5 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE SEP

### 1.5.1 Scope

This SEP applies to all stakeholder engagement activities associated with the SAPZ Project across its full lifecycle, from preparation through implementation to completion in Kambia and Port Loko Districts.

Specifically, it outlines:

- The timing and methods of engagement as agreed with the AfDB and MAFS, including public meetings, focus group discussions, radio programming, and written disclosures.
- Differentiated strategies for project-affected persons (PAPs) such as landowners, farmers, and communities near infrastructure sites and other interested parties, including government agencies, private actors, and CSOs.
- The nature and timing of information to be disclosed to stakeholders (e.g., E&S risks, project designs, job opportunities, mitigation plans) and the type of feedback to be sought (e.g., input on land access, grievance procedures, project benefits).
- Stakeholder typologies based on their roles, levels of influence, vulnerabilities, or potential benefits, and appropriate levels of engagement for each group.

### 1.5.2 Inclusion and Accessibility

The SEP includes measures to:

- Remove obstacles to participation (e.g., language barriers, mobility constraints, gender norms).
- Ensure inclusive outreach through targeted women's meetings, separate youth consultations, and radio-based information for hard-to-reach communities.
- Capture the perspectives of differently affected groups using culturally appropriate, accessible, and locally trusted engagement channels.

### 1.5.3 Limitations

- This SEP is not a legal instrument for compensation or land acquisition; those issues are governed by national laws and applicable resettlement frameworks.
- While closely aligned with the GRM, PMP, and ESMP, this SEP does not duplicate their operational content.

- Project phasing, site selection, and stakeholder dynamics may evolve over time, necessitating periodic updates to this SEP.

The SEP is a living document and will be reviewed and revised as needed to reflect implementation realities, feedback, and new risks.

## 2 ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RISKS REQUIRING STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

---

This section discusses project categorization, identifies the priority environmental and social (E&S) risks and issues that require sustained stakeholder engagement throughout the lifecycle of the SAPZ Project, from project preparation through implementation to completion. These risks have been drawn primarily from the Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) for Kambia and Port Loko Districts, as well as the Pest Management Plan (PMP), and the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM).

### 2.1 PROJECT CATEGORIZATION

The proposed activities under the SAPZ pose high potential environmental and social risks and generally fall under the First Schedule of the SLEPA Act (No. 15 of 2022) necessitating a full Environmental, Social and Health Impact Assessment (ESHIA) in compliance with the SLEPA's 2023 Agricultural and Agro-based Industrial Activities Regulations and the 2022 Agricultural Sector Specific Environmental, Social and Health Impact Assessment (ESHIA) Guidelines. This national categorization is also matched by the Category 1 (High Risk) categorisation assigned to the project by the African Development Bank due to its potential for dispersed environmental and social impacts in the riverine communities of Port Loko and Kambia Districts which will form the core of the cultivated areas under the project.

### 2.2 PRIORITY ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL RISKS

The following risks have been identified as requiring active stakeholder engagement:

#### 2.2.1 Land Access, Tenure, and Use

- Customary land ownership structures require adherence to Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) protocols under the Customary Land Rights Act, 2022.
- Stakeholders, including tenant farmers and land users without formal titles, may be excluded from consultations or compensation processes.

#### 2.2.2 Pesticide and Agrochemical Use

- The use of synthetic pesticides and fertilizers under Component 1 of the SAPZ Project raises risks of water contamination, biodiversity loss, and health impacts for farmers and nearby communities.
- Stakeholders, particularly smallholder farmers, require capacity building on Integrated Pest Management (IPM) techniques, safe chemical handling, and alternatives to hazardous pesticides.

### **2.2.3 Gender-Based Violence (GBV), Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA), and Child Labour**

- Construction and agro-industrial activities involving labour influx may increase risks of GBV/SEA and the use of child labour.
- Women, girls, and persons with disabilities may face increased vulnerability without proper codes of conduct, awareness raising, and monitoring.
- Stakeholder engagement is essential to build local understanding, strengthen prevention mechanisms, and link affected individuals to response services.

### **2.2.4 Employment and Livelihoods**

- Local expectations for job creation are high. Failure to deliver on employment promises may create social tension.
- Labour rights abuses such as delayed payments, discrimination, or exclusion of women and youth could affect project credibility.
- Inclusive recruitment and training strategies must be communicated and coordinated with local communities.

### **2.2.5 Water Use and Resource Competition**

- The expansion of irrigation and water-intensive rice production could place pressure on local water sources, particularly in dry seasons.
- Communities and water user groups need to be engaged in the planning, monitoring, and equitable allocation of water resources.

### **2.2.6 Occupational and Community Health and Safety**

- Risks during construction and operation phases include accidents, exposure to dust and agrochemicals, and equipment-related injuries.
- Communities located near project facilities or transport routes must be informed of associated risks and emergency response procedures.

### **2.2.7 Environmental Degradation**

- Land clearing, deforestation, and runoff from farming and processing activities could degrade ecosystems, including inland valley swamps, mangroves, and biodiversity corridors.
- Farmers and local environmental actors must be involved in environmental monitoring, conservation planning, and restoration efforts.

### **2.2.8 Grievance Redress and Accountability**

- An effective Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) must be understood and accessible to all stakeholders.
- Community-level grievance structures require formal recognition and integration with project grievance pathways.

## **2.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

Each of the risks listed above presents a potential point of tension or opportunity for co-ownership. Effective stakeholder engagement will help:

- Increase transparency and local buy-in.

- Prevent and resolve disputes early.
- Strengthen adaptive management and safeguard compliance.
- Enhance the sustainability and equity of project outcomes.

Stakeholder engagement must be tailored to each issue, with emphasis on inclusive communication, participatory planning, and meaningful involvement of affected persons, especially vulnerable groups.

### 3 STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION AND MAPPING

Effective stakeholder engagement is critical to the success and sustainability of the SAPZ Project. Stakeholders have different levels of influence and interest over time, depending on their relationship to specific components and phases of the project. This section provides a comprehensive mapping of stakeholders, their roles, influence across the project lifecycle, and how they can contribute to and benefit from project implementation.

#### 3.1 STAKEHOLDER CATEGORIES AND TYPOLOGIES

Stakeholders are categorized as follows:

- I. **Project-Affected Parties (PAPs):** Individuals or groups directly impacted by project activities.
- II. **Other Interested Parties (OIPs):** Institutions, agencies, private actors, or civil society groups with an indirect stake or enabling role in the project.

#### 3.2 STAKEHOLDER MAPPING BY ROLES, LIFECYCLE PHASE, AND EXPECTED BENEFITS

Stakeholder Group	Roles and Responsibilities	Lifecycle Phase(s)	Expected Contribution	Expected Benefits	Influence
Landowners and Customary Landholders	Negotiated agreements / agreements in principle to participate in SAPZ project	Preconstruction	Facilitate legitimate land access; ensure FPIC compliance	Access to farms and recognition of tenure rights	High
Tenant Farmers and Land Users	Participate in consultations on land access and use; continue farming activities	Preconstruction, Operations	Provide feedback on land access impacts; support seasonal land use	Safeguarded land use rights, access to extension services	High
Smallholder Rice Farmers	Adopt improved practices; participate in extension and input programs	Construction, Operations	Implement <sup>1</sup> GAP/IPM; contribute to productivity goals	Yield improvement, market access, income growth	High
Women's Groups	Advocate for inclusive land access, job opportunities, and GBV safeguards	All Phases	Promote gender-equitable engagement; co-lead outreach	Access to land, inputs, training, protection from GBV	Medium

<sup>1</sup> G **GAP** (Good Agricultural Practices): refers to a set of farming standards and methods that aim to improve the safety and quality of agricultural produce while ensuring environmental sustainability, efficient resource use, and the health and welfare of farmers and communities..

Youth Groups and Associations	Mobilize for employment, training, and entrepreneurship programs	Construction, Operations	Participate in labour force and skill-building activities	Jobs, start-up support, skills development	Medium
Community Members near Project Sites (AIH/ATC)	Monitor environmental/social impacts; engage in grievance resolution	Construction, Operations, Demolition	Provide local knowledge; support social accountability	Infrastructure access, jobs, grievance resolution	Low
Vulnerable Groups (e.g., widows, PWDs)	Require targeted outreach and adaptive engagement methods	All Phases	Provide insights into barriers; flag risks of exclusion	Inclusion in decisions, protections under safeguard protocols	Medium

Other Interested Parties	Roles and Responsibilities	Lifecycle Phase(s)	Expected Contribution	Expected Benefits	Influence
MAFS / SAPZ PIU	Lead implementation, coordinate safeguards and SEP delivery	All Phases	Oversee engagement, coordinate with partners	Sector reform, project success, institutional capacity	High
EPA-SL	Review and approve ESIA/ESMPs; monitor compliance	All Phases	Enforce environmental and disclosure obligations	Environmental protection, regulatory credibility	Medium
District Agricultural Offices (DAOs)	Deliver IPM and extension services; coordinate farmer training	Construction, Operations	Bridge between project and farming communities	Institutional relevance, farmer trust	High
District Councils	Oversee local engagement and GRM; integrate project in planning	All Phases	Facilitate consultations and conflict resolution	Improved infrastructure and public service delivery	Low
Traditional Authorities	Provide legitimacy for land access and local decisions	Preconstruction, Construction	Validate land agreements, mediate local disputes	Community stability, respected local authority	Medium
Ministry of Lands and Country Planning	Guide land policy and conflict resolution	Preconstruction	Validate documentation, support mediation	Improved land governance, tenure security	Medium
Ministry of Trade and Industry	Link project to SME and market development	Operations	Support agribusiness ecosystem development	SME growth, rural market expansion	Low



CSOs and NGOs	Facilitate inclusion, safeguard monitoring, community training	All Phases	Amplify voices of vulnerable groups; build trust	Partnership opportunities, increased community trust	Medium
Private Sector Actors	Operate in AIH/ATC, provide inputs, processing, off-taking	Construction, Operations	Generate demand for production, invest in value chains	Profitable ventures, secure value chain linkages	Medium
Academic/Research Institutions	Support pest management research, training, monitoring	All Phases	Conduct studies, deliver capacity building	Research partnerships, real-world learning	Low

### 3.3 STAKEHOLDER INFLUENCE ACROSS THE PROJECT LIFECYCLE

Phase	Key Stakeholders	Core Engagement Topics
<b>Preconstruction</b>	Landowners, traditional leaders, MAFS, EPA, MLCP, PAPs	Land access, FPIC, site selection, ESIA disclosure
<b>Construction</b>	Contractors, youth, local labour, DAOs, EPA, councils	Employment, GBV risk, nuisance impacts, grievance processes
<b>Operations &amp; Maintenance</b>	Farmers, ATC/AIH tenants, private sector, DAOs, councils	Water use, pest management, agrochemical safety, benefit-sharing
<b>Demolition &amp; Restoration</b>	Communities, contractors, EPA, traditional leaders	Site decommissioning, waste removal, ecological restoration

### 3.4 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT AND PERIODIC REVIEW

This stakeholder mapping will be updated regularly based on:

- Field-level realities during implementation;
- Feedback from community engagement and GRM reports;
- Recommendations from safeguards monitoring and AfDB supervision missions.

A revised matrix may be annexed to the SEP mid-project if material changes in stakeholder dynamics or engagement needs arise.

## 4 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM

---

### 4.1 OBJECTIVES AND ENGAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

The overall objective of the stakeholder engagement program is to ensure inclusive, transparent, and participatory communication with all stakeholders throughout the SAPZ Project lifecycle. This section outlines how engagement will be operationalized, by phase, method, and target group consistent with AfDB's Operational Safeguard 10 and national legislation.

Engagement will adhere to the following principles:

- **Inclusiveness:** Ensuring the participation of all relevant stakeholders, with special attention to women, youth, persons with disabilities, and vulnerable groups.
- **Timeliness and Accessibility:** Delivering information early, in formats and languages that stakeholders understand, and through culturally appropriate channels.
- **Two-Way Communication:** Promoting dialogue rather than one-way information dissemination.
- **Accountability:** Creating structured feedback loops and grievance redress mechanisms to demonstrate responsiveness to stakeholder inputs.
- **Adaptability:** Adjusting engagement methods as needed to address changes in project scope, risks, or community feedback.

### 4.2 ENGAGEMENT METHODS AND CHANNELS

Engagement will use a combination of physical and digital communication approaches suited to each stakeholder group, including:

Method	Description / Application
Community Meetings	Large group consultations for general awareness and input
Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)	Targeted sessions with women, youth, farmers, or vulnerable groups
Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)	Used for government, traditional authorities, NGOs
Radio Announcements	Dissemination of public information in local languages
Posters and Flyers	Visual materials placed in community centers and public spaces
Digital Tools (e.g., WhatsApp, SMS)	Used selectively for reminders and follow-ups with literate stakeholders
Grievance Redress Meetings	Feedback and resolution forums, especially during construction and operations
Monitoring Visits	Safeguard teams to assess participation effectiveness and address emerging concerns

### 4.3 ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES BY PROJECT PHASE

Phase	E&S Issue	Target Stakeholders	Engagement Method	Information to be Shared	Inputs Sought	Expected Outputs / KPI
<b>Preconstruction</b>	Land access, site selection, FPIC	Landowners, Chiefs, PAPs, MLCP	Meetings, KIIs, FGDs	Land criteria, FPIC rights, site maps	Consent, location preferences	Verified land agreements, signed FPIC records
	Vegetation clearance and biodiversity impacts	PAPs, Chiefs, EPA, NPAA	Public meetings, field inspections, FGDs	Vegetation clearance plans, sensitive habitat locations	Concerns on habitat loss, alternatives	Approved clearance plans, biodiversity offset measures (if any)
	Risk disclosure (ESIA, GRM, SEP, PMP)	PAPs, Councils, EPA	Meetings, flyers, radio	Summary of E&S risks, mitigation plans, GRM process	Risk concerns, suggestions	E&S disclosure logs, radio logs, meeting minutes
<b>Construction</b>	GBV/SEA risks, labour influx	Workers, Contractors, Women's Groups, Chiefs	Awareness sessions, FGDs, CoC signing	GRM, labour rights, code of conduct	Risk perceptions, referral pathways	Training logs, signed CoCs, awareness reports
	Employment expectations	Youth, local labourers, DAOs	Meetings, job boards, posters	Recruitment procedures, job quotas	Interest in roles, skill levels	% local employment, gender balance
	Child labour risks	Contractors, youth groups, community leaders, CSOs	Sensitisation meetings, posters, site inspections	Legal working age, project labour policy, reporting channels	Local practices, community concerns	No child labour reports, verification logs, community reports
	Occupational health & safety	Workers, CSOs, EPA	Toolbox talks, site visits	PPE, hygiene, safety protocols	Risk feedback	Safety audit reports, incident logs
<b>Operations &amp; Maintenance</b>	Agrochemical use, water access	Farmers, DAOs, youth, women	Extension visits, training, FGDs	IPM, GAP, input timing	Practices, seasonal challenges	% trained in IPM, pesticide use compliance
	Facility use and access	Private sector, cooperatives, PAPs	Business meetings, outreach	Operational rules, user fees	Feedback on access, pricing	User registry, feedback logs
	Grievance tracking	PAPs, CSOs, councils	Quarterly GRM forums	Complaint trends, resolutions	Unresolved grievances	GRM reports, % grievances resolved

<b>Demolition &amp; Restoration</b>	Restoration of natural areas	Chiefs, PAPA, EPA, councils	Meetings, field walks	Restoration plan, waste management	Local concerns	Signed restoration agreements, field inspection reports
	Final project closure	All stakeholders	Exit meetings, media brief	Final activities, handover process	Legacy expectations	Closure report, final stakeholder audit

## 4.4 ENGAGEMENT OF VULNERABLE GROUPS

The SAPZ Project recognizes that certain individuals or groups due to their social, physical, economic, or legal status, may face disproportionate risks or barriers to participation in the project. In line with AfDB Operational Safeguard 10, the SEP includes targeted strategies to engage these vulnerable and disadvantaged groups to ensure they can participate meaningfully in consultations and benefit equitably from project interventions.

### 4.4.1 Identification and Barriers to Participation

Vulnerable groups identified in the SAPZ operational areas include:

- Women, especially those excluded from land and decision-making processes;
- Youth, including out-of-school and unemployed young people;
- Elderly persons, especially those with mobility or support limitations;
- Persons with disabilities, including hearing, visual, and mobility impairments;
- Illiterate persons, who may require visual or oral communication;
- Migrant laborers, settlers, or non-landowning families;
- Children, particularly child-headed households or survivors of GBV;
- Remote communities, where infrastructure limits outreach and participation.

Common participation barriers include:

- Language and literacy constraints;
- Limited mobility or accessibility of meeting venues;
- Gender norms limiting participation in mixed forums;
- Scheduling conflicts (e.g., with market days, domestic duties);
- Lack of transport or funds to attend consultations;
- Absence of appropriate communication formats (e.g., Braille, sign language).

### 4.4.2 Commitments and Differentiated Measures

To address these gaps, the SAPZ PIU and all contractors or partners will apply the following core principles:

1. **Inclusivity:** No stakeholder group will be excluded from engagement based on gender, literacy, location, or physical ability. Separate meetings or parallel engagements will be conducted as needed.
2. **Accessibility:** All engagement venues will be chosen for physical accessibility, cultural appropriateness, and proximity to target groups.
3. **Culturally Appropriate Formats:** Communications will be tailored using local languages, audio-visual tools, and trusted intermediaries like town criers, teachers, and women's leaders.
4. **Logistical Support:** Where required, the project will provide transport, meals, or childcare support to facilitate participation by women, PWDs, or rural residents.

5. **Community-Based Partnerships:** Local CBOs, disabled persons organizations (DPOs), women's cooperatives, and faith-based groups will be mobilized to identify and represent vulnerable stakeholders.
6. **Documentation and Tracking:** Engagement activities will track attendance and participation of vulnerable groups, disaggregated by gender, age, and disability status, and reported in monthly E&S updates.
7. **Contractor Accountability:** Third parties (e.g., construction firms, input suppliers) will be required to conduct inclusive stakeholder engagement in accordance with the SEP and report on their outreach to vulnerable populations.

#### 4.4.3 Illustrative Table: Tailored Strategies for Engaging Vulnerable Groups

Group	Barriers	Communication Needs	Engagement Methods	Support Required
<b>Women</b>	Time, mobility, exclusion from leadership	Verbal, pictorial, Krio/local languages	Women-only FGDs, female facilitators, home visits	Local meetings, childcare, scheduling sensitivity
<b>Youth</b>	Lack of trust, economic disenfranchisement	Peer group networks, youth reps	Youth-focused FGDs, WhatsApp groups, sport-linked outreach	Incentives, facilitation training
<b>Elderly</b>	Mobility, hearing/vision impairment	Local language, one-on-one engagement	Home visits, separate seating areas	Transport, short sessions, visual aids
<b>PWDs</b>	Physical access, format of information	Braille, sign language, audio tools as appropriate	Small group sessions, DPO-led outreach	Accessible venues, interpreters, visual materials
<b>Illiterate Persons</b>	Exclusion from written materials	Visual and oral formats	Skits, storytelling, radio broadcasts	Use of visuals, pictograms, audio loops
<b>Migrant labourers / Settlers</b>	Isolation, lack of land ownership	Native language or dialects	Targeted meetings through community gatekeepers	Tailored invitations, conflict sensitivity
<b>Remote Communities</b>	Distance, poor infrastructure	Radio, word-of-mouth, village meetings	Embedded facilitators, cluster-based engagement	Transport, fuel allowances for field teams

#### 4.5 COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION TIMELINE

Stakeholder engagement will be led by the PIU Social Safeguards Officer, in collaboration with District Councils, DAOs, and local facilitators. A 6-month rolling calendar of engagement activities will be developed and updated semi-annually.

Quarterly stakeholder reports will document:

- Activities conducted,
- Groups engaged,
- Key issues raised,
- Responses provided,
- Adjustments made to the SEP.

Engagement during peak agricultural periods or religious holidays will be adjusted to respect local schedules.

## 5 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

### 5.1 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The successful delivery of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) depends on clearly defined responsibilities at national, district, chiefdom, and community levels. Stakeholder engagement activities will be led by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) under the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), with implementation support from local government authorities, traditional leaders, and sectoral institutions. The table below outlines the core institutions and their roles.

Institution / Actor	Role in SEP Implementation
<b>MAFS / SAPZ PIU</b>	Overall coordination of SEP implementation; budgeting and resource allocation; ensures safeguard compliance; prepares monthly stakeholder engagement reports; maintains central documentation.
<b>Social Safeguards Specialist (PIU)</b>	Lead execution of stakeholder activities across project phases; coordinate consultations; oversee grievance management; track gender inclusion; report to MAFS and AfDB.
<b>District Agricultural Offices (DAOs)</b>	Mobilize farmer groups; deliver IPM and pesticide training; support feedback collection during project implementation; coordinate community extension sessions.
<b>District Councils (Kambia and Port Loko)</b>	Oversee local stakeholder forums; integrate SEP activities into district plans; co-chair community engagement events; track responsiveness to citizen concerns.
<b>Traditional Authorities (Paramount and Town Chiefs)</b>	Validate community entry; provide access to customary landholders and renters; support FPIC and conflict mediation; co-facilitate grievance awareness sessions.
<b>Community-Based Facilitators / Field Agents</b>	Act as local engagement focal points; assist in organizing meetings and recording feedback; ensure continuous flow of information to and from the PIU.
<b>CSOs and NGOs (as partners)</b>	Facilitate engagement with vulnerable groups; deliver GBV/SEA training; help verify grievances and monitor project impacts on at-risk populations.
<b>Contractors / Private Sector Operators</b>	Communicate directly with host communities during construction and operation; ensure local hiring protocols and grievance pathways are followed; support joint outreach when using AIH/ATC facilities.

### 5.2 SEP MONITORING AND REPORTING

Monitoring will be an integral part of SEP implementation. The PIU will establish a Stakeholder Engagement Logbook and update it quarterly with:

- Stakeholder groups engaged;
- Date, method, and location of each activity;
- Key concerns raised and responses provided;



- Grievance trends and status of resolution;
- Participation of women, youth, and vulnerable persons.

A Stakeholder Engagement Summary Report will be submitted monthly to MAFS leadership and the AfDB (as part of monthly environmental and social reporting requirements) , and shared with district stakeholders through coordination meetings.

Where appropriate, participatory monitoring techniques will be applied to collect community-level feedback.

### **5.3 CAPACITY BUILDING FOR SEP DELIVERY**

To strengthen the effectiveness of stakeholder engagement activities:

- Training sessions will be organized for PIU staff, District Councils, contractors, and facilitators on topics such as community entry, participatory methods, inclusive facilitation, conflict sensitivity, and AfDB safeguard requirements.
- A special orientation module will be developed for traditional leaders and youth/women's representatives to strengthen their roles in communication, consultation, and grievance mediation.

### **5.4 INTEGRATION WITH PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

Stakeholder engagement will not be implemented as a stand-alone function. Instead, it will be fully integrated into the SAPZ workplan and Monitoring Framework.

Each major technical component (e.g. land access, infrastructure, agrochemical delivery, GBV mitigation, capacity building) will embed SEP milestones and activities in their respective schedules and budgets. The PIU M&E Officer will ensure SEP indicators are tracked in line with project results targets.

## 6 GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM (SUMMARY)

An effective grievance redress mechanism (GRM) is essential to stakeholder engagement. It ensures that individuals or groups who believe they have been adversely affected by project activities can raise concerns and receive timely, transparent, and culturally appropriate responses. The GRM for the SAPZ Project was developed in May 2025 and applies across all project sites in Kambia and Port Loko Districts.

### 6.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE GRM

- Provide a clear, accessible, and inclusive process for receiving and resolving complaints.
- Strengthen transparency and accountability in project delivery.
- Prevent escalation of disputes through early resolution.
- Ensure that the rights of affected persons, especially vulnerable groups, are protected.

### 6.2 SCOPE OF THE GRM

The GRM covers all SAPZ-related grievances, including but not limited to:

- Land access and voluntary donation disputes.
- Labour and employment-related grievances.
- Environmental concerns (e.g., dust, noise, chemical use).
- Social impacts (e.g., GBV/SEA/SH, exclusion from benefits).
- Delays or gaps in communication or stakeholder consultation.
- Perceived corruption or malpractice by project implementers.

### 6.3 GRM STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

The GRM operates through a four-tier structure, ensuring complaints are addressed as close to the source as possible:

Level	Mechanism / Committee	Lead Actor
<b>Community / Sectional Level</b>	Community Grievance Redress Committee (CGRC)	Section Chief (Chair), supported by field agents
<b>Chiefdom Level</b>	Chiefdom GRC	Paramount Chief (Chair), assisted by Ward Councillor
<b>District Level</b>	District GRC	District Agriculture Officer / Council Rep (Chair)
<b>National / Project Level</b>	SAPZ Project GRC	PIU Social Safeguards Specialist (Registrar), MAFS Chair

Each level includes representatives from women, youth, farmers, landowners, and persons with disabilities. Technical experts (e.g., labour officers, GBV specialists) may be co-opted when required.

## 6.4 STEPS IN THE GRM PROCESS

1. **Receiving and Acknowledging Complaints:** Via drop boxes, in-person, phone, or digital platforms; all complaints are registered by the assigned focal point.
2. **Screening and Classification:** Complaints are categorized by risk level and assigned to the appropriate committee.
3. **Investigation and Resolution:** The committee investigates and proposes resolution within a defined timeframe (e.g., 14 days for community-level cases).
4. **Escalation (if unresolved):** Complaints can be elevated to the next level if not resolved satisfactorily.
5. **Feedback and Closure:** Complainants are informed of outcomes and their right to escalate or seek judicial remedy.

## 6.5 INTEGRATION WITH STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

The GRM is a key feedback loop within the broader stakeholder engagement process. Key integration points include:

- SEP consultations will inform communities about the GRM and how to use it.
- GRM summaries will be shared during community meetings and disclosed on notice boards and local radio.
- GRM data will be used to adapt SEP activities (e.g., if complaints show gaps in engagement or inclusion).
- Safeguards staff will triangulate feedback from both the SEP and GRM to refine project approaches.

## 6.6 SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR GBV / SEA / SH COMPLAINTS

- A confidential referral protocol exists for survivors of Gender-Based Violence (GBV), Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA), and Sexual Harassment (SH).
- These complaints are not handled through the general GRM but referred to the Family Support Unit (FSU) or other relevant service providers.
- Survivors may report anonymously, and resolution will prioritize safety, dignity, and consent.

## 6.7 MONITORING AND REPORTING

The PIU will track all grievances through a central Grievance Monitoring Matrix, disaggregated by type, location, gender, and resolution status. Key indicators include:

- Number of grievances received and resolved;
- Average resolution time;
- Percentage of grievances resolved at the community level;
- Satisfaction levels (where feedback is available).

Grievance data will be included in monthly environmental and social implementation reports and reviewed during stakeholder coordination meetings.

## 7 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT DURING SEP PREPARATION

The preparation of this Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) was grounded in extensive stakeholder consultations carried out during the development of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) for Kambia and Port Loko Districts, the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), and the Pest Management Plan (PMP). These consultations ensured that the views of project-affected persons (PAPs), local institutions, and other stakeholders were integrated into the design of the SAPZ's safeguard instruments.

### 7.1 CONSULTATION OBJECTIVES

- Inform stakeholders about the SAPZ Project objectives, scope, and expected impacts.
- Identify concerns and expectations related to land use, livelihoods, environment, and social risks.
- Gather feedback to shape risk mitigation measures, engagement strategies, and grievance procedures.
- Ensure early inclusion of vulnerable groups, including women, youth, and persons with disabilities.

### 7.2 METHODS USED

- Community meetings in target villages near proposed project sites;
- Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with women, farmers, youth, and tenant land users;
- Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with Paramount Chiefs, District Agricultural Officers, council representatives, and EPA-SL officials;
- Stakeholder workshops with NGOs, civil society, and MAFS technical teams;
- Informal dialogues during site reconnaissance and baseline data collection.

All engagement sessions were conducted in Krio and local languages with support from community facilitators to ensure accessibility and cultural appropriateness.

### 7.3 SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

District	Location	Stakeholder Type	Method	Date(s)
<b>Kambia</b>	Mambolo, Kychum, Robanna	Farmers, landowners, tenant farmers, youth, women's leaders, town chiefs	FGDs, community meetings, KIIs	Oct 2024, Feb–Apr 2025
<b>Port Loko</b>	Kathoma, Mange, Rothum, Mankara	Traditional authorities, women, youth, farmers	FGDs, KIIs, meetings	Feb–Apr 2025
<b>Both</b>	District HQs and Chiefdoms	District Councils, DAOs, EPA-SL, MAFS	KIIs	Apr – May 2025
<b>National</b>	Freetown	MAFS, EPA-SL, MLCP,	Technical meetings	May 2025

## 7.4 KEY ISSUES RAISED BY STAKEHOLDERS

The consultations generated a range of inputs which were integrated into the SEP and other safeguards tools:

Issue Raised	Response/Integration into SEP
<b>Need for clarity on land access procedures, especially for tenants and renters</b>	SEP includes targeted engagement for tenant farmers and awareness on FPIC and land tenure under the Customary Land Rights Act
<b>Concerns about gender-based violence and labour influx during construction</b>	SEP includes tailored outreach and GBV/SEA mitigation integrated with GRM referral protocols
<b>Risk of exclusion of women and youth from project benefits</b>	SEP provides for disaggregated FGDs and quotas in consultations; youth/women reps are included in GRCs
<b>Lack of information on agrochemical risks and safe use</b>	SEP links to PMP and outlines training through DAOs and CSOs on pesticide safety and IPM
<b>Interest in local employment and SME opportunities in AIHs and ATCs</b>	SEP includes communications on jobs, business services, and engagement with private sector
<b>Demand for transparent complaint handling</b>	SEP outlines full GRM structure and regular community-level grievance reporting
<b>Delayed delivery of inputs (seeds, fertilizers, etc.) in previous programs</b>	SEP incorporates early-season consultation with farmers to determine input needs and timelines; feedback loop through the GRM to address procurement and distribution delays

## 7.5 LESSONS FOR SEP IMPLEMENTATION

The preparation consultations highlighted the importance of:

- Starting engagement early in the project cycle;
- Using participatory methods that ensure inclusion of underrepresented groups;
- Simplifying technical content into community-accessible formats;
- Building trust through follow-up visits and timely feedback;
- Using trusted intermediaries like chiefs, extension agents, and women's leaders to sustain dialogue.

These lessons have directly informed the design of the stakeholder engagement program in Section 4 and will continue to guide adaptive SEP implementation.

## 8 MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING

Monitoring and evaluating the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) is essential to ensure that engagement activities are inclusive, meaningful, and effective throughout the SAPZ project lifecycle. This section describes the indicators, methods, and reporting systems that will be used to track SEP implementation and adjust engagement strategies in response to stakeholder feedback and project dynamics.

### 8.1 MONITORING OBJECTIVES

- Ensure that planned stakeholder engagement activities are carried out as intended;
- Assess the quality and effectiveness of consultations and information disclosure;
- Identify and address emerging concerns, complaints, or unintended exclusions;
- Inform project management, AfDB supervision, and stakeholders of progress and gaps.

### 8.2 MONITORING INDICATORS

The Project Implementation Unit (PIU) will monitor SEP implementation using both quantitative and qualitative indicators. These indicators will be disaggregated by location, gender, stakeholder group, and project phase where applicable.

Indicator Category	Sample Indicators
<b>Participation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Number of stakeholder meetings conducted (by type, location)</li><li>• % female, youth, and vulnerable group participation</li><li>• Number of FGDs/KIIs held with target groups</li></ul>
<b>Information Disclosure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Number of materials distributed (flyers, radio broadcasts, posters)</li><li>• Languages used in outreach activities</li><li>• Feedback on clarity and usefulness of materials</li></ul>
<b>Feedback and Responsiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Number and type of issues raised during consultations</li><li>• % of stakeholder concerns addressed or integrated into project planning</li><li>• Timeliness of PIU response to feedback</li></ul>
<b>Grievance Redress</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Number of grievances received and resolved (by type and location)</li><li>• % of grievances resolved within specified timeframe</li><li>• Satisfaction levels of complainants (where feasible)</li></ul>
<b>Adaptiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Number of SEP revisions made during project implementation</li><li>• Stakeholder suggestions leading to procedural changes or improved services</li></ul>

### 8.3 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

- Stakeholder Engagement Logbook maintained by the PIU Safeguards Officer;
- Meeting records, attendance sheets, and community feedback forms;
- GRM database, with issue classification and resolution tracking;
- Field monitoring visits and interviews with community facilitators;
- Quarterly coordination meetings with District Councils and implementing partners.

Participatory monitoring tools, including focus group reflection sessions and community scorecards, may be piloted in selected sites to supplement formal tracking.

## 8.4 REPORTING FRAMEWORK

- Monthly E&S Implementation Reports: Submitted by the PIU to MAFS and AfDB, covering all stakeholder engagement activities, grievances, inclusion outcomes, and responsiveness metrics.
- Quarterly Coordination Briefs: Shared with District Councils, traditional authorities, and key community representatives to ensure transparency at the local level.
- Annual Safeguards Report: Synthesizes key stakeholder engagement trends, unresolved issues, and adaptive actions taken throughout the year.
- Midterm and Final Evaluations: SEP implementation will be assessed as part of broader project performance reviews, potentially including stakeholder satisfaction assessments.

## 8.5 SEP REVIEW AND REVISION

The SEP is a living document. Formal revisions will be undertaken if:

- Project scope or geographic coverage changes significantly;
- New stakeholder groups emerge;
- Monitoring shows that engagement approaches are ineffective or exclusionary;
- Guidance from the AfDB or national authorities requires adaptation.

All revisions will be validated with key stakeholders at district level.

# 9 BUDGET

---

Effective stakeholder engagement requires adequate and predictable financial resources to support consultations, information dissemination, grievance handling, monitoring, and capacity building. This section presents an estimated budget for implementing the SAPZ Stakeholder Engagement Plan over the full project lifecycle i.e. preconstruction, construction, operations & maintenance, and demolition and restoration.

## 9.1 BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS

- Costs are indicative and will be adjusted during annual work planning based on field realities.
- Values reflect coverage in Kambia and Port Loko Districts, across multiple stakeholder categories.
- The budget does not include compensation-related costs or resettlement expenses (these are covered under separate instruments, if applicable).
- Budget lines align with the roles and responsibilities outlined in Section 5.
- GRM costs are not indicated as they are covered in the standalone GRM Document.



## 9.2 SUMMARY BUDGET TABLE (INDICATIVE)

Budget Category	Estimated Cost (USD)	Description
<b>Stakeholder Consultations</b>	60,000	Community meetings, FGDs, local workshops during all phases
<b>Information Disclosure</b>	25,000	Flyers, posters, radio broadcasts, public notice boards
<b>Translation and Interpretation</b>	8,000	Materials translated into Krio and local languages; real-time interpretation at meetings
<b>Training and Capacity Building</b>	30,000	SEP orientation for PIU, traditional authorities, facilitators, CSOs
<b>GRM Operations</b>	See GRM	GRC formation, training, grievance documentation tools, referral mechanisms
<b>Field Facilitation and Logistics</b>	35,000	Transportation, per diem, venue hire, refreshments for field teams and participants
<b>Monitoring, Documentation, and Reporting</b>	20,000	SEP logbooks, feedback forms, monitoring visits, monthly E&S reporting support
<b>Participatory Evaluation and SEP Revision</b>	10,000	Midterm stakeholder review sessions and SEP updates
<b>Contingency (10%)</b>	22,800	Buffer for emerging engagement needs or underbudgeted activities
<b>Total Estimated Cost</b>	<b>210,800</b>	

## 9.3 FINANCING AND MANAGEMENT

- The Project Implementation Unit (PIU) will manage the SEP budget
- SEP-related expenditures will be reviewed during monthly E&S implementation reporting and annual work planning sessions.
- The PIU will ensure that funds are equitably allocated across districts and that activities targeting women, youth, and vulnerable groups are prioritized in disbursement schedules.
- AfDB and MAFS oversight will verify that stakeholder engagement activities are adequately resourced and implemented as planned.

## ANNEX1: STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS (COMMUNITY): KAMBIA AND PORT LOKO DISTRICTS

### SAPZ Project: Minutes of Community Consultations Held: Kambia

	<b>Date</b>	24-Oct-25	<b>Time:</b>	11:40	<b>Venue:</b>	Chief Barray, Mambolo, Kambia
Chiefdom/Community		<b>Introductory Project Meeting:</b> Team containing staff from the Ministry of Agriculture including the Directors of Extension & National Development Partner Program Coordinating Office, Environmental and Climate Smart Specialist, District Agriculture Officer (Port Loko), etc. Team also included staff of the AfDB.				
ESIA Team & Key Persons Met		<b>Key Persons Met</b> Mambolo Town Chief, Sierra Leone Produce Marketing Company (SLPMC) representative, Land Owning Families; farmers. Also present were about forty (40) community members, including District Elders, Women and Youths, Farmers, Imams, Person with Disability.				
Issues presented		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Background, importance and components of the SAPZ Project;</li><li>• The facilities that will be constructed by the project – including aggregation centers and agro-processing hubs;</li><li>• The need for stakeholder acceptance of and support for successful implementation of the SAPZ Project;</li><li>• Potential Environmental and Social risks and impacts that may be triggered by the project</li><li>• The need for meaning stakeholder engagement and participation for improved project outcomes</li><li>• The mission team provided opportunities for stakeholders to bring voice out issues of interest or concerns to them.</li></ul>				
Responses and Discussions		<b>Town Chief, Mambolo;</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• On behalf of the Kambia District and Mambolo Town, he welcomed the news about the SAPZ Project with delight, and expressed their willingness and readiness to fully support its preparation and implementation;</li><li>• He requested the MAFS to ensure active involvement of stakeholders, in the planning and implementation of the SAPZ Project. This he said is crucial for stakeholder ownership of the project;</li><li>• Chief requested the project to ensure that employment opportunities are provided to their youths and women;</li><li>• He called for timely supply of inputs (seeds, fertilizers, tractors, etc) to farmers to ensure maximum outputs (rice production to make SAPZ stand out)</li><li>• He urged the Sierra Leone Produce Marketing Company (SLPMC) to work with district and community stakeholders to address land ownership and agreement legacy issues and processes for the site currently used by the company.</li><li>• He requested for further engagement with his people for clarity on how the project will benefit their communities, as well as their contributions to the project;</li></ul>				

Chiefdom/Community ESIA Team & Key Persons Met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To ensure improved production, he requested for the project to consider facilitating access to improved climate information for timely planning and improved yields.</li><li>• He concluded that any land acquisition process on the SAPZ must comply with applicable land tenure systems, and active participation of concerned parties;</li></ul>		
	<b>Representative, Sierra Leone Produced Marketing Company (SLPMC)</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• That SLPMC bought the land from land owners</li><li>• That the Paramount Chief of Mambolo was part of the land sales process</li><li>• That his company is willing and ready to fully support and address any legacy issue relating to the land in question.</li></ul>		
	<b>Representative, Land Owning Family</b>		
Issues presented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• That the land occupied and/or being used by the SLPMC was sold with condition, that the land owners should be fully aware and be involved in any transfer process.</li><li>• That the land-owning family is open to supporting development programs, including the SAPZ Project</li></ul>		
	<b>Date</b>	12-Feb-25	<b>Time:</b> 12:17
	<b>Venue:</b>	Chief Barray, Kychum, Kambia	
	Kychum, Samu Chiefdom, Kambia		
Issues presented	<b>ESIA Team:</b> Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) Consultant; Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialist assigned from the Sierra Leone Rice Agro-Industrial Cluster Project MAFS; Environmental and Social Safeguards Consultant, assigned from the Smallholder Commercialization and Development Project MAFS.		
	MAFS provided a comprehensive overview of the proposed Sierra Leone Special Agro-Industrial Processing Zone (SAPZ) Project. It was emphasized that, as part of due diligence, all investment projects financed by the African Development Bank (AfDB) must adhere to both the Bank’s Environmental and Social (E&S) Safeguards Standards and the E&S regulatory requirements of the Government of Sierra Leone (GoSL).		
	MAFS further noted that the visit of the mission was part of ongoing efforts by the GoSL and AfDB to identify and proactively address potential environmental and social impacts of the SAPZ Project, particularly those involving community access to land and natural resources. It was stressed that active participation and the inclusion of community voices are critical to the project’s success and that the project will depend on the availability of adequate land from host communities for activities such as rice production, processing, and the development of transformation hubs.		
Issues presented	The Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) Consultant, delivered a detailed presentation on the purpose and value of the ESIA process. He explained that the ESIA is a critical instrument for assessing potential negative and positive environmental and social impacts associated with development projects like SAPZ. It serves as a tool to inform decision-making, enhance project sustainability, and develop appropriate mitigation measures to manage adverse effects.		

Responses and Discussions	<p>The Consultant outlined several key benefits of the ESIA process, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of environmental and social well-being;</li> <li>• Promotion of compliance with national and donor safeguard requirements;</li> <li>• Facilitation of informed planning and decision-making;</li> <li>• Provision for meaningful stakeholder engagement;</li> <li>• Establishment of mechanisms for grievance redress and communication.</li> </ul> <p>He encouraged participants to share their concerns, expectations, and any issues they believed should be taken into account. Topics he invited the community to comment on included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Socio-cultural practices related to land and natural resources;</li> <li>• Traditional rites or sacred areas around the proposed SAPZ sites;</li> <li>• Gender equity in land access and benefit-sharing;</li> <li>• Potential land acquisition or resource use restrictions;</li> <li>• Preferred sustainable livelihood alternatives;</li> <li>• Environmental or social concerns specific to the communities;</li> <li>• Community leadership and land ownership structures;</li> <li>• Preferred channels for information dissemination and grievance resolution;</li> <li>• Opportunities and constraints to community participation;</li> <li>• Anticipated risks and threats to project success from a local perspective.</li> </ul> <p>The team ended by calling for open dialogue and inclusive participation to ensure the SAPZ Project is responsive to community needs and priorities and implemented in an environmentally and socially responsible manner</p>
	<p><b>Wife, of Paramount Chief of Mambolo:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On behalf of her husband, the Paramount of Mambolo Chiefdom, she pledged the total support and commitment of his people to support the preparation and implementation of the proposed SAPZ Project. As an agricultural rich area, she emphasized the potential for SAPZ Project, to address the ever-increasing issue of food insecurity in Sierra Leone.</li> <li>• She confirmed to the visiting team that a land, which she believes is adequate for construction of facilities on the SAPZ could be voluntarily donated to the MAGFS, for use by the project;</li> <li>• She promised to inform the Town Chief about the deliberation held and to help mobilize further support to the proposed project. She expressed gratitude to the AfDB and the Government of Sierra Leone (GOSL) for selecting their town for implementation of the proposed SAPZ Project.</li> <li>• She requested the MAFS, through the SAPZ Project to ensure employment opportunities are provided for their women and youth population.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Also, she requested for further support for the provision of basic social services. This includes support to health, security, water, education and security structures in the communities.</li><li>Most importantly, she pleaded for the GoSL to consider constructing the road leading to Kychum to ensure that Kychum Community is accessed all year round. This she said will help greatly boost production and supply processes, including transporting and sales of agricultural produce.</li><li>She concluded by requesting for further consultations with other members of the Kychum and communities that may be affected by the SAPZ Project for access to improved information, and facilitate active participation in the design and implementation of the project.</li></ul> <p><b>Youth Representative</b>, described the SAPZ as a project that would benefit Kychum, Kambia and Sierra Leone. On behalf of the youths of Kychum, he pledged their willingness and readiness to fully support the preparation and implementation of the SAPZ Project. He added that they will work with project stakeholders to ensure that donated land is fully access and utilized by the project. He expressed their gratitude to the Government of Sierra Leone, the African Development Bank (AfDB), and the project consultants for the SAPZ Project, adding that they look forward for improved job opportunities and their socio-economic transformation expected to be associated with such opportunities. He concluded by stressing the need for the road network between Mambolo and Kychum to be improved by the GoSL, to facilitate access to and from their community, throughout the year, as opposed to only the dry season, as it is now.</p> <p><b>A community stakeholder:</b> stated that the SAPZ would boost rice production in their communities, improve livelihoods at household levels, and help promote the socio-economic conditions of the community.</p>				
	<b>Date</b>	13-Feb-25	<b>Time:</b>	11:40	<b>Venue:</b>	Chief House, Robana, Kambia
Chiefdom/Community		Robanna Community, Kambia				
ESIA Team & Key Persons Met		<b>ESIA Team:</b> ESIA Team: Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) Consultant; Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialist assigned from the Sierra Leone Rice Agro-Industrial Cluster Project MAFS; Environmental and Social Safeguards Consultant, assigned from the Smallholder Commercialization and Development Project MAFS.. <b>Key Persons Met</b>				
Issues presented		Same as presented at Kychum, Kambia Town Chief, Robana:				
Responses and Discussions	and	He welcomed the ESIA team and expressed his strong support for the proposed SAPZ Project. He cited numerous benefits that the project may bring to his community, chiefdom, district and Sierra Leone as a whole. The Chief assured the mission team that his community has already identified about 50 acres of land, for use by the SAPZ Project if required. He confirmed that majority (over 80%) of his people are involved into agriculture and animal rearing. As such, access to and use of donated land will not negatively impact on anyone’s livelihood or well-being. He confirmed that the land is secondary forest, previously used for agriculture and other uses. As such, the land allocated for SAPZ would not infringe on any ecologically sensitive areas. Moreover, he confirmed that none of his community members will be looking towards any financial compensation from the project or MAFS / GoSL as the wild fruits were not planted by anyone, nor does anyone depend on them for livelihood or socio-economic gains. He advocated for improved job opportunities for women and youths, whilst hoping that the proposed SAPZ Project would position his community as a center for improved rice production in the country. On behalf of his people, he expressed hope that the SAPZ Project would commence as soon as possible. He concluded by requesting for further consultations with his people, as well as documentation of the donated land to ensure smooth implementation of the SAPZ Project.				

# PHOTO GALLERY: STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS IN MAMBOLOL KYCHUM & ROBANA, KAMBIA DISTRICT

## Stakeholder Consultations at Mambolo, Kambia. 24 October 2025



Stakeholder meeting held at Paramount Chief's Hut, Kychum



Team delivering statement to stakeholders at Mambolo, Kambia



Ag Director Extensions Services of MAFS, delivering statement on behalf of the ministry at the stakeholder consultation at Mambolo, Kambia

## Stakeholder Consultations at Kychum, Kambia. 12 February 2025



Meeting held at Paramount Chief's Hut, Kychum



ESIA Team engaging cross-section of stakeholders, Kychum

## Stakeholder Consultations at Robbana, Kambia. 13 February 2025



ESIA team engaging the Town Chief of Robana, Kambia		

### SAPZ Project: Minutes of Community Consultations Held: Port Loko

<b>Community/Chiefdom/Date</b>	<b>Dates</b> Kathoma / Kamasondo Chiefdom / 12 <sup>th</sup> February 2025 Mange / Bureh Chiefdom / 14 <sup>th</sup> February 2025 Rothum / Bureh Chiefdom / 16 <sup>th</sup> February 2025 Mankara / Bureh Chiefdom / 13 <sup>th</sup> February 2025
	<b>ESIA Team &amp; Key Persons Met</b>
	<p><b>ESIA Team:</b> Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), Consultant; Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialist, assigned from the Sierra Leone Rice Agro-Industrial Cluster Project, MAFS; Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, SLARIS Project</p> <p><b>Persons Met:</b> Chiefs, farmer representatives, women leaders, farmer representatives, landowners, youth leaders, teachers, community based officers and other members of the community Kathoma:</p> <p>There were about 100 community members comprising of Community Elders, Farmers, Tribal Authorities, Women, Youth and Children;</p>
<b>Issues Presented</b>	<p>During a stakeholder engagement meeting held with local community members, the SAPZ Project ESIA team provided a comprehensive overview of the proposed Sierra Leone Special Agro-Industrial Processing Zone (SAPZ) Project. The presenters emphasized that, as part of due diligence, all investment projects financed by the African Development Bank (AfDB) must adhere to both the Bank's Environmental and Social (E&amp;S) Safeguards Standards and the E&amp;S regulatory requirements of the Government of Sierra Leone (GoSL).</p>

	<p>The team noted that their visit was part of ongoing efforts by the GoSL and AfDB to identify and proactively address potential environmental and social impacts of the SAPZ Project, particularly those involving community access to land and natural resources. They stressed that active participation and the inclusion of community voices are critical to the project's success and that the project will depend on the availability of adequate land from host communities for activities such as rice production, processing, and the development of transformation hubs.</p> <p>Following this, the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) Consultant, delivered a detailed presentation on the purpose and value of the ESIA process. He explained that the ESIA is a critical instrument for assessing potential negative and positive environmental and social impacts associated with development projects like SAPZ. It serves as a tool to inform decision-making, enhance project sustainability, and develop appropriate mitigation measures to manage adverse effects.</p> <p>Mr. Conteh outlined several key benefits of the ESIA process, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of environmental and social well-being;</li> <li>• Promotion of compliance with national and donor safeguard requirements;</li> <li>• Facilitation of informed planning and decision-making;</li> <li>• Provision for meaningful stakeholder engagement;</li> <li>• Establishment of mechanisms for grievance redress and communication.</li> </ul> <p>He encouraged participants to share their concerns, expectations, and any issues they believed should be taken into account. Topics he invited the community to comment on included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Socio-cultural practices related to land and natural resources;</li> <li>• Traditional rites or sacred areas around the proposed SAPZ sites;</li> <li>• Gender equity in land access and benefit-sharing;</li> <li>• Potential land acquisition or resource use restrictions;</li> <li>• Preferred sustainable livelihood alternatives;</li> <li>• Environmental or social concerns specific to the communities;</li> <li>• Community leadership and land ownership structures;</li> <li>• Preferred channels for information dissemination and grievance resolution;</li> <li>• Opportunities and constraints to community participation;</li> <li>• Anticipated risks and threats to project success from a local perspective.</li> </ul> <p>This session concluded with a call for open dialogue and inclusive participation to ensure the SAPZ Project is responsive to community needs and priorities and implemented in an environmentally and socially responsible manner.</p>
--	---



<b>Responses &amp; Discussions</b>	<p><b>Community Feedback and Reactions</b></p> <p>Following the SAPZ Project presentation, several community leaders and residents shared their reflections and feedback on the proposed initiative and the ongoing Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) process.</p> <p>A local councillor, expressed strong support for the SAPZ Project, emphasizing its potential to address the growing challenge of food insecurity in Sierra Leone. He assured the team of the community's full willingness to allocate land—both existing farmlands and additional areas—for project implementation. He further noted that such land allocation would not infringe on any ecologically sensitive zones such as forest reserves or protected areas. Councillor Merah advocated for continued stakeholder consultations throughout the project lifecycle to ensure transparency and local ownership.</p> <p>The Town Chief of Kathoma echoed this enthusiasm, describing the SAPZ as a project that would benefit not only his own community but the entire region. He confirmed the community's readiness to voluntarily provide land and expressed gratitude to the Government of Sierra Leone, the African Development Bank (AfDB), and the project consultants. He stressed the importance of open communication and reiterated the community's commitment to supporting project implementation.</p> <p>A community member, shared his appreciation and highlighted that the people of the area have long recognized their agricultural potential and have eagerly awaited an opportunity such as the SAPZ. He affirmed that they were willing to participate and noted the availability of both active farmland and secondary forest areas suitable for project activities.</p> <p>Another Town Chief, expressed his support for the project and offered blessings for its success. He welcomed the new boundary demarcation proposal and confirmed the community's willingness to cooperate fully with project requirements.</p> <p>An elderly contributor stated that the SAPZ would enhance local rice production and improve the socio-economic conditions of the community, especially for women and youth. He emphasized that the lands to be donated do not encroach on any sensitive environmental habitats and voiced the community's keen anticipation for project commencement.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Summary of Community Feedback and Expectations</b></p> <p><b>Community Observations and Conditions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dominant ethnic groups in the project locations (Kathoma, Mange, Mankara, Rothum) are the Temne and Loko.</li> <li>• All proposed SAPZ sites are outside protected areas or critical natural habitats and primarily consist of active farmlands and secondary forests.</li> <li>• Clear demarcation and mapping of the land parcels are requested to avoid future disputes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Livelihood Preferences and Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to rice farming, community members expressed interest in livelihood support through:</li> </ul>

- Livestock rearing (including poultry),
- Civil works employment,
- Community health facilities,
- Educational infrastructure (especially for the girl-child),
- Tools for local road maintenance, and
- Access to improved water supply (gravity-fed systems, deep wells).

**Community Expectations of Leadership:**

- Chiefs and local leaders are expected to mobilize the community, conduct sensitization, and enforce agreed terms related to land use.
- Formal agreements or Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) should be developed and upheld to ensure transparency and fairness.

**Women and Youth Priorities:**

- Greater understanding of the SAPZ Project's components and benefits.
- Access to transportation for rice and vegetables to markets.
- Reliable and timely access to seeds and fertilizers to avoid water pollution and improve yields.
- Alternative protein sources for nutrition.
- Interest in micro-finance opportunities to support agribusiness.
- Clarification on the benefits communities will receive in exchange for voluntarily donated land.

This feedback underscores a strong willingness to support the SAPZ Project, coupled with clear community expectations for transparency, inclusion, and tangible benefits. The project team is expected to integrate these views into its planning, land acquisition, and benefit-sharing frameworks.

**Table 1: Summary of Concerns, Comments and Views from Stakeholder Engagements in Selected Communities in Port Loko District**

Comments, Issues and Views	Required Action / Response	Expectations
No drying floor and shelter from the sun and rain	The project will construct drying floors and shelters to provide facilitate rice drying and provide shelter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provision of personal protective equipment (PPE) for machine operators, farmers, and during fertilizer</li> </ul>

	Poor land development of rice fields from previous intervention projects	The project aims to improve land development practices through comprehensive evaluations and insights from past interventions. It will focus on detailed, sustainable land development plans that involve community engagement, aligned with the goals of the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) and the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA). Additionally, strong monitoring and evaluation systems will be put in place to continuously assess progress and make necessary adjustments.	<p>application activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Incorporation of local expertise in the development of the irrigation system and other project-related infrastructure</li><li>● Project stakeholders are looking forward to environmental sustainability and technological innovation.</li><li>● There is an expectation among stakeholders for support in acquiring quality seedlings, maintaining agricultural practices, and accessing machinery.</li><li>● Stakeholders anticipate that the project will lead to market diversification.</li><li>● Stakeholders expect the initiative to contribute to foreign exchange savings.</li><li>● A crucial expectation is the creation of stable markets for local farmers, ensuring a reliable outlet for their produce.</li><li>● Stakeholders foresee the project as a catalyst for business growth and development within the community.</li><li>● Increased rice production and enhanced food security are anticipated by stakeholders.</li><li>● There is an expectation for improved access to land for women.</li></ul>
	Community members have expressed the need for a transparent and user-friendly process for submitting complaints and grievances.	Robust grievance redress mechanism (GRM) will be implemented to guarantee the prompt and equitable resolution of concerns.	
	Stakeholders voiced their concerns regarding wildlife incursions on rice farms, specifically highlighting the adverse impact of Grasscutters and cattle.	The project will introduce wildlife management strategies and protective measures outlined in the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) to effectively protect crops.	
	Commitment to fostering ongoing engagement and maintaining transparent communication channels.	The project management team will ensure ongoing stakeholder engagement and maintain transparent communication channels throughout the project, as outlined in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP).	
	Fears that the project might impact water quality, specifically due to pesticides and saltwater intrusion.	A robust environmental management plan will be established to address water quality concerns, as outlined in the ESMP.	
	The insufficient availability of pumping machines presents a significant challenge to meeting irrigation requirements.	The project will guarantee the supply of pumping machines to enhance irrigation efforts.	
Pictures			

Rothum



Kathoma



Mankara

