



# Project Information Document (PID)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 10-Nov-2022 | Report No: PIDA35144

**BASIC INFORMATION****A. Basic Project Data**

Country Western and Central Africa	Project ID P180211	Project Name Additional Financing to Sierra Leone Food Systems Resilience Program, Phase 2	Parent Project ID (if any) P178132
Parent Project Name West Africa Food System Resilience Program (FSRP) Phase 2	Region WESTERN AND CENTRAL AFRICA	Estimated Appraisal Date 14-Nov-2022	Estimated Board Date 15-Dec-2022
Practice Area (Lead) Agriculture and Food	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Republic of Chad, Republic of Ghana, Republic of Sierra Leone	Implementing Agency Ministry of Agricultural Development - Chad, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry - Sierra Leone, Ministry of Food and Agriculture - Ghana

## Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent

To increase preparedness against food insecurity and improve the resilience of food systems in participating countries.

## Components

Digital Advisory Services for Agriculture and Food Crisis Prevention and Management  
Sustainability and Adaptive Capacity of the Food System's Productive Base  
Regional Food Market Integration and Trade  
Contingent Emergency Response (CERC)  
Project Management

**PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)****SUMMARY**

<b>Total Project Cost</b>	50.00
<b>Total Financing</b>	50.00
<b>of which IBRD/IDA</b>	50.00
<b>Financing Gap</b>	0.00



## DETAILS

### World Bank Group Financing

International Development Association (IDA)	50.00
IDA Grant	50.00

Environmental and Social Risk Classification  
Substantial

## A. Introduction and Context

### Country Context

1. **Sierra Leone is one of the poorest countries in the world**, with a Human Development Index of 0.452 and ranked 182 out of 189 countries in 2019, and with Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita of only US\$509 in 2020. A high population growth rate (2.1 percent in 2020) results in annual per capita GDP growth averaging 2.2 percent. Following the COVID-19 outbreak in 2020, and the subsequent restrictions and disruption to the global supply chains, the economy contracted by 2 percent in 2020. The national poverty rate declined by 5.6 percentage points over the past decade but remains high at 56.8 percent.<sup>1</sup> Poverty is mostly rural (with a rural poverty incidence of 78.7 percent) and agricultural (the poorest households are those headed by people engaged in agriculture). More than 70 percent of the rural poor are women, most of whom are engaged in agriculture. Economic growth resumed in 2021 at an estimated rate of 3.1 percent.<sup>2</sup> The economy is highly vulnerable to domestic and external shocks due to its dependence on mining – which is sensitive to shifts in global demand and prices – and on agriculture – which is rain-fed and subject to erratic weather changes.

### Sectoral and Institutional Context

2. **Agriculture is the engine of economic growth and poverty alleviation in Sierra Leone, but agricultural productivity remains low.** The sector contributed about 60 percent to the country's GDP in 2020, 28 percent (9 percent without wood products) to total exports in 2018<sup>3</sup>, and employed 55 percent of the population in 2019<sup>4</sup>. The agricultural sector (including forestry and fisheries) contributes over 55 percent to GDP and provides employment for 75 percent of the population but is characterized by low and stagnating productivity in key crops, limited market-oriented diversification, major aggregation and coordination bottlenecks, a weak private sector, and a low-capacity public sector. Sierra Leone has tremendous diversity and growing potential for agriculture in

<sup>1</sup> World Bank. 2019. Poverty and Shared Prosperity in Sierra Leone, 2011-2018C

<sup>2</sup> World Bank. 2022. Data. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG?ep=0&locations=SL>

<sup>3</sup> World Bank. National Accounts Data

<sup>4</sup> World Bank. based on data from the International Labor Organization



its upland and lowland ecologies but has been unable to fully exploit this potential. Yields of rice, the main staple, in major producing areas average less than 1 metric tons (MT)/ha. Per capita rice consumption stands at 185 kg/year, 5th highest in the world. Domestic demand for rice exceeds domestic supply by over 400,000 MT/year, requiring imports valued at over \$200 million/year.<sup>5</sup>

3. **Climate change risks are significant and growing.** Over the past 40 years, the average annual temperature in Sierra Leone has risen by around 0.5°C<sup>6</sup>. It is expected to further increase by 1°C to more than 2.6°C by 2060 relative to current conditions<sup>7</sup>. By 2060, the annual number of hot days (T max > °C 35) is expected to increase by approximately 26 days in the countries' Northern and Eastern parts and by 7 days in the Southern parts of the country<sup>8</sup>. Being already highly prone to inundations today<sup>9</sup>, Sierra Leone is projected to experience increases in extreme rainfall events that may induce even more severe flooding and lead to increased streamflow rates<sup>10</sup>. Climatic changes are expected to make cropping calendars more unpredictable and to negatively affect crop production for key staple crops such as rice and cassava. In the absence of appropriate adaptation measures, possible increases in the incidence of flooding may put farmers' agricultural assets at heightened risk of destruction, especially in areas marked by high levels of deforestation and land degradation. The social impacts of climate change, especially on vulnerable, resource dependent households, exacerbates social-economic vulnerabilities given dependence on subsistence agriculture. As such, social climate impacts contribute to widening inequalities, social fragility, and conflicts over scarce resources.

4. **Food insecurity and malnutrition are worsening.** The Cadre Harmonisé results from March 2022 indicate that countrywide 1.23 million individuals (15 percent of Sierra Leone's population) are currently facing Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) 3+ crisis or emergency level food insecurity.<sup>11</sup> This number is up from approximately 600,000 people estimated to be in IPC3+ in June-August 2020.<sup>12</sup> Sierra Leone's IPC3+ population is expected to increase to 1.61 million (20 percent of the population) by September 2022 (a 30 percent increase from March 2022), with 26,400 people projected to be in IPC4 (a 57 percent increase).<sup>13</sup> The 2021 Sierra Leone Health and Nutrition Survey revealed deteriorating nutrition for vulnerable groups. Some 5.4 percent of children under five years of age are wasted due to acute undernutrition, and 29.5 percent are stunted due to chronic undernutrition. Consumption of fruits, vegetables, whole grains, nuts, and seeds are below recommended levels, with starchy staples continuing to loom large in diets. Micronutrient deficiencies are widespread. Anemia affects more than 50 percent of children, and 70 to 80 percent of women. Vitamin A deficiency affects one-third of all

<sup>5</sup> Graham, E. G., Tchale, H., & Ndiane, M. (2020). An Optimal Rice Policy for Sierra Leone : Balancing Consumer and Producer Welfare. Washington DC: World Bank Policy Research Working Paper; No. 9369.

<sup>6</sup> <https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/sierra-leone/climate-data-projections>

<sup>7</sup> Wadsworth, Richard, Amie Jalloh, and Aiah Lebbie. 2019. "Changes in Rainfall in Sierra Leone: 1981–2018" *Climate* 7, no. 12: 144. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cli7120144>

<sup>8</sup> <https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/sierra-leone/climate-data-projections> (Assuming the SSP 1-2.6 Scenario where global emissions are cut severely but fail to reach net zero before 2050)

<sup>9</sup> From 1980-2010, heavy precipitation-induced floods accounted for 90 percent of people affected by disaster in Sierra Leone (GoSL 2018. Third National Communication of Sierra Leone to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change)

<sup>10</sup> <https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/sierra-leone/vulnerability>

<sup>11</sup> <https://fews.net/sectors-topics/approach/integrated-phase-classification>. The use of the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) is a landmark in the fight against food insecurity. Widely accepted by the international community, IPC describes the severity of food emergencies. Based on common standards and language, this five-phase scale is intended to help governments and other humanitarian actors quickly understand a crisis (or potential crisis) and take action.

<sup>12</sup> Sahel and West Africa: Food and Nutrition Food Security Situation. [https://www.food-security.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/SNAPSHOT2019\\_WEST-AFRICA\\_EN.pdf](https://www.food-security.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/SNAPSHOT2019_WEST-AFRICA_EN.pdf). RPCA. 2020.

<sup>13</sup> Food and Nutrition Situation Sierra Leone. RPCA. <https://www.food-security.net/en/datas/sierra-leone-2/>



children.<sup>14</sup> The pervasiveness of micronutrient deficiencies reflects the lack of affordability of a healthy diet to the vast majority of Sierra Leoneans. As of 2020, a healthy diet<sup>15</sup> in Sierra Leone was unaffordable to 89% of the population which corresponds to 7.1 million people<sup>16</sup>. With the recent increases in food prices caused in large measure by the war in Ukraine, it is very likely that the share of Sierra Leone's population with access to healthy diets has seen further significant decreases in the meantime.

5. **On July 18, 2022, the CRW ERF Technical Expert Group on Food Security (TEGFS) confirmed that Sierra Leone meets the requirements for an eligible food security event under the Crisis Response Window Early Response Financing.** The TEGFS endorsed the following points: (i) the evidence provided in the Eligibility Note sufficiently supported the view that the country is or could be facing an acute food security crisis which may be worsening; (ii) the Eligibility Note sufficiently provided information about the readiness of the Bank's operations to respond to the crisis and fits very well with the WB Group's Country Strategy; (iii) conflict-related risks are considered minimal for the ERF support in the areas affected by food insecurity; and (iv) the information included in the Eligibility Note corroborates views provided by external experts, including Cadre Harmonisé, Statistics of Sierra Leone, WFP, and Food Crisis Prevention Network, among others.

## B. Proposed Development Objective(s)

### Original PDO

To increase preparedness against food insecurity and improve the resilience of food systems in participating countries.

### Current PDO

To increase preparedness against food insecurity and improve the resilience of food systems in participating countries.

### Key Results

1. **The AF will introduce one additional PDO-level indicator to capture new activities.** In addition, the targets of selected indicators have been amended to reflect the scaled-up activities. The proposed AF will also include additional intermediate results indicators. The following changes apply to the outcome indicators:

**Table 1: Changes to key PDO Level Targets**

Indicator	Original Target	Revised target
PDO-level (outcome) indicator		
Project beneficiaries (number and percentage of female beneficiaries)	365,200 (40% women)	465,200 (40% women)
Percentage of reduction of food insecure people in program targeted areas	25	NO CHANGE

<sup>14</sup> Diet and Nutrition Profile Sierra Leone. 2021 Sierra Leone Health and Nutrition Survey. WFP/UNICEF/FAO/Ministries of Health and Agriculture.

<sup>15</sup> The cost of a healthy diet is based on global average quantities of food groups recommended in national food-based dietary guidelines (FBDGs). See also [The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2022](#) Report (FAO et al. 2022).

<sup>16</sup> Food Prices for Nutrition DataHub: global statistics on the cost and affordability of healthy diets (worldbank.org)



Indicator	Original Target	Revised target
Food system actors accessing hydro and agrometeorological advisory services (number and percentage of female beneficiaries)	120,000 (40% women)	200,000 (40% women)
Producers adopting CSA technologies and services (number and percentage of female beneficiaries)	160,000 (40% women)	180,000 (40% women)
Land area under integrated landscape management practices (Hectare (ha))	3,000	6,000
Intra-regionally traded production in selected value chains (Percentage)	30	NO CHANGE
NEW INDICATOR: Number of people receiving emergency support from the project	N/A	165,000

## D. Project Description

2. The focus of the AF is twofold: (i) filling resource gaps in the emergency response to address the budget reallocation required to reallocate US\$25 million to Component 4 (CERC) under the original grant - US\$ 25 million from Component 2 (US\$5 million from sub-component 2.1 and US\$20 million from sub-component 2.2); and (ii) scaling-up investments to support improved production for the next harvest season.

3. New activities are proposed under the CERC. The changes described in the table below are included in the approved CERC Manual and will be further detailed in the Project Implementation Manual. All scaled-up and new activities will build directly on relevant methods and structures put in place under the FSRP-SL project. Implementation arrangements, responsible agencies, and partner institutions from the Project will be retained in full, led by the PIU within the Ministry of Agriculture.

4. The AF will scale-up activities within existing components of the parent project, specifically scale-up investments in productive activities under components 2 and 3. Under FSRP Phase II, the GoSL chose to invest in the three priority value chains rice, cassava, and livestock (for rational and specific intervention areas see FSRP Phase II PAD). In addition to these three value chains, the AF and the CERC financed intervention will support additional value chains with high agro-pastoral potential and potential for food insecurity reduction (in line with the provision in FSRP Phase II PAD that additional value chains can be supported given a strong rationale). These additional value chains chosen are vegetables, biofortified crops, aquaculture, poultry, and small ruminant that promote improved nutrition while expanding income-generating opportunities for targeted households and communities.

Component	AF Additional and Scaled-up Activities
<b>Component 2: Sustainability and adaptability of the productive base of the food system</b>	
<i>Subcomponent 2.1 Consolidate Regional Agricultural Innovation System</i>	-Upgrading the National Seed System -Modernizing National Extension Services
<i>Subcomponent 2.2: Strengthening Regional Food Security through ILM</i>	-Sub-Projects, Matching Grants and Technical Assistance for CSA and irrigation technologies
<b>Component 3: Regional Food Market Integration and Trade</b>	



<i>Sub-component 3.1: Facilitate Trade Across Key Corridors and Consolidate Food Reserve System</i>	-Upgrading of storage facilities
<b>Component 4: Contingent Emergency Response Component</b>	
<i>Sub-Component 4.1: Support to Implement Government's Quick Action Food Security Response Plan</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Cash transfers to provide food and nutrition assistance to vulnerable households</li> <li>- Provide cash for work to support local food production</li> <li>- Support school feeding to prevent the deterioration of nutrition status of Children</li> <li>- Finance procurement of agricultural planting materials and inputs</li> <li>- Promote the cultivation of high nutrient crops such as legumes</li> <li>-Grants to acquire assets for on-farm productivity</li> </ul>

#### Legal Operational Policies

	Triggered?
Projects on International Waterways OP 7.50	Yes
Projects in Disputed Areas OP 7.60	No

#### Summary of Assessment of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts

##### Environmental Risk Rating

The parent project and the AF environmental risk rating is Substantial. This classification considers the potential risks and impacts of proposed interventions, the nature of the program, and the environmental sensitivity of potential project areas. Potential environmental risks include soil degradation, surface and ground water contamination, waste generation (including domestic and hazardous), destruction of vegetation and habitats, pesticide poisoning, noise and dust production, vibration, animal attacks and other occupational and community health and safety issues etc. Some impacts will be limited and localized. However, the risks of surface water contamination which could arise from misuse of agrochemicals and leakages of petroleum and hazardous materials from construction related activities could be carried through downstream fringe communities. These risks will be mitigated through proper screening of subprojects once the sites are identified and preparation



and implementation of relevant environmental and social risks and impacts management instruments, as per the guidance under the ESMF.

### **Social Risk Rating**

The parent project and the AF social risk rating is Substantial. The rating considers the potential risks and impacts of proposed interventions both of the parent and AF, and client capacity to manage social risks under the ESF. The activities related to the AF is expected to have significant social benefit of improving access to food and strengthening agricultural production, particularly for food insecure districts and smallholders, and limited manageable adverse impacts. Key social risks stemming from all project activities of both the parent and AF include: economic and/or physical displacement which may arise from activities which will involve the construction/rehabilitation works and expansion of agricultural farms, lowland rehabilitation; construction of post-harvest, storage, and processing facilities, seed laboratory, including community stores and drying floors, etc. Other social risks include potential legacy issues related to rehabilitation of 2,500 ha of Inland Valley Swamps (IVS) and small-scale irrigation systems to support the cultivation of rice and vegetables, covering 1,000 ha of irrigable land, restoration of 500 ha of degraded catchment areas and planting of 25,000 economic trees. While these are expected to be government owned land, private ownership and encroachment could potentially happen. The project screening E&S screening and RPF requires the exclusion of sensitive sites and prepare RAPs as appropriated to mitigate the risk of land acquisition and displacement. There is also the risk of elite capture of project benefits, social exclusion and lack of access to agri-inputs, trainings, access to cash for work programs, extension and agricultural advisory services, hydromet and agromet information, early warning and disaster preparedness systems by vulnerable groups (i.e. women, persons with disabilities, communities in remote and hard to reach areas, etc.). Given the project's objective, in particular the AF to target extremely vulnerable villages and groups, enhancing social inclusion will be prioritized in sub-components ranging from targeting criteria, quotas, and removing barriers to facilitate participation. Additional risks the possibility of child and forced labor; community health and safety (including the spread of communicable diseases such as COVID-19 and STDs/STIs; SEA/SH risks due to labor influx and other project workers in project areas, as well as SEA/SH risks (including exploitation of children/youth) related to the AF's new activities, namely cash transfers, cash for work, and support to school feeding. Lastly, improved value chain may be accompanied with unhealthy competition leading to the crowding out of small farmers most of whom are women as big players may involve in price fixing to gain a larger share of the market. This will be addressed through the provision of incentives to ensure their improved production techniques and retention.

### **Sexual Exploitation and Abuse/Sexual Harassment (SEA/SH) Risk Rating**

The overall SEA/SH risk rating for the proposed AF is maintained as Substantial. All AF activities are consistent with the parent project interventions except, (i) provision of cash transfer, (ii) support to alternative income generation activities like poultry and aquaculture, and (iii) school feeding. These and other project-induced SEA/SH risks will be managed by ensuring implementation of the SEA/SH Prevention and Response Action Plan, with specific attention to reduce vulnerabilities to children and youth girls, boys and those with disabilities. The GBV expert who will be recruited within three months of Project Effective Date will monitor and implement SEA/SH activities such as: the development of codes of conduct, including prohibited behaviors and sanctions for violations of standards that explicitly



address sexual and gender-based violence and child abuse; consultations with women's groups in accessible and safe places separately from men; sensitization of contractors, workers and neighboring communities on the code of conduct, implementation of a sensitive GM to SEA/SH which includes multiple entry points; mapping of a referral pathway of GBV services providers (at least legal, medical and psychosocial services); and quality evaluation in the project implementation areas. Also, the allocation cost will be done to clearly identify what each project (parent project and additional funding) supports in terms of SEA/SH risk mitigation activities.

## **E. Implementation**

### **Institutional and Implementation Arrangements**

5. The institutional arrangements for the parent project are organized around the following functions: (i) oversight and orientation by a National Project Steering Committee (NPSC); (ii) overall coordination of project activities and partners, and management of the Designated Account and fiduciary responsibilities, by the MAF National Development Partner Programs Coordinating Office (NDPPCO); a PIU established within NDPPCO coordinates the day-to-day implementation of the project activities; and (iv) technical execution of project activities is vested with strategic government entities. The PIM details all coordination, management, implementation, M&E, and reporting functions.

## **CONTACT POINT**

### **World Bank**

Katie Kennedy Freeman  
Senior Agriculture Economist

Kadir Osman Gyasi  
Senior Agriculture Economist

### **Borrower/Client/Recipient**

Republic of Chad

Republic of Ghana



Republic of Sierra Leone

### Implementing Agencies

Ministry of Agricultural Development - Chad  
Abdelkhadir Altidjani KOIBORO  
Secrétaire Général du Ministère du Développement Agricole  
bordaba2021@yahoo.com

Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry - Sierra Leone  
Dr. Abu Bakarr Karim Karim  
Minister, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
abkarim@maf.gov.sl

Ministry of Food and Agriculture - Ghana  
Mr Patrick Robert Ankobia  
Chief Director MOFA  
rankobiah@gmail.com

### FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

The World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20433  
Telephone: (202) 473-1000  
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

### APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	Katie Kennedy Freeman Kadir Osman Gyasi
----------------------	--

### Approved By

Practice Manager/Manager:		
Country Director:	Boutheina Guermazi	10-Nov-2022

