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Executive Summary

This study examines the Bui Resettlement Programme within the context of international guidelines and protocols focusing on how the processes of the resettlement scheme have been informed by national and international standards, since the original Environmental and Social Assessment in 2007. The choice of Bui for this study is based on the myriad of problems associated with previous similar resettlements in Akosombo and Kpong. These problems range from inadequacy of resettlement houses built for the people, to inadequate compensations. The rationale is to examine the extent to which GDD activities in relation to Bui have influenced the processes in Bui and to draw lessons for future resettlements.

The methodology used in undertaking the study included a systematic review of the activities of the large Ghana Dams Dialogue (GDD) and primary (field) data collected from stakeholders using focus group discussions, key informant interviews and observations. These approaches allowed us to capture wider perceptions and experiences of key stakeholders in the resettlement process.

This case study reviews and assesses changes made in policy and practice since the inception of the GDD process as illustrated by its influences on the Bui Resettlement Programme designed for the Bui Dam Project since 2006. GDD was set up in 2006 as a multi-stakeholder dialogue to learn lessons from past dams in Ghana with a view to improving future resettlement outcomes. The Dialogue, which has been managed by IWMI since its inception up until 2010, coincided with the planning and construction of the Bui dam.

Major findings in the study show that the GDD platform is known and is supported by stakeholders. It is perceived as a platform for discussing on shared concerns as far as the Bui resettlement scheme is concerned. It is credited as the only platform that successfully engaged all stakeholders and which could be used as a planning tool for the development of dams not only in Ghana but in the West African Region, providing multiple stakeholders with opportunities to hold discussions on deep-seated differences and contribute to the development of equitable solutions. Relating to the activities of GDD in the Bui Power Project, a livelihood study was undertaken to understand the implications of the dam on livelihoods and review alternative livelihood arrangements to mitigate livelihood loss. The GDD platform also created opportunities for stakeholder dialogue on the provision of social amenities and contributed to the involvement of affected communities in the resettlement scheme. Also, because of the niche it created for itself, the GDD has been regularly approached as a mediator on contentious issues by both the authorities and the affected communities.

There is general acceptance among all stakeholders of the type, nature, quality and quantity of rooms of the resettlement houses, except the initial houses that were built at Jamah area, but these were later changed as a result of some contributions from the Dialogue process. There were however fewer issues with provision of sanitation facilities and market centres. Nonetheless, compared with the Volta River Authority (VRA) Resettlement houses in Kpong and Akosombo, interactions with community leaders and members who visited Akosombo and Kpong revealed that the houses built under the Bui project are far better than those provided by the VRA at Kpong and Akosombo. The visit was initiated and facilitated by GDD.

The study also reflected some challenges for resettled communities. For example, community members, men, women and young people, indicated that the Bui Power Authority has reneged on some of its promises prior to the resettlement, especially in the areas of livelihoods and compensations. There are delays in the payment of both crop and land compensations. The delay in payments has also been supported by other stakeholders, through key informant interviews expressing difficulties with land compensations as there are issues with land titling, land ownership and land registration. Thus some stakeholders have justified the delay in the payment of land compensation but not those for crop compensation. However, it is important to note that there have been efforts on the part of Bui Power Authority (BPA) to get the appropriate agencies to speed up the process of paying crop compensation.
Adjusting to new situations takes some time and this is taking a toll on the livelihoods of some of the inhabitants. Many members of affected communities, especially women and young people, expressed worry over growing food shortage and hunger as a result of livelihood losses, coupled with delays in implementing the alternative livelihood programme. According to BPA, the first phase of the alternative livelihood programme has just been completed and they will soon be rolling out the second phase, which has some practical benefits. This is one of the areas some of the respondents thought that the GDD could continue to be useful. Finally, even though there have been stakeholder consultations prior to the resettlement, all such consultations have declined since the people moved to their new resettlement localities.

Based on evidence from this study, two key issues are critical in moving forward. First of all, it is imperative that the GDD platform takes another step to promote interactions among stakeholders on the issue of compensation payments and should involve the Land Commission. It is important for parties, especially the resettlement communities, to understand the dynamics of compensation payment, especially land compensation and the processes involved. Timelines must be agreed upon by parties for payment of compensations and other benefits due to affected communities.

On the issue of livelihood, the BPA noted that efforts with other stakeholders such as the Fisheries Department at the University of Ghana to find an alternative route to ensuring sustained livelihoods of the fisherfolks who have lost their livelihood as a result of the resettlement was under way and this is one of the many initiatives being undertaken by the Authority.
1. Introduction

1.1 Background to the study

Monitoring of natural resource governance is an important activity for promoting equity, accountability and transparency within the context of global governance (Darby 2010). Thus, water resources utilisation such as damming for hydropower and irrigation require a governance system that promotes equity, transparency and the protection of human rights (ibid). It is therefore important to examine how the damming of the Volta River at Bui under the Bui Power Project has followed the principles of promoting equity, accountability and human wellbeing especially for communities, households and individuals that are directly or indirectly affected by the dam. Consequently, this study is commissioned by the International Institute of Environment and Development to examine in particular how the activities of the Ghana Dams Dialogue (GDD) have influenced policies, processes and practices of the Bui Power Authority (BPA) in promoting equity, transparency, human rights and eventual human wellbeing within the BPA Resettlement Scheme. The purpose is to use the GDD experiences in Bui as a Ghanaian best practice for future resettlement schemes.

The context of the study

Ghana is one of the West African states with an estimated total population of approximately 24.5 million as at 2010 according to preliminary data from the Ghana Statistical Service. It is a middle-income country with an estimated economic growth rate of 14.4 per cent in 2011.1. The domestic economy continues to rely on agriculture, which accounts for about 35 per cent of GDP and employs about 55 per cent of the work force, mainly small landholders. Cocoa, timber, gold, and in recent times crude oil, remain the key resources on which the country depends.

Dams in Ghana also constitute a key source of energy for the country. There are currently two functional hydropower dams located in Akosombo and Kpong over the Volta River, which runs across the country. There are other smaller irrigation dams located across the country, particularly in Northern Ghana such as the Tano dam. The construction of a third functional hydropower dam began in 2006 on the Black Volta at the Bui Gorge under the auspices of the Bui Power Authority. The Bui Project is located within the Tain district of the Brong Ahafo Region in Ghana and the Bole district of the Northern Region.

The GDD was established in 2006, inspired by the processes and findings of the World Commission on Dams (WCD), with financial support from GTZ (now GIZ) The GDD was designed as a national dialogue process, following international and global examples of such processes. It is the first inclusive planning tool for the development of dams in the West African Region, providing multiple stakeholders with opportunities to hold discussions on irreconcilable differences and contributed to the development of equitable solutions. The GDD in keeping with the beliefs of the WCD has equity, sustainability, efficiency, participatory and accountability as the core values of future development of large dams (Nelson and Selby 2009; GDD 2010a).

Since its establishment, GDD has functioned in three phases. The first phase of the project focused on the establishment of the dialogue; the second sought to strengthen the process; while the third phase aimed to consolidate its achievement. It has clarified the institutional setting and decision-making processes and pathways for hydropower dams in Ghana. It has strived to reconcile national government issues with local level issues, as well as strengthened interactions between various sectors. It has also assisted in shaping the context of dams-related issues by playing a key role in negotiations and

---

resolving conflicts between stakeholder groups; knowledge-sharing and awareness creation (Nelson and Selby 2009) as mediators. The GDD also sought to learn from Kpong and Akosombo by involving the Dam Affected Communities (DACs) and Volta River Authority (VRA).

This study is a review and assessment of progress made in policy and practice since the inception of the Ghana Dams Dialogue process. It reviews the principal issues brought up through the dialogue over the years and assesses the degree to which they have been implemented (either as attitude, practice, binding policy or budgeting) by different actors.

The report also documents the changes that have occurred in policy and practice between 2006 and 2011, using the issues raised in the Dialogue as the best indicator of Ghanaian “good practice” as identified by a large multi-stakeholder group. It uses the Bui dam outcomes as the best indication of real practice on the ground. The study focused on the Bui resettlement area to examine the delivery of resettlement arrangements under the Bui Dam Project in accordance with planned arrangements and actual implementation scenarios and GDD recommendations.

It was recognised from the onset of the study that changes may not be attributable solely to the Dialogue as many of the ideas may have other influences (for example, the role of the independent Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for Bui that followed World Bank Guidelines). The study therefore sought to answer the question: What difference did the recommendations of the Ghana Dams Dialogue make in the Bui Power Authority Resettlement Programme?

1.2 Specific Objectives of the Study

The study was based on the following specific objectives:

1. To review GDD documentations, programmes and meetings, and examine how GDD outputs have influenced policy and practice on natural resource governance under the Bui Project.

2. To assess resettlement arrangements under the Bui power project in line with GDD recommendations and ESIA guidelines.

3. To examine the perceptions, attitudes and shared concerns of displaced persons of the Bui power project.

1.3 The Methodology of the Study

The first part, which is purely a desk review, was done using all the available print and electronic resources, documentations, minutes, etc. related to the Bui Power Project and other related projects. Key institutions contacted in this regard were members of the Ghana Dams Dialogue, the Volta River Authority, Bui Power Project, the Ministry of Energy and others.

The study was designed as a case study of the Bui Power Project resettlement arrangement and hence a qualitative research approach was employed in delivering the objectives of the study. This approach allowed for an in-depth analysis of issues while at the same time allowing assessment through direct observations and interactions with their subjects. The specific methods employed are threefold; field observations, key informant interviews and focus group discussions.

Direct Observation

This method afforded opportunity for researchers to directly observe the physical provisions made by the Bui Power Project in the resettlement communities in terms of housing, water and sanitation, energy, and other livelihood arrangements. This was done during the period of stay in the area for the data collection component of the study. In the process, informal interactions with community members gave more insights into the resettlement arrangements.
Key Informant Interviews

This approach allowed the researchers to identify people with knowledge and experience of the subject under investigation and to engage them in formal or semi-formal interviews in order to draw lessons from them. Such individuals spoke the minds of the people they represent, either in the resettlement communities (chiefs, Assembly men/women, opinion leaders, and so on) or the district administration or officials of the Bui Power Project.

Focus Group Discussions

In each of the two resettlement communities, two focus group discussions were held with elderly men, elderly women, young boys and girls. Each group consist of 8–12 people. The discussions were moderated by two researchers and supported by two assistants.

Interview Guide

For the purposes of consistency in primary data gathering, an interview guide was designed to cover areas of concern for this study. In view of the fact that the study is qualitative by design, the interview guide as much as possible created room for probing questions (see Appendix B for the question guides).

Data Management

All the interviews and discussions were audio recorded for easy storage and transcribed before subjecting them to qualitative analysis. In the process, major themes were isolated and discussed in the presentation of findings of the study.

1.4 Structure of the Report

This report is in four sections. Section one is the introductory section which provides the background and context of the study. The objectives of the study, as well as the research methods employed in it have also been discussed. In section two, we examine the Bui Resettlement Planning Framework (RPF) and the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) interchangeably as both seem to highlight similar issues, alongside a discussion of tangible resettlement programme outcomes since the implementation of the resettlement scheme. The section focuses on the key objectives and principles of the scheme, a description of the affected communities and eligibility for resettlement. It also discusses major findings relating to replacement of housing, livelihoods issues, cash compensation, culture and diversity issues and the processes of participation and stakeholder consultation.
Section three focuses on the key roles or activities of the Ghana Dams Dialogue (GDD) and how these activities have led to changes in practices, processes or policies of the Bui Resettlement Scheme. Typically, we discuss what the GDD platform does in general, its key interventions in Bui and how the interventions link with any change in the scheme of things as far as the resettlement programme was concerned. In section four, we outline the key issues emerging from the study and provide our conclusions and thoughts on ways forward in addressing the issues raised in respect of promoting fairness, justice and the overall improvement in the welfare of people affected by the construction of the Bui hydropower dam as lessons for the construction of other large dams.
2. Review of Ghana Dams Dialogue’s Engagement with Bui

2.1 The Ghana Dams Dialogue: Introduction

The GDD was instituted in 2006, inspired by the processes and findings of the World Commission on Dams (WCD), with financial support from GTZ (now GIZ) for the second and the third phase of the project (2007–2008 and 2009–2010). The founding principle was increasing interaction among key stakeholders, a critical issue for sustainable dam development (GDD 2010a; International Water Management Institute (IWMI) 2011). The GDD was designed as a national dialogue process, following international and global examples of such processes. It is the first inclusive planning tool for the development of dams in the West African Region, providing multiple stakeholders with opportunities to hold discussions on irreconcilable differences and contributed to the development of equitable solutions. The GDD in keeping with the beliefs of the WCD has equity, sustainability, efficiency, participation and accountability as the core values of future large dams development (Nelson and Selby 2009; GDD 2010a).

Since its establishment, GDD has functioned in three phases. The first phase of the project focused on the establishment of the Dialogue; the second sought to strengthen the process; while the third phase aimed to consolidate its achievement. It has clarified the institutional setting and decision-making processes and pathways for hydropower dams in Ghana. It has strived to reconcile national government issues with local-level issues, as well as strengthened interactions between various sectors. It has also assisted in shaping the context of dams-related issues by playing a key role in negotiations and resolving conflicts between stakeholder groups; knowledge-sharing and awareness creation (Nelson and Selby 2009) as mediators. The GDD also sought to learn from Kpong and Akosombo by involving the Dam Affected Communities (DACs) and Volta River Authority (VRA).

2.2 Key Engagement of GDD with the Bui Project

Research and Knowledge-sharing at Bui

Apart from interactions between different stakeholders during forums, meetings, workshops and field trips, the GDD, through its Secretariat, commissioned several studies on specific issues. Initially, a background paper that highlighted the situation and institutions of relevance to dams decision-making in Ghana in 2006 provided the basis for the set-up of the dialogue process (Gordon 2006). For instance, during the second phase in 2008, three research papers were produced and presented on the principles of participation by affected people and communities and compared it with Ghanaian practice in three cases of dam projects (Ofori 2008), issues on existing laws and regulations on compensation of projects affected persons and the experiences from Akosombo and Kpong (Kalitsi & Associates 2008), while Raschid-Sally et al. (2008) examined the Bui ESIA study as well as existing institutional capacities related to research and development capacity building on sustainable dams development issues.

Further research comprised an institutional analysis of the hydropower dams context and a study on livelihood opportunities of the resettled communities around the Bui dam, in which case only preliminary results were presented during several forums (see Raschid-Sally 2009; King 2009, 2010). It is worthy of note that the larger forums were used regularly for scientific and practical knowledge presentations and discussions. There were also several presentations held on the impacts of climate change on the Volta Basin and its implications for hydropower projects (see GDD 2008: 31ff), which predicted that “a significant negative impact of global climate change on water resources in the Volta River Basin would have an impact on the Bui Dam”.

The GDD also commissioned research on alternative livelihood for settlers at Jamah resettlement site by the Faculty of Human Settlement, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana. The study revealed that most of the settlers were able to save GH¢1200 a year per household.
through the sale of fish and/or farm products. Based on those research findings, the heads of the 42 resettled households received a monthly allowance of GH¢100.00 for a one-year period (i.e. from May 2008 through April 2009). The resettlers travelled more than 4.5km to their old farms to harvest their foodstuffs, as the newly acquired farmland had only recently been tilled and had no crops ready for harvest as at 2009; the first yield would not be ready for at least eight months. The monthly allowance of GH¢100.00 was intended to support the resettlers while they commuted the 4.5km to their old farms (GDD 2009b: 28–29).

Field Trips/Study Tours
The GDD organised several field trips and visits, both to the Akosombo, Kpong and Bui areas as well as to media representatives, government ministers and others, to obtain an improved understanding of situations on the ground or to communicate outcomes from the Dialogue. In so doing, the Dialogue actually takes the role of an actor. For instance, the GDD participants actively tried to mediate or facilitate on several occasions. In 2009 an action team was formed from NCC members specifically for these occasions. In 2007 representatives from communities around the Bui dam due to be resettled were taken to visit the two existing dam sites at Akosombo and Kpong and a few resettlement communities there (GDD 2007a).

Consultative Platform for Stakeholders to discuss resettlement issues
The GDD organised four larger annual forums that were attended by people, representing sixty different stakeholders (GDD 2007b, 2008, 2009c, 2010c). Additionally, two large meetings specifically for Dams Affected Communities (DACs) representatives were organised. The first and second “annual meetings of DACs” were attended by approximately 170 and 80 people respectively from villages within the areas impacted by dams (GDD 2009b, 2010b). By and large, the GDD is mainly a platform that allows for discussion and an exchange of views between the participants who represent different stakeholder groups. The National Coordinating Committee (NCC) meetings of the GDD, which also involve stakeholder institutions, leaders of Dam Affected Communities and District Assemblies of dam affected communities, is another platform for the discussion of various issues that emerged from the larger meetings and annual forums. These mainly centred on the ongoing resettlement process of the Bui Dam Project as well as conflicts between the old resettlement communities around the Volta Lake and the authorities, namely those from Akosombo and Kpong. During the institutional networking meeting for DACs, some of the issues raised included land acquisition and ownership in which the affected communities have no title deeds to their respective occupied lands and have been treated as strangers by host communities. These issues emerged as a result of experiences from Akosombo and Kpong resettlements in the past and attempts have been made by GDD to avoid such a situation in Bui. However, the problem of land titling remains unresolved even in Bui because of the difficulties in ascertaining ownership of land. The BPA is therefore in consultation with the Lands Commission to address ownership issues in the Bui dam area.

Throughout the process of resettling the affected communities, GDD provided a platform for stakeholders to discuss the possible outcomes of dam construction, especially for the affected communities. This was essential because these communities were rural in nature with limited knowledge and understanding of resettlement issues and its outcomes. The GDD therefore became a platform for learning and sharing of ideas with communities to be affected by the construction of the dam as well as making it possible for the BPA and government to convince the people to accept the resettlement plan. A key informant asserted that:

Ghana Dams Dialogue was in control for some time so it made things easy in the sense that were always at a round table meeting with VRA and BPA and the affected communities were brought in so if there was an issue, we the leadership were invited and we discuss. When that was going on, there were no problems. (Interview with chief, Bui)

2 The NCC is the apex body for decision-making within GDD.
A typical example of the GDD platform in making an impact on the resettlement process is that it served as a mediator in the resettlement process. For example, the GDD Secretariat (2009b) and NCC (2009a) observed that the Battor and the Dokokyina communities at Bui were undecided about where they should be relocated to, as a result of a controversy over the resettlement process (related to livelihoods after resettlement, compensation for crops and lands, and autonomy and land ownership). This resulted in some level of tension between the communities and BPA. In responding to that in May 2009 the NCC/GDD put up a team, which intervened in the issue by assuring the affected communities that there would be livelihood options. Afterwards, the communities concerned agreed to be settled alongside the Bui community in Bui City. Consequently, these two communities have been peacefully resettled.

The NCC also organised mediation between community members and representatives from the Bui Power Authority (GDD, 2009d). The Bui dam area was visited by NCC members on three other occasions, including the original villages, and the new resettlement sites when the communities had been resettled. The last visit in 2010 was upon an invitation by the Bui Power Authority to facilitate a meeting on “cultural harmony” with the objective of support good relations between the people from newly resettled communities and those from existing neighbouring villages (GDD 2010a: 3; interview with a BPA official). This gesture of BPA to the GDD was attributed to the successful mediation role played by GDD when tension arose between some communities such as Dokokyina and Battor and the BPA.

Another clear intervention of the Dialogue was the consultative meetings between BPA and the Jamah resettlement communities over the nature of the housing provided. The process led to the old housing type being changed. One respondent noted that:

*Ghana Dams Dialogue has done a lot to assist us in the sense that we were told that the structures in which we were to be resettled were temporary but we realised that they were not good and they stood on our behalf and they held a forum and came out with a good outcome so the structures have been changed.* (Interview with a Jamah leader)

Even though some level of consultation took place, much still needed to be done in order to create harmonious conditions for the resettlement process to be fully complete in all the communities involved. GDD provided an opportunity for the people to learn their rights to demand the facilities that will let them live in their new communities without deprivation.

*With all that, God has helped us, NGOs like Ghana Dams Dialogue and GTZ have dealt with the Bui dam affected communities. They took us through certain challenges that the people of Akosombo have had to go through and did not leave us to go through the same problems. They even arranged for our leaders to interact with the people of Akosombo in order to enable us to know how to bargain with the government. They taught us what the government is supposed to do for us and many more. That was what helped us to be able to also talk such that we were able to bargain as to how we should be treated.* (FGD with adult males, Akanyakrom)

*The Ghana Dams Dialogue helped us a lot. We now dialogue with the BPA until there is understanding and then they do that which we agree on. For instance, the houses they have put up here, at first they said if you have two rooms, they will build the same two rooms for you. We told them that will not help and after dialoguing, they agreed to add one extra room.* (FGD with adult males, Akanyakrom)

Thus, the GDD platform helped diffuse tensions, thereby creating the right circumstances for the project to proceed. The lack of GDD activities recently is felt by the people, who have to face challenges about their livelihoods on their own.

A summary of lessons that were learnt from GDD’s intervention of organising study visits to the Akosombo and Kpong resettlement sites in the Eastern Region of Ghana is provided on Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VRA resettlement programmes at Akosombo and Kpong</th>
<th>Lessons learnt by GDD</th>
<th>Changes implemented at Bui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe encroachment on resettlement area rendering the place unorganised and unattractive. The area has lost any planning scheme</td>
<td>Population growth and migration can affect resettlement arrangements. Apart from ensuring that resettlement areas are used for the intended purposes only, there is the need to make provision for future expansion</td>
<td>Communities want land to expand their houses as their children grow. BPA has indicated plans to demarcate lands for future expansion of the villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses poorly constructed and irrespective of household size without provisions for kitchen, toilets and baths</td>
<td>Houses provided should be commensurate with family and house sizes or number of previous rooms. Houses should be provided alongside kitchens and other amenities</td>
<td>Houses have been constructed with quality materials with the number of rooms previously owned, plus an extra room. Kitchen, toilet and bath facilities have been provided in all the houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of livelihoods not compensated for &amp; alternative livelihoods not supported</td>
<td>Alternative livelihoods provision is critical and all efforts must be made to ensure that the alternative livelihoods are sustainable</td>
<td>A comprehensive alternative livelihood programme LEP has been designed under the Bui project, but is yet to be implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses were not connected to the national electricity grid</td>
<td>Connect houses to the national grid</td>
<td>Electricity has been connected to all houses by BPA and households pay for what they use monthly bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities were under the management of VRA up to date</td>
<td>It is important to ensure that communities are integrated into the scheme of things of the District Assemblies so that social services that they provide can be extended to resettlement communities</td>
<td>There are plans by BPA to handover communities to the District Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evidence of ownership of houses by resettled people. No title deeds and no property documents</td>
<td>There is the need to provide title deeds on all the lands and houses for well-defined ownership</td>
<td>The issue of title deed is still under Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement without cultural consideration where people of different cultures were mixed together</td>
<td>Do not mix people of different cultures together</td>
<td>People of similar culture were properly settled in Bui resettlement area except the Jamah area where there are lingering cultural issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from creating a platform for dialogue among stakeholders, GDD educated the affected community members on the challenges of resettlement, equipping them with the knowledge to engage the state in negotiating their resettlement and spelling out the risk of not doing so. To this end, GDD organised trips to previous resettlement sites in Kpong, Somanya and Akosombo for leaders of the affected communities. The idea was to enable them to interact with those communities affected by the construction of the Akosombo and Kpong dams and to learn from their experiences. Accordingly, community leaders in the area affected by the Bui dam confirmed that these trips opened their eyes, emphasising the need to negotiate with BPA for all they will need to make their living conditions good if not better.

**Policy-level Changes**

Even though the discussions of the Ghana Dams Dialogue at the various levels have not yet found their way into national policies and plans, it is evidently clear that some of the national agencies especially the power authorities have found it expedient to take on board some key recommendations. Looking at how national policies are crafted in Ghana, especially with key inputs from government agencies, it is expected that some of the recommendations that came out of the discussions on the platform would be given attention and transformed into national policies and programmes in the near future. Some of the recommendations which have been adopted by both the Volta River Authority and Bui Power Authority are:

- Restructuring of the Volta River Authority Trust Fund to make it more responsive to the needs of the resettlement communities and to widen the benefit-sharing mechanism to include not only resettlement communities but also other project affected communities.
- Properly integrating the dam affected communities into the decentralised system of Ghana and making the district and municipal assemblies take full responsibility for the communities.
- Involving communities in key stages of the decision-making process using appropriate communication channels.
- Proper acquisition of land to avoid future tension between resettled and host communities.
- Transferring ownership titles of resettled houses to the occupants.
- Payment of compensation in timeframes acceptable to stakeholders.
- Using dialogue and negotiated approaches to resolve outstanding issues.
3. The Bui Resettlement Planning Framework and Current Programme Results

3.1 The Bui Project Timelines

The Government of Ghana in 2005 in collaboration with Sinohydro confirmed the acquisition of funding from the Exim bank of China for the construction of the Bui Power Project. By January 2007, an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) was conducted by EMR/SGS Environment which later led to the development of a Resettlement Planning Framework. By August 2007, the Government of Ghana created the Bui Power Authority to oversee the implementation of the project. Dam construction related activities commenced by November 2007 and are still under way. The draft Resettlement Action Plan was prepared in November 2009 but was shared with GDD in April 2012. As seen in Table 1, the first communities (those that were immediately affected by the construction namely, Brewohodi, Agbegikuro, Dam Site and Lucene) were settled in May 2008. Between 2009 and 2010, the BPA and Bui communities held series of meetings to finalise resettlement arrangements and by June 2011 the Bui communities including Bui and Battor Akanyakrom have been resettled.

Table 2: The Bui Power Project timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Sinohydro confirms funding for Bui from Chinese Exim Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td>Environmental and Social Impact Assessment of the Bui Hydropower Project (ERM/SGS Environment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td>Resettlement Planning framework ERM/SGS Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2007</td>
<td>Bui Power Authority created to deliver the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2007</td>
<td>Access roads and construction camp established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>First communities relocated away from dam site to Jamah (Brewohodi, Agbegikuro, Dam Site and Lucene), initially in temporary accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>River diversion completed, construction begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2009</td>
<td>Draft Resettlement Action Plan prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2010</td>
<td>Negotiations between BPA and Bui communities to finalise and agree the resettlement package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2011</td>
<td>Dokokinya community resettled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>Bui community resettled (Bui Village and Battor Akanyakrom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some households in Jamah community resettled in permanent buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 The Bui Resettlement Planning Framework and Action Plan

Under the laws of Ghana, especially under Article 20 of the 1992 Constitution, involuntary acquisition of private property, especially land, is expected to be conducted in accordance with laid down statutory procedures. Section 24 of Article 20 also provides that fair and adequate compensation is paid promptly or, alternatively, resettlement assistance is provided for people who are directly or indirectly affected by such involuntary acquisition for the sake of national interest. The 1999 Ghana Land Policy also
makes adequate provision for the prompt payment of compensation in situations of forced eviction or involuntary acquisition of private property. As a reference point, even though the World Bank’s Policy on Resettlement (OP-4.12) requires that a Resettlement Action Plan is prepared prior to resettlement programmes; it is not explicit in Ghanaian law. However, given that a lot of inspiration is taken from the Bank’s policy as in the case of the development of the Bui Dam, it is a matter of principle and using the Bank’s policy is a matter of principle.

In the construction of the Bui Hydropower Project, a comprehensive Resettlement Planning Framework (RPF) was developed in 2007 by Environmental Resource Management and funded by the Ministry of Energy. The RPF was developed using the Work Bank’s policy as a guide and the provisions of the 1992 Republican Constitution of Ghana (see ERM, RPF 2007). The aim of the RPF among other things was to:

*ensure that the Bui Dam Project improves people’s economic opportunities and living conditions and minimises adverse impacts while also providing remedial measures for those adverse impacts that are unavoidable, particularly among the communities most directly affected by resettlement either through physical displacement or loss of economic resources. (ERM, RPF 2007: i)*

Given this broad objective, the RPF clearly sought to promote fairness, equity and transparency in the management of the Bui resettlement scheme as enshrined in the ideals of global natural resource governance (Darby 2010), Article 20 of the 1992 Constitution of Ghana and the World Bank’s resettlement policy (OP 4-12). In addition to this broad-based objective, the RPF and RAP outlined some principles that will guide the implementation of the resettlement scheme. On the basis of the RPF, the BPA developed a RAP in 2009 for Bui but the report has not yet been published. The principles as summarised in Table 1 focus on the choice of host communities, housing and social infrastructural development, environmental protection, participation and integration with host community. The selected resettlement principles are based on weaknesses in past resettlements in Kpong and Akosombo and also in line with international best practice.

Table 3: Resettlement principles of the RPF/RAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Selected Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of host community</td>
<td>Ensure that land tenure is compatible in the host site to minimise disruption; Ensure that the additional households will not place excess pressure on the natural resources of the host community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, infrastructure and social services</td>
<td>Houses designed to be sympathetic to traditional style and equally reflect villagers’ preferences; Location of housing fair, and just allocation of houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection and management</td>
<td>Conducting biodiversity surveys; and developing a land use plan in conjunction with communities, including rules for land use, roles and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation</td>
<td>Ensure participation of stakeholders throughout resettlement process for preference identification and management of expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with host population</td>
<td>Selecting resettlement sites that have a similar cultural and ethnic background and that are under the same chieftaincy. Ensure adequate consultations with chiefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: EMR, RPF (2007)*
The RPF further indicates that the dam, when constructed, will affect a total population of 859 people (as at 2006). In all, 93 households were expected to lose land completely. However, the Draft Resettlement Action Plan which was developed in 2009 notes that a total 219 households, making a total of 1,216 people, will require resettlement, as represented on Table 4. In addition to this, both the RPF and RAP indicate that some other communities such as Jamah Bongasi, Banda Nkwanta and Bui Camp will lose some farm lands for which compensation will be required.

Table 4: Resettlement communities in the Bui Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agbegikuro</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battor Akanyakrom</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewohodi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bui</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam site</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dokokyina</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucene</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bui Camp (Game &amp;Wild Life Wardens)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.3 Eligibility for Resettlement and Compensation

The RAP and the RPF are clear on the type and nature of compensation and resettlement package that each beneficiary group is expected to get. There are three categories of beneficiaries including Group 1 (resettled communities), Group 2 (households losing land only) and Group 3 (host communities). As seen in Table 4 resettled communities are expected to benefit from full resettlement and rehabilitation measures. The full resettlement package includes replacement of housing; cash payment for crop or tree compensation; replacement compensation for assets which cannot be moved; and for those with enterprises or businesses that have been affected a profit allowance paid for a period of six months. Resettled communities shall also be provided with essential social amenities such as schools, health centres and community centres. Water and sanitation facilities are also expected to be provided for this category of beneficiaries. The other two groups are expected to be compensated only for loss of land and livelihood programmes and other rehabilitation programmes.

Table 5: Eligibility group and resettlement package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Group</th>
<th>Resettlement Package</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Resettled households</td>
<td>Full resettlement and rehabilitation measures, to be assessed for each household based on assets and crop inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Households losing only land</td>
<td>Compensation for loss of assets associated with inundated land – land, crops and trees, grazing and forest products. Livelihoods Enhancement Programme for households losing more than 20% of their land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3: Host communities</td>
<td>Rehabilitation measures relating to pressure on natural resources, public infrastructure, and social service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ERM, RPF (2007)
3.4 Resettlement Measures and Key Outcomes under the Bui Project

Replacement of Housing

At the time of this study, field evidence shows that adequate housing facilities have been provided, especially in the resettlement sites at Bui, Akanyakrom Battor and Dokokyina, and the people have been properly settled in their houses. The housing arrangement was such that an additional room was built for each household in addition to the total number of rooms the household previously had. For instance households which had two bedrooms now have three and each house constructed comes with kitchen, toilet and bath. The inclusion of an extra room under the Bui resettlement plan is a result of GDD's intervention in the provision of housing for the DACs as well as lessons from the experiences of previously resettled communities in Kpong and Akosombo. It is also in recognition of the fact that households may increase in number over time and hence the need to make some provision for that increase.

However this was not the case at the site first constructed in Jamah in 2009. It was however noted that the first set of houses built under the Bui dam resettlement arrangement was built in Jamah in 2009, in the Northern Region, for communities along the Black Volta, which were to be immediately affected by the start of the Bui dam construction. But the initial houses were not up to the expectations of the people affected. A community leader from the Jamah resettlement site noted in an interview that the houses, though better than at their previous location, were too small for them:

… the houses they built for us were too small. It is very difficult to sleep in them. We are just managing but as you can see they are changing them and construction is under way. (Interview with community leader at Jamah resettlement site)

For the residents in the Jamah resettlement, the general perception is that the houses built for them were good compared to where they were before. However, the youth in the community were of the view that the houses were too small, especially for large families. The argument was that no consideration was given to the number of rooms owned by the affected families prior to the resettlement. The same structures were built for all the affected families, irrespective of the number of rooms owned previously. Following unrest, and interventions by GDD and other stakeholders, discussions led to new housing being developed in 2011 in line with what was built for the Bui resettlement, as seen in the picture below. At the time of this study, most of the households were being relocated to the new dwellings which, in the opinion of community members, were acceptable, convenient and fair.

Thus, community members who owned houses with three rooms, received new houses with four rooms, and those who had houses with 10 rooms, now receive houses with 11 rooms. Kitchen and sanitary facilities are attached to each house. Electricity had been provided in the community and a borehole was dug for the entire community. There is a general sense of satisfaction with the housing provision. This is indicated by a statement made by a community leader that; “… we are happy with the new houses, at least these are better than what we had earlier”.
Within the Bui resettlement area, the communities finally moved in July, 2011, after the houses were completed. Three separate communities were created, namely Bui, Akanyakrom Battor and Dokokyina. The difference in the arrangement made for these and those resettled in Jamah is that, in Jamah, four separate communities were resettled in one site and the people mixed up without their different cultures being taken into consideration. This happened contrary to recommendations from GDD and might have been a result of the rush to begin the building of the dam. In the new resettlement site, however, the three communities were not mingled in a single community. They were located separately, side by side; approaching from the dam site, the first community is Bui, followed by Akanyakrom Battor and then Dokokyina. Because of their proximity to each other, they have been provided with a common basic school, community centre and a small market. The houses provided in these communities were of the same design, with each household having a kitchen and a sanitary facility but, we observed during the field data collection, with the number of rooms ranging from two to as many as five. Commenting on the housing provision, adult women confirmed that it was generally good for them.

*We are very pleased with the houses provided for us, especially the additional rooms, the kitchen, toilet and bath. Previously, we lived in mud houses but you can see this beautiful concrete building with electricity. We never had lights where we were. We are very grateful.* (FGD with adult women, Dokokyina)
In effect, as far as housing was concerned, the community members are generally satisfied, even though issues of malfunctioning of sanitary facilities were reported, especially in the three communities in the Brong Ahafo Region (Bui, Akanyakrom Battor and Dokokyina).

Livelihood Issues

The general objective of the Bui resettlement programme, as quoted in the Resettlement Planning Framework of the Bui Hydropower Project (2007:14) is, to ensure that the Bui Dam Project improves people’s economic opportunities and living conditions and minimises adverse impacts while also providing remedial measures for those adverse impacts that are unavoidable, particularly among the communities most directly affected by resettlement either through physical displacement or loss of economic resources. Thus, affected households, families and individuals were to be assisted to live meaningful lives in their new communities, without a sense of loss. However, field evidence shows that there are clear difficulties with livelihoods. This is largely because, at the time of conducting this study, no alternative livelihood arrangements had been put in place. Prior to their resettlement, the people depended mainly on farming and fishing. These livelihood activities have been reduced after the resettlement and hence the need for alternatives. Even those who were resettled in 2009 have not been provided with any alternative means of livelihood. The young people in the area made this point strongly:

Before we were brought here, they told us that if we relocate here and living conditions are not good, they will get us some skills-related jobs to pursue or a fish pond so that we can have some work to help ourselves. However, they have not provided any of those things. (FGD with youth group – males, Jamah site)

They said if they bring us here and our farms don’t go well, they will give us lands on which we can farm for things to get a bit better for us but this has not yet been done. (FGD with youth group – males, Jamah site)

The chief of Jamah confirmed the point raised by the young people to the effect that they do not have any alternative livelihood. Those who were fishing in the previous communities are not able to engage in that effectively because of the distance to the river and also because they are not allowed to fish in parts of the river which falls within the game reserve. At the time of the fieldwork, a number of the fishermen had been arrested and handed over to the police and the case is being handled by a court in Wenchi. The chief of Jamah noted that:

At first they lived close to the river and so when the wife puts food on the fire, the man will say he was going to the riverside to catch fish for the meal and would at least return with two or three fishes. But ever since they came here [to the resettled village], the distance from here to the riverside is about four miles, which is an impediment for them. (Interview with chief of Jamah)

What this means is that, as far as fishing is concerned, they are unable to engage in it as much as they used to. Hence, there is expectation, especially among the young, that alternative arrangements should be created in their new community to provide work.

A follow-up to the BPA on the subject of alternative livelihood provisions indicates that the full resettlement package, coming with the Livelihood Empowerment Programme (LEP), is expected to provide safety nets for households who might have experienced excessive shock as a result of the resettlement; the package includes assistance to set up new businesses, skills training programmes and agricultural support programmes and create access to employment opportunities under the Bui Power Project. The indication was that the first phase of the LEP was beginning to be initiated.
Cash Compensations

According to the Resettlement Action Plan, a number of cash compensations were outlined. Some of these include crop/economic tree compensation, which would go to the individual farmers whose crops were to be destroyed by the construction of the dam; land title compensation for those who have titles to land; land use compensation for those who lose land that they did not have title to (farm lands); and livelihood compensation (profit compensations for a period of six months). There is also a resettlement compensation (allowance) to be paid monthly for a period of 12 months.

At the time of conducting this study, of all the cash compensations to be paid only the resettlement compensation had been. Community members noted that each month an amount of GH¢100 was paid to each household irrespective of household size. How the sum of GH¢100 was not clear and community members said they were not consulted on the amount to be paid. The BPA noted that the monthly sum was mainly decided on administrative grounds, given the prevailing cost of living within the area and possible average household income. At the Jamah settlement area, the 12-month resettlement compensation was paid in bulk to the households, each receiving GH¢1,200.

Interactions with community members in the two resettlement sites show that the people are more comfortable with the payment of the 12-month resettlement in bulk (that is GH¢1200.00 in a lump sum, rather than paying GH¢100.00 over 12 months). They were of the view that receiving the amount in bulk will enable them to invest the money in a venture that can sustain them.

The delayed payment of the rest of the compensations, especially the land compensation, as explained by the BPA relates to the fact that issues of land are very difficult and the Lands Commission had many difficulties in determining the true ownership of some of the lands. There were also difficulties with documentations and processes but the assurance was give that the entire process was at its advanced stage and the compensations will definitely be paid. The BPA also noted that crop compensation was going to be paid within one month from the time of the field visit for data collection (January 2012). In fact, crop compensations were to be paid in May 2012. There was however no clear indication on the compensation payment for loss of profit on livelihoods for six months. Quite surprisingly, community members did not mention anything about this type of compensation. There are only two assumptions to explain the situation: either people were unaware of such compensation or there were no members qualifying for it at the time of the study.

The delayed payment of the compensations is resulting in frustration, some community members regretting the entire resettlement process. Naturally, having lost their lands and crops, they expected to be given the compensations promised on time in order to make adjustments in their new settlements. For example, some respondents indicated that:

We are regretting in the sense that we used to sell the products and get something to pay the school fees of our children and for other things. Now, we are in a new environment and the crops in the old fields have been destroyed. We know the
processes that one has to go through to pay land compensations but that of the crops compensation should have been paid by now. Inventory has been taken so there is no justification for delaying the payment. It is a whole lot of problem, how can people sacrifice for the whole nation and you are punishing us unduly? The constitutional right says that there should be prompt payment of adequate compensation but that has not been done. When you inquire you would be told that it is at the Ministry of Finance, is the Ministry not aware that construction is going on and if they are why can’t they pay the crop compensation? (Interview with Chief of Bui)

The monies they promised to pay concerning those things [crop compensation], the monies have not come. They also stated that they will give every household GH¢100 per month. The abusuapanyin [the head of the royal family at Bui] and Nana [the Chief of Bui] wrote a letter stating that the money was too small. Even the Jamah people who were relocated last year were given GH¢100 per month to be used to buy things, so, you cannot get the same value now and they later talked and talked but to no avail till we eventually got relocated here. When we got here, the hardship we faced is a lot. None of the monies they have promised have they paid. (FGD with adult men, Bui)

In other words, the people recognise the fact that inflation may have eroded the value of the fixed amount of GH¢100.00 paid at different periods. It would have been better had inflation been taken into account in paying the resettlement compensation in 2011.

Given the above responses, it is obvious that the delay in payments, especially the crop/tree compensation, is seriously affecting the people, whose expectations were high. The delay also seems to have greatly affected women whose livelihood depended on cashew plantation in the previous location. The women lamented that the delay has resulted not only in difficulty in getting food but also in paying school-related costs. Some women in Jamah noted:

We have relocated here for about four years now and our crop compensations have not been paid. We find it difficult to send the children to school. We normally make a lot of money from the sales of cashew nuts but now all have been destroyed… Even food to buy is a problem because there is no money. The delay is too much for us. (FGD with women)

Culture and Diversity Considerations

Cultural and diversity considerations had considerable exposure in the RAP and at the Bui resettlement area, the remains of the ancestors were exhumed and reburied in the middle of the settlement area, indicating that the ancestors have also relocated. Until a few months into this study, the Bui resettlement area was peaceful without any feeling of cultural alienation. But the settlement is currently expressing disappointment over a new name that BPA has given to the resettlement areas within Bui. Without any discussion with the chiefs and people of the affected communities, the BPA announced that the new settlements (Bui) as to be known as “Lupokrom”. This seems to have infuriated the people and their anger was made known to the BPA. Consequently, the signpost with the new name that was mounted in the community was replaced with another with the old name. Even so, the people think that BPA must make a public announcement to the effect that the name of the community remains Bui. A respondent in an in-depth interview noted:

The most immediate is the name because the name is bringing a lot of tension and if steps are not taken to arrest the situation then I don’t know because not everybody can contain it. I would not blame anybody apart from the BPA because they brought the name and if they don’t do anything to ensure that the name goes off then in case of any eventualities they have to be blamed for it. (FGD with adult men, Bui)
There was no definite response from the BPA or the District Assembly as further consultation was ongoing. The communities however felt that GDD was needed to identify difficulties and to help resolve this issue.

On the subject of diversity, a lot was done by the resettlement scheme (BPA) in making sure that people stay close to those they wanted to as in the previous location. Also, people with similar religion were grouped together. Nonetheless, some respondents were not satisfied with some of the arrangements. Some women thought that the resettlement has somehow broken the social cohesion that they had been used to. Others were also of the opinion that they find themselves living close to people they did not want to. Nonetheless, given the way the resettlement was managed, it was clear that there is some appreciable level of fairness in placing people in their new homes.

**Consultation/Participation**

The RAP has made significant provision for community participation in the resettlement process in line with international standards such as the World Bank's Policy on Involuntary Resettlement (OP-4-12). Indeed, in situations where people are to be physically removed from their communities or lose their source of livelihood, a number of actions should be taken to cushion them. Among them is the preparation of a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), which provides a framework for specific activities to be embarked upon with regards to the people to be affected by the project. The preparation of such a plan can only be made possible through consultations with all stakeholders, including the people to be affected. Generally, the production of RAP involves disclosure of intentions to stakeholders, inputs from stakeholders, negotiations, and finalisation of the plan before implementation of actions (see Inter-American Development Bank Guidelines for Resettlement Plans, PRI Environmental and Social Guidance, 2001). All these necessitate consultations at various levels if the objective of the project is to be met.

Evidence from community level discussions suggests that the communities affected by the construction of the Bui dam were briefed by the government about the plan to build the dam and subsequently a number of meetings were held with elders. These meetings were held not only to brief them about government's intentions but also appeal to communities to accept the resettlement plan, which was a necessary part of the construction of the dam. The possible effects of the construction were discussed with the people and they accepted the resettlement plan. Interviews with traditional and community leaders as well as FGDs with community members show that from the beginning the government made attempts to engage them in discussions regarding their resettlement and payment of various forms of compensation. However, since agreeing with government and the BPA and moving to their resettlement areas, consultations have been virtually non-existent and decisions are taken without sufficient consultation and agreement. The reported case of an attempt by BPA to change the name of Bui resettlement community to Lupokrom is an example. The anger and frustration of the people on this matter are expressed in statements made during in-depth interviews and FGDs:

*The resettlement for us started in 2009 and so we were consulted and the land was shown to us, cleared and inventory of the number of people per household, our crops and others, the design of the buildings that they wanted to construct for us was shown to us and we also went with our experts to discuss the issues with them. (Key Informant Interview at Bui)*

The following is an account of the resettlement processes, provided by an informant at Bui:

*The buildings were constructed and after their completion there was no electricity and even before that we met to discuss some of the facilities that we would like to see at the new site. But some of those facilities that they promised were not there so we had to struggle with them for some time. For example they promised to build kindergarten [KG], primary, Junior High School [JHS], police station, market and clinic but when they finished the project, there was a KG and primary but no JHS. We insisted that until the JHS is built, we would not move there. We were also told to use the clinic at another town but we disagreed because they promised to build a clinic for us and so it should*
be provided and even with the electricity we were told to wire our own houses and we said that the peasant farmers cannot afford it and they promised to do all these things. There was a delay in the time they wanted us to move because of all these things. We were three communities, Dokokyina is very far away and they were moved first and they came there on 15th February 2011 but Bui and Akanyakrom said we would not move until those things were provided. We had to struggle with them and the Bureau of National Investigations even had to come in but I stood my grounds and they accepted that those things would be provided. A letter was written to us before I told my people to move in June 2011 and the JHS and electricity have been provided and the clinic is almost near completion. (Interview an informant at Bui 2012)

The then President [J. A. Kufuor] came with the Minister of Finance and other persons to Bui to meet with our elders and announced that the Bui dam was to be constructed and that they wanted us [the people of Bui] to understand that we will be relocated and so we should bear that in mind and whatever concerns we have will be discussed with us. (FGD with adult males, Bui)

So far, the things they have promised, they have done some and left some undone. They promised to tar the roads here but it has not been done, they promised to build a clinic; now they are still working on the clinic; built a primary school and KG; community centre. What is left now is a market; lorry park; police station and post office. Right now, we are confused about what to do about the things left, whether they will provide them or not. Now they [BPA] said they are handing over [the resettlement communities] to the district. We came to agreement with BPA and not the District Assembly. (FGD with adult males, Bui)

The statements above reflect two basic difficulties with consultation. It seems to us that after agreements have been reached on what is to be done as contained in the RPF and RAP, the expectations of the people have altered and they seem to ask for more. For example, in one of the interviews, there was an issue of the construction of a police station but in the RAP only those community/social facilities that were destroyed were to be replaced. There was no provision in the RAP for the tarring of roads as indicated by a respondent in the statement above. Thus managing the alterations in the expectations of the people is crucial. Hence, the Dialogue process should be ongoing. The summary of key findings relating to the resettlement outcomes is provided in Table 6.
Table 6: Key resettlement action areas and current delivery status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Resettlement Actions</th>
<th>Current Resettlement Status (Based On Community Perception And Field Evidence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder consultation</td>
<td>Frequent consultations at the beginning of the project but this has slowed down in the midst of emerging resettlement difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and allocation of resettlement houses</td>
<td>To date, all household within the Bui resettlement area have been resettled in their new houses. The renewal process at the Jamah resettlement area is ongoing but most households have been resettled in their new homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community amenities</td>
<td>Two community centres constructed, one each at Bui and Jamah areas. A JHS and primary school constructed at Bui area and the construction of a clinic is under way. A KG has been constructed at the Jamah area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement allowance</td>
<td>An amount of GH¢100 per household per month for 12 months has been paid to households in Jamah area whereas the Bui area is still ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensations for crop</td>
<td>At the time of this study, no crop compensation was paid. There was assurance from BPA that the crop compensation would be paid sooner than later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for land</td>
<td>Payment of compensation for land was not to be expected in the near future as the processes regarding this payment were cumbersome. Discussions were still ongoing on this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood Enhancement Programme (LEP)</td>
<td>The livelihood programme was still pending at the time of this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity consideration</td>
<td>Some cultural diversity issues especially within the Jamah area are still pending as community members felt that their different tribal and religious orientations were not considered before mixing them up. In the new resettlement houses, however, there are indications of the area being properly demarcated for the four different communities that are settled there</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field data 2012*
4. Conclusion and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusion

The Bui resettlement programme has achieved fairly remarkable success in terms of providing good quality housing for displaced people, and some social and communal facilities such as water, electricity, sanitation, school, health posts and community centres. The success in some cases is partly due to the role of GDD in ensuring equity, fairness and transparency though its Dialogue platform.

The Ghana Dams Dialogue remains a functional platform for promoting positive interaction among stakeholders on issues of large dam management and resettlement planning. The GDD’s presence in the Bui Power Project and all its associated issues such as resettlement and compensation was continuous. Through the activities of GDD, the Bui Power Authority introduced changes to their policies and practices especially in the construction of resettlement houses. The Dialogue has also resulted in a very peaceful resettlement process which is uncharacteristic of projects of this nature. The platform eased the tension associated with resettlement processes, giving way to a more cordial relationship between the resettlement communities and the Bui Power Authority.

The resettlement houses constructed under the BPA Resettlement Project is one of the best in the sub-region in terms of quality, space, quantity and comfort. Most respondents attested to this and they were quite happy with the housing. In some of the communities, construction was under way for health and educational facilities. Yet there are key outstanding issues that require urgent attention to restore livelihoods in the midst of power differentials between BPA and the resettlement communities. Some of these are discussed below.

The need for prompt payment of compensations

A number of cash compensations were outlined in the RAP. These compensations covered payment for loss of crops, lands and alternative other livelihoods, as well as assistance with farm inputs to aid crops cultivation. Among the compensations negotiated and agreed with the people only one was paid, by BPA, a monthly resettlement allowance of GH¢100 per month for 12 months. Stakeholders are very much concerned about the delay in the payment of the cash compensations especially those for crop/tree and land.

Land, crop and property

For people living in rural communities, land provides essential livelihood. Since the construction of the dam was going to lead to loss of lands through inundation, it was necessary to make alternative land arrangements for farmers. To this end, the government, through BPA and in consultation with the communities to be affected, identified the new resettlement sites for construction of houses and adjoining lands for farming activities. For instance, in the Jamah resettlement site, the chief of Jamah willingly provided land for both. In the three resettlement communities of Bui, Akanyakrom Battor and Dokokyina, the chief of Bui is said to have done the same. Farmers in the Jamah resettlement site were restricted in terms of the number of acres they could cultivate due to limited land availability. This was not, however, the case with farmers in Bui, Akanyakrom and Dokokyina.

But in both cases there were problems with the quality of the land provided for farming. This was further aggravated by the lack of supply of fertilisers and insecticides for spraying crops to prevent destruction by insects. The lack of these have affected crop yields and in extreme cases some farmers completely lost their crops. A young man in the Jamah resettlement site reported how his father, who used to cultivate a large tract of land in their previous community and could harvest several truckloads of yams and maize, can hardly produce one truckload of yams in the new community because of lack of land and the low quality of what is available. He lamented that, at the time of the study he had not reported to school (he was attending Bole Senior High School) because his father has not been able to pay him to get there.
Another issue which emerged is the ownership of lands allocated to people to cultivate. In the Jamah resettlement site, conflicts over lands for farming have already emerged between indigenous people of the area and the resettlers and also between the resettlers. On the other hand this situation is not pronounced in the three resettlement communities in the BrongAhafo Region (Bui, Akanyakrom, Dokokinya). The challenge, however, lies in the fact that specific demarcations were not made at the time of resettlement; some individual farmers have more land then they are able to cultivate. The issue of land ownership, who cultivates what land and what size of land is a potential flashpoint for conflict among the people, especially in the long run, and urgently needs clarification.

Livelihood needs

In view of the fact that cultivation of crops and yields was low in the resettlement areas, the need for alternative livelihoods, as envisioned in the resettlement negotiations, was advocated by the people, who also wanted the provision of training and skills for the youth to prepare them for alternative ways of making a living. Since this has not been done, it is deemed necessary to suggest that BPA readdress the matter to determine what forms of livelihoods the new environment can sustain; for instance the youth in the Jamah resettlement site mentioned fish ponds as an alternative source of livelihood, which was promised as part of the LEP but as yet have not been provided. In the absence of such arrangements, poverty looms.

It is important to note that, under the Bui dam resettlement action framework produced by the Environmental Research Programme in 2007, a number livelihood packages were proposed for resettled households, households losing lands and host communities. These included full resettlement and rehabilitation based on inventory of assets and crops for resettled households, compensation for loss of assets associated with inundated lands, crops, trees, grazing and forest products, and the Livelihoods Enhancing Programme (LEP) for households losing more than 20 per cent of their land. LEP, which is funded by the Government of Ghana, consisted of micro-credit programmes to enhance agriculture, fishing trading, hunting and forest product collection, in order to improve livelihoods over and above pre-project levels and to serve as a safety net for households directly affected by the Bui Dam Project.

Even though houses were built for people who owned houses in the previous communities, it is also a fact that there were settlers in those communities who did not own houses but lived in the communities as tenants. In the process of resettlement, these people also moved but since they were not provided with houses they have had to continue renting rooms. Moreover, after resettling in the new communities, many more people have come to live there and these have also had to rent rooms. In situations like this, some house owners have rented out rooms to make money, putting pressure on their own household space. Some youth in the Jamah resettlement site lamented that their parents have had to do this to get money to take care of their families, leaving less space for the youth.

4.2 Recommendations

Recommendations for GDD

Based on evidence from this study, three key issues are critical in moving forward. First, the GDD platform must take another step to promote interactions among stakeholders on the issue of compensation payments. It is important for parties, especially the resettlement communities to understand the dynamics of compensation payment, especially land compensation and the processes involved. Timelines must be agreed upon by parties for payment of compensations and other benefits due affected communities.

Second, it is crucial for GDD to strengthen its financial and institutional base to be able to undertake programmes that will feed into national policy and legislations. The policy level influences of GDD at the national level are still at a teething stage and need to mature to to make the desired impact. Continuing interaction with BPA and VRA for improved policies and practices is recommended.

Third, GDD must strengthen its engagement with the Lands Commission and other relevant government agencies to speed up issues on land title deeds under the Bui project.
Recommendations for BPA

BPA's efforts in the resettlement process are commendable. However, the Livelihood Enhancement Programme (LEP) is a very important component of the resettlement package and has implications for the wellbeing of the people who have lost their livelihoods especially the youth. It is recommended that BPA speeds up processes on the rollout of the LEP. Other issues relating to crop compensation and land compensation will require a more urgent approach in the spirit of equity and fairness.

Finally, all stakeholders in the Bui Dam Project must revisit the RAP and ensure compliance with provisions it makes for resettlement of the affected communities. This will help create the right atmosphere for the work to progress, while ensuring adherence to commitments and principles at both national and international levels.
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The Ghana dams dialogue (2006–2010) was designed to learn lessons about resettlement from past dams in Ghana and to improve social outcomes when building a new generation of dams in Ghana. Bui Dam was completed in 2013 and some 1200 people in 8 affected communities were resettled between 2009 and 2011. The study asks how the lessons learned from past experience were applied and how the national level dialogue ultimately fed through into improved policy and practice as seen in the observed outcomes for affected communities at Bui Dam.