



Parliamentary Brief on Land Bills

“We want laws that are intended to genuinely address the core problems affecting land governance”

February 2022



As contributors to the legislative reform process on land in Sierra Leone, CSOs in and out of the TWG present this brief to the Honourable Members of Parliament on behalf of the larger population including vulnerable land-owners, land-users, women, youth and large-scale investment entities who still hold the opinion that their concerns and interests have not been adequately addressed in the gazetted land laws tabled in Parliament.



SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Define the Chieftdom Council's oversight role**
- **Clarify the question of land ownership;**
- **Clearly define what 'customary land acquisition' means to answer the question of whether a piece of customary land can be bought on freehold basis**
- **Regulate Cattle-herder and farmer relationships**
- **Fix a lease floor price of no less than 100 USD per hectare**
- **Simplify the creation process of Town/Village Area Land Committees**
- **Define or prevent sustainable investments in protected areas**

1. **Chieftdom Councils should not have an oversight role over land and only Paramount Chief Nominees should serve as chairperson for chieftdom land committees** – otherwise, the intention of the proposed laws to remove all forms of discrimination and protect customary land rights will be undermined and corrupt practices risk continuation. If the oversight responsibility of the Chieftdom Councils is to stay, we argue that responsibilities and functions of the Chieftdom Councils should be clearly spelled out.
2. **The proposed Customary Land Right Act does not adequately answer the question of: Who owns the land?** Given the complexity of family lineage in our rural settings, where almost an entire village has its roots with a few families, it is very necessary for the proposed Customary Land Rights Act to dedicate a part of the Act to the definition of land ownership. This section needs to detail the various forms of owners; circumstances under which one can own land; and other issues such as who is counted as part of a land-owning families and qualifications for rights, or under which situations (regarding a given period of land occupancy) can a land user be considered as owner of a piece of land onto which he/she has invested. The fact that community land is also defined under Section 1 as “family lands that exist within the community” defies the idea of vesting family land in the family as a unit. We thus recommend removal of the term “family lands” from the definition of community lands.
3. **Land lease fee redistribution should be clearly disaggregated.** Landowners consulted argue that land lease fees are their private monies and should not be redistributed. However, in order to consolidate the cooperation of other authorities, we propose that the lease fee should be disaggregated in the following manner: 80% for land owners, 10% for Chieftdom Development Funds, and 10% for Constituency Development Funds. This, we believe will facilitate and support inclusive land governance and make the respective stakeholders play an active role in preventing and managing land-related conflict, supporting the rights of customary land owners and investments. It will also show that communities are contributing to the development in their localities.
4. **In the absence of any existing law and relevant policy on possible conflicts between cattle-rearers and crop-farmers** over the same piece of land, a section of the Customary Land Rights Act should be dedicated to clarification of how commercial cattle-rearers can acquire customary rights to use lands. We suggest that cattle rearers be requested to enter into formal land use agreements with Town/Village Land Committees and Chieftdom Land Committees, clarifying range of land used, period of time uses, and the protection of water resources among other things. A respective schedule could be added to the bill.
5. **The laws need to clarify whether a maternal grand-child can lay claims of ownership on his/her mother's family land** - Usually, nephews and nieces are told to lay such claim only on their mother's family land. Grand-children are forbidden against claiming ownership right with their uncles and aunties.
6. **The establishment of Town/Village Area Land Committees should be simplified** – Section 56 of the National Land Commission charges District Commissions with the task of establishing Town/Village Area Land Committees. Because this process would be lengthy and costly, we suggest that Towns/Villages have the possibility to register their Town/Village area Land Committees with their respective Chieftdom Land Committees, providing proof of having followed a given procedure. A schedule for proper elections could be added to the National land Commission Act.

- 7. Village Area Land Committees membership should be extended to the amount of land-owning families.** Section 57 (1) limits the membership to Village Area Land Committees to 4 resident land -owners in the town or village. It implies that on some occasions, not all land-owning families of the village will be represented in the committee. Furthermore, there is no indication in the Bill of the duration of membership for neither the Chiefdom Land Committees nor the Town or Village Area Land Committees. This omission may be the cause of future conflicts. We therefore suggest changing the section to:

57. (1) Each Town or Village Area Land Committee shall consist of the following members who shall reside in the respective towns or villages:

(a) town or village chief who shall be the Chairperson or a representative of the chief;

(b) A member of each land-owning family

(c) an equal number of resident non-landowners

Furthermore, because no tenure duration is defined, we propose addition of the following section:

57. (4) Town or Village area Land Committees should give the opportunity for members to be replaced through elections once a year

- 8. Disagreement between majority and few members of a family to lease family land may forestall investment and discriminate against majority rights** - Section 31 of the Customary Lands Right Acts proposes that a lease agreement is only valid when signed by ALL adult family members. This is being vehemently opposed by the investors we engaged, who argue that it has always been a very difficult task getting ALL family members under one roof to agree to sign a lease agreement. In the case of disagreement between a majority and few family members (usually due to the personal differences in polygamous homes), investment will be delayed or completely debarred. Disagreements may also discriminate against the majority rights of those few members of the landowning family who want their land leased out. While a solution could be to legitimize a large fraction (e.g. 80%) of the family to sign lease agreements, we argue that this could lead to abuses, such as whereby certain bad investors may easily circumvent a section of the family who already have conflicting interests. We therefore suggest to complement sections 11, 31, and 32 with a clause wherein if a few family members oppose a lease, they should be heard by a grievance committee to mediate a consensus. Where this committee concludes that the decision of these few family members is "unreasonable", then they should not be allowed to veto.

- 9. Sustainable investment should not be allowed in protected areas** – In section 25 of the Customary Land Rights bill, *sustainable investments* are permitted in environmentally protected areas. The loosely used term "sustainable investment" is not defined in the bill. If the section alludes to investments benefiting the protection of the environment, such as ecotourism, research, or restoration activities (such as mentioned under Section 12 of the "National Protected Area Agency Act, 2021"), Then this Section contradicts Section 21 of the same bill, which prevents mining, plantation, farming or any large-scale development activities to take place in wetlands, wildlife habitats, steep slopes, old growth or virgin forests, or other ecologically sensitive areas. Investments should, therefore, not be carried in protected and environmental sensitive areas generally. We therefore argue changing section 25 to:

25. Only investments for the benefits of the environment shall be carried out in areas designated as protected under - ...

- 10. The government shall fix a standardized floor price for a hectare of land at minimum USD 100** - We deduced from comments from community members and stakeholders we engaged that there is always a huge power imbalance between landowners and a wealthy multinational investor who is accompanied by government authorities and the paramount chief. Thus, it is not feasible that land-owners can fairly negotiate any lease fee for their land above the government's stipulated fee as proposed by the draft Customary land Right Act. We therefore suggest altering Section 38. A [study by the Ruhr-University Bochum](#) suggested that adequate compensation in a case in Bombali District, should amount to between €48.5 and €55.41 per acre of land. We argue to alter Section 38 of the National Land Commission to:

38. Government agencies may set minimum rates of no less that US\$ 100 per hectare for leasing of land for specific purposes, but communities and families shall have the right to negotiate for higher rental payments than the minimum rates.

1. INTRODUCTION

Dear Honourable Members of Parliament;

On behalf of the customary land-owners, traditional leaders, investors and civil society members around the country engaged in land governance advocacy, we heartily congratulate the leadership of the House of Parliament for allowing the draft land laws to be introduced in the Well on 22nd October, 2021.

We are excited about this land reform process because, for far too long, Sierra Leone has lived with antiquated colonial rules/ordinances and old laws. These legislations have been widely criticised for not matching with modern trends. In their misalignment, they have undermined our goal for inclusive, people-centred natural resource governance and redistribution and utilization of resources for sustainable development.

It is our understanding that when stakeholders were contributing to the content of the draft **National Land Commission (NLC) Bill**, the desire was to institute an organized, effective, and inclusive national land administration structure that would separate operational duties from regulatory roles. So, the establishment of a National Land Commission and decentralised District Land Commission, chiefdom, as well as village and area land committees is expected to bring on-board more actors into the land governance sphere. These roles have been detailed out so that each level of authority has clear functions and responsibilities.

Similarly, the draft **Customary Land Rights (CLR) Bill** is expected to correct social and economic flaws facilitated by various customary laws, rules and practices across the country. The desired goal of the proposed law is therefore to promote inclusive access to land by removing all forms of discriminations in the acquisition, management and ownership of land, to guarantee customary ownership right to land, strengthen tenure security and above all promote responsible land-based large-scale investment in rural communities.

So far, the civil society, in consultation with cross-section of citizens of Sierra Leone have interrogated the content of the draft bills and have identified some critical issues that we want to bring to your attention. The hope is that you will use your legislative authority to ensure the draft laws are reviewed to address the concerns raised by the citizens.

2. THE GOAL, OBJECTIVE AND RATIONALE

The civil society's desire is to support the Government of Sierra Leone, through its legislative arm, to make land governance laws that are consistent with international standards and to provide practical solutions to the complexities characterising our current land governance ecosystem.

The goal of this Brief is therefore to promote sustainable rural development in Sierra Leone through effective management of the country's natural resources, including land, with the objective of amplifying the concerns of community stakeholders and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), some of which the draft land laws have either not adequately addressed or have entirely left out.

3. THE AUDIENCE

We are sharing this Brief with all policy stakeholders who have interest in the on-going legislative reform process on land.

However, given the level at which the bills are, our primary targets are the Honourable Members of Parliament, through the Clerk of Parliament, for the attention of the Leader of Government Business, the Speaker of Parliament, and the Parliament Committee Chairman on Land.

4. METHODOLOGY -

The content of this Brief and its recommendations herein were in part reached after we held several district-level inclusive town hall engagements in Pujehun, Kenema, Port-Loko and Magburaka, Kamakwie (Karene) and Kambia. The recommendations are additionally informed by the concerns expressed by members in our organizations.

5. The ISSUES/CONCERNS

Our engagement with community stakeholders, landowners and land users, representatives of investment companies, and government authorities has revealed that the problem with land reform is not just with the bills – but also with two core issues:

1. Customary Land Ownership is not clearly defined, resulting in confusion arising from perpetual contestation over the same pieces of land - Honourable Members of Parliament, we have critically analysed and noted that the general understanding that customary land belongs to families and communities, does not adequately help us understand who owns the land. This is why women, adopted children, and other family members are – and will continue to be – discriminated against on a frequent basis. This is why investors are acquiring land from people with illegitimate claims and paying land leases to various sets of the wrong people. Significantly, as a result, implementation of the land titling process proposed in the National Lands Commission Act, may therefore be marred by several complexities and set-backs.

To elaborate further on this matter, here are some of the key sensitive issues/concerns and questions raised by stakeholders:

- 1.1.1. **Maternal Right still not protected adequately** – The difficult question asked in Magburaka was: *'My mother is from the Kamara family and got married to my father, whose family name is Sow'. By heredity, my father does not own land anywhere in the district. I have tried to lay claim on a portion of the Kamara family land, but I am told to only lay such claim on the Sow family land. Meanwhile, the new law will guarantee my mother's right to her family land. But what if she dies and I am denied on the basis that I am not one of the Kamara's, as is the case currently?'* Based on this case, the question remaining unanswered by current policy is: How can the proposed

Customary Land Rights Act address the maternal rights of grand-children? (Ref. Part I, Sec. definition of family Land)

1.1.2. **Chieftom Council remains in control of the land:**

The oversight responsibility of Chieftom Councils mentioned under **Section 9** of the CLR bill is not clarified, nor is it mentioned anywhere else in the CLR or NLC bill. Given the fact that the Paramount Chief is heading the Chieftom Land Committee, we argue that this oversight responsibility should be removed from the legislation. If it is to stay, the oversight responsibility should be clarified by clearly listing responsibilities and functions of the Chieftom Council.

1.1.3. **Land Users are not considered**

Many people living in rural Sierra Leone are land-users rather than landowners, implying that they use lands of land-owning families without "owning" them. While those land-users may have lived on and used those lands for several generations, they do not have the rights to register those lands under their own name. We therefore suggest to include a provision in the bills explaining the entitlement of land-users to their lands after living and working on them for a period of more than (say) 50 years, in exception of large-scale land acquisitions.

1.1.4. **Cattle-Rearers and customary landowners' conflict is unaddressed and will continue**

A participant asked in Karene, 'In our district, we have many migrants from neighbouring Guinea who have lived in our communities for several years. But everybody knows they don't own land. However, the original immigrants have died and their children have of recent, engaged in massive commercial cattle-rearing and have refused to acquire land through the rightful legal channels.'

They argue that they were also born in the communities and therefore own the land. They do not have control over their cattle and do not normally take any responsibility if their animals trespass on other people's land. When conflicts arise between them and the crop farmers, the court usually has no law to reference. These matters are referred to the customary courts. In the case of violence and hostilities, the police conduct mass arrest of crop farmers.'

The question now is: How can the customary land Rights Act clarify the land right relationship between cattle-rearers and customary land owners?

- 1.1.5. Family land within communities may be claimed as community land** – A community member we engaged shared, 'My family owns a land within the community. The proposed law says a community land is any land within the community, including family land.'

Regarding claimed land, we question: How is it possible that a family will lose its land due to its situation within the community? (Ref. Part I, Sec.1 (g): definition of Community Land)

- 1.1.6. Method of land acquisition to be abundantly clear - to state whether or not customary land can be acquired privately through purchase** - The proposed Customary Lands Right Act will remove all forms of discrimination of land acquisition. However, the Act did not make any effort to first define the word 'acquisition' or state whether a customary land can be bought and owned freely. It is still emphasised that customary land rights are vested in families and communities. The proposed law further defined 'long term tenancy' is not to exceed 50 years and is meant for the use of land for purposes such as construction of dwelling. In the views of the stakeholders we engaged, these

specifications mean discrimination will surface once the 50-year tenancy expires; an indefinite tenancy does not address the perennial conflict between the first settlers and the other families who have also asserted ownership over other portions of land within the chiefdom or communities.

Also, given the prevailing situation, individuals are already buying customary lands within cities and peri-urban areas in the provinces and titling those lands into private/individuals names. This trend is already threatening the customary land right that the proposed law intends to protect. And in the proposed customary Land Rights Act, the word 'buyer' is mentioned as an alternative rightsholder to a leasee. (Ref. part IV: Sec. 11 9") (2) 'A prospective leasee or **buyer** shall ensure that the head of the family furnishes him with the document containing the collective consent of the family members.'

The questions that remain unanswered are: Can one permanently acquire customary land by purchase? Can one buy land in the provinces? Is customary land for sale?

2. Lack of adequate benefit, compensation or consolation for the use and destruction of Land People who lease their lands in rural Sierra Leone, and often as a result lose their primary livelihood, should be adequately compensated in order to cover their socioeconomic needs for the year – especially in the case where all the land is being leased out (such as is Socfin's case in Malen chiefdom, Pujehun district). It is unfortunate that landowners are getting a maximum of \$2.5 USD (being 50% of the total lease rent) for a hectare of land, which often will be shared among a large number of family members. It is a process which does not come without allegations of fraud and corruption.

Previously, land lease redistribution was addressed in Section 34A of the Mines and

Minerals Act of 2009, but the new version of that law (already in parliament) now recommends land lease redistribution to be in accordance with government statutes (leaving room for the new land law to address).

We therefore suggest that the bill set a minimum floor price for the lease of an acre of land, and set the distribution of those fees to 80% for land owners, 10% for Chieftom Development Funds, and 10% for Constituency Development Funds.

6. Other Issues in the National Land Commission Bill

- i. **The Use of 'his/her'** – During the community engagements, and specifically while discussing the Customary Land Rights Bill, a participant raised a concern about the consistent use of 'his' instead of his/her. Our response was that, generally law recognises the masculine gender as universal. However, this is proven incorrect in Section 7 (1 a) which dictates: *'in the case of the Chairperson the members of the Board shall elect one of their number to act as Chairperson until such time as the Chairperson resumes his office or another is appointed in her or his stead...'*

Since this section explicitly specifies gender, it is no longer a valid argument to say that 'it is okay to ignore specifying the female gender in law or that masculine titles are applied universally.

- ii. In support of the gender equality perspective in the proposed inclusive land administration, the following is further recommended:
 - a) A representative of the Ministry of Gender be included in the Board;
 - b) Aside from the technical members of the District Land Commissions, let there be an inclusive district level multi-stakeholder group that can serve as a microcosm of the national Board of Director, whose

core mandate shall be to act as an inclusive and alternative grievance redress mechanism.

- iii. **Section 37 (2)** – We suggest adding the responsibility to the District Land Commission, to accompany communities in leasing their lands for investment, by making communities and/or families aware of their rights, enhancing their understanding of the potential impact of the lease and supporting them in negotiation with the leaser.
- iv. **Section 43 – No mention of land registration fee** – it was recommended that, in order to ensure women have more titles to land, the cost for land registration for women-headed families be reduced compared to families headed men.
- v. **Section 44 – Conflict Resolution Unit shall work with Multi-Stakeholder Platform** – The District Alternative Dispute Resolution Units created through the Act shall be required to work with Inclusive Multi-Stakeholder Platforms.
- vi. **Section 50 (b) – Difficulty selecting members of the Chieftom land Committee** – By geographical interpretation, a section of a chieftom is a collection of villages and areas. In that regard, it will be difficult for one village or area to determine who represents the section on the chieftom land committee.
- vii. **AMBIGUITY - Section 17, 18 and 82 from the NLC bill** - The sections mentioned make provisions for Chieftom Land Committees to take responsibilities for specific tasks in the case that Village Land Committees are not yet established. In the NLC Bill, Town/Village Land Committees will, however, enable the constitution of the Chieftom Land Committees through the nomination of members. This implies that the Chieftom

Land Committees will only start functioning after the Village Land Committees are established.

viii. Section 51 (e) – Function of the Chieftom land Committee to Levy Taxes

- The functions of the chieftom land committee should not include 'levying' taxes but rather support to the collection of taxes levied by the appropriate government authorities.

ix. Section 56 – Composition of Town or village Land Committee

- It is likely not feasible for the 'Commission to establish' Committees in every chieftom, village and area as proposed. Acknowledging the huge task of creating thousands of Village Land Committees, we suggest altering section 56 and providing communities with the possibility to independently form committees and register them with their respective Chieftom Land Committees, thereby respecting requirements set by the Commission, such as proof of the conduct of elections. An additional schedule could clarify those requirements.

- x. Section 57 (1)** - Limiting membership to Village Area Land Committees to 4 resident land-owners in a town or village implies that on some occasions, not all land-owning families of the village will be represented in the committee. Furthermore, there is no indication in the Bill about the duration of office membership for neither the Chieftom Land Committees nor the Town or Village Area Land Committees. This omission may be the cause of future conflicts. We therefore suggest increasing the membership of VALC to (b) a member of each land-owning family to be appointed through a consensus by the rest of the family members, (c) an equal number of resident non-land owners. The Tenure of office for Committee members should be up to two terms, with four years per term.

xi. Section 64 – Relation between Land Registries and Registrar General

- While the NLC bill provides for the creation of a National Land Registry and District Land Registries, it does not address how the existing Officer of the Registrar General (ORG) will be incorporated into the new system. We recommend clarifying in the bills the legal relationship between the ORG and the proposed Land Registrar. One option may be for the land registry department of the ORG to be strengthened instead of creating a parallel registry.

xii. Section 68 (2) – Registrar of District Land Registry

- The law proposes that, '*Where a District Land Commissioner is yet to be appointed the Chief Registrar shall provide the services required*' – As an alternative suggestion, in the absence of a District Land Commissioner in a district, a designated person can be attached to the local councils to oversee land related matters.

xiii. Section 73 (1) – Instrument of Transfer

- It is proposed that the instrument of transfer shall be signed by 'an authorised person of the Chieftom Land Committee, but there is no mention of how the authorised person from the Chieftom Land Committee shall be appointed, who that authorised person shall be, or details of his/her terms of office.

xiv. Section 73 (3)

- The proposed law stipulates that '*The Commission shall establish the maximum fee that an authorised member of the Chieftom Land Committee and the Chief Administrator of the District Council may charge for endorsement of the instrument of transfer*'.

As mentioned above, we argue to reduce the fee for women.

xv. Section 74. (1) Land Tenure Right

- Initially, based on subsection (74)1, the authentication of tenure security within

the policy is clear and seemingly complete; however, subsection (74)3 adds confusion given additional conditions on the topic of authenticating customary land right in its entirety, for subsection (74)3 reads, *'Except where the right or its registration was obtained by fraud or dishonesty, earlier registered rights shall be considered superior to later registered rights'*. We argue that the proposed law does not attempt to authentic land rights based on sequence of registration. We are already aware of how individuals have wrongfully appropriated land that was never theirs and got away with it based several known and unknown factors.

- xvi. **Section 84 (1)** – There may be an omission in the sentence that reads: *'The Commission shall establish a grievance... whereby a person can challenge decisions of the Commission in respect of land for which he has a right or claim'*.
- xvii. **Section 92 - Funds of the Commission** - The law proposes that as part of the revenue sources of the Commission, *(c)any revenue derived from the sale of property, movable or immovable by or on behalf of the Commission'*; This, we believe, may conflict with the one treasury account order by government.

7. Other issues in the CUSTOMARY LAND RIGHTS ACT

- i. **Section 2: Application of Act** - It is proposed that the law will apply **throughout Sierra Leone**. It is not clear whether this includes villages round the Freetown Peninsula where headmen have some authority to allocate land and they also hold the view that they reserve a customary right of ownership to their land;
- ii. **Section 33 - Lease Agreement** (2) *"A lease agreement for the acquisition of community land within a town or village shall be signed by two members of the Town or Village Area Land Committee, one of whom shall be a woman"* – It is not

clear who the two signatories shall be and how they should be selected.

- iii. **AMBIGUITY - Section 17, 18 and 82 from the NLC Bill** - These sections mention making provisions for Chiefdom Land Committees to take responsibilities for specific tasks in the case that Village Land Committees are not yet established. In the NLC Bill, Town/Village Land Committees will, however, enable the constitution of the Chiefdom Land Committees through the nomination of members of the village/area land committees. This implies that the Chiefdom Land Committees will only start functioning after the Village/Area Land Committees are established.
- iv. **Section 31 and 32 - DISCRIMINATION OF MAJORITY RIGHT TO LEASE LAND** - The law proposed that: *'No investment shall take place on any customary Land unless the investor obtains the written informed consent of the male and female adult members of the family or community with rights to the land.'* We contend that this provision is not only a threat to investment, it is also a discrimination to majority right to lease their land if they want their land leased. Similarly, in Section 32, there will be a challenge in having ALL the adults in one meeting give consent for the lease of community land.
- v. **Section 19. putting on hold disputed land transactions** - We suggest adding *"Section 19 (3): legal action shall suspend the disputed land transaction"*.
- vi. **Section 25. Sustainable investments in protected areas** - The term "sustainable investment" is not defined in the bill. If the Section alludes to investments benefiting the protection of the environment, such as ecotourism, research, or restoration activities, such as mentioned under Section 12 of the "National Protected Area Agency Act, 2021", we argue to change section 25 to *"Only investments for the benefits of the environment shall be carried out..."*. Otherwise, Section 25 contradicts Section 21 of the same bill, which prevents mining, plantation, farming or any large-scale development

activities to take place in wetlands, wildlife habitat, steep slopes, old growth or virgin forests, or other ecologically sensitive areas. Investments should, therefore, not be carried in protected and environmental sensitive areas generally.

- vii. Section 28. Information provided to concerned communities** – We suggest adding the investment's Environmental and Social Impact Assessment to the list of information to be provided to the affected communities. (c) expected profits should be supplemented with the number and description of employment opportunities created as well as their respective salaries. For the disclosure of beneficiary ownership, the identity and interest of the (say a minimum of 5% holders) shall also be transparently communicated to the communities. Furthermore, we stipulate that conditions in terms of time, means, and language for the delivery of the information should be mentioned. The information should be provided at least six months ahead of the start of a negotiation, through appropriate means and language understandable by the affected communities.

- viii. Profit Sharing Concession for land owners in land based agreement** – As CSOs, we are of the view that, hitherto, land has not been perceived as a commodity in the investment. In the absence of any such law on profit sharing arrangement between land owners, communities and investors, we recommend the bills stipulate a 10% profit benefit be given to land owners once an investment has reached a breakeven point and begins making profit.

- ix. GENERAL CONCERN** – Finally, attention must be drawn to past deals which have not benefited from equitable or empowering land agreements. Civil Society Organization request Parliament to discuss and take action on the following question since laws are not retroactive.

What will happen to the existing investment companies, (foremost) whose lease agreements were not ratified by Parliament, including those who never

had lease agreements with communities and have land exceeding 5000 hectare or lease periods of over 50 years?

Contacts:

Land for Life Secretariat - Sierra Leone

Network Movement for Justice and Development (NMJD)
22^c Collegiate School Road,
Off Wilkinson Road – Freetown.
Mobile: +23276645314/+23279036969
Email: abu.brima@nmjdsi.org
[/bklebbie@yahoo.com](mailto:bklebbie@yahoo.com)

Green Scenery Sierra Leone

42 Charles Street, Freetown
Mobile: +23276601979
Email: josephrahall@gmail.com
www.greenscenery.org

National Coalition for Community Legal Empowerment (NaCCLE)

46 Krootown Road, Freetown
Mobile: +232591956
Email: adamatic.karitimi55@gmail.com
<https://naccle.org.sl>





Parliamentary Brief on Customary Land Rights and National Land Commission Bills 2021

"The right to own, hold, use, inherit, succeed to or deal with customary land shall be guaranteed to women and men equally"

24th February 2022

