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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPC</td>
<td>Area Policing Partnership Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASJP</td>
<td>Access to Security and Justice Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSP</td>
<td>Commonwealth Community Safety Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>Criminal Investigation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRD</td>
<td>Community Relations Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>Community Relations Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>Corporate Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSV</td>
<td>Community Safety Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMB</td>
<td>Executive Management Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGP</td>
<td>Inspector-General of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSDP</td>
<td>Justice Sector Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSRS-IP</td>
<td>Justice Sector Reform Strategy and Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCU</td>
<td>Local Command Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPPB</td>
<td>Local Policing Partnership Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUC</td>
<td>Local Unit Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>National Electoral Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>Public Relations Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP</td>
<td>Sierra Leone Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSD</td>
<td>Operational Support division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

1. This report analyses how community policing is organized in 17 of Sierra Leone’s 33 police divisions by looking at the role and responsibilities of Local Policing Partnership Boards (LPPBs) in:
   a. Establishing linkages between local communities and the Sierra Leone Police (SLP);
   b. Enforcing local security; and
   c. Setting priorities of the SLP.

2. ASJP recognizes that LPPBs have a history in Sierra Leone, dating back to 2002 when the first pilot project was implemented in Congo Cross division. ASJP recognizes that the leaders of the SLP and of the local communities themselves have been supportive of the principles and practice of community policing in Sierra Leone. In addition, international programmes such as the DFID-funded Commonwealth Community Safety and Security Project (CCSSP) and the Justice Sector Development Programme (JSDP) as well as partners such as the United Nations (UN) have provided continuous support in the area.

3. It is for these reasons that there are many good things to say about LPPBs:
   a. They democratize security. First of all, they include the citizenry in defining and acting on local security concerns. Second, they have engendered a shift of focus from police collaboration with ‘local authorities’ to collaboration with ‘communities’, meaning that policing at the local level is not restricted to collaboration between the SLP and traditional leaders, but involves a cross-section of society, including women’s representatives, bike riders, teachers, small traders, businesspeople, farmers, etc. (Paramount Chiefs cannot sit as members of the LPPB’s executive).
   b. They are a nationally and locally driven initiative. While LPPBs incorporate international best practices, they were first and foremost initiated and supported by the SLP. Voluntary in nature, they function without much (if any) outside financial support, and have proven to be sustainable, because the SLP and community members alike consider them important for local safety and security.
   c. They support a police force that is logistically challenged, provide information and report crimes to the police, mediate minor disputes within the communities and between the community and the police.
   d. While members are interest-driven, LPPBs are not political (at least not openly). Without exception, LPPBs in the various police divisions that we visited noted that members who were openly politically active were excluded from being a member of the LPPB.

However, the LPPBs and community policing more broadly continue to face challenges. For one thing, it is not possible to say precisely how many and which types of cases the LPPBs intervene/mediate in, because the LPPBs do not keep records (either locally or nationally). This leads to the first recommendation of the report:
4. **Community Relations Department (CRD):** The SLP needs to clarify the roles and responsibilities of their Community Relations Officers (CRO) and the CRD as a whole at the Local Command Unit (LCU) level. In addition, a formal reporting channel needs to be established between the LPPBs and the police. Currently, it is not evident from the 2011 LPPB Constitution who LPPB members report to. As a consequence the research team encountered a varied picture in the police divisions with respect to police-LPPB relations. In Congo Cross, for instance, the CRD was established as part of the first community policing pilot immediately after the war in 2002 and is considered the first point of contact to the LPPB Chairman. Similarly, a strong CRO is in place in Kissy division. In Waterloo, the Media Relations Officer has the role of CRO added to his portfolio, without clear direction on what this entails. In other divisions up-country we were told that CROs had recently been appointed and that they were currently undergoing trained. In others, they did not have any. Gaining clarity and consistency about the role of CROs across Sierra Leone’s divisions will provide LPPBs with a clearly identified point of contact and ensure that one officer/department is tasked to engage with the LPPBs and record activities. This will also ensure that a degree of institutional memory with respect to community policing is ensure at the level of the police division. There is a need to develop clear job descriptions for the Community Relations Officer as a focal point of community policing.

5. **2011 LPPB Constitution:** The Constitution is the single most important written guidance available to the LPPBs. It provides an overview of the formal membership of the LPPB, including ‘functions of board officials’ and a list of the LPPB’s primary tasks. However, LPPBs will benefit from clarifying and aligning the Constitution with realities on the ground. This means adjusting the list of ‘board officials’ by adding youth and women’s representatives; clarifying how LPPBs may input at the national level; and outlining the geographical representation of LPPBs as well as their structure and status outside the divisional headquarter town and below the LPPB executive (in the divisions of Kenema, Tankoro and Kabala, for instance, all executive members were elected from within the main area of the town). More importantly, what the Constitution does not provide is a step-by-step explanation and guidance on how to carry out the many tasks that are expected of the LPPB. It is therefore suggested that the CRD and the Corporate Services Department analyze and propose clarifications of the LPPB Constitution while at the same time put a process in place to develop a ‘LPPB Handbook’ to guide the SLP and LPPB members.

6. **Civil and criminal cases:** Without exception, LPPB members noted that serious cases such as wounding (with intent), theft and sexual abuse would be referred directly to the SLP. However, a grey area persists in this regard, in particular with respect to domestic violence. Like a number of other actors such as chiefs and even the police, the LPPBs carry out informal conflict resolution. Most LPPB members would deal with fraudulent conversion, common assault, and matters between husband and wife. Precisely what these cases entail, whether violence and theft are involved and so forth, means that discussion/debate and even training for LPPB members and constituents on what criminal and civil cases entails is vital. Clarity for LPPB members on what constitutes criminal and civil cases is required. Related, discussion/debate/training on what informal resolution entails, how and in what cases it should be carried out is recommended.
7. **Training for sustainability**: On the basis of conversations with LPPB members, numerous ideas for trainings could be considered, which would involve CRD, Local Unit Commanders (LUCs) and LPPB members together. SLP-LPPB strategic planning, interrogation techniques, report writing and communication skills were mentioned as significant, and while some LPPB members have these skills others do not. Equally important, thought must be given to how to generate income to sustain and develop the LPPBs, possibly through small-scale farming/business projects. *It is recommended that ASJP and SLP sit down and agree on a training strategy around community policing and LPPB sustainability at regional and/or divisional level.*
1 Introduction¹

Guided by Sierra Leone Police’s (SLP) community-orientated concept of Local Needs Policing and led by volunteers, Local Policing Partnership Boards (LPPBs) have been established across Sierra Leone over the past decade. While Local Needs Policing is the ethos of the entire police force, LPPBs and their continued development are the responsibility of the Community Relations Department (CRD).

The primary role of LPPBs is to ensure provision of security and safety at the community level, that is, the towns, villages and neighborhoods across Sierra Leone’s rural and urban areas. They have been established to enable local communities to have a say and be involved in finding solutions to local problems relating to safety and security. They function as a de facto interface between the SLP and the local community, enabling the resolution of minor offenses. They facilitate and ensure that criminal offenses such as murder and cases of rape are reported to the police. Finally, they provide information to the police on ‘hotspots’, thereby influencing where local police patrols are deployed.

Anecdotal knowledge on and localized studies of how LPPBs operate as providers and enablers of safety and security are available (Albrecht 2010, 2012; Horn et al. 2011). That the LPPBs contribute to local stability is unquestionable, and some of the findings of this work will be presented below. At the same time, however, suspicion is often raised about the neutrality of the partnership boards. It is questioned which accountability mechanisms are in place to ensure that the LPPBs are not exploited by the police or used by its members to pursue private interests.

It has been argued, for instance, that the LPPBs are mechanisms for intelligence gathering for the police, which is partly the case. Indeed, the SLP sees the LPPBs as integral to their ambition of being intelligence-led (rather than being reactive). The suspicion – and critique – is also partly valid because the LPPBs are not interest free security actors at the local level. It may even be argued that it is because of the private interest of individual citizens that LPPBs are functioning in the first place.

As any governance institution, the LPPBs have not been established in isolation from the political, social and historical context in which they operate. They are shaped by it. They are part and parcel of it. This often means that the primary allegiance of the LPPBs outside the main District headquarters towns is with traditional leaders rather than the police. In addition, personal incentives – accessing political power, generating an income, securing a business – are often primary motivational factors of becoming involved in the work of the LPPBs.

ASJP should develop ways to work with the LPPBs from this point of departure rather than assume that ‘complete neutrality’ is even a possibility. It is not. How and by whom security and justice are provided is not a purely technical matter, but has political implications that relate to how resources and power are distributed. This is particularly the case in Sierra Leone.

While a general understanding of how partnership boards operate is available, concrete and systematic analysis of how LPPBs in Sierra Leone’s 33 police division is lacking. According to the head of the Community Relations Department (CRD), the home of the LPPBs within the SLP, this is a general issue within the police

¹ Thanks to Iben Villumsen at the Danish Institute for International Studies for comments and analytical input on earlier drafts of this report.
organization as a whole. On this background, this report explores the following five areas of research in 17 of Sierra Leone’s 33 police divisions.

1. How are the LPPBs organized?
2. What is the social profile of key members in the LPPBs (specifically focusing on how or whether private interests interfere with the public nature of the LPPBs)?
3. How are the LPPBs run/financed and what are the options for making the LPPBs sustainable in the future (outside the SLP budget)?
4. How are incidents reported to/by the LPPBs and what are the reporting channels of the LPPBs (from when an incident that warrants police involvement occurs to when and how it is reported to the SLP and beyond)?
5. What kinds of cases do the individual LPPBs take up?

In a collaborative effort between ASJP and the SLP, CRD and Corporate Services Department (CSD) specifically, the aim of this research has been to gain in-depth insight on these five key areas. In turn, this will inform how programming to engage and reform the LPPBs will be developed.

The report is broadly divided into two sections. The first section outlines the general history of police reform in Sierra Leone from the late 1990s and onwards. The second section presents findings from the field research carried out by the ASJP and SLP (CSD) during the second half of 2012 and early 2013.

1.1 Methodology

The research is qualitative in approach. Together with the CRD and CSD, police divisions have been selected along the following parameters:

1. Regional differences/representation.
2. Tribal identity.
3. Political affiliation.
4. Rural and urban areas.

On the basis of these parameters, field visits were conducted across the country’s four Regions and in the Western Area. The following 17 police divisions out of 33 were visited:

- Bo East division
- Bo West division
- Makeni division
- Kailahun division
- Daru division
- Kenema division (x2)
- Tankoro division
- Motema division
- Waterloo division (x2)
- Adonkia division (x2)
- Congo Cross division (x2)
- Kissy division
Special attention has been paid to female participation in the LPPBs, both with respect to members of the LPPBs, the cases that the LPPBs deal with, and the degree to which women members represent women’s interests.  

Being qualitative in approach means that data has been gathered primarily through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with the SLP, LPPB members and users of the LPPBs. Focus group discussions were primarily carried out with partnership board members themselves.

Users of the LPPBs have been accessed through LPPB members and by analyzing cases that have been recorded at the level of Local Command Units (LCU). This means that the end-users, i.e., those who are ultimately to benefit from the LPPBs, are not accessed independently from the police hierarchy. The main complication in this approach to selecting interviewees among end-users is that LPPB members will point to cases that they consider themselves to have been successful in resolving. This will be remedied, if not fully resolved in three ways:

- The selection of interviewees through conversations with LPPB members was, where possible and available, cross-checked with police records of cases that have been resolved by the LPPB.
- An explicit request was made to speak to both parties to a criminal act in which one or more LPPB members were involved.
- By recognizing the political context in which LPPB members operate, it was also as point of departure recognized that private interests play a significant role in executing the role of partnership board member.

---

2 ASJP is of the impression that there is renewed interest in gender mainstreaming and training within the SLP relating to equality, anti-discriminatory practices and harassment, etc. As ‘police mandated’ bodies, support to the LPPBs should take these general developments within the SLP into account. In connection to this, ASJP takes note of and works alongside the SLP Self-Assessment Survey on Gender Responsiveness that was produced in May-October 2011 and the plan for training on gender that is currently being drafted in the SLP’s training department.
2 History of Police Reform

2.1 The Context

In 2013, reforming Sierra Leone’s justice sector has spanned close to 15 years, going through phases of stabilization, peacebuilding and long-term development. The structure of this section follows the three phases that justice and security reform has broadly consisted of in Sierra Leone. Focus will be on police reform as it has generally evolved, and specifically the position of Local Needs Policing, community policing and LPPBs as part of this process.

The Commonwealth Community Safety and Security Project (CCSSP) began implementation in the midst of war during the late 1990s and continued until 2005. It included community policing, initially only in Freetown. In parallel to the CCSSP with its exclusive focus on the police, the Law Reform Programme worked on the state-sanctioned court system. From the outset, a separation was established at the level of policy and programming between access to legal mechanisms (judiciary) and provision of security (policing).

This lack of coordination between programs in support of establishing the justice sector was addressed with the initiation of the Justice Sector Development Programme (JSDP) in 2005. While a Primary Justice Sector Coordinator was now appointed, it was Freetown-based providers that continued to receive the most attention and funding. Moyamba district was the notable exception as the pilot outside Freetown and the Western Area.

The third phase of internationally supported justice sector reform is the Access to Security and Justice Programme (ASJP), the design of which began in 2010. As the third cycle of reform, it has been designed to split its efforts between District level and central government institutions, with a heavy emphasis on the former. While CCSSP and JSDP to a greater or lesser extent assumed a trickle-down effect from Freetown to local communities in the provinces, ASJP will have a permanent presence in four districts outside Freetown, including Western Rural (Waterloo division), Kenema (Kenema division), Koinadugu (Kabala division and Mongo division) and Moyamba (Moyamba division).


The initial years of police reform in Sierra Leone took place during the latter stages of Sierra Leone’s brutal conflict that began in 1991 and ended in 2002. Police reform was primarily supported by the UK-funded CCSSP. How re-organization of justice and security in Sierra Leone was envisioned and pursued cannot be analyzed separately from how investments were channeled by the CCSSP into equipment, infrastructure, logistics and human capacity to rebuild the SLP.

The CCSSP constituted the ‘heyday’ of police reform in Sierra Leone. From 2000 to mid-2005, investments of approximately £27 million were made with the sole purpose of establishing a state-centered police organization that could enforce ‘internal security’ and replace the chaos of war and military coups with the rule of law. Central to the CCSSP was the purchase of new vehicles, uniforms and radios procured by the UK, which became an essential component of the post-war state-building effort.
Programmatically, what took precedence was to enable the SLP to establish law and order through “visible policing,” which implied getting the police back out on the streets, in marketplaces, and on the roads (Albrecht 2012:168; Scheye 2013). Given the extent to which the Sierra Leone state had failed in the late 1990s, indeed, war was ongoing, police advisers believed that they were working from a clean slate. It was also commonly assumed that if the state did not fill the ‘power vacuum’ created by war, criminal groups and warring factions would (Jackson and Albrecht 2011:52-53). Adrian Horn, who managed the CCSSP, believed that “a complete re-structuring of the police service in Sierra Leone” was necessary (Horn quoted in Albrecht and Jackson 2009:32). “I had the luxury of free thinking”, Horn recalls, “my previous involvement in developing change were usually constrained by systems and procedures, which only allowed tinkering and not ‘blue sky’ thinking. This was different” (notes, Adrian Horn, 2008).

Apart from the work of the CCSSP, Keith Biddle, a retired UK police officer, was appointed by the President at the time, Ahmad Tejan Kabbah, to become Inspector-General of Police (IGP) in 1999 (Albrecht and Jackson 2009:33). This was a remarkable move. Not since W. G. Syer headed the police force during the final years of colonial rule and handed over command to L. W. Leigh in 1963, had a non-Sierra Leonean been the executive head of the SLP (Krogstad 2012:131-136). As it were, 40 years later in 2003, a UK police officer would again hand over executive powers over the police to a Sierra Leonean.

Generally speaking, the initial phase of police reform was characterized by the notion that building a strong police force from the center (Freetown) and out (provinces) would automatically allow the police to monopolize the provision of security. This was in a very clear-cut way state-building by police reform.

### 2.2.1 Police Charter and ‘A Force for Good’

Before the CCSSP and Biddle’s appointment as IGP, Horn and Biddle had come to Sierra Leone in 1997 to initiate project appraisal activities (Albrecht and Jackson 2009:29). Together, they wrote the new policing charter that was delivered to and signed off by Kabbah. “I did the first draft”, Biddle explained. It was subsequently circulated amongst senior SLP officers and then refined. “That police charter was presented to Kabbah by Adrian and myself”, and made publicly available in August 1998. The new slogan of the SLP became ‘A Force for Good’. “Kabbah took up this and I christened the police in charge as a ‘force for good’ and he used that. That was the basis that we then gave to everybody and said: ‘that is the type of police force you’ve got to create’” (Biddle quoted on Albrecht 2012:172).

### 2.2.2 Local Needs Policing

In line with the re-birth of the SLP as a ‘force for good’, its new doctrine was conceptualized as Local Needs Policing (LNP). Related to notions of community policing, it was defined as: “Policing that meets the expectations and needs of the local community and reflects national standards and objectives” (Adrian Horn quoted in Albrecht and Jackson 2009:32). While what was meant by ‘community’ was not
clearly defined – an issue that will come under continued scrutiny in this report – LNP became the basis of future police developments across the entire force.

2.2.3 Policing During Open Conflict and in its Immediate Aftermath

The first years of police reform began during open conflict. Therefore, before 2002, reform efforts took place predominantly in Freetown and emphasized strategic issues, in part because of a genuine need to do so and in part because it was not possible to move outside the capital. In particular, emphasis was placed on building capacity among the senior personnel levels of the SLP, including training at the Police College in Bramshill in the UK. The emphasis on Freetown at the time was also precipitated by the severity of the security situation in the capital, particularly the high number of internally-displaced people occupying any large building available, including former railway train sheds and derelict factory buildings in the east end of the Freetown.

After the war ended, it became possible to move SLP operations outside Freetown and move from a theoretical, strategic approach to a more practical one. It was during this period that deployment across the country began, which would not have been possible without the UK’s massive investment in a vehicle fleet and nationwide communication systems (Albrecht and Jackson 2009:86-97; CCSSP 2000, December 2000).

By 2004, one assessment noted, “the SLP has improved its responsiveness and its visibility. A major factor in achieving this situation has the communications, vehicles and infrastructure support provided through the CSSP (sic)” (CSSP 2004).

2.3 Justice Sector Development Programme (JSDP), 2005-2012 – The Holistic Approach

In 2005, the CCSSP was taken over by another program cycle with different priorities. Biddle left the post of IGP (and Sierra Leone) in 2003, and a Sierra Leonean, Brima Acha Kamara, had been appointed to the position of IGP (Albrecht and Jackson 2009:91-92). The Justice Sector Development Program (JSDP) that replaced the CCSSP reflected a turn to what was referred to in international policy discourse as a more ‘holistic’ approach to reforms.

Rather than targeting one organization within, such as the SLP, and addressing its effectiveness as an enforcing agency, the justice and security sector was to be worked upon as a whole. As such, the JSDP constituted a fundamental break with previous efforts, in the sense that traditional leaders as well as bureaucratic oversight were now factored into reforms. While initiating community policing, the CCSSP had not methodically engaged local actors in the process. They made a clear dividing line between what they considered state and what they considered non-state, with the latter being more or less irrelevant to the reforms that they supported.

The ‘holistic’ approach of the JSDP meant that the primary focus now was spread across the ‘security system’, something that the CCSSP in its very design had worked

---

3 Biddle was replaced in June 2003. An IGP succession plan had been in the making since early 2001. The President and the Police Council, together with the Minister of Internal Affairs, approved the final plan (the IGP is appointed by the President on the advice of the Police Council, with approval of Parliament) (Albrecht and Jackson 2009:91).
against by focusing exclusively on the SLP (Albrecht 2010:69). Investments of approximately £27 million had been made in the police force (9,500 officers). In the next phase, approximately £25 million were to be distributed among the actors considered to make up the justice and security sector as a whole, encompassing the judiciary, prison, Ministry of Internal Affairs, and so forth. Only £3-4 million was to be spent on the police (Albrecht 2010:69-70).

With the demise of the CCSSP and the onset of the JSDP, the SLP had lost Biddle as a clearly identifiable and decisive international leader. However, the SLP continued to be financially dependent on contributions from international donors. As one key adviser to the JSDP noted, this was somewhat of a double blow to the SLP: “Withdrawal of international funding inevitably leads to short-term paralysis and degradation of service with a real danger of attrition to the status quo ante” (Howlett-Bolton 2008:8).

2.3.1 The Holistic Approach

Under the holistic approach, priority reform areas were expanded beyond any one organization. Areas to be reformed included out-of-date and inaccessible laws and procedures such as the indexing of customary law, prisons overcrowding, delays in courts, absence of juvenile justice provision and the lack of support mechanisms to meet the “needs of the poor, vulnerable and marginalized to access justice and the lack of connection between community needs and police operations” (Bredemear et al. 2007:9-10).

The focus on the SLP as an institution was eclipsed by DFID’s emerging reluctance to support programming considered too orientated towards security and ‘the state’ rather than ‘the people’ and to be dominating issues relating to the broader justice sector, the judiciary in particular. JSDP thus marked DFID’s return to its perceived ‘core business’: bettering conditions for the poor (Bredemear et al. 2007:9-10). This shift was supported consistently by the JSDP in both Freetown and Moyamba District, which became the ‘pilot district’ outside the Western Area in which concentrated reform efforts took place.4

The JSDP placed a heavy emphasis on what can best be described as governance-related activities, i.e., the organization and inter-linking of state and community-based institutions. This was the practical recognition of the link between development, quality of governance and security, which gained prominence up through the 2000s.

A Justice Sector Reform Strategy and Investment Plan for 2008-2010 (JSRSIP), launched in February 2008, was regarded by the donor community in particular as an

4 Moyamba District was chosen as the district outside Freetown in which the JSDP would ‘pilot’ its holistic approach. Practically, it was chosen because it had a number of statutory justice institutions, including a prison, four police stations and five police posts, encompassing 14 chiefdoms and a population of 260,000 people. The District was also chosen because of its easy accessibility to Freetown. The original JSDP program document suggested that the JSDP would branch off into other Districts. This, however, did not occur, which in all probability was due to the overwhelming ambition of encompassing the justice and security field in its entirety. By 2009, a review referred to Moyamba in the context of JSDP as “a district test-bed for new projects and ideas” (Biesheuvel et al. 2009). The general focus of the JSDP in Moyamba has been on community access to courts and, more generally, institutions such as Partnership Boards. A so-called ‘circuit court,’ holding sessions across Moyamba, was established in an attempt to overcome the inaccessibility of many parts of the district (Bredemear et al. 2007).
DEMOCRATIZING SECURITY – Local Policing Partnership Boards in Sierra Leone

Access to Security and Justice Programme (ASJP)

important contribution to Freetown-based reform efforts across the justice sector. A donor supported and Government of Sierra Leone led Justice Sector Co-ordination Office was established in July 2007 (and continues to have a central role in coordinating the justice sector in 2013). It is located next to the Attorney General and Solicitor General’s offices within the Ministry of Justice and played a pivotal role in producing JSRSIP, and particularly JSRSIPII. Moreover, it has had a central role in establishing an inter-linked and coordinated justice sector (Bredemear and Lewis 2008; Biesheuvel et al. 2009).

Finally, JSDP started implementation outside the Western Area in a way that was hardly possible under the CCSSP, given the context of war in which implementation began. JSDP also engaged local level actors such as traditional leaders to a much greater degree than was ever the case during the life of the CCSSP (this had more to do with programme design than what was possible). For instance, this is indicated by an important training initiative undertaken by the JSDP in 2009 with respect to the LPPBs, where Chairmen, Secretary-Generals, women’s representatives, CRD officers and LUCs from across the country were given several weeks of training at the Police Training School in Hastings.

2.4 Access to Security and Justice Programme (ASJP), 2012-2016 – The Service Delivery Approach

The end of JSDP became evident during 2010 when DFID in Sierra Leone proposed a ‘new intervention’, initially referred to as Improved Access to Security and Justice (IAJSP), later renamed Access to Security and Justice Programme (ASJP). ASJP began implementation in 2012, and is scheduled to run until 2015. As such, the third phase of reforms is under way and implementation has begun in earnest during 2013. Unlike CCSSP and JSDP, the focus of ASJP is predominantly in the districts outside Freetown, and by extension therefore also takes the local level into greater account. In brief, this has meant striking the balance between the needs and demands for improved justice and security by individuals and their communities with supply of an accountable service delivery approach.

2.5 Community Policing in Sierra Leone

2.5.1 Policing by Consensus

Brima Acha Kamara, who replaced Biddle as IGP in 2003, described the police’s scope to enforce order in the late 1990s as ‘policing by consensus’: “There were other forces, warring factions, RUF combatants, CDF, competition about who should really be in charge of internal security. We were not able to flex our muscle, and we were ultimately doing policing by consensus” (interview, Brima Acha Kamara, 2009; italics added). Kamara was describing policing in the immediate aftermath of war. In his assertion, however, also lay the rationale of policing in the years to come, and inadvertently the basis of the role that the LPPBs would play in peacetime.

2.5.2 Popular Inclusion

LPPBs were established in each police division from 2002-2003 by Brima Acha
Kamara and onwards. They were set up in Sierra Leone to ensure stakeholder participation in the process of policing, signifying a clearly perceived need within the police to rebuild relations with local communities. It is a role that they have held up until today.

In the words of the 2010-11 Strategic Plan of the SLP, LPPBs are “an initiative to engage communities to fight crime and the fear of crime in cooperation with the police… The LPPB forms part of the community policing strategy aimed at involving non-police stakeholders in security and crime prevention” (SLP 2009:ii). LPPBs are thus seen as a bridge between the police and communities across the country. In this regard, they are expected to “investigate and resolve conflict between members of the community”, and “increase the level of interaction between the police and the local communities” (LPPB Constitution 2011:3). This point is reiterated in the 2012-14 Strategic Plan: While much has been done, there is “increasing need for the involvement of citizens in policing through LPPB” (SLP 2011:10). Unpacking what ‘the involvement of citizens’ implies is put under scrutiny in the remainder of the report. Suffice to note here, however, it has different meanings, including:

1. **Involving** the citizenry in providing their own security;
2. **Influencing** local deployments of police officers; and
3. **Informing** the police of crimes and general community developments that require police involvement.

### 2.5.3 Inclusion by Necessity

While the SLP commonly use a language of inclusion to explain the rationale of the LPPBs, they were also a pragmatic response to the understanding that the “numerical strength of the Sierra Leone Police (SLP) in coverage is smaller compared to the fast growing population for the entire nation” (i.e., a continuance of ‘policing by consensus’). The quoted statement is taken from the *Proposed Guidelines and Codes of Conduct for Operations of the Local Policing Partnership Boards of Sierra Leone* (SLP 2005). These guidelines – a precursor to the 2011 LPPB Constitution – were never formalized by the executive of the police. However, they express the common perception that LPPBs could compensate for the lack of resources within the SLP.

As a “community based structure” and a “non-partisan, inter-religious, social integration and development group” the LPPBs were established to “create a peaceful and healthy police/community co-existence at all levels, with the ultimate goal to fight and reduce crime to an appreciable level and contribute to the socio-economic and political development of Sierra Leone” (SLP 2005).

Mustapha Kambeh was involved in developing the Partnership Board concept when he was posted at police headquarters in Freetown in the mid-2000s. He recognized their importance and had worked hard to set them up in the seven chiefdoms that Motema division in Eastern Kono cover. LPPBs, he said, are:

> Critical in assisting the police to curb and mediate in conflicts within the areas of the police division. The Partnership Board members know that they have the role because they’re part and parcel of the community and they are listened to, and will understand the situation very well. So that is helping us, the SLP, police our area. So what the LPPBs are now doing is helping us to do early
warning, they are an early response mechanism to conflict, given the economic situation in the country. The resources are inadequate if you allow conflict to erupt and grow within your areas of responsibility. The sooner we observe that conflict is about to erupt, we are able to move quickly to curb it in a timely way; the LPPB assists us in resource use (Mustapha Kambeh quoted in Albrecht 2012:185-186).

In December 2012, the LUC in Mongo division – a particularly challenging area in terms of road and communication infrastructure – noted that prior to the establishment of LPPBs, policing had been “difficult”. Paramount Chiefs would interfere in crimes beyond their mandate such as murder, unlawful possession of weapons, and so forth. The team was not able to verify the correlation between the establishment of LPPBs, however, and the role of traditional leaders in enforcing local security. It was evident that LPPBs provided what was considered necessary support to an overstretched police force.

2.5.4 Evidence of Their Effectiveness?

The general focus of the JSDP in Moyamba was on community access to courts and, more generally, the police institutions such as LPPBs, which interface with the population. In 2009-2010, the only two police divisions where the LPPBs existed in all chiefdoms were in Motema (western Kono) and Kailahun (District-wide). However, the JSDP revived the LPPBs in Moyamba, and at chiefdom level they amounted to what appeared to the external observer as a ‘House Watch’ scheme, which is part of community policing and the overall LPPB organization. A decrease in some crimes, including larceny (63%, 297/109) and housebreaking (67%, 22/7) was reported in 2006 compared to 2005.

Supposedly, an assessment notes, the “pilot neighborhood watch scheme set up by the youths is working well and is helping in the reduction of crime” (JSDP OPR, April 2007). It should be kept in mind that the involvement of youth groups in providing security is not new in Sierra Leone, and is never done in isolation from local authorities (as such, they are not vigilante groups per se). This has been a common method to ensure community security in places where the SLP has not been present. Given the limited reach of the police in Sierra Leone’s rural areas, and the fact that the police is often overwhelmed in densely populated areas of Freetown, a degree of vigilantism has always characterized local security provision.

The report now turns to a detailed presentation of data on the LPPBs that was collected during fieldwork in Sierra Leone in the second half of 2012 and early 2013. Insight is provided on how LPPBs operate across Sierra Leone’s police divisions, including how they are organized, the cases they take up, what they have meant to how local security is provided, and the ability of the SLP to manage/guide their activities and further development.
3 Local Policing Partnership Boards

LPPBs have been engaged in all three cycles of security and justice programming (CCSSP, JSFP and now ASJP) for the past 15 years. However, the establishment of community policing in the country has been characterized by remarkably limited formal national policies and guidelines, not to mention legislation.

As noted above, a set of guidelines were produced and circulated informally in 2005 (i.e., not agreed and signed off on by the police leadership). In 2011, *The Sierra Leone Police Local Policing Partnership Board Constitution* was agreed by the SLP’s Executive Management Board (EMB), and has since provided the most important piece of written guidance to set up and run the LPPBs.

However, even if formal written guidance has been limited – and non-existent until 2011 – LPPBs have been established across practically all of Sierra Leone’s police divisions, mostly in urban settings, but also in rural areas. They have come to play an important role in providing local security, in raising community concerns and in liaising with the police on behalf of community members. This relative success does not stem from their formal status in legislation or from (international) funding, but from their organization around already existing local structures of authority. It is the argument of this report that the LPPBs have the potential to change how security is provided at the local level in Sierra Leone by building on and transforming already existing structures of authority.

As such, LPPBs have to a degree supported the democratization of how local security is provided. Chiefs are not in a position to simply bypass the opinion and voice of LPPB members that come from a range of backgrounds. As such, LPPBs constitute the potential for a positive rupture in local power structures. Women’s representatives, bike riders, teachers, small traders, businesspeople, farmers, and so forth, now have the chance to play a central role in defining local security needs and provision. Chiefs are involved in the selection/election of LPPB members, and we return to this point below, but they do not fully dictate the LPPB.

The remainder of the report provides insight into how Sierra Leone’s Local Policing Partnership Boards work. It concludes by suggesting a number of activities that the ASJP could undertake to further strengthen and improve the work of the LPPBs.

3.1 Lack of Clarity on the Exact Role of the LPPBs

3.1.1 Recordkeeping

The number and type of cases that LPPBs deal with are unclear. Recordkeeping by the SLP and LPPBs alike is limited and inconsistent in headquarters of the divisions, both in the Western Area and in the provinces (a notable exception in this regard was Kissy division due to the commitment of the Community Relations Officer, a university graduate). In police posts visited by the team outside Freetown, records were commonly non-existent.

The primary reason for this is not that the SLP lacks a consistent and regular recording system for the cases that they deal with; the SLP consistently keeps a handwritten record (hard copy) of cases that are being reported in all divisional headquarters and most police stations and posts. The lack of a record has likely more to do with the nature of cases that the LPPBs engage in. Because these cases are often
considered minor (an issue that we return to below), they are dealt with informally and orally. In most of the headquarters of divisions visited by the team, several cases and minutes of meeting – ordinary and emergency – were kept on file (in hard copy). However, cases, minutes and documents for other activities of the CRD were not kept separately from those relating to the LPPB, and therefore an overview of the full scale of LPPB activities could not be provided (Congo Cross and Kissy divisions were notable exceptions where activities of the LPPBs were kept by the Information Officer and the CRO, respectively).

The lack of records makes it difficult to isolate and get a full picture of the role played by LPPBs at the local level. When ASJP’s district offices in Western Rural, Moyamba, Koinadugu and Kenema are up and running, an important role will be to collect evidence of which cases are dealt with by which actors at what time over an extended period of time.

3.1.2 Hybrid Provision of Security

In addition to the matter of record-keeping, it is not always evident whether LPPB members act in the capacity of being part of the LPPB or in the capacity of being community members of a certain status. This is because how security is provided and enforced locally in Sierra Leone is constituted by a hybrid order of numerous actors, including the police, quasi-vigilante groups, traditional leaders, secret societies, bike rider unions and so forth (indeed, the LPPBs are constituted by representatives from these and other groups).

Following from this, the ‘division of labor’ between LPPB members and traditional leaders, for instance, is not evident, since the types of cases that both deal with – ‘minor disputes’ – are not easily distinguishable from one another in practice. In the longer-term and as the LPPBs develop further, tracking the types of cases that LPPBs and chiefs deal with in each of ASJP’s district offices (Western Rural, Moyamba, Koinadugu and Kenema) would benefit the evidence-base of and help to direct implementation of ASJP. The picture that is likely to emerge is that there is an overlap of cases dealt with by traditional leaders and LPPB Chairmen, respectively (the two often collaborate as findings from the fieldwork for this report suggest).

The key role of traditional leaders more generally and elders is undeniable in Sierra Leone. In a recent survey of public attitudes towards local justice and security providers, one of the questions asked was which institution – chiefs, Local Courts or the SLP – people preferred to have deal with cases. Respondents, the report notes, expressed a preference for chiefs’ justice because it is “decisive, quick and relatively cheap” (Fanthorpe and Gaima 2012:19).

At divisional headquarter level the team did not encounter LPPBs where the Chairman or any other member of the executive was a Paramount Chief (several section chiefs and town chiefs did serve on the executive). They or their representatives serve as advisers.

5 Indeed, as Chirayath, Sage and Woolcock (2005:2) note, “the vast majority of human behavior is shaped and influenced by informal and customary normative frameworks. Even in societies with the most developed legal systems, only about 5% of legal disputes (that is, 5% of situations that have been understood as ‘legal’) end up in court.”
However, with respect to selection, election or at times appointment of the LPPB executive, the chiefs were always involved, and often in direct ways. We return to this point in greater detail, but emphasize it here to make the obvious point that LPPBs do not act in isolation from the broader context in which they operate – not in Freetown and not in the provinces. A broad range actors and institutions, including but not limited to chiefs, secret societies, bike riders unions, trade unions, and so forth all have a stake in how local (and hybrid) security is organized.

The important contribution of the LPPBs in this network of actors is that they constitute a new way of structuring interaction with the police. By extension, they have the potential to democratize how security is accessed by the general population, because they expand the number and type of actors that are given a voice in raising security concerns – to the SLP and relevant community actors represented within the LPPB.

In general, the LPPBs considered themselves to be performing on much more of a voluntary basis than tribal heads, chiefs and other traditional leaders. In Waterloo, for instance, the LPPB Chairman compared his approach to traditional leaders in the following way: “With the tribal heads you definitely lose money, you have to ‘shake their hand’, tell them why you are there, upon your explanation, they ask you to pay. With the LPPB you can come with a complaint, either against the police or another person. I introduce myself, I show my ID Card, say that we are here to settle minor disputes. I ask for your consent. We are not coercing. I ask if I can mediate; most times I can go ahead. Then, I can give reasonable mediation. Others will say: ‘No, take me to the police’. I’ll take them to the police, let them make a report, leave them there.”

3.2 ‘Communities’, ‘Local Authorities’ and the Social Profile of LPPB Members

Findings from the fieldwork for this report suggest that LPPBs are part of and could further consolidate a process of social transformation. Findings also suggest that this is a long-term process that reaches far beyond – but nevertheless should be supported by – ASJP. A distinction exists between what the concept of ‘community’ is considered to encompass in rural and urban areas. Reflecting discussions with LPPB members, a general rule is that in rural areas – outside headquarter towns of divisions and districts – ‘community’ is equated with local authorities such as headmen, section and paramount chiefs. In urban or densely populated areas, however, the establishment of the LPPBs has expanded the range of actors involved in defining and responding to local security needs. In short, ‘community’ does not to the same extent equate local authorities.

3.2.1 Rural Sierra Leone → Communities = Local Authorities

When involvement of the community is mentioned by police officers, ‘community’ has, particularly in areas outside District headquarter towns and police divisional headquarter towns, tended to mean the local authorities, i.e., chiefs, officially referred to as headmen, section and paramount chiefs. In other words, LPPB ‘involvement of the community’ has not meant ‘involvement of the general population’ (with notable exceptions such as several chiefdoms in Mongo division).
The equation ‘community = local authorities’ has been compounded by the fact that the LPPB is not necessarily tribally or socially representative of the locality in which it operates, because ‘local authorities’ commonly are considered ‘sons of the soil’. Traditionally close working relations between the police and local authorities in rural areas have also compounded the equation. Indeed, it is commonly accepted that the police will be hampered in operating in areas where they do not entertain close ties with traditional leaders.

A common scenario at town/village level is that the LPPB representative, if he (or she) exists, is one of the authorities of the town (or represent a town authority) and at the same time acts as a police proxy. When someone is suspected of committing a crime the LPPB member will be supported by the young men of the village/town to make an ‘arrest’. These youth groups are the physical force of community provision of security. As such, LPPB Chairmen and other members can only operate if paramount and lesser chiefs accept them.

3.2.2 Urban Sierra Leone → Communities ≠ Local Authorities

In District headquarter towns, and most of the divisional headquarter towns that the research team visited, the LPPBs seemed to have led to a shift in thinking about what the concept of ‘community’ entails. This is an important point to explore in greater detail, because it provides insight into the transformative effect of the LPPBs. It shows how LPPBs have the potential to provide checks and balances on traditional leaders and the police alike (even if neither the police nor the traditional leaders can be fully differentiated from the LPPB).

As is the case in most rural areas of the country communities still more often than not equate ‘communities’ and ‘local authorities’. The chiefs are still considered an important stakeholder. As one LPPB member in Bo West division noted “All Paramount Chiefs are members [of the LPPB serving] as advisers. They are major stakeholders, because they have traditional control over their people. However, they are not members of the executive.” Indeed, it was noted, “some people may listen to them more. Even this election [on 17 November 2012], when the parties are campaigning, they need to inform the Paramount Chief, because he or she is in charge of the Chiefdom, directly representing the head of state here.” However, as was noted in one group discussion with the LPPB in Tankoro division: “Before the police would work with the chiefs, and not work with the communities.” (a similar sentiment was relayed to the team at Dogoloya Police Post in Mongo division). In short, it was explained, the community is no longer equated with chiefs, but a broader range of actors, and the LPPB supported this development. While Paramount Chiefs are involved in the operation of LPPBs, the LPPBs constitute a general shift on two fronts. The first shift is reflected in the broad range of actors that constitutes the LPPB executive, including teachers, petty traders, business people, Okada driver, youth chairmen, women’s chairmen, and so forth. The second shift has to do with the general change in perception of the police, and “an understanding of how the police work. Before, people would run away and hide when the police showed up, but with the sensitization that the LPPBs have undertaken this has changed” (Tankoro LPPB member, 12 December 2012). The LPPB will not alone lead to a more inclusive community concept that in turn democratizes the provision of security. However, it can support the process.
3.3 Policy/Legal Basis of the LPPBs

3.3.1 Existing legislation (SLP and Chiefdom Police)

The SLP was established in 1964 with the passing of the ‘Law Relating to the Organisation, Discipline, Power and Duties of the Police’. As an Act, it set up the Police Council, chaired by the Minister of Internal Affairs (now chaired by the Vice President as per the 1991 Constitution). This piece of legislation continues to define the role of the SLP as “the detection of crime and the apprehension of offenders, the preservation of Law and Order, the protection of life and property, and the due enforcement of all Laws and Regulations with which they are directly charged” (The SLP Act, Act No 4 of 1964).

A separate legal entity than the SLP, the Chiefdom Police appears in numerous pieces of legislation. Its primary role is to summon for local courts, enforce by-laws and assist with the collection of chiefdom revenue. The 1960 Chiefdom Police Act established the Chiefdom Police (Cap 284, Laws of Sierra Leone of 1960). According to the Act, the Chiefdom Police is employed by the Chiefdom Councils upon the recommendation of District Watch Committees, which comprise the District Commissioner, the Superior Police Officer commanding the police district and one representative from each Chiefdom in the district, as appointed by the District’s Chiefdom Committee (sections 4, 5 and 6 of the Chiefdom Police Act).

3.3.2 LPPBs and Legislation

The role of the LPPBs is not defined in law; indeed, no police legislation has been developed since they were established in 2002-2003. Instead, they have until now been developed and implemented at the operational level, and have become one of the critical ways of implementing and consolidating Local Needs Policing (LNP).

LPPBs are still evolving as a concept and as a set of practices, and therefore continue to be characterized by a number of ambiguities (more on this below). Following from this, it is essential that the LPPBs are not formalized through legislation prematurely, but are given time to develop further and to be tested in practice.

---

6 The Chiefdom Police were previously the enforcement arm of the District Councilors and Paramount Chiefs as ‘Court Messengers’. Around 1956, as the British began to prepare Sierra Leone for independence, the SLP moved into the Protectorate (beyond the Western Area). The Commissioner at the time was asked by the Colonial Secretary to absorb the Court Messengers. He considered it but eventually refused on almost the same grounds as the leaders of police reform in the early 2000s. In short, the financial and management implications of doing so would have been too great. The UK police officer who initially led international reform assistance and served as the first post-war IGP in Sierra Leone, Keith Biddle, noted about the Chieftain Police: “I had enough on my plate without taking on the personnel problems that would emanate from such an amalgamation and suggested to Peter [Penfold, British High Commissioner in the late 1990s] that the CP [Chieftain Police] be left to wither on the vine with the SLP through LNP [Local Needs Police] and LPPB [Local Policing Partnership Board] filling the space. An issue that exercised my mind was the manner in which the PCs [Paramount Chief] and DOs [District Officers] managed the CP. Many were enforcing questionable practices and collecting ‘local taxes’ – extortion money – for the chiefs and DOs. In some chiefships, they were used to drag recalcitrant girls to the Bondo Bush for FGM [Female Genital Mutilation]. Many of the PCs and DOs really opposed the suggestion [of incorporating the CP into reform efforts] as they were apprehensive that things might turn difficult for them and that they would lose their powerbase” (email communication, Keith Biddulph, 2009) (Albrecht 2010:9).
This does not mean that LPPBs should be left out of discussions of reforms to current legislation regarding policing in Sierra Leone. This could be done in a quite simple way by inserting a clause in future legislation, obliging the SLP to consult with and be advised by community representatives (community here understood in the broad sense of the term). As a few LPPB members would rightly point out, giving the LPPBs even minimal attention in future legislation – and involving them in the ongoing reform process as a whole – would emphasize the central role of community policing in Sierra Leone’s security provision infrastructure. This may be done by giving the 2011 LPPB Constitution the status – and thereby flexibility – of being secondary legislation.

The importance of this point is not theoretical. In meetings between ASJP staff and the newly appointed Minister of Internal Affairs, Joseph Bandabla Dauda, it was noted that reform of police legislation is on the agenda during his term. In other words, consideration of how LPPBs may be acknowledged for their role regarding policing – and without putting the LPPBs into a legislative straitjacket – will be important.7 This is not least the case, because new legislation may not be developed for the next several decades (as noted above, current police legislation was developed in the 1960s).

At the moment, the most important direction to establish and organize LPPBs is found in ‘The Sierra Leone Police Local Policing Partnership Board Constitution’, which was developed with support from international partners, including JSDP and UNIPSIL. It was agreed by the Executive Management Board of the SLP in 2011, and has been distributed to all LUCs across Sierra Leone’s 33 police divisions. Long under way, the 2011 Constitution has proved a vital reference document for LPPB members and police officers alike. Rather than focusing on legislative reform that is politically sensitive and time-consuming, continued work on the Constitution, refining and clarifying the guidance that it contains, should be the priority of CRD and Corporate Services Department (with support from ASJP).

3.4 Community Relations Department (CRD)

Reestablishment of the Community Relations Department (CRD) in Police headquarters occurred in July 2009 where it is subsumed under the Community Affairs Directorate together with the Media and Public Relations Department. The CRD is led by one Chief Superintendent, which in turn has eight staff working under her. Each LCU is meant to have a CRD with three officers, however, as will be elaborated on below this number varies a great deal (from none to six).

The CRD had been established centrally as part of reform efforts under the CCSSP in the early 2000s, but was relatively quickly devolved to the LCUs. A small Community Relations Office was maintained at HQ level, but was not able to effectively promote community policing across the SLP. The CRD’s resurrection

7 The legislative process in general and with respect to the police in particular is cumbersome and politically sensitive, due to the role played by the Police Council (chaired by the Vice-President). Indeed, there may be discomfort within the Office of the President regarding redefining clearly the roles and limitations of the police in present-day Sierra Leone. In passing the legislation delays are to be expected, both in finding space on the parliamentary agenda and obtaining executive sign-off. All this to say that while community policing is important there are more vital political debates around management and accountability that will take precedence.
came after the “EMB saw that community relations are important,” one CRD officer noted, to ensure that policing was not by mere ‘fire fighting’ (CRD, interview, January 2013). “We went back to our roots, back to the drawing board; they [the EMB] thought they could do better” (CRD, interview, January 2013).

The CRD’s current mandate is to:

1. Support the formation of LPPBs in all police divisions.
2. Direct public sensitization with respect to fighting crime and the fear of crime.
3. Organize consultative meeting with LPPBs and find solutions to issues relating to public safety.
4. Organize school visits.
5. Inform the public about the activities of the SLP (in collaboration with the Media and Public Relations Department).

In the coming years, it will be the role of the CRD at police headquarters in collaboration with the LCUs to further systematize precisely when and how LPPBs are to be involved in policing their communities. In particular, attention must be given to the nature of the cases that LPPBs are and should be involved in. Until this is done systematically by the SLP, the full scale of how LPPBs operate day-to-day will not be fully understood, and therefore clear direction cannot be provided from headquarters.

The ability to do so centrally will support the further development of community policing across Sierra Leone, and will in turn allow headquarters to learn from community policing practices across the country’s divisions.

A report evaluating transition priorities in the move from JSDP to ASJP noted that (re)establishment of a department dedicated to community policing in headquarters, “risks limiting community policing approaches to one silo rather than enabling the police to understand this as the overall philosophy for policing”. Caution is important and necessary. However, a qualified voice on community policing by a dedicated CRD has been identified as a necessity to ensure that community policing is being discussed at the national level (i.e., by the EMB).

Furthermore, community policing is a key aspect of general policing in Sierra Leone, which is evident at LCU level. All the LUCs that the team spoke to noted that they would have a difficult time policing within their areas of responsibility without entertaining strong ties with the LPPB Chairmen, and the broader community. Indeed, one might say that the LUCs become too involved in community matters, rather than allowing a qualified CRD to engage with the LPPBs.

The problem in this regard is that in a number of divisions, insufficient priority and human resources are given to CRDs, whose function at LCU level is not clearly articulated. Indeed, as the Director of the CRD noted, in a number of LCUs, the CRD does not have a dedicated office space in the headquarters of the divisions. It was mentioned that where there is space, a ‘Court Barrie’ could be constructed in connection with the CRD where LPPB meetings could be held. Holding meetings in a Court Barrie would make LPPB meetings a public affair, as was the original intention with the LPPB (and constructing a Court Barrie would be relatively cheap). However, the ideal is to establish a dedicated office space for the CRD and LPPB within the LCU.
Also, as was noted by CRD staff in headquarters, it is “frustrating when you come across the LUCs that do not know the importance of community policing. They will appoint officers that are no good, the ‘dormant’ ones to the CRD [at LCU level].” It was evident that the best functioning CRDs were located in the Freetown area, with 4, 5 or 6 officers employed (e.g., Kissy, Eastern and Congo Cross police divisions). In Western Rural, the CRD was one officer (the media officers had community relations attached to his portfolio).

In other places such as Kabala no CRD existed. It should be noted, however, that the lack of a functioning CRD does not mean that LUCs across the country do not understand the need to liaise and communicate with members of the public. “You cannot operate in a vacuum and isolation,” the LUC of Eastern division noted. However, ensuring a structured approach to community relations requires a dedicated department at divisional level, which may ensure a degree of institutional memory, expert knowledge on what community policing entails and daily interaction with and outreach to the community (LPPBs, schools, market associations, bike riders, etc.). It is no doubt a positive that the LUCs generally find it necessary to liaise with community members, but they cannot dedicate the necessary time to build up and sustain community relations by themselves. Furthermore, in support of the institutionalization of community relations at divisional level, building up a CRD is crucial.

It will be the responsibility of headquarters, notably Corporate Services Department, to support the development of strong CRDs at LCU level. This will not only establish the CRD as the home of community policing in the divisions, but also ensure that there is some institutional memory in the event that a new LUC is appointed to a division.

Apart from developing job descriptions for CROs under the level of the Director in police headquarters (they are currently non-existent), CRDs across the country may be further consolidated through the consistent provision of training and development of written material on how to carry out community policing. For instance, the CRD could develop and issue a handbook that lays out guidelines to how community policing is to be carried out in the particular context of Sierra Leone, precisely what types of cases the LPPBs can and cannot engage in, and so forth.

The LPPB Constitution combined with a handbook may not ensure full coherence across the country, and in any case this should not be the aim of international support. Different local contexts require different contexts. However, more clarity on the role of the CRD and the LPPBs will lead to greater inclusion of community policing across the entire organization.

3.5 Structure, Formation and Social Profile of the LPPBs – the Constitution and Beyond

As an initial disclaimer, it is worth noting that while the Constitution provides vital guidance on the role and organization of LPPB, it will be necessary to clean up its language. As the report progresses, a number of ambiguities of the Constitution will be emphasized.
3.5.1 The LPPB Structure Outlined in the 2011 Constitution

At its full capacity, the LPPB consists of 26 individuals, occupying 21 different categories of positions. The Constitution refers to 12 categories of ‘board officials’, where eight constitute the ‘Executive Board’. However, it is not entirely clear from how the Constitution is structured who is ‘executive’ and who is a ‘board official’. For instance, while ‘Auditors’ should be “appointed from outside the Board by the Chairman upon consultations with the Board/LUC”, they are listed under ‘Board Officials’ (and were often considered executive members by LPPB members). Given their role as an external accountability mechanism, however, they might be board officials, but cannot at the same time be constitutive members of the Executive Board.

In general, it should be clarified in the Constitution who among the ‘board officials’ are ‘executive members’. Doing so will align language both within the Constitution, and in accordance with the empirical reality of how (most) ‘board officials’ refer to their position in the overall structure. In the Constitution, the Chairman is tasked to “be the head of the Executive Board”, but the positions that are comprised by the ‘Executive Board’ are not clearly outlined in the Constitution. It is in this context also worth noting that since the LPPB is run by volunteers, having a treasurer, a financial secretary and three auditors may not adequately reflect an appropriate LPPB structure.

Related to this, the SLP should be clearer about the status of non-executive members of the LPPB (this is particularly important since the SLP is involved in issuing ID Cards to executive members of the LPPB, thus creating lines of divisions within the LPPB). Finally, while the LPPB Constitution outlines the tasks that each ‘board official’ is expected to undertake, it might be worth giving some consideration to what the role of the remainder of the LPPB members should be.

The positions of the board as they are outlined in 2011 Constitution are as follows:

**Executive members (board officials)**

1. Chairman (board official/executive member), the head of the Executive Board with the responsibility to direct the affairs of the board.
2. Vice Chairman (board official/executive member).
3. Secretary-General (board official/executive member) keeps documentation of all LPPB activities and records proceedings in all meetings.
4. Assistant Secretary-General (board official/executive member).
5. Organizing/Social Secretary (board official/executive member) organizes all domestic and public social activities on behalf of the board.
6. Financial Secretary (board official/executive member) records all monies and donations received on behalf of the board.
7. Treasurer (board official/executive member).
8. Public Relations Officer (board official/executive member).

**Other Board members**

9. Youth Representative.
10. Women’s Representative.
11. Two Traditional Chiefs – Advisers (board officials).
12. Two Religious Leaders – Advisers (board officials).
13. One Legal Counsel Representative – Adviser.
15. Three Auditors.
16. Local Unit Commander – Chief Adviser (board official).
17. Regional/divisional Commander – Operational Support division (OSD).
18. The TCG – Supports, Operations, Information, CID and CRD.
20. Traditional Society Representative (male and female).

3.5.2 The LPPB Structure in the Field

3.5.2.1 Who is the Executive?

In general, the number of positions of the executive should be kept small and manageable for the SLP to oversee. This is particularly the case, since it is the SLP that hands out ID Cards to executive members. For this reason, individual Executive Boards of LPPBs should refrain from issuing their own ID Cards to members who are not part of the executive. LPPB members did bring this up as an option, for instance in Tankoro division, where one member noted how “the executive should be able to recommend other members [to become part of the executive]”. However, as long as authority of the LPPBs remains dependent on police recognition, it should be up to the police to decide – control and manage – how many members can have an executive status within each police division.

Following from this, it is crucial to outline which members are part of the executive and which ones are not and that whatever is agreed is communicated clearly across Sierra Leone’s police divisions. For instance, APPC Chairmen in urban and densely populated areas are de facto executive members in Freetown, Bo and Kenema, but are not considered to be so in the Constitution. Among the LPPBs that the team met, the eight executive member listed in the Constitution were standard, including the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary-General, Assistant Secretary-General, Organizing/Social Secretary, Financial Secretary, Treasurer and Public Relations Officer.

The roles of the Financial Secretary and the Treasurer are for now limited, since LPPBs work on a voluntary basis. However, given that activities may be put in place to support the sustainability of LPPBs in Sierra Leone, financial management may to some degree become a more central feature of the Partnership Boards in the future.

3.5.2.2 Zonal Policing Partnership Boards/Area Policing Partnership Committees

The Constitution notes that the LPPB should ensure that “the Local Zonal Policing Partnership Boards sustain good working relations between the community member
and stakeholders and the police policies” (LPPB Constitution 2011:6). However, it is not clear how these ‘Local Zonal Policing Partnership Boards’ that are also referred as ‘Zonal Policing Partnership Committees’ (LPPB Constitution 2011:7) are organized and with what membership. This leads to some confusion on the ground. Zonal Chairmen play an important role locally, particularly in densely populated urban areas such as Freetown, Bo and Kenema. Therefore, they are often considered part of the executive group of LPPB members, but do not receive ID cards, which the CRD in Freetown has made clear are only for the Executive Board.

Who the executive members are, is left for interpretation and at times leads to misunderstandings that are difficult to deal with for the LPPB Chairman. In Eastern division, the LPPB Chairman noted: “If myself and others get ID, how would you feel [if you did not get one]? Is there a way to include them? According to the Constitution, all the Chairmen [of the zones] are automatically members of the board, but they did not get the ID Card”. Clarifying the Constitution would be helpful in this regard.

In discussions with the police and LPPB members, Zonal Policing Partnership Boards were also referred to as Area Policing Partnership Committees (APPCs), both in the Western Area and in the provinces. Referred to as “another layer in the LPPB,” APPCs in Motema, Lunsar, Kabala and Mongo are structured around the Chiefdom. Members are drawn from each section of the Chiefdom, and commonly selected by the Chiefly hierarchy and less commonly by election.

### 3.5.2.3 Women’s Leaders

In the various police divisions visited by the team, the common number of executive members mentioned was twelve (there were exceptions, such as Bo, which told us that the executive had 8 members). In other words, there is a discrepancy between the ‘board officials’ (executive positions) listed in the Constitution, and the structure that the research team met on the ground.

Without exception, a women’s leader was considered part of the inner circle of the LPPB by those members that the team interviewed. In many cases, women took up leading positions within the LPPB. In Daru division, for instance, the Vice Chairman and the Secretary General were women.

The role of the women’s leader is not reflected in the Constitution, even though it is generally accepted that women play a unique role in matters of local security, and notably with respect to women and children (mostly domestic violence). Among those interviewed, there was general consensus that women “are dominated in the community” as one LPPB member in Kabala put it, and that violence against women and children is common.

Being part of semi-formalized structure such as the LPPB was considered beneficial in terms of being in a position to intervene, as noted by the Vice Chairlady in Kabala division: “Some people beat their wives, some people beat their children. When such things happen we intervene. When somebody beats his or her child, we will come in and advise. We don’t have the right to get involved if they don’t accept our involvement. However, we can advise them that there may be trouble, and that we can call the police – the LPPB gives us the opportunity to involve the police”. Women were considered better equipped than their male counterpart to deal with issues
relating to domestic violence, broadly speaking. “Feeding, taking care of their children, not supporting the women – we call the man to say that he should take on his responsibility”, as one LPPB member noted in Tankoro division.

Commonly, with respect to domestic violence, “if the beating is severe, we come into it, and if it’s above us, we refer to the FSU [Family Support Unit]. However, in most cases we try to handle the issue.” In sum, women deal with types of violence that are widespread in Sierra Leone, and as LPPB members, they are able to represent the voice and interests of women in a way that men are not (always) able to. Another female LPPB member in Daru, who worked as a social worker and referred to herself as an activist, noted how her key interest in being a LPPB member was to bring justice to women and children, who she considered to be the most vulnerable and deprived in her community.

Finally, matters relating to Sande (or Bondo), the women’s secret society that initiates girls into adulthood, can only be dealt with by women who have themselves been initiated. Female circumcision (often referred to as Female Genital Mutilation), which is considered part of Sande initiation practices, can only begin to be addressed if those who carry out initiation are incorporated into structures such as those of the LPPBs.

In the context of the LPPBs, this means providing targeted support to those women who are already members of the LPPB in order to raise their profile. In one LPPB meeting attended by the team, only one woman was in attendance among 25-30 men. While she noted that women are better at handling “sensitive domestic matters”, she also pointed out that women are not able to engage in LPPB meetings due to the money involved in travelling.

3.5.2.4 Youth Representatives

Just as women’s leaders are considered part of the inner circle of the LPPB, i.e., the executive, so too are representatives of the youth. The ‘youth’ label is precarious and highly political in Sierra Leone. It identifies someone who is considered socio-economically disadvantaged and someone who has not yet established a family who he or she takes care of. In other words, emphasis is not on chronological age – a man in his mid-40s may very well be considered a youth – but on whether social and economic adulthood has been achieved. Youth also denominates physical strength or what was referred to as being ‘able-bodied’ in numerous conversations. Bottom line is that Sierra Leone experiences high unemployment and poor education in the general population. A large proportion of the population is as a consequence considered part of the ‘youth’.

A good example of the central role of youth in local security is found in Tankoro division, Kono District. It is one of Sierra Leone’s main Kimberlite mining sites (OCTEA Ltd, formerly Koidu Holdings), and one of the areas in which youth from across the country seek employment as seasonal and day workers (many of which are considered ex-combatants). Therefore, ‘outsiders’ or ‘strangers’ are numerous in Kono, a common social category in Sierra Leone denoting someone who is not born in the area in which he or she resides. Relating this to the topic of this report – LPPBs – this category of the citizenry should be represented on the LPPB, particularly in the mining areas.
We do not go into detail on Sierra Leone’s diamond industry or the conditions of miners in the country’s mining areas. Suffice to note here that Kono has been – and continues to be – one of the most volatile areas of the country. The reason for this is to a large degree the considerable numbers of youth-as-strangers working in the District. The shootings in December 2012 following a strike outside the OCTEA Ltd premises and involving OSD officers are an indication of this.

When the team visited Tankoro division one week before the OCTEA shootings, the LUC at the time explained that when he had arrived in post a few months earlier, he had identified all youth groups in and around Koidu. Clearly, meetings between the LUC and youth groups in Koidu did not prevent violence from breaking out a few months later (the LUC had started in his post in October 2012). However, this does not detract from the need to collaborate with and involve the youth in policing activities as was the intention of the Tankoro LUC. This is acknowledged in Freetown. “We don’t want to be reactive”, the Director of Community Relation based in Freetown noted referring to the Koidu incident, “if only we had used our men and women to gather more info; the LPPBs are living with the people, and the police need to engage the LPPB to address the issue.”

Generally speaking, while the youth are considered a ‘security threat’ that needs to be contained, they are also a key partner in providing security. In Kailahun, for instance, a murder was committed in 2010, and the perpetrator, trying to escape to Guinea, was arrested by the youths. On another occasion, larceny was on the rise in one area of Kailahun town. An emergency LPPB meeting was held with stakeholders, and it was agreed that night patrols of youth groups should be organized, which led to a considerable reduction in crime rates. In other areas such as Motema, Yengema and Bumpeh (Motema division) ‘Task Forces’ had been established to assist the police. Similarly, the LPPB Chairman of Tankoro division noted that a ‘Task Force’ had been established, consisting of youth who are organized on voluntary basis.

In general, in Sierra Leone’s rural areas, groups of young men constitute the physical force of community provision of security in isolated towns and villages as well as in urban areas. They could be referred to as vigilantes, but they do not act in isolation from local authorities. In rural areas, groups of young men are often selected according to allegiance to the local chiefs. In urban areas, and notably the Western Area, they are formally tied to the LPPB, and referred to as Community Safety Volunteers (CSVs).

In sum, a youth representative should be written into the Constitution as an executive member. Special note should be taken of the fact ‘youth’ is not a homogenous group, but consists of numerous factions with different interests.

3.5.2.5 Community Safety Volunteers (CSVs)

Due to Freetown’s size and continued growth, density of the population and consequent crime rates across the Western Area, the role of youth in providing security has been structured to a degree that has not been the case in the provinces. While similar to Task Forces in the provinces, Community Safety Volunteers (CSVs) have been distributed across all police zones in the Western Area (partly orchestrated from police headquarters). They work directly with the SLP’s Operations Department and under the leadership of the executive of the LPPB, support night patrols of the police, and ‘sensitize’ the communities on their roles and functions.
The CSVs are not appointed through elections, but are selected from the community by executive members of the LPPB and other local authorities. In 2010, then LPPB Chairman in Eastern division noted that “these people are like police, but they are not police”, meaning that they provide security in support of the police as part of the community in which they live – not as part of the police. In 2010, they were referred to as a “civil defence force”, a term used to describe local militias that emerged during the war in the 1990s to defend localities where the government was unable to do so (and thus referencing a time during which the state was unable to provide these services).

The CSVs are “a group”, the LPPB Chairman in Waterloo explained, “helping the police to combat crime; young men and women, working with the police 24/7 finding criminals, making reports to the police, and so forth. We have arrested people who committed murder in Freetown, and handed them over to the police. They have helped greatly to reduce crime rates from where they [i.e., the crime rates] were.” As the Chairman in Congo Cross noted, supporting this statement, CSVs “monitor activities at night, and when there is any crime, they have the police hotline. Either they call me at night or they call the police directly”. The Chairman and the executive of the LPPB are often individuals of some status (businesspeople, teachers, etc.), and therefore a certain age. Working alongside CSVs provides the LPPB with physical backup.

In the past, CSVs had been paid an allowance/stipend of Le2,000 per day (unlike LPPB members who work on a voluntary basis). When police headquarters withdrew funding, the CSV programme stopped functioning. Through funding from ASJP, police headquarters restarted payments during the election period (November-December 2012). In Waterloo division, for instance, 150 CSVs were active during the election period, and in Kissy and Eastern division more than 200 CSVs have been active during the election period.

The CSVs are commonly unemployed youth, and are therefore motivated by the stipend they receive. The authority that comes with being aligned with the police is also an important factor, as is the possibility of being recruited into the police following good service as a CSV. Without funding, it was clearly indicated that the CSVs would stop their activities.

In Eastern division, the CSVs were represented on the Executive Board of the LPPB, but they have not been written into the Constitution. As for now, they are not a permanent body attached to the LPPBs due to the availability of funding, and therefore it may not be worthwhile giving them a role on the Executive Board. However, the formation of CSVs should be mentioned as a possibility in the Constitution, under which conditions they should be formed and how. The notion of a Task Force should be avoided as it has an unfortunate political undertone. Groups of youth attached to political parties for security are often referred to as Task Forces.

When the CSVs operate, it is important that they are clearly identifiable, especially since they are not a permanent institution. In early 2010, the LUC in Eastern division noted: “Sometimes people say they are CSVs when they are armed robbers; so it is important that they can show that they are indeed part of us”. Already in 2010 in Eastern division, CSVs were provided with “white t-shirts with the crest, just like SLP uniforms”. This was also the case during the election period in November 2012.
3.5.2.6 Bike Riders Union

While women’s leaders and youth representatives are listed as members of the LPPB in the Constitution, the Sierra Leone Commercial Bike Riders Union is not. However, during discussions with the SLP and LPPB, they were in many cases mentioned as central members of the LPPB (if not as part of the executive). At other times, such as in Kabala, the LUC noted that if “it’s an issue that relates to bike riders, we invite those stakeholders [to LPPB meetings]”. Cases that often come up and involve bike riders relate to unlicensed motorbikes (LPPB members have assisted a number of times in this regard).

The Bike Riders Union estimates that there are around 189,000 riders – known as Okada riders – operating across the country.

In Koinadugu alone, the Bike Riders Union has 2,800 registered members, consisting of former criminals and unemployed youths (in Kono, many Okada riders are referred to as ex-combatants). According to the leadership of the Bike Riders Union, the rising numbers of bike riders has reduced rates of theft. In Koinadugu, the Union was organized around a district executive, park executives and chiefdom executives. At the District level, they had a Chairman, Vice Chairman, PRO, Accident Officer, Secretary-General, and so forth.

To avoid involvement of the police or traditional leaders (paramount and lesser chiefs), they have established their own ‘Task Force’ referred to as ‘Police and Chief Justice’. This body handles matters like outstanding debt, lent bikes that are not returned in time, theft of bike parts and abusive language among Union members. According to the executive in the Bike Riders Union in Koinadugu, the Police and Chief Justice handles six cases per day in Kabala alone. The significance of the LPPB to the bike riders only relates to cases that involve individuals outside the circle of Union members.

Given the strong organization of bike riders across Sierra Leone, and given that bike riders are often involved in incidents, a representative should be appointed to sit on the general LPPB, if not on the Executive Board.

3.6 Motivation to Engage in the LPPB: Altruism, Business and Political Motivation

LPPB members are motivated by a number of factors. First, and importantly is the sense, as communicated by one Bo-based member to “to give something to my country as a Sierra Leonean”. In Kailahun, it was noted that the LPPB works because of “the dedication of a few members”. Similarly, there was also a generalized – rather than personalized – concern about the consequences of high levels of crime. As the LUC of Bo West noted, “if there is insecurity, your business cannot prosper. We have to look at the security aspect.” Similarly, in Bo East, a LPPB member noted that “everybody has their own priorities; there is nothing to derive from the LPPB. We are just satisfied with the fact that we can come in to help our people to maintain security and peace.” In sum, it should be assumed that one reason why LPPB members engage in community policing is the altruistic belief that he or she is doing something positive for the community in which he lives.

Following from this, LPPB members who have the means to do so, supply fuel and transportation to the police; they have helped building police posts, paint police
stations and so forth (in Kenema they started, but did not finish, the construction of a police hospital). The Chairman of the LPPB in Bo notes that “number one: we are not policemen. We are only supporting the police to be able to police properly. We force them. We pressure them”. The LPPB provides support, including logistical support, to the police, while at the same time seeking to keep it to account for its actions.

While LPPB members serve their country, there are at the same concrete benefits for being a member. The Chairman of Kissy division noted that he had wanted to become the Chairman to secure his business. In Kenema and Bo both the Chairmen are Lebanese Sierra Leonean shop owners who are able to consolidate their positions, both with respect to the police and the communities in which they live. In Waterloo, the Chairman of the LPPB explained that without security, his business would run at a loss, “but if there is security and stability in a country, then investors will come, and I will have more contracts. Therefore, my personal interests and those of the LPPB are the same”.

While personal interest is legitimate motivation to become a LPPB member, political activity is not. The only division in which we met an openly dysfunctional LPPB was in Makeni where the Secretary-General was also the Chairman of the ruling party. In general, the LPPB had been heavily politicized. In other divisions, however, politically active members were removed from their positions.

3.7 Geographical Representation

Working with the LPPBs requires working with an explicit distinction between rural and urban areas of Sierra Leone. LPPBs in densely and scarcely populated areas are up against different challenges in terms of distances and the availability of transport and communication (in Mongo Division large areas are not covered by the telephone network).

The 2011 Constitution does not clearly spell out how to ensure geographical representation on the LPPBs, including on the Executive Board, and the different challenges of establishing and running LPPBs within and outside Sierra Leone’s urban areas. As a minimum, some thought should be given to how this might be done, and written into the Constitution to ensure a degree of geographical representation across the country (in turn, this might support the continued democratization of security provision in Sierra Leone).

Together with the CRD and other relevant departments in police headquarters, a structure should be agreed and disseminated to the relevant stakeholders.

3.7.1 Freetown and Western Area

One of the key weaknesses of the LPPB structure is its organisation and geographical representation outside Freetown (Western Area) and other densely populated areas of Sierra Leone such as Bo, Kenema and Koidu. More than anything else, this is related to the logistical challenges in getting to headquarter towns from the far reaches of a district. Where people live in close geographic proximity of one another, it is relatively easy – and cheap – for LPPB members to attend meetings in police headquarters on a regular basis. Indeed, in Eastern division the LUC has meetings with the LPPB Chairman on a daily basis.
In the divisions visited by the team in the Western Area, including Kissy, Congo Cross, Eastern and Waterloo, the structure of the LPPB is therefore relatively straightforward and streamlined. The CRO in Kissy explained to the team that the LPPB consists of three bodies, including:

1. The Executive Board.
2. Area Policing Partnership Committees (APPCs).
3. Community Safety Volunteers (CSVs).

The Executive Board of the division was referred to as the “main membership” in Kissy, and each police zone constitutes an APPC which has its own Chairman and set of CSVs that in turn answers to the Executive Board. APPC Chairmen – referred to as Zonal Policing Partnership Chairmen in the 2011 Constitution – are part of the general membership of the LPPB. In a densely populated area such as Eastern division, APPC Chairmen are de facto considered executive members.

3.7.2 Provinces

3.7.2.1 Concentration around Urban Centres

In the provinces less of a homogeneous structure emerges. Kenema, the third-largest town in Sierra Leone, constitutes one of the country’s six municipalities with an elected city council that is headed by a mayor. It is divided into 29 police zones, and we were told by Kenema division’s CRO that so far 22 APPCs have been established. Outside Kenema town in the 12 chiefdoms of the district, however, LPPB only functions in three, including Nongowa (Kenema town), Simbaru and Small Bo. Consequently, we were told, there is no representation from the chiefdoms on the Executive Board.

A similar picture came across in discussions with the LUC in Kabala division. While it was recognized that the LPPB provided vital support to the police – “the police are not everywhere at all times” – APPCs had not been established in the six chiefdoms covered by the division. In Makeni division, the LPPB had been politicised and was dysfunctional: no meetings or elections had been held for the past several years.

In places like Kenema, Kabala and Makeni where the LPPB only operates in urban centres or has ceased to function, collaboration between the police and local communities still takes place in the rural areas. However, the nature of collaboration reflects pre-war practices where working with ‘the community’ means working with the ‘local authorities’, i.e., paramount and lesser chiefs, as discussed earlier in the report.

In Binkolo (police post in Makeni division), for instance, the Post Commander noted that an LPPB had recently been established, however, the Paramount Chief was the Chairman, and the Speaker the Vice Chairman. In Fadugu (police station in Kabala division), the officer-in-charge had knowledge of LPPBs, but noted that it had not been established within his area of responsibility. Community policing was practiced, however, and good working relations existed with the chiefs. In other places such as Kamabai (police post in Makeni division), the Post Commander did not know what an LPPB was, but noted, as is common, that relations between the police and the community, meaning the chiefs, were good. A similar picture emerged in Kodembia (police station), a mining town of approximately 3,000 people, in Kabala division.
None of the police station’s six personnel in Kodambaia had knowledge of what an LPPB was.

### 3.7.2.2 Different Models of Rural LPPBs

The examples above represent the general picture of LPPBs in rural Sierra Leone (and outside the Western Area). However, exceptions exist in a number of the divisions visited by the team, including those of Tankoro, Mongo, Kailahun and Motema. I will briefly present findings from each of these divisions in the following. Each provides insight into how infrastructural and logistical obstacles might be overcome under resource scarce circumstances.

#### 3.7.2.2.1 Tankoro division

Tankoro division in Kono District covers nine chiefdoms and borders Guinea. While APPCs have not been established outside Koidu town, ‘chiefdom coordinators’ – one per chiefdom – have been appointed. The coordinators reside in Koidu town, and have the primary task of coordinating between the divisional Executive Board (mostly from Koidu town) and the chiefdom that they represent. Communication is by cell phone. On the team’s visit to Njagbwema Fiaima (police post), it was confirmed that the chiefdom coordinators, which were set up by the Executive Board, played an important role in connecting Njagbwema Fiaima and Koidu (Executive Board).

While not ideal compared to having APPCs in each chiefdom, the establishment of chiefdom coordinators has meant that the Executive Board has had somewhat structured lines of communication with the outskirts of the division.

#### 3.7.2.2.2 Mongo division

Mongo division in Koinadugu District covers five chiefdoms. It is a vast division that shares a porous border with Guinea, has challenging road infrastructure and limited telephone network (the only line of communication of divisional headquarters of Mongo is a police radio with Kabal LCU). Despite or perhaps because of the challenging environment of the division combined with a limited number of police officers (84), a variety of structures have been set up across the division’s chiefdoms. As a common reflection across urban and rural areas, but for different reasons, the LUC noted that “the police cannot cover the entire area effectively without the help of the partnership board”. APPCs had been established, if not by the LUC then with his active and on-going support across the four chiefdoms visited by the team (including Bendugu, the headquarters town of the division).

Covering two Chiefdoms, Dembelia Sikunia Chiefdom and Folasaba Chiefdom, a functioning APPC had been established on 1 May 2012, with representation from across the Chiefdoms (34 ordinary members and 11 executive members). Women were considered to play a key role, being “quick to understand issues” and “faster to get information/intelligence than the men”, as the Chairman put it. APPC members had made their own blue t-shirts, with ‘Police Partnership Board – Mongo division – Fолосaba Demblia (sic) Chiefdom’ printed on the front.
At each LPPB meeting, money was collected for the transport of members. It would be worthwhile drawing this particular APPC into trainings/discussions with other LPPBs/APPC about their skills and not least motivation.

The team met a similarly structured APPC in the neighbouring Chiefdoms, with a more or less strong involvement of the chiefs (particularly with respect to selecting candidates among which the APPC executive are elected). Due to the infrastructural challenges of Mongo division, members of the LPPB executive are mostly drawn from Mongo Chiefdom. The LCU (based in Bendugu, Mongo Chiefdom) plays an important role in liaising with APPCs and obtaining information from the population, in particular from the border areas.

3.7.2.2.3 Kailahun and Motema divisions

In both Kailahun (bordering Kailahun and Liberia) and Motema, LUCs are or have been in place that put strong emphasis on the importance on setting up LPPBs. For this reason, members of the executive come from each chiefdom. As in Mongo, these divisions provide insight into the great importance of a motivated and engaged LUC. Even as Motema division experienced a disengaged LUC for a couple of years in 2010-2011, the structure had been established, and was easily reconstituted by the LUC who arrived in post in 2012. At the same time, as the Chairman of Kailahun noted: “The problem with finance – fair representation – and then to call somebody from Koindu, he has to pay transport. Some cannot afford to come, and when they come, they expect per diem. At least they expect to have lunch. One time I had to pay their transport from my own pocket, but I cannot offer that every time. When they come, and they know they are not getting anything, they find it difficult to come”.

In sum, as it is being considered how to ensure geographical representation on the Executive Boards of the LPPBs, reference should be made to the different solutions that LPPB members across the country have found in a resource scarce environment.

3.8 Election of LPPB Members – and the Role of Chiefs

It is generally accepted that the Executive Board of the LPPB is formed through election as outlined in the 2011 Constitution (In Motema division in 2009, the National Electoral Commission (NEC) was called in to oversee LPPB elections, thereby emphasizing the level of formality of being on the Executive Board). However, because these positions are not clearly outlined in the Constitution, there is as a consequence not full clarity on which positions are in fact up for election.

In addition, the Constitution provides only limited guidance on how APPCs should be formed. At the moment, therefore, APPC/zonal members are at times appointed by the chiefly hierarchy in the provinces and by ‘community authorities’ in the Western Area (also referred to as local chiefs). At times, chiefs/‘community authorities’ appoint the candidates among which the APPCs are elected (as is the case with respect to the LPPB executives). This is often presented as a community decision, which is why keeping in mind that ‘community’ and ‘local authorities’ are commonly closely aligned in Sierra Leone (though not exclusively as discussed earlier in this report).
The Constitution speaks of the LUC’s role in establishing the Electoral College for the election of executive LPPB members. 5 delegates are to be chosen by “zonal members” as the Constitution notes. What this means is that without exception, ‘the community’ is left to choose the candidates that can run for election to the Executive Board. In the case of Kailahun, for instance, functioning LPPB structures have been established across the division’s 5 chiefdoms, however, this number varies. In Motema division, Paramount Chiefs and elders were asked by the LUC to appoint 10 people from each chiefdom to be members of the Electoral College.

According to the LUC and the Chairman of the Executive Board in Kailahun, APPCs have been established in all chiefdoms (this was confirmed in the case of Koidu (police station) that the team visited). A message had been sent through the Paramount Chiefs to the Section Chiefs of their chiefdoms to put appropriate candidates forward for elections. In turn, five delegates from each Chiefdom came to Kailahun to take part in elections of the Executive Board in March 2012 (most of the LPPBs in the 16 divisions visited by the team had elected new executives during 2012). An election process similar to those in Kailahun and Motema had been followed in Daru division.

3.9 The Activities and Roles of LPPBs – conflict resolution, Strategic Planning, Sensitization

LPPBs broadly speaking undertake three types of activities:

1. In the Western Area and urban areas across the country, in particular, they support the SLP in day-to-day policing, bringing criminals to the police and undertaking informal resolution.

2. They engage in strategic planning and advise on the deployment of police officers.

3. They support preventive measures to avoid situations from escalating and spiraling into violence.

3.9.1 How LPPBs Deal with Everyday Cases

3.9.1.1 ‘Minor’ and ‘Sensitive’, ‘Civil’ and ‘Criminal’ Cases

“First and foremost, you need to ensure that the individual you are talking to trusts you. That’s the first step, you are not taking sides, you are not there as a policeman.” (LPPB member, Bo West division).

Generally speaking, LPPB members distinguish between cases that are considered ‘minor’ or ‘trivial’ and cases that are ‘sensitive’ and considered ‘above’ the LPPB. Murder, severe beatings, rape (referred to as ‘blood crimes’ in some communities), substantial theft and sexual abuse of children are commonly referred to the police. By extension, most LPPB members that were interviewed made an explicit distinction between civil and criminal cases. As one LPPB member in the newly established Bo West division noted, the “partnership board does not investigate or charge to court; if they can, they mediate and do informal resolution.”
Like a number of other actors such as chiefs and the CRD of the police, the LPPBs carry out informal conflict resolution. In Kabala, ‘informal resolution’ was explained by one LPPB member as a situation “where people are dealing with minor crimes, minor cases – they come to us, we examine, we talk to the two parties”. In Waterloo, the LPPB Chairman said that ‘informal resolution’ involved “matters that you settle out of court, out of the police, but [that are] more or less recognized by the police. If you lock a person up in prison, there is every possibility that he will become a hardened criminal. If there is a way to settle this matter; tell him: ‘this thing is not good for you, you are healthy, able-bodied’ – tell him to find a job.”

Most LPPB members would deal with what they referred to as ‘fraudulent conversion’, ‘common assault’, but also cases of domestic violence (unsurprisingly, the picture varied in this regard, depending on whether an incident of ‘domestic violence’ occurred in an urban or a rural area).

### 3.9.1.2 A Grey Area between ‘Minor’ and ‘Sensitive’ Cases

Particularly with respect to domestic violence – which commonly involve women and children – it was evident from our conversations with LPPB members that a grey exists with respect to the cases that the LPPB takes up. As such, there is no doubt that cases involving violence and theft were dealt with by the LPPB and through informal resolution. As one female LPPB member in Daru noted, “if a girl is raped, that one is not compromised. Flogging of a child, I will just say stop it. Bruises and wounds, I will report. Where there is no wound, I don’t.” In other words, there is work to be done to understand better how LPPBs can play a positive role in dealing with cases of ‘domestic violence’.

In short, this is an indication that more training should be provided to ensure that LPPB members and police officers alike are able to distinguish between civil and criminal cases.

### 3.9.2 Resolving Matters Between the Public and the Police and Gradually Changing the Image of the Police

The role of the LPPB in mediation between the police and the public is vital, and the team was presented with a number of cases in which the LPPB has played this role. In Kailahun, for instance, the police was accused of mishandling a civilian, and the situation was getting out of hand. LPPB members would go on the radio and talk about the issue, call the parties involved and arbitrate. The LPPB Chairman would lead a process of arbitration in his capacity of being a respected elder as well as in his capacity of being LPPB Chairman. A compromise was found. Similarly, members of the Bike Riders Union in Bo noted that the LPPB “serve as middle men between the community and the police, playing an active role when problems occur with the police, customs, etc. They go in between to make sure that peace and tranquility prevails”.

### LPPB Oversight Committee in Kabala

In Kabala division, the Executive Board has established what they refer to as an Oversight Committee. It keeps a check on the police, how suspects are treated in
retention, how they are fed, and so forth. More generally, the Oversight Committee plays an important role in holding police officers to account for their actions in the public sphere. The rationale is, the LPPB Chairman in Kabala noted, that “whenever a police officer is doing something wrong in public, it will reflect on the entire police force and it will affect the perception of civilians of the police in the community. If it is a minor issue done by the officer, he will be advised to stop and not to repeat it. If it is a bigger crime, he will be reported at the police station”.

The LPPB has the potential, if it continues to be seen as community-driven, to support the ongoing change of the police’s image. As noted in Bo West by the LPPB, “it’s a gradual process; we are actually not at the end of the road, it’s a gradual process – to change perceptions takes a long time”. Previously, as the Ops Officer in Daru noted, “the civilians saw the police as enemies – some police officer were hostile to the population, because of the power vested in the police. The community was not collaborating with the police, because we thought we should isolate ourselves from them. The police thought they could do anything. People did not know their rights.” The LPPB Chairman in Waterloo said that the image of a deeply corrupt and unresponsive police force has stuck, even when the police, in his understanding, has sought to change how they do policing (as a perception rather than a quantitative fact, he believed that around 15% of police officers accepted/demanded bribes from the general public).

The LPPBs have encouraged a degree of transparency/openness and not least accountability within the police, because they do not pay allegiance to the police, but (partly are able to) hold them to account for their actions. The LPPB as a police accountability mechanism should be supported and strengthened.

3.9.3 Strategic Planning and Preventive Measures

At the national LPPB conference held on 4-5 October 2012 in Freetown, it was noted that greater effort should be made on the part of the SLP to involve LPPB members in strategic planning. While the point was important, the team did come across numerous examples of police deployments taking place on the advice of the LPPB. For instance, if crime levels rise in an area, an LPPB meeting, involving the LUC as Chief Adviser, will be summoned to discuss how best to deal with the matter.

In Daru, the Operations Officer told us: “Even in certain operations we involve them, such as in cases of arrests of unlicensed Okada riders. We call them [i.e., LPPB members] before we do this – probably they will come up with suggestions, and we reach something that will be ‘comfortable’ for both parties.”

Finally, the LPPB are instrumental in taking preventive measures when a situation has the potential to get out of control and possibly turn violent. This is primarily done by calling an emergency meeting among the implicated parties, and ensuring that everyone has the correct information, including what the police is doing to resolve a given matter. For instance, when a bike rider was accidentally killed by a police officer in Western Rural, bike riders assumed that the police would not deal with the matter, which led to tensions and threats of violence against the police. The LPPB played an important role in informing the bike riders about how the police officer was being disciplined.
LPPB and Informal Conflict Resolution in Kenema

The Chairman of the Bike Riders Union in Kenema had lent a motorbike to one rider. The rider decided to go through the Hamaddiya Muslim Secondary School compound and by accident hit a female student. One teacher and a few students witnessed the accident, apprehended the rider and beat him up. The rider managed to escape and sought refuge in the house of one of his friends. The group of students that had beaten him up began to stone the house in which he was hiding. They demanded that the rider should leave the house of his friend, but he refused. The students then forced their way into the house and one of the students stabbed and killed the rider.

Immediately after the incident, the bike riders threatened to burn down the Hamaddiya Muslim Secondary School and kill any student seen in the street. A meeting was called by the Resident Minister (Eastern Province), involving the family of the deceased, the bike riders, the principal of Hamaddiya Muslim Secondary School, and LPPB members. The matter was discussed, and it was agreed that all parties should refrain from using violence. The LPPB members were actively involved in monitoring developments after the event and provided the SLP with information on plans of the bike riders. After a week had passed, LPPB members, members from the Bike Riders Union and the principal of the Hamadiyya Muslim Secondary School successfully undertook a joint sensitization tour around Kenema, in which students were called upon to return back to school after a week with no classes.

3.10 LPPBs in Support of Police Activities

3.10.1 Non-Threatening Force Multipliers

One of the key functions of the LPPBs is to be a ‘non-threatening force multiplier.’ In Bo West division, LPPB members saw themselves as actively supporting crowd control by intervening as community members. At times, the SLP is themselves considered a threat to stability and can lead to the escalation of a situation. One LPPB member noted to the team that the “police should not be seen as an enemy. Some will see the LPPB as closer to the SLP – others see them as part of the community. They are not a second or third force; they are the same as the community.” It is in this capacity, as “part of the people”, and because the “police is overstretched” that LPPB members use their mediation skills to settle matters and support the police.

It is this in-between role of LPPB members that should be maintained, where LPPB members are considered part of the community while in a position to liaise with the police when necessary.

3.10.2 Information-Gathering and Sharing

Before the war that took place during the 1990s, the public feared passing on information directly to the police. Doing so could mean that they were taken into custody. Given the history of police-community relations, the SLP are therefore still feared to a degree. Hence, it was noted, “it is easier to pass on information to the LPPBs, who will then pass it on the police” (Bo West, LPPB member). Indeed, the
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LUC for Bo West noted, “with a growing population, we rely on the board to give us information, and the boards have been very instrumental in this regard.”

In a review of the training of LPPBs and SLP that the JSDP carried out in 2009, one participant noted: “We provide information and the police act on the information”. It is as another participant commented “intelligence and community-led policing” that has been developed and encouraged in previous cycles of police reform. “The board makes it easier”, the LUC of East division noted in 2010, “a murder has been committed, we call the board and tell them that ‘we want you to go and find the person for us’. Before the reform, we were not having the board, and it was difficult to police. The difference is that now, when we want information, we contact the chairman, he will then call the zonal heads. They will discuss and come back to us.”

This comment is in line with the SLP 2010-2011 Strategic Plan, which notes that “Civilian partners have and continue to provide sensitive information permitting the institution to respond to local issues and concerns” (SLP 2009:ii).

The boards are also significant in terms of gaining access to areas where community members actively resist police involvement. “This Sierra Leone business, this family business, means that they will save their sons. Initially, when I came here,” The LUC of Eastern division told us, “a serious theft occurred – the chiefs saw it, and the CSVs arrested the criminals. They held them, called the police, but when we came they were no longer there. I sent my intelligence people out there, but we could not do anything. If it had been an outsider to their own community, they would have reported the case to us, but since it was done by their own community, they dealt with it within themselves.” A number of cases like this were recorded by the team, including cases where the SLP was not able to resolve the matter without involvement of the LPPB.

However, even with the establishment of the boards, communal access of the SLP is a challenge, which has little to do with logistical conditions, and more to do with general relations between the population and the SLP.

3.11 The LPPBs and Future Sustainability

As one LPPB member in Bo noted, “when you are talking about sustainability, there must be some kind of training, micro-financing, farming so that sustainability can occur.” The biggest constraint to LPPB members, and something that is a cause of complaint, is that they have no budget, and therefore receive no money for their efforts, not even for transportation to attend LPPB meetings.

For LPPB meetings to take place there is currently a reliance on the commitment of police officers and community representatives, including private donations. In Motema division, Kono District, this meant that a disproportionate amount of time during meetings concerns fundraising for the partnership board. For instance, in 2008-2009, an agricultural committee was set up in Motema division, which suggested to establish a Casava farm that could generate an income for LPPB members (with strong support and input by the LUC at the time). In Bo, the LPPB Chairman suggested that an ‘entertainment center’ could be set up to support the running of the LPPB. It is initiatives and suggestions such as these that need to be further developed so that an income can be generated for the LPPBs. Overreliance on temporary donor funding should be avoided, because it will create a short-term need, and possibly jeopardize the voluntary nature of the LPPBs, rather than a long-term solution. Future training should as a minimum include elements on how to integrate components on
how to make LPPBs able to pay for their members to pay for transport to and from meetings.

The LPPB has also supported fund-raising for the SLP. In Kabala a Fund-Raising Committee had been established, first, to raise funds within the executive through individual contributions for meetings, refreshments, phone bills, transportation, and so forth. Second, the Fund-raising Committee wrote project proposals, and had at the time of the team’s visit written two proposals that had been sent to President Koroma, one to support the construction of a three-bedroom house for the LUC, and another repair divisional headquarters.

3.12 LPPBs and the 2012 Elections

Generally speaking, the LPPBs played a central role during the 2012 general election period:

- Ensuring political neutrality;
- Taking confidence-building measures;
- Involving of LPPBs in the strategic planning of the SLP; and
- Undertaking joint patrols of LPPBs and the SLP.

Meetings were intensified during the elections in a number of the police divisions that the team visited. In some of the divisions challenged by far distances or lack of infrastructure – such as Motema – meetings were held less regularly. At the national conference of the LPPBs held in Freetown in October it was emphasized by the police that both the police and civilians should be actively engaged in preparations for the upcoming elections. Chief Superintendent Mustapha Kambeh (now Assistant Inspector-General) noted that the key to good working relations is information-sharing, especially during the election period, which was followed to some extent by having regular meetings.

An important role of the LPPB was to roll out the message of non-violence to their communities, and educate them on aspects of the electoral law. As was noted in Koindu (Kailahun Division on the border to both Guinea and Liberia), the APPC Chairman, a school teacher, explained: “We go about to educate people about non-violence. Three days ago, I went around the border – we have some villages along the border – sensitizing them about how to vote. I did this in my capacity of being LPPB Chairman”. In other divisions, LPPB members went on the radio, at times with police officers to discuss election security. Meetings were held with the political parties as well to have them commit to non-violence during the election period.

On the day of election, the LPPB Chairman was in a number of divisions present in the operations room in an advisory capacity. The LUC in Kabala: “On the day of the elections; some of them were with me, some were in the field monitoring. In the Ops room, relevant issues were discussed. There was one area, in the voter registry, where the NEC stamp was missing. We sat together with the LPPB and other stakeholders and discussed what to do, and went to the polling station to explain to the people that were getting impatient, that NEC was working hard to solve the issue.” In Tankoro, it was explained how LPPB members were present in the operations room from 8AM to
8PM on the day of elections.  
In the divisions that were most challenged in terms of logistics and infrastructure (Mongo division, for instance), LPPB members functioned as regular police, and helped to transport officers that had been deployed from Freetown around the division. In an urban division such as Congo Cross, the LPPB did not play a role.

---

8 On 4-5 October 2012 the SLP with support from ASJP organized a conference that involved LPPB members, LUCs and CROs from across the country. While the conference was held specifically in support of the upcoming national elections, general matters relating to how the LPPBs are organized and work were discussed. The authors of this report, visited a number of police division after the elections were held, including Kabala, Mongo, Motema, Tankoro, Congo Cross and so forth. Here it was mentioned, that a number of LPPB members had gone back to their respective communities after the conference and informed the LPPB members who were not present about the role that they should play during the elections (e.g., Mongo division, Koinadugu). LUCs went back, confirmed in their assumption that LPPBs and community policing is important to their role as police heads at the divisional level. Consequently some began to consult communities within their jurisdiction to set up LPPB structures where they did not exist (e.g., Tankoro division, Kono). From the perspective of ASJP, this was not the set aim of the October conference, and while positive, a lot of the activities that are planned by the SLP and ASJP should be sped up so that the programme is guiding the process (rather than guided by it).
4 Summary of Suggested Programming Activities

1. LPPBs are based on a voluntary principle. Support to develop the LPPBs and community policing more broadly should maintain this principle until such a time when LPPBs might be able to raise their own funds or when the Government of Sierra Leone begins to provide regular support.

2. Support should be given in a way that puts the SLP in the leads so as to both give the right ‘face’ of support, but also to ensure that LPPBs are as the SLP’s way of reaching out to and engaging communities across the country.

3. However and whatever support is given, the ‘in-between’ status of LPPB members should be maintained. They are part of the community while at the same time in a position to liaise with the police as and when necessary.

4. Together with the CRD, the ASJP should initiate a process of clarifying the Constitution. The Constitution is a vital instrument for the SLP and LPPBs alike to gain greater clarity on what its role should be. In its current form, however, it contains a number of ambiguities:
   - Who are the exact members of the Executive Board?
   - How is geographical representation to be (constitutionally) ensured?
   - How can women’s position in the LPPB, including on the Executive Board, be strengthened?
   - Etc.

5. To ensure that community policing – and Local Needs Policing – is discussed across the police organization, reformulation of the Constitution should involve a cross-section of departments, including but not limited to Corporate services, Operations and Criminal Investigation → Local Needs Policing is not for the CRD to deal with in isolation, but the ethos for the SLP as a whole, including the OSD.

6. Support the CRD in developing job descriptions for all CROs in order to clarify their role, both in police headquarters, but especially at divisional levels. Job descriptions should be developed in collaboration with currently serving CROs and LUCs, and ensure that the CRD at divisional level becomes the ‘institutional memory’ of community engagement, including around community policing, in the divisions.

7. Because of the central role of the LUC in establishing LPPBs and APPCs, all activities considered with respect to community policing must involve this management level of the SLP.

8. The Constitution should – and does – say what is expected of LPPB members, but does not give guidance on how carry out its task. It would be useful if a LPPB handbook was to be developed, which could constitute the basis for training. Any material of this nature that is developed should be developed in collaboration with both LPPB members and LUCs across the country. Areas that the LPPB handbook could cover are:
   - Mechanisms to hold the police to account for their actions.
• Informal conflict resolution.
• Dos and don’ts of interviewing.
• Report writing.
• The difference between civil and criminal cases, emphasizing domestic violence.
• LPPB elections.
• The role of LPPBs in national elections.
• Etc.

9. On the basis of a revised Constitution and the *LPPB Handbook*, a training strategy should be developed in collaboration with the SLP, and rolled out to the districts in which ASJP operates, but to the greatest degree possible involve neighboring divisions. *Trainings must incorporate thinking on how to make LPPB structures sustainable.*

10. Ensure that ASJP’s field offices build up relations with LPPBs in the divisions where they work, and monitor LPPB activities.

11. Support the LPPBs in developing further as a police accountability mechanism.

12. Develop a simple monitoring framework that can be used to collect data on which types of cases LPPB members deal with; how LPPBs deal with those cases; and what the follow-up has been.

13. Ensure that geographical representation on the Executive Board is promoted. In the process of finding the most appropriate structure, the different models that are already being used in the divisions of Mongo, Kailahun and Motema, for instance, should be drawn upon. In the medium-term, develop and agree a structure in rural and urban areas.

14. In the context of the LPPBs, provide targeted support to those women who are already members of the LPPB in order to raise their profile, and encourage general recruitment of women into the LPPB.

15. Draw on notable champions of community policing in all of the activities suggested above, notably the current CRO in Kissy division, the current LUC of Eastern division (former Director of CRD), the current Director of CID (former LUC in Eastern division), the current LUC in Mongo division, the current LUC in Kailahun, and the current AIG of Western Rural (former LUC of Motema division). In addition, the expertise and ideas of a number of LPPB Chairmen should be engaged. In the opinion of the team, the Chairmen in Bo, Waterloo and Kailahun as well as the Secretary-General in Daru have particularly important insight to share in this regard.
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6 Interviews

LPPB members and end-users, police officers, bike riders and traditional leaders were consulted in and around:

- Bo West Division HQ.
- Bo East Division HQ.
- Tinkoro Police Post.
- Makeni Division HQ.
- Binkolo Police Post.
- Kamabai Police Post.
- Lunsar Division HQ.
- Kailahun Division HQ.
- Koindu Police Station.
- Daru Division HQ.
- Kenema Division HQ.
- Kabala Division HQ.
- Mongo Division HQ.
- Tankoro Division HQ.
- Motema Division HQ.
- Sewafe Police Station.
- Tombodu Police Post.
- Peyima.
- Waterloo Division HQ.
- Kabala Division HQ.
- Fadugu Police Station.
- Kodembaia Police Station.
- Blama Police Station.
- Mano Junction Police Station.