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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Take context as the starting point</td>
<td>Donors need to close the gap between planning and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do no harm</td>
<td>Donors should review the aid modalities of PIUs and salary top-ups to assess the best way for external support to strengthen capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Focus on state-building as the central objective</td>
<td>Donors need to reduce the complexity of their requirements, which in aggregate are a huge capacity drain on GoSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prioritise prevention</td>
<td>Remain committed to structural governance reforms, in particular to decentralisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sierra Leone priorities for OECD-DAC Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations - 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Align with local priorities in different ways in different contexts.</td>
<td>Donors need to ensure further alignment in order to devolve power to the GoSL and allow accountability to run to both donors and citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Agree on practical coordination mechanisms between international actors.</td>
<td>Make real progress in simplifying and harmonising donor support. More work needs to be done to co-ordinate aid modalities to support alignment and ownership under GoSL. There needs to be greater use of MDTFs, grants and SWAps to support GoSL in improving service delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Population 2005 5.6 million
2015 6.9 million
Urban Population 2005 40.7%
2015 48.2%
Population using improved sanitation 2004 - 39 %
Uncontrolled urban development in Freetown
Relevant fragile state issues

- Weak institutions are the central driver of state fragility.
- The key to understanding fragility is understanding where weaknesses exist in a state’s institutions.
- Frustrated expectations amongst a population previously accustomed to higher levels of service delivery.
- Natural resources, ethnic composition and a colonial heritage do not in themselves drive fragility. Rather, it is the political manipulation of these factors that can impact on state stability. This manipulation is more likely in states with weak institutions.

- Donors often channel large amounts of aid through CSOs, but are concerned about undermining weak states or even creating ‘parallel states’. The recognition that capable, accountable and responsive states are important for long term development goals means that support to civil society should be strategically designed to support this end goal.  
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## Current Institutional Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Responsible Institution</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage</td>
<td>Sewerage Team under the Water Supply Division under MoEP</td>
<td>Only 4km system. This is likely to be handed over to the Freetown Waste Management Company which will operate under Freetown City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation - Freetown</td>
<td>Currently Ministry of Health and Sanitation but will be returned Freetown City Council</td>
<td>Actual sludge collection is done by private contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation - elsewhere</td>
<td>Local Councils but with MoHS oversight</td>
<td>CLTS being promoted. Inadequate resources and plans to improve sanitation and increase coverage. NGOs are the main providers. Council funds are not ring-fenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene promotion</td>
<td>No responsibility allocated for public health promotion but Ministry of Health &amp; Sanitation is responsible for health studies</td>
<td>NGOs already a significant provider of health promotion and likely to increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predominant forms of sanitation in Freetown
Faecal sludge management operations

2 - 3 private operators of desludging vehicles

Sludge dumping at King Tom solid waste disposal site
Sewerage

4 km of sewerage partially serving the central business district
Freetown Sanitation Improvement Plan:
Integrated framework for sanitation improvements

- **Private domain**
  - Household sanitation
  - Reduction of diarrhoeal diseases
  - Faecal sludge management

- **Public services**
  - Hygiene promotion
  - Communal latrines
Promotion of improved household sanitation

Aim: Increase the quality of latrine design and construction to enable more hygienic conditions within the household environment to be achieved.

- A range of different latrine options in accordance with the homeowner demand.

- Development of supply chains - promote the supply of cheap and good quality latrine components.

- Technical assistance for homeowners and landlords.
Servicing of on-site sanitation

Aims:

- expanded pit and septic tank cleaning service and facilities for faecal sludge management.
- increased frequency and quality of emptying operations

Key elements

- Options for desludging pits in inaccessible areas
- Better equipment, protective clothing for workers
- Supply chains of spare parts for vehicles/equipment
- Provide local points for waste collection
- Support to private sector
- Proper treatment and disposal of collected faecal sludge.
- Support to FCC to develop regulatory instruments.
City-wide faecal sludge management operations
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Improved sanitation services to strengthen local government

- Often not possible to wait until conflict or ‘fragility’ has passed before addressing problems with basic service delivery.
- Quality of services is one of the strongest indicators of the effectiveness of local government to perform.
- Investments in improved service delivery are an important step towards bridging gaps and overcome tensions between a local government and its constituents.
- Investments in sanitation have strong potential to improve stability of society.
- Important that the State plays an important role in service delivery from as early as possible.
Key challenges in relation to fragile states

- No fixed responsibility or resources for sanitation
- Huge pressure from CSOs and communities for improvements in service delivery
- Institutional memory and expertise is being lost due to the loss of staff and a lack of documentation and data storage systems.
- Reasons for loss of staff often due to political interference but even includes murder of staff who were only doing their job on a pittance.
- Institutional memory also applied equally to INGOs.
- Most sanitation work being done by INGOs and CSOs in isolation from state institutions. We were acting as a bridge but were there too short a time to cement in place.