

**Appendix 1 – Household socio-economic questionnaire survey
instrument**

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC SURVEY INSTRUMENT – TEBEREBIE SOUTH EAST WASTE ROCK
DUMP, TARKWA, GHANA**

1 INTERVIEW RECORD

1.1 Interviewer

1.2 Date

		03
--	--	----

2 HOUSEHOLD IDENTIFICATION

2.1 Household head's FULL name									
2.2 Household head's ethnicity (please circle below). If <i>not listed</i> , state here:									
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Ahanta	Akwapim	Ashanti	Ewe	Fanti	Northerner	Nzema	Wangara	Wassa	
2.3 Respondent's name									
2.4 Location (Teberebie, Tarkwa etc).....									
2.5 Time (years) that household has been in this location						< 1 year	1-10 years	> 10 years	
						1	2	3	
2.6 If < 1 year, where did the household move from (give place name):									

3 CATEGORY AFFECTED

Please describe your household's relationship to the affected area. *More than one option possible.*

- Own farmland within the area, and utilize it yourself?
- Own farmland within the area, and hire/lease it to somebody?

If you OWN land which is hired/leased to somebody, please provide details as follows:

Name of person(s) using land	Nature of tenure (e.g. lease, sharecrop – Abusa/Abunu)	Main crop grown on land	Duration of agreement	Time that agreement has been in place?	Area (acres)

- Hire/Rent land within the affected area from somebody?
- Have leasehold over land in the affected area?
- Sharecrop within the affected area?
- Work for somebody who owns land within the affected area?
- Other (please describe).....

If you USE land which belongs to somebody else, please provide details as follows:

Name of landowner	Nature of tenure (lease, rent etc)	Main crop grown by you on land	Duration (lease)	Used for how long?	Area (acres)

5 ASSETS

5.1 Household items:

Which of the following items are available (in a working condition) for use by your household?

Item	Own? (please tick)
Bicycle	
Telephone	
Radio	
Television set	
Cassette player / Radio cassette	
Sewing machine	
Motor cycle	
Car/truck	
Refrigerator / deep freeze	
Foam mattress	
Gas/electric stove or cooker	
Furniture suite (cushion chairs)	

5.2 Buildings/structures (more than one option/material is possible)

No.	Type of building/structure e.g. house, kitchen, storage area	Materials used		# rooms	Status of utilisation Used = 1 Not used, complete = 2 Not used, incomplete = 3
		Walls	Roof		
		Wood & mud = 1 Stones & mud = 2 Stones & cement = 3 Cement blocks = 4 Wood poles = 5 Bricks = 6	Thatch = 1 Tin = 2 Poles = 3 No roof = 4		
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					

5.3 Toilet facilities:

Type	Please circle
No toilet	1
Outside toilet - VIP - pit latrine	2
	3
Inside toilet	4

6. INCOME & EXPENDITURE (MONTHLY)

6.1 Sources

INCOME SOURCE		Cedis
Agriculture	Livestock sales	
	Crop, vegetable, fruit sales	
	Animal products' sales	
	Palm oil production	
	Other (specify)	
Employment (non-farm)	Self-employment: petty trading (hairdresser, seamstress, carpenter etc), sale of handicrafts	
	Salaries, wages of resident household members	
	Small scale mining (galamsey)	
	Charcoal / fuelwood sales	
Migrant remittances / transfers from other households	From elsewhere in Ghana	
	From another country (specify)	
Pensions, allowances, social welfare grants and insurance payments		
Housing and land rent		
Other income sources (specify)		
ESTIMATED MONTHLY INCOME		

7.2 Savings

Does your household have cash savings?

Yes	1
No	2

7.4 Financial assistance

Does your household currently have a loan?

Yes	1
No	2

7.3 Sources of financial assistance

If your household is short of money, who do you ask for help? (*more than one answer possible*)

Source of assistance	Please circle
Do not ask for money	1
Sell property	2
Sell livestock	3
Relatives	4
Neighbour	5
Formal lending facility/bank	6
Informal lending facility	7
Other (specify)	8

7.5 Expenditure

Indicate the effect of the following expenditure items on your family income over the past year.

Item	Very strong effect	Strong effect	Minor effect	No effect
Food				
Education				
Health				
Transport				
Funeral(s)				
Dowry				
Clothes				
Hire of labour				
Agricultural inputs				
Other (specify)				

8 AGRICULTURE AND LAND

8.1 We would like to know about the agricultural production of your household. Does your household have access to arable land that you use for cultivation?

Yes	1	
No	2	If no, proceed to question 8.7.

8.2 If yes, ask the following (for each piece of land):

	Main crop grown on land	Size (acres)	Distance (miles from homestead) At homestead = 1	Affected by project? Yes = 1 No = 2	Ownership / Land tenure rights Belonging to household = 1 Renting from another household = 2 Sharecropping with another household = 3 Other (specify) = 5
A					
B					
C					
D					
E					
F					
G					

8.3 Please provide details of crops grown.

Type	No. of acres	Labour Family only = 1 Hired paid only = 2 Neighbours non-paid = 3 Family & paid labour = 4	Quantity harvested (estimate: weight or value)	Proportion used for household consumption (i.e. half, one third, etc)

	Family & non-paid = 5		
Cassava			
Plantain			
Maize			
Cocoyam			
Rice			
Vegetables			
Oil Palm			
Cocoa			
Coconut			
Sugar cane			
Other (please specify)			

8.4 Name the two main food crops used by your household:

Crop 1:.....

Crop 2:.....

8.5 Name the two main crops bartered or sold by your household (may be same as in Q. 8.4):

Crop A:.....

Crop B:.....

8.6 Where do you sell the crops listed in Q. 8.5?

Location	Crop A	Crop B
1 = In the village market		
2 = In Tarkwa market		
3 = Sell to traders who visit the village		
4 = On the roadside		
6 = Other (please specify)		

8.7 What livestock does your household have (if any)?

Type	Number owned
No livestock	0
Goats	1
Sheep	2
Pigs	3
Cattle	4
Chicken/poultry (ducks, geese)	5

8.8 What fruit trees does your household have?

Type	Number	Are some planted within the affected area? Yes = 1 No = 2
No fruit trees	0	
Orange		

Avocado		
Mango		
Banana		
Papaw		
Apple		
Pineapple		
Guava		
Other (specify)		
TOTAL		

8.9 Where do your household's livestock graze?

.....

9 SOCIAL SERVICES

9.1 Which schools do the children of your household currently attend?
 (more than one answer may be given)

Name of school / educational institution	Level Preschool = 1, Basic = 2, Secondary, vocational/technical = 3, Tertiary = 4)

9.2 Which ailments have **persons in your household** suffered from in the past year?

Illness	Please circle
Malaria	1
Cough / lung problems	2
Diarrhea	3
Skin infection	4
Sexually transmitted disease	5
Eye disease	6
Tooth ache	7
Cholera	8
Fever	9
Birth complications (women)	10
Other (specify)	11

9.3 Where do you normally seek help when a member of your household is sick?

Facility	Please circle
Tarkwa General Hospital	1
GAGL Health Centre (Iduapriem)	2
Private Clinic	3
Traditional healer	4
Mine hospital	5
Chemist / pharmacy	6

Other (specify)	7
-----------------------	---

9.3 Is any member of your household mentally or physically disabled in any way? If so, please name that person and describe the condition:

.....

9.4 Where does your household get water from? (*more than one answer may be given*)

Source	Cooking, drinking	Washing, watering animals
Borehole	1	1a
Dam	2	2a
Private tap at house	3	3a
Rain collected at homestead	4	4a
Communal stand pipe	5	5a
Well/spring	6	6a
River/Stream	8	8a
Water sold by other people	10	10a
Other (specify)	11	11a

9.5 Which of the following energy sources (for light and/or for fuel) does your household use in the buildings where you live here? (*more than one answer may be given*)

Source	Please circle
Electricity	1
Gas	2
Paraffin	3
Charcoal	4
Candles	5
Wood	6
Other (specify)	7

9.6 Please indicate whether you or another member of your household belongs to one of these:

Organisation	Please circle
Church group	1
Farmers' Association	2
Development Committee	3
Youth Group	5
Women's group	6
Other (specify)	7

Appendix 2 – Description of common crop types

Oil palm (*Elaeis guineensis*)

Oil palm is indigenous to tropical African forest and is cultivated widely within Ghana. The trees begin to flower and fruit in the third year and, depending upon soil conditions and weed control, maximum yields are obtained by the sixth year. The trees are felled at 15-25 years old and the plot re-planted the following season. Oil palm seedlings are bought at 9 months old and nursed for two years before planting out. The trees are planted at 30 yard intervals and with a density of 60 trees / acre.

A number of products are obtained from oil palm. Two types of oil are produced from the fruit – palm oil is obtained from the fleshy outer tissue of the fruit by crushing while palm kernel oil is extracted from the seed once the hard shell surrounding it has been crushed. The fruits of the oil palm are also used in the preparation of palm soup (*abenkwan*). Palm wine is obtained by tapping the male flowers but this necessitates felling of the tree. The local gin *akpeteshi* is distilled from palm wine. Both these products are only produced for local consumption and do not provide income. The fronds of the tree are also used locally for thatching and woven fences.

Cocoa (*Theobroma cacao*)

Cocoa was introduced into West Africa in 1878 from Central America and for much of this century Ghana has been the leading producer of this crop. In 1965 world cocoa prices started to fall and production has since declined such that Ghana now stands as the world's third largest cocoa producer (1990).

The fruits require 5-8 months to ripen, and, once harvested, are cut open and the seeds removed. The seeds are gathered into heaps within the cocoa plantation, covered with plantain leaves and allowed to ferment for six days. The beans are then washed and air dried on large tables. The outer shells of the seeds are removed by crushing and are used as fertiliser, fodder or fuel. The seeds are then sold to the District Cocoa Board, located at larger towns within the area.

Cocoa trees require a shady environment and a continually damp tropical climate in order to grow and fruit. Mature forest trees are normally left standing when an area is cleared to provide shade for cocoa. The presence of mature trees provides a more varied and valuable habitat for indigenous wildlife than with many other crops.

Cassava (*Manihot esculenta*)

Cassava, introduced originally from South America, is the most widely cultivated food crop in Ghana and is the staple food of the local people of the Concession area. The plant is cultivated for the tubers which, although poor in protein, are a rich source of carbohydrate. The tubers are harvested after 9 months and following harvesting a

piece of cassava stem is buried in the ground to provide the following crop. An area of land can support a cassava crop for two years before being left fallow.

The tubers are usually boiled as *ampesi* or pounded into *fufu* and may also be eaten roasted or fried. The species will not tolerate water-logging and requires good light for growth but the nutrient demands are moderate. It will, therefore, grow on most well-drained soils.

Plantain (*Musa paradisiaca*)

Plantain is a native of tropical Asia and is cultivated particularly within the forest region of Western Africa. The plant is grown from suckers taken from the base of the parent plant and the fruit is ready for harvesting 15 months after planting. The fruit is boiled as *ampesi* or pounded into *fufu*, or, alternatively, fried or roasted.

Cocoyam (*Xanthosoma mafaffa*)

Cocoyam was introduced from tropical America and is widely cultivated in the forest regions of West Africa, including Ghana. Plants are cultivated by vegetative reproduction by dividing up the central root of an old plant. In good, early worked soil, plants can each produce 8-10 tubers/plant.

The tubers are rich in starch and eaten as *ampesi* or *fufu*, roasted or fried. Dried tubers can be ground into flour. When young and tender the leaves of this plant are used as a spinach-like vegetable.

Cereals

Maize (*Zea mays*) is more important as a staple amongst peoples of the southern savannah than in the forest zone and the northern savannah. This species will grow on almost any site although the best yields are obtained on well-drained sites. The crop matures 60-90 days after planting depending on the variety. The major use of the crop is as a dried and milled maize flour (cornflour).

Appendix 3 – List of vulnerable persons identified

Vulnerable persons identified during RAP fieldwork

Name	Sex	Age	Marital status	No. of children	Owner or Tenant	Main source of income	No. of acres	Main claim on income
Ackom-Wilson, Richard	M	68	Widower	5	O	Salary	7	Education
Adwoa, Maame	F	60	Widow	12	O	Agriculture	7	Education
Agyire, Kwesi	M	60	Married	1	O	Agriculture	4	Food
Akosua, Janet	F	75	Widow	9	T	Agriculture	1.5	Education
Akyere, Ama	F	60	Widow	6	O	Agriculture	2	Education
Aluwa, Maame	F	60	Widow	5	O	Agriculture	4	Transport
Amartey, Esi	F	29	Divorced	5	O	Agriculture	2	Education
Amukubia, Doris	F	35	Divorced	2	T	Agriculture	4	Hire of labour
Asmah, Joseph	M	62	Married	2	T	Agriculture	8	Education
Badu, Adwoa	F	65	Married	6	T	Non-farm	2	Education
Bronya, Maame	F	70	Married	7	O	Agriculture	43	Education
Essien, Mary	F	60	Widow	1	T	Remittance	5	Agric. Inputs
Kojo Kraa, Nana	M	97	Married	8	O	Remittance	10	Education
Mensah, Janet	F	37	Widow	5	T	Agriculture	4	Hire of labour
Narh, Abena	F	50	Widow	5	T	Agriculture	4	Education
Nsowa, Efua	F	70	Married	3	O	Remittance	7	Food
Nuakoh, Stephen	M	58	Married	8	O	Agriculture	26	Education
Woyaba, Yaa	F	50	Widow	5	O	Agriculture	15	Education

Appendix 4 – Minutes

MEETING HELD WITH: Teberebie Community Leaders & Assemblyman		DATE: 20.02.03 (Thursday) TIME: 16H30 – 18H15
Held at: GAGL Mine Offices		
Purpose: Introduce the resettlement team, outline <i>modus operandi</i> , request assistance, obtain preliminary issues list		NOTE TAKER(S): Ankomah & Pooley
PRESENT Name/Organisation:	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
<p>Teberebie representatives Nana Kwabena Pan., Kontihene Nicholas Nkrumah, Safihene Stephen B. Anyam, Sec. to Assembly John K Kwesie, Organising Secretary John Nkrumah, Concerned Citizens James Amuaful, Unit Committee Chairman Ernest Amoateng, Assemblyman</p> <p>Resettlement Team Justin Pooley Isaac Ankomah, Community Liaison Officer, GAGL Albert Quansah, CARE Joseph A. Sowah, Nat. Youth Council (interpreter)</p>	<p>Introduction of team leader by Mr Nkrumah-Boateng</p> <p>Pooley: Introduced team members, including Dr Agyemang-Mensah (absent).</p> <p>Overview:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ As you know, GAGL is developing a new waste rock dump at its Teberebie site, a process which has already begun. As a result of this, households using that land have been, and will be, affected. ➤ Although GAGL has compensated people for loss of land and structures in the past according to Ghanaian law, it has been decided that this process needs to be reviewed to ensure that peoples' livelihoods do not suffer as a result of displacement from their lands. ➤ This team has therefore been appointed to investigate the issue of people's displacement from the waste rock dump site, and to come up with what is referred to as a Resettlement Action Plan which will lay out resettlement principles and practice which GAGL will commit to. Called a RAP even though only one or two houses are likely to be physically displaced, because under World Bank definition, the term resettlement includes both physical and economic displacement (i.e. loss of lands, in the second case). ➤ This plan will be put together based on the findings of a social survey which we will need to conduct, property surveys being conducted by the mine together with affected household heads, on the outcome of meetings such as this one with community leaders and affected parties, and on discussions with the relevant Government authorities, and will be guided by World Bank social protection guidelines. ➤ These guidelines require the process to be open and transparent, which is why we are here today and why we will be meeting with yourselves and many others in the next few weeks and again in a month or so from now. ➤ It is broadly based on the principle that people who are negatively affected by the creation of the new dump should at the very least be no worse off after the dump development than before. This study aims to find the best mutually acceptable way of achieving this result. ➤ I should stress at this point that the development of the RAP will not be dealing with prior episodes of resettlement, i.e. those occurring before the creation of Teberebie's new waste rock dump, although it will of course be important to take the lessons learned from previous experience into account. ➤ Timing: relatively short timeframe, quite intensive process: be running social survey in parallel with public consultation and key stakeholder meetings and briefings. The team will be here until March 9th, then will go away to process all the information and issues collected, prepare a draft Plan, then will return for a week, probably in early April, to present it to mine and people, before it is finalised. Urgency lies in that some people have already been affected, and the dump is being extended slowly as we speak, so in order to achieve anything meaningful, need to work quickly. <p>Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Our first task is to undertake a household survey involving all the households that will be affected. The household survey will investigate the socio-economic conditions of all the affected households. These surveys are very important as we need as much information as possible to ensure that we plan properly. ➤ We need to start the household survey asap, on Monday if possible, and continue over the next few weeks. Need you to let the households know what we are coming to do and ask for their co-operation. ➤ Will start with those households whose lands have been enumerated by the mine already, and as we gather information from them and others, will expand 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Teberobie Community Leaders & Assemblyman	DATE: 20.02.03 (Thursday) TIME: 16H30 – 18H15
Held at: GAGL Mine Offices	
	<p>survey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ We understand that this might interfere with farming activities. However we ask for everyone’s assistance. <p>Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ We would like to hold meetings with leaders in the affected village, and once the household survey is complete we will need to hold a meeting with all the affected households, to give them the opportunity to raise their issues. ➤ For your information, we will also be meeting with representatives of NGOs based in Tarkwa, and other key stakeholders, to obtain their input and views. <p>Identification of PAPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A critical part of process is to identify and survey all affected households, establish a final register of PAPs. Basis will be existing mine list, but likely to include those working the land but not owning it – doesn’t mean they will be treated like landowners and compensated in cash etc, but is essential to find out who they are and what their relation to the land is, in order to plan properly. ➤ Your assistance required to ensure that we don’t get a lot of freeloaders, that is people who have not been using the land and who now try to get their names on the list. Will be undertaking a cross-checking process, involving landowners, farmers groups and yourselves in order to identify real PAPs and sift out any imposters. Must understand that mine is sensitive about this: if perceive that local people are flouting system, less likely to co-operate on fair treatment for all. <p>ISSUES RAISED, AND RESPONSES GIVEN</p> <p>Issue 1: Some people were not around when the cropland surveys were conducted for areas now covered in waste rock – how will they be dealt with? <i>For now the only information we have is derived from the mine’s enumeration survey, which should have been comprehensive. It will be difficult to deal with outstanding claims, obviously, given the lack of information, although we will of course investigate the issue further as the study proceeds to see whether or not this occurred.</i></p> <p>Issue 2: When Iduapriem Mine was established in 1991, alternative land was given to people displaced by the mine. If the mine occupies the waste rock dump land now, will it give alternative land? (Suggested a piece, but another community representative indicated that it had already been utilised). <i>One of the main tasks of this study is to determine whether such an option, i.e. provision of land-for-land, is a) fair, and b) feasible, or whether the current process should be left as is.</i></p> <p>Issue 3: People want peace: with people forced off the land, the youth have to go into galamsey activities and the like. Would like to find alternatives for them. <i>The purpose of the exercise is to identify whether and how people’s livelihoods can be restored.</i></p> <p>Issue 4: The waste rock dump has already covered some croplands. Will those people who have already lost lands be catered for? <i>As stated already, the study will look at everyone who has lost access to land or who will lost access to it in future as a result of the creation of the new waste rock dump.</i></p> <p>Issue 5: You have talked about the new site only: what about the old problems (previous resettlement)? Many people were affected in the past – why aren’t we dealing with them? For example, people from Teberobie were not allowed to use their previous lands after resettlement. <i>Although it is understandable that people are concerned about past episodes, it is simply not practicable to investigate these now. For one, there is no substantive information upon which to base any compensation or land claims. Secondly, there are a great many claims by a great many communities in this area, so that if we started such a process it could go on for years and never be resolved. Thirdly, Teberobie Goldfields Limited were responsible for your own previous resettlement, but they no longer operate this mine: it would be unfair to expect one company (GAGL) to compensate people for the historical practices of another. Fourthly, one must remember that GAGL, along with</i></p>

MEETING HELD WITH: Teberebie Community Leaders & Assemblyman	DATE: 20.02.03 (Thursday) TIME: 16H30 – 18H15
Held at: GAGL Mine Offices	
	<p><i>other mining houses, are currently compensating people according to Ghanaian law: thus, the fact that they are reviewing their practices with a view of possibly making them more equitable should be encouraged: community leaders have a choice of working together to ensure that the current generation are dealt with fairly, or of obstructing the process and ending up with nothing at the end of the day. This exercise is aimed at, possibly for the first time, establishing a transparent and comprehensive set of planning principles to safeguard people's livelihoods, and establishing a socio-economic baseline to inform this process.</i></p> <p>Issue 6: You say that you will be dealing with all affected people at the new waste rock dump site: what will happen to those who were not landowners, but used the land? How will they be taken care of? <i>That is an issue which is being looked into by this study, so we cannot have the answers now. There is no guarantee at this stage that they will be taken care of at all, although according to the World Bank's resettlement principles this should be an overriding aim of the final recommendations.</i></p> <p>Issue 7: The dump site is near Teberebie settlement, thus when dumping occurs overnight one wakes up to find dust in one's room. What will be done about this during this planning process? <i>Although this is clearly an important issue for you and one which has no doubt been taken up with the EPA and others, it is beyond the scope of the resettlement planning team to investigate. We have a short operating life, and cannot be distracted by the big range of peripheral social issues, some of which are intractable and are unlikely to be solved in the next few years, if at all.</i></p> <p>Issue 8 (comment only): There are a lot of swampy areas around, which the mine could have used as a waste rock dump site. I think that the reason good land was used was because of the cost of transporting the material further away. <i>That may or may not be so. It should be borne in mind that the waste rock dump is a huge feature, and that dumping waste rock into a swamp might also not be feasible in the first place. This is clearly not an issue we'll be looking at in this study.</i></p> <p>Issue 9: When Teberebie people were resettled before, they lost control over much of their former land, which has been taken by outsiders. Thus some people are 'originals' and others are 'immigrants', some of whom have taken our land without our permission. How will this issue be dealt with? (followed by general discussion). <i>Note: issue resolved between Teberebie community leaders themselves.</i></p> <p>Issue 10: If the team provides us with a list of prospective people to be surveyed, then we can organise for these people to be ready next week. <i>We shall try to provide you a list of these people tomorrow, so that we can begin on Monday (next week) with the survey.</i></p>

MEETING HELD WITH: Teberebie Community Leaders		DATE: 22.02.03 (Saturday) TIME: 10h00 – 13h00
Held at: Teberebie Village		
Purpose: To ensure a smooth take-off for the socio-economic survey undertaken by the resettlement team		NOTE TAKER: Isaac Ankomah
PRESENT Name/Organisation:	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
<p>Teberebie community representatives</p> <p>James Amuaful, Unit Committee Chairman John K Kwesie, Organising Secretary James Cobbinah, Unit Committee member John Nkrumah, Concerned citizen Martin Gyimah, Farmers Association Chairman Nicholas Nkrumah, Safohene Nana Koicrah, Tumfohene</p> <p>Resettlement Team</p> <p>Dr Agyemang-Mensah Isaac Ankomah, GAGL Joseph Sowah, Nat. Youth Council (interpreter)</p>	<p>Dr Agyemang-Mensah: opened the meeting at 10h00 and made the following introductory remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Introduced himself as being part of the resettlement team, engaged to assist Justin Pooley (resettlement consultant) to prepare Teberebie South East waste rock dump resettlement action plan (RAP), and welcomed participants to the meeting. ➤ Re-iterated the importance of the RAP to the affected farmers and urged all community leaders to give the exercise the necessary support. ➤ Provided a brief background to the exercise, emphasising that it was aimed at resettling affected farmers economically. This would involve restoration of the livelihood of affected farmers, so that they will not be worse off after being displaced from their land than before. ➤ Explained that the essence of the meeting was to recap some of the issues discussed with Justin Pooley during the first meeting, as the leaders had had some time to think the issues through. ➤ Proposed that a meeting involving community members whose property/livelihoods would be affected be convened in order to enhance the take-off of the socio-economic survey next week. ➤ Stated that this meeting would allow the resettlement team to brief affected farmers on the nature of the exercise before the survey begins. In addition it will create the opportunity for community members to provide a list of affected households which could then be added to GAGs own list. <p>Community Response and questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community leaders present welcomed the suggestions. Mr James Amuaful, unit committee chairman, offered to mobilise affected farmers to be met by the RAP team on Monday February 24, at 8am at Teberebie. • Issue 1: Why are those who have already been compensated being asked to take part in the exercise? <i>The RAP intends to cover all affected farmers, whether compensated or not. The RAP will attempt to provide an alternative means of livelihood to both tenants and landowners, and will not discriminate between those already compensated and those awaiting compensation. However, the exercise will not be extended to land previously expropriated by the defunct Teberebie Gold Mine, because GAG is not responsible for their liabilities.</i> • Issue 2: Will land owners receive compensation? <i>All cropland will be enumerated and compensation will be paid to the owners. In addition, issues relating to vacant land will be discussed with either the land owners and/or the chief. Mr Sowah added that the RAP will consider in detail economic resettlement to ensure that those who will be denied access to land will be provided with alternative livelihood options.</i> • Issue 3: (reply in response to opinion on waste rock dump's impact) – Apart from denying the affected farmers a source of livelihood, the waste rock dump will likely block access to farms which are not going to be affected by the dump. Appealed to GAG to create an alternative footpath to make life easier for affected farmers. <i>Mr Isaac Ankomah of GAG responded by informing the leaders that a new footpath has already been cut at the base of the proposed waste rock dump boundary by the Environmental Department. Soon, community members will be invited to observe this and comment on its use/effectiveness.</i> 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Teberebie Community Leaders	DATE: 22.02.03 (Saturday) TIME: 10h00 – 13h00
Held at: Teberebie Village	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue 4: The unit committee chairman appealed to GAG to provide alternative land for those who have lost their farm land. This will also contribute to the idea of finding alternative livelihood for affected farmers. He suggested that GAG could explore Mkwanta and Wangara areas because there is vacant land in those areas. • Issue 5: The unit committee chairman also appealed to GAG to offer their youth employment in the company. <i>The importance of the employment issue was recognised, and Dr Agyemang-Mensah assured the leaders that he would take it up again with mine management.</i> • Issue 6: The community leaders requested logistical support from GAG to enable the community clinic to start operation. They also further appealed to GAG to re-shape their road which is in a deplorable state. • Issue 7: Dr Agyemang-Mensah suggested that the Teberebie community should form a Community Based Organisation (CBO) that will be a mouthpiece for issues bordering on mine land/activities. This would create effective communication links between the community and the mining companies. Mr Isaac Ankomah of GAG added that the company had recognised the importance of such organisations; consequently, efforts are being made to assist the community to form such an organisation.

MEETING HELD WITH: Tarkwa NGO's working with the affected households		DATE: 21.02.03 (Friday)
		TIME: 15h40 – 16h45
Held at: CARE Offices, Tarkwa		
Purpose: Introduce the resettlement team, outline <i>modus operandi</i> , request assistance, obtain preliminary issues list		NOTE TAKER: Justin Pooley
PRESENT	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
Name/Organisation:		
Tarkwa NGO representatives: Albert Quansah, CARE E.A. Fletcher, CARE Lillian Arthur, CARE Eden Ametewe, CARE Peter Yeboah, Director Programmes, WACAM Kwesi Aduakwah, WACAM	NOTE: Project Concern – another Tarkwa NGO – was invited to the meeting but did not show. Quansah (CARE) briefly introduced the study team, and CARE's involvement in the planning process. Pooley: Introduced team members, including Dr Agyemang-Mensah and Joseph Sowah (interpreter, absent), and provided an overview (see previous minutes of Teberebie Community Leaders meeting) of the team's task and <i>modus operandi</i> . Indicated that NGOs, being closest to the local communities, had an important role to play in conveying issues and concerns regarding past and present resettlement activities, and in ensuring those issues were put on the table so that they could be taken into consideration in drawing up a resettlement action plan.	
Resettlement Team Justin Pooley Isaac Ankomah, Community Liaison Officer, GAGL	ISSUES RAISED, AND RESPONSES GIVEN Issue 1: What will be the role of NGOs in this process? <i>We see NGOs as being an entry point into the communities affected, as you are working close to the people and are well acquainted with their livelihoods and problems. As such, we recognise that you often represent their views in various forums, and voice their concerns, hence we would like to hear those concerns. Also, as we will be working in the communities, we will require assistance in organising the relevant people so that we can reach them (for meetings etc). Finally, once the RAP is drawn up and discussed, there may be a role for local NGOs to play in the implementation process.</i> Issue 2: WACAM comment: We were only notified by our HQ today of this meeting, and were not fully informed as to what it concerned, hence we have no prepared questions for you. Our main involvement in local resettlement issues of late was in relation to the Goldfields court case, where we provided legal advice to the affected communities, in a protracted process which was finally resolved out of court. One possible concern is the short timeframe for these studies, as people take a long time to understand what is being done, and need time to respond. However, we have a lot of hope in the study, and are glad that the initiative has finally been taken to do resettlement planning 'properly': we hope that it will set the scene for more transparent and fair resettlement in future. <i>Thank you. Apologies for you not knowing the content of this meeting in advance. Your HQ was in fact informed a week ago, and the content was discussed with your superior officer in Accra; however, this information obviously did not filter through. From now on, we shall be here (as a team) and will ensure that we consult with you directly and in person. This will not be the last time we interact, hence you shall have more weeks to deliberate and provide your concerns or suggestions.</i> Issue 3: (WACAM): The proximity of the waste rock dump to Teberebie Village is problematic, and has various negative consequences for the people living there. What will you be doing about this issue? <i>This issue came up yesterday with Teberebie Community Leaders. In short, we shall not be looking into it, as it is not related directly to the current resettlement process. Instead, we are focusing our efforts on the issue of land which is being taken away from households, and finding was to restore their livelihoods after this has occurred. It is clearly an important issue of the affected persons, and one which has</i>	

MEETING HELD WITH: Tarkwa NGO's working with the affected households	DATE: 21.02.03 (Friday) TIME: 15h40 – 16h45
Held at: CARE Offices, Tarkwa	
	<p><i>been and no doubt will be taken up with the EPA, the mine and NGOs like yourselves for some time to come. However, we have limited time and an enormously complex task to deal with, and if we get side-tracked by the many points of conflict locally we are unlikely to achieve our objective, which is to assist those affected households to restore their livelihoods post-displacement. What we will be looking into, and in fact this is something which the mine has already started to think about on its own accord, is whether the dump size and shape might be modified in any way to reduce its extent or at least its protrusion out towards Teberebie Village. This would limit the number and area of farms affected, as well as making life for Teberebie residents less problematic. It may of course not be possible, but it will be investigated and commented on in this study, as it is directly related to the displacement under consideration.</i></p> <p>Issue 4: (CARE): We are interested in resettlement aftercare activities, i.e. work we can do on behalf of GAGL with affected communities, as we are trying to establish a base of operations in Teberebie at the moment. <i>Your interest is noted. As I have said before, the RAP may or may not contain implementation issues requiring local NGO involvement. Once it has been drawn up, or during the process, you will be consulted as to the nature and extent of your possible involvement.</i></p> <p>Issue 5: (In response to request for names of other key NGOs): In addition to Project Concern, the District Assembly has a desk officer who is responsible for NGOs in Tarkwa District. One can obtain a list of these from him/her. <i>Thank you, we shall do that early next week, and approach further NGOs as appropriate.</i></p> <p>The meeting closed with an agreement that the team would meet up again with NGOs once some work had been done and some of the key issues had been clarified, or when further advice and assistance was required.</p>

MEETING HELD WITH: Teberebie Farmers & community leaders		DATE: 24.02.03 TIME: 09h00 – 10h15
Held at: Chief's 'Palace', Teberebie Village		
Purpose: Introduce the resettlement team and enumerators, outline <i>modus operandi</i> , pave the way for socio-economic studies to commence		NOTE TAKER: Isaac Ankomah
PRESENT Name/Organisation:	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
<p>Teberebie Leadership</p> <p>James Amafuafu, Unit Committee Chairman Martin Gyimah, Chairman, Farmers Association (Chief's representative) Nicholas Nkrumah, Safohene Several other leaders Teberebie Community</p> <p>Resettlement Team Dr Agyemang-Mensah, University of Ghana Justin Pooley Isaac Ankomah, GAG William Addo, GAG Albert Quansah, CARE Joseph Sowah, Interpreter 8 enumerators (socio-economic study)</p>	<p>Sowah:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Sowah (interpreter) welcomed opened the meeting, welcoming the community members to the meeting and introducing the RAP team members one by one. He then handed over to Dr Agyemang-Mensah. <p>Dr Agyemang-Mensah:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided the community with a brief background to the RAP. Stated that for the exercise to proceed as planned, there is a need to sensitise the stakeholders on their roles and responsibilities, hence the reason for this meeting. Stated that the exercise is being promoted by the IFC, which are part of the World Bank Group, whose major concern is that their collaboration in the mining industry can restore the livelihood of people whose land/assets have been taken over by mining. Explained that the exercise will affect those within the catchment of South East waste rock dump; farmers and land owners are going to be interviewed by the enumerators. Appealed to the community to offer their maximum support to as to achieve the objectives of the programme. <p>Pooley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stated that Dr Agyemang-Mensah had said the important things, he would briefly introduce himself as team leader – provided brief reason for being here/background. Noted that the main aim of the team was to look at GAG's current system and decide whether it need modification or not, i.e. whether or not people's livelihoods were being restored by the current compensation once their land was taken. There was no guarantee that anything would change: the aim of the exercise at this point was simply to gather information and listen to people's views regarding matters surrounding the waste rock dump. Expressed his satisfaction at the level of co-operation so far, and stated that he was hopeful that community members will assist the RAP team to complete the exercise as planned. Explained that the RAP will cater for affected tenant farmers and landowners and look into alternative options for their sources of livelihood, as outlined by Dr Agyemang-Mensah. Stated that part of is role would be to meet key government officials to solicit their inputs for the RAP; thus Dr Agyemang-Mensah would be with the community most of the time. However he would be in the community on and off, and if any issues arose which the community needed to discuss with him, they should let him know via his colleagues. 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Teberebie Farmers & community leaders	DATE: 24.02.03 TIME: 09h00 – 10h15
Held at: Chief's 'Palace', Teberebie Village	
	<p>Chief's representative's response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin Gimyah of the Farmers Association reported that he had been delegated by the Chief to represent him. He said that the Chief's message to the RAP team is briefly this: although the exercise intends to deal only with those affected by the waste rock dump, it should also be extended to deal with the entire community ('to give everyone something'). <i>Dr Agyemang-Mensah responded that the outcome of the survey will indicate the next steps to take.</i> <p>Community questions and issues raised / response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue 1: How will actual diagnosis of compensation issues be carried out? <i>Agyemang-Mensah explained that the analysis of the survey will indicate what type of compensation would be appropriate. Pooley added that the RAP would cover both the compensation of people's croplands and look at ways in which livelihoods could be restored once the land had been taken by the waste rock dump. Asked that people should be patient and support the preparation of the RAP – all issues would be listened to.</i> • Issue 2: What will happen if somebody's lands are flooded by a stream which has been blocked by the waste rock dump? <i>Pooley indicated that this was not an issue which had been considered as yet, but would be looked into if it was thought to be a potential problem for any farmer.</i> • Issue 3: A landowner with land on the border of the waste rock dump asked whether his land outside of the dump would also be compensated, as it would be unsafe to use. <i>Agyemang-Mensah and Ankromah explained that the Senior Inspector of Mines and the Environmental Superintendent would be invited to inspect those whose lives were endangered, but that mining laws were in place to ensure that safety was looked after.</i> • Issue 4: What provision is being made for farmers whose sources of water will be polluted by the waste rock dump. <i>Ankomah explained that the RAP would consider all related issues affecting farmers.</i> • Issue 5: What will be the actual distance between the waste rock dump and where it will be safe to work on one's land? <i>Agyemang-Mensah explained that a line has been created at the base of the waste rock dump, to serve as a footpath: this would indicate where it was safe to work (once the dump had been completed).</i> • Issue 6: John Nkrumah pleaded with citizens to suspend questions and let the survey begin (each of these issues having involved much discussion amongst the assembled gathering, and there having been several other interruptions). He stated that issues relating to compensation would be raised during interviews and fieldwork and that this would enable the exercise to be completed properly within schedule. <p>Mr Martin Gimyeh suspended further questions from community members, indicating that further questions could be directed to the enumerators during household question times. He further charged the community members .to involve the opinion leaders in the community fully in future issues regarding compensation. This would enable the community to present a uniform stand in their discussions with the mining authorities</p>

MEETING HELD WITH: Dr William Ahorator, GAG Environmental Superintendent		DATE: 27 / 28.02.03 TIME: 10h30 – 12h00 /10h00 –11h00
Held at: Iduapriem Mine, Plant Offices		
Purpose: To discuss resettlement & compensation issues, in particular the mine's procedures		NOTE TAKER: Justin Pooley
PRESENT Name/Organisation:	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
<p>Iduapriem – Teberebie Operation: Dr William Ahorator, Environmental Superintendent William Addo, Environmental Officer responsible for compensation issues</p> <p>Resettlement Team Justin Pooley Isaac Ankomah, GAGL</p>	<p>Pooley: ➤ Outlined the RAP team's objectives and requested information regarding historical resettlement issues, compensation procedures and operational practices, land issues and related background.</p> <p>Ahortor: Process followed for enumeration of affected farms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When an area is to be developed, mine surveyors produce a survey grid of the area. At the same time, they check to see whether it has been developed (farmed). • Where cropping or other livelihood activities are identified, the owners are called for a site meeting, following which the area is enumerated in the presence of each individual farmer. The farmer or his/her delegated representative must be present at this stage, and has to sign off on the total number of crops identified. • One of the big problems with this system is that the farmer is often a sharecropper working another persons (the landowner's) lands. Because nobody, or at least very few people, have title to the land, and because many owners are absentee farmers, it is often difficult to differentiate owners and sharecroppers. In any event, compensation is paid to the person actually farming each portion of land, and the arrangement as to how this money is split between owner/sharecropper is left to the parties involved. • Neighbouring farmers are generally asked to confirm the boundaries of each farm, in order to prevent conflict or re-enumeration of the same lands. • Enumeration is undertaken in terms of either a) area affected or b) counting the number of a given crop affected. The choice of option is normally defined by the size of the affected farm(s), i.e. if large farms are affected, then an area based enumeration is employed, if small enough to count within a reasonable timeframe, then this is done. Certain crops are, for practical reasons, always enumerated by area (e.g. cassava), whilst others may be enumerated by either method (e.g. oil palms). A crop such as coconut trees is always counted, because compensation is paid out according to the size of the tree in question (i.e. small, medium and large). • In one particular instance, i.e. that of palm trees, a market exists for the trees as these are sometimes bought by palm wine tappers: this is then factored into the compensation allocation for palm trees. • Occasionally, this process breaks down as a tract of land is covered before formal enumeration takes place. This is almost inevitably the case where a tract of land is not recognisably farmed, yet the landowners claim that it has been (or is). Commonly, oil palms or pineapple plants remain within secondary forest or thicket, and are claimed as farm produce. • Where land has been covered up before enumeration, the mine team consults with the affected farmer as to the crop type and area, and pays compensation accordingly. • Once enumeration has been completed, compensation schedules are prepared and compensation amounts negotiated with the affected farmer(s). 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Dr William Ahoritor, GAG Environmental Superintendent		DATE: 27 / 28.02.03
		TIME: 10h30 – 12h00 /10h00 –11h00
Held at: Iduapriem Mine, Plant Offices		
	<p>Previously, this process was undertaken on a one-on-one basis. However, farmers in Teberebie area have now requested a collective bargaining arrangement, i.e. so that universal rates apply. A second rates revision has recently been published (February 2003).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once the compensation rates have been arrived at and agreed upon, the farmer signs a declaration stating that (s)he is satisfied with the deal and will not enter into any further dispute over the land in question. A photograph of each farmer is affixed to the enumeration sheet, in order to help resolve potential problems in future. • There is no fixed time period for the payment of compensation. Once information has been finalised, the process of sorting out payment takes approximately 2-3 weeks, although when farmers have several farms the mine usually waits until all of these have been enumerated (causing delays). • The financial controller also doesn't like dealing with smaller groups or individuals when processing compensation claims, preferring to process payments associated with larger groups (i.e. in bulk), which sometimes causes delays. • In general the contractors involved in dumping do not dump when asked not to by the mine, although occasionally there have ben problems at night. • There have been speculative attempts at Teberebie by isolated individuals to acquire compensation for lands which will not infact be affected by the dump: so far these have been resisted. <p>Compensation rates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anything more than 1m below the surface belongs to the Government, according to Ghanaian law (mineral rights). Within the MLA any crops and structures destroyed must be compensated for, but not the land itself. • The Land Valuation Board publishes 'orientational' compensation rates, which it uses to advise governmental agencies (e.g. the highway and electricity agencies), but not private institutions such as mines. • When GAG compensates, it considers the LVB's base rates, takes into consideration local conditions, and makes proposals. Negotiation is entered into between the mine and affected parties, with no third party involved unless there are disputes (the third party would then either be the LVB or the Department of Agriculture). • Historically, the mines have always paid higher rates than the LVB in terms of compensation. However, a new set of rates has recently been published by the LVB for the VRA, Highway Authority and Electricity Company of Ghana (i.e. 3 government agencies) which are very high. Upon the inquiry from mines as to these rates and their basis, the LVB has indicated that they should not be used for non-governmental purposes, and have reportedly refused to comment on how the rates were derived. <p>Land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land in Ghana is divided into state land, stool land (i.e. communal land administered by the Chief), and family land. In theory, stool land is to be held in trust for future generations: in practice, it is often sold off or given away, leading to widespread litigation. In general, land tenure in Ghana is characterised by poor documentation and a lack of formal title to land. In the case of family land (within a Chiefdom), the Chief often has no land left, all of it belonging in fact to families. • The Teberebie situation is awkward, as the Chief does not own anything himself, with the land belonging to families or external landowners. Most of the land affected by GAG belongs to outsiders who reside in Tarkwa. • Teberebie Village was resettled in 1992, and still work some of their old lands. These lands formed part of a process of identifying alternative options for 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Dr William Ahorator, GAG Environmental Superintendent		DATE: 27 / 28.02.03 TIME: 10h30 – 12h00 /10h00 –11h00
Held at: Iduapriem Mine, Plant Offices		
	<p>the waste rock dump, but (aside from the cost of this option), it was discovered that more farms would be affected there than at the current site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All lands in this area have traditionally fallen under the Apinto Chief (not the paramount chief, the customary administrator of lands). <p>Nkwantakrom</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Iduapriem Mine surveyors entered the areas around Pit 5 in 1996 to establish the blasting safety zone, and several farmers were compensated for affected croplands within this zone. Soon afterwards, people began speculative construction within the blast security zone, knowing that the mine was due to use it. Many persons were involved, both outsiders and some local households who went as far as borrowing money to construct structures there. A contractor became involved, taking money from people and putting up structures for them rapidly, most of which were of poor quality and obviously put up in haste. The mine took exception to this process, and after warning the settlers (who named the place Nkwantakrom, after a village which was in fact originally located a few miles away: possibly because some of the original Nkwantakrom residents had moved to the area prior to the mine's work). The matter was taken to the District Assembly, and several meetings were held. The District Security Co-ordinating Council was involved, and decided that the issue was 'threatening the peace', and that the settlement was unjustified. The area Chief, Apinto, also became involved, and supported the finding of the District Security Council. After a series of meetings and warnings, the Ghanaian police force evicted the settlers off the land. Litigation was entered into by several of the persons who were affected by the eviction; these included the Chief of Adisakrom, who has subsequently indicated that he may drop his case in <i>lieu</i> of mine assistance in other matters. <p>PCDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A draft was produced in 2000, and finalised in September 2002 when the IFC visited site. Copies were given to NGOs at that time, although the plan has not been disclosed to a wider audience. Operationalisation of the plan will now be assisted by the appointment of the Senior Community Liaison Officer (Isaak Ankomah). 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Environmental Protection Agency, Tarkwa Office		DATE: 21.02.03 (Friday)
Held at: EPA Office, Wassa West District Council, Tarkwa		TIME: 11h30 – 12h30
Purpose: Introduce the resettlement process, outline <i>modus operandi</i> , obtain issues, request relevant EPA regulations		NOTE TAKER: Justin Pooley
PRESENT Name/Organisation:	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
<p>Tarkwa EPA representative: Michael Sandow Ali, District Programme Officer, EPA</p> <p>Resettlement Team Justin Pooley Isaac Ankomah, Community Liaison Officer, GAGL</p>	<p>Pooley: Explained the resettlement team make-up and provided an overview (see previous minutes of Teberebie Community Leaders meeting) of the team's task and <i>modus operandi</i>. Indicated that the meeting was scheduled to a) let the EPA know what was taking place, b) request any specific resettlement related concerns held by the EPA, and c) collect information regarding any regulations which the EPA might have regarding the resettlement process or associated issues.</p> <p>Issues</p> <p>Issue 1 (comment): People are compensated for crops, not land, and sharecroppers (whose agreements are in cash/kind) are often left out of this process. Thus tenants are often compensated, rather than the crop 'owner'. Most landowners are not indigenous, and have acquired land from others. In general, the advent of mining in this area has led to local people losing out. There have been a lot of problems with compensation, e.g. with people running away with the money, rather than splitting it up, and there has also clearly been speculative farming and housing with a view to exploiting the situation for material gain.</p> <p>Issue 2 (comment): It would be useful if a given mine produced a comprehensive mine plan which identified land required for mining purposes. However, if farmers were to be allowed to use excess land, it should be only for seasonal crops, as cash crops are long-lived and with fluctuations in the price of gold the mines might require land again for mining. We have seen people planting cash crops fairly extensively in the areas where compensation is expected, including oil palms, teak, cocoa and so on. People also build structures which are used as temporary shelters during the rainy season, but are not lived in for long, and which are not regarded as permanent features thus falling outside safety regulations: this can be problematic in terms of compensation. Even when a good compensation deal is arrived at – as with Goldfields – one can have problems with people moving out. Abosso have also had problems.</p> <p>Issue 3: A big problem is that of people who work on other people's lands, as the owners are under no obligation to pay them anything and they lose everything (their livelihood). This happened at Abosso with one of the biggest and most influential landowners.</p> <p>Issue 4: Compensation rates: the Government is likely to come out with a new rates structure soon; however, although the mining houses have approached the Land Valuation Board for these new rates – the previous ones were published in 1997 – they have resisted giving these out. This may be because the Land Valuation Board receives 10 % of the total value of crops evaluated; thus in the past, when friction arose over rates, many communities resisted the introduction of the Board as a mediator, knowing that they would get less (and lose 10 %). Rates are usually negotiated in block form, i.e. groups of affected people. Some mines revise the rates annually, in consultation with Farmers Associations (May/June annually). This requires mining houses to co-ordinate their efforts, and to undertake negotiations once a year, trying to avoid distortion in rates between them. Problems have arisen in situations – e.g. with Satellite Goldfields (Bogoso run now), where very high rates were set, and people thereafter expected such rates to be applied all round. To date the annual</p>	

MEETING HELD WITH: Environmental Protection Agency, Tarkwa Office	DATE: 21.02.03 (Friday) TIME: 11h30 – 12h30
Held at: EPA Office, Wassa West District Council, Tarkwa	
	<p>rate review mentioned is a voluntary process, and is only taking place in isolated locations.</p> <p>Issue 5 (comment): Wonders why Teberebie community (village) was not initially relocated outside of the mining concession area (by Teberebie Goldfields Limited). There is a big difference between the rates and structures applied to Teberebie Village resettlement, for example, and the new Goldfields resettlement, which naturally causes friction between the mines and communities. Goldfields have, prudently, moved all people well out of their mining concession area, thus dealing with all of their resettlement related problems in one go. There was a problem with tenants (regarding housing) with the Goldfields relocation; in this case, a Social Investment Fund was established to cater for these people.</p>

MEETING HELD WITH: District Chief Executive, Wassa West District Assembly		DATE: 26.02.03
		TIME: 10h40 - 11h05
Held at: Wassa West District Assembly, Tarkwa		
Purpose: To inform the DCE of the work of the Resettlement Planning Team		NOTE TAKER: Justin Pooley
PRESENT <i>Name/Organisation:</i>	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
Wassa West District Assembly District Chief Executive (DCE)	Pooley:	
Resettlement Team Justin Pooley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mentioned the nature of the problem, described the team involved to deal with it, summarised the team's objectives and the timeframe in which planning will be undertaken. 	
	DCE:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thanked Pooley for informing him of what was occurring. Discussed the issue of alternative compensation for land, and whether this should be 'in kind' (i.e. land for land) or cash for actual land lost. Indicated that although land for land sounded positive, it would possibly put somebody else out of land, as the Ghanaian clan system meant that people held land in trust for future generations – expressed the perception that 'all land in Africa is allocated to somebody', hence finding unused land without disadvantaging somebody could be a problem: might be better to pay out cash instead for actual land (in addition to crops). Commented that a national initiative (via Chamber of Mines) was underway to propose the payment of compensation for actual land, i.e. not just crops, but that this was in the government's hands at the moment and he had no indication as to when or whether it would be passed as law – expressed the hope that the team would come up with a solution. Noted that people were concerned about fair compensation, and asked whether the issue would come up again and what the team would do. 	
	Pooley	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Pooley replied that paying cash for land is often problematic, as people tend to use the money for other things and not for replacing their land/livelihoods.</i> <i>Indicated that a willing landowner might be sought who would be willing to provide the mine with land / sell some land that wasn't being used, in order that place could be made for people to farm.</i> <i>Indicated that compensation rates would be looked at, but that the national issue of whether land should be compensated could not be established by the team.</i> 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Ministry of Food and Agriculture		DATE: 24.02.03
		TIME: 11h00 – 11h45
Held at: MOFA Office, Tarkwa		
Purpose: To introduce the planning exercise and to request associated issues related to the affected farmland.		NOTE TAKER: Justin Pooley
PRESENT Name/Organisation:	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
<p>Mr E.O. Opong, District Agricultural Director</p> <p>Resettlement Team Justin Pooley Isaac Ankomah, GAGL</p>	<p>Pooley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided an overview of the planning exercise and <i>modus operandi</i>. Requested issues and regulatory guidance, if any, relating to the use of agricultural land and/or agricultural assistance. <p>Opong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Directorate is working with Abosso Goldfields on alternative livelihoods generation, in the form of writing project proposals for funding. This organisation sponsors a different group of local farmers each year in development exercises, although of course this has sustainability problems as there is no continuity / ongoing support. • In situations where concession lands are involved, options may include allowing people to use land but requiring them to not grow long-duration crops (e.g. > 5 years), or supporting residential agriculture (field gardens and the like). • The principal impact of mining has been to take people's agricultural lands, hence source of income. • Mr Opong undertook a soil and crop desktop study for Metago in 2000, and is willing to undertake the same sort of exercise for GAG if required (as a consultancy). • It will be important to speak to the local communities to establish their preferred forms of alternative livelihood. • Have not been involved in compensation issues between mining houses and communities, unless there is damage and the Directorate is called in. • There should be an extension officer resident in Iduapriem/Teberebie area, however the chief there is not able to provide accommodation for this person, hence there is an access problem (Tarkwa based instead). Transport is also often an issue. 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Principal inspector of Mines, Wassa West District		DATE: 03.03.03 TIME: 10h00 - 10h45
Held at: Ministry of Mines office, Tarkwa		
Purpose: To inform the Principal Inspector of the exercise and to obtain information pertaining to resettlement issues.		NOTE TAKER: Justin Pooley
PRESENT Name/Organisation:	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
Mr Otu, Principal Inspector of Mines, Wassa West District Resettlement Team Justin Pooley	<p>Pooley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mentioned the nature of the problem, described the team involved to deal with it, summarised the team's objectives and the timeframe in which planning will be undertaken. Asked several questions relating to previous local resettlement projects, including compensation issues and how these had been dealt with. <p>Otu:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ministry has advocated for compensation for 'land use', and not just for crops, as is currently the case. People are often involved in shifting agriculture, and fallow areas are not enumerated / compensated for under the present system, which is unfair. There are no specific laws concerning compensation rates: communities tend to go into negotiations with the mining houses in this regard. The district administration is not in favour of cash compensation where original inhabitants of the area are concerned, preferring a company to find alternative land and construct new buildings. This is because historical cases of resettlement have shown that people tend to take their cash and simply move into other local settlements, putting increased pressure on the facilities there. There is also the issue of what people do with cash compensation: most are farmers, and end up squandering compensation without establishing alternative forms of livelihood: as a result, the administration prefers 'relocation' (i.e. for new structures to be put in place by the mine involved, rather than paying cash compensation). Goldfields recently undertook a major resettlement/relocation exercise, and had many problems with compensation. Eventually a Regional Steering Committee was established to oversee the matter, and the District Administration was involved. Before this happened, most people had opted for cash compensation, as generous rates (big amounts) were on offer. For example, a flat 50 % extra was paid out for lost crops, on top of the Land Valuation Board's base rates for that year. People opted for cash, and Goldfields encouraged this, a much simpler administrative option for the company. One of the problems with this approach was that involving tenants: if an owner wanted to take the money, what happened to tenants? As buildings were demolished, increasing pressure began to be put on alternative existing accommodation in the district. The Goldfields case involved a lot of problems, and many court cases / sets of litigation. One unfortunate situation arose when a few households who had held out against the accepted rates were offered full compensation for all 'lost rooms'. Previously, an agreed ratio of original wattle and daub rooms to new sandcrete rooms had been agreed to, e.g. 4 old for 3 new, but in order to seal the final deal, Goldfields offered the remaining households compensation on a one-for-one basis. This of course created havoc with those households that had accepted the original proposal – the problem continues through the courts. 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Principal Technical Officer, Town Planning Office		DATE: 04.03.03
		TIME: 10h00 - 10h45
Held at: Town Planning Office, Wassa West District Assembly, Tarkwa		
Purpose: To elicit views on compensation and resettlement planning.		NOTE TAKER: Justin Pooley
PRESENT	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
Name/Organisation:		
Mr Tony Frans, Principal Technical Officer, Town Planning Office, Wassa West	Pooley:	
Resettlement Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that a meeting had been requested with the District Planning Officer. Mentioned the nature of the problem, described the team involved to deal with it, summarised the team's objectives and the timeframe in which planning will be undertaken. Asked several questions relating to previous compensation issues and how these had been dealt with. 	
Justin Pooley	Frans:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The District Planning Officer is away for six weeks on a course. The office has had some experience with resettlement-related issues, particularly in recent times associated with Goldfields' efforts at the Tarkwa Gold Mine. One of the major problem areas in the past has been associated with cash compensation for crops involving original inhabitants of the area. People have tended to take the case, spend it, and then return to the company to complain that it was not enough and that they have lost their basis of livelihood (e.g. at Atuabo, one of the villages affected by Goldfields' operations). This problem then generates a range of new issues, all related to original dissatisfaction with what had been accepted in lieu of lost lands and crops. Suggest putting together a package for those immediately affected, including measures to support people until the next harvest, if crops are to be lost immediately. Tenant farmers should be given priority in terms of compensation issues, or problems will undoubtedly arise. Landowners clearly have to be dealt with too: it is likely that a separate meeting and arrangement will have to be held with these landowners as their case is a longer term issue. It seems likely that landowners will have to be convinced of any land-for-land deal not involving cash, and that this will have to be incentivised via an appropriate package. 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Gold Fields Ghana Resettlement Planning Representative		DATE: 25.02.03 TIME: 15h45 - 16h30
Held at: Gold Fields Ghana Offices, Tarkwa		
Purpose: To discuss the Goldfields experience and discuss related issues		NOTE TAKER: Justin Pooley
PRESENT <i>Name/Organisation:</i>	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
<p>Gold Fields Ghana Ltd Stephen Yirenkyi, Manager, Community Affairs</p> <p>Resettlement Team Justin Pooley Isaac Ankomah, GAG</p>	<p>Pooley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided an overview of the planning exercise and <i>modus operandi</i>. Asked about Gold Fields recent experiences, the type of planning undertaken, land related solutions (if any), compensation issues and the usefulness of a proposed District wide compensation rate standardisation amongst mining houses. <p>Yirenkyi:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Ghana mining takes precedence over housing, and housing over agriculture, thus negotiation is required between the mine and affected parties: normally, a compensation agreement is reached and then signed by the Land Valuation Board, the Mines Department or EPA etc, i.e. to give it official status and to avoid subsequent legal challenges. • The Gold Fields relocation was large, affecting around 20 000 people. Both physical and economic displacement was involved. People were given the option of either resettling on their own (taking cash compensation) or having houses rebuilt for them. Roughly three quarters of these took cash compensation, based upon rates approved by the Land Valuation Board (an extra 50 % fee was given to people over and above normal rates). • Those seeking relocation were moved into a new township. Mr Yirenkyi is the former District Planning Officer, who was involved in drawing up the township plans during the resettlement process, and was involved mainly on the technical side of the process. • Although the process generally went well, there were several key problems (which continue today in some cases). One of these was the payment of cash compensation, which many people spent and then came back saying they had nowhere to stay (in general, settlers took cash, whilst original inhabitants opted for the new structures). • A formula was arrived at as to the conversion of wattle and daub housing units into improved structures, e.g. 75 % of the original number of rooms/structures would be replaced with the more expensive improved versions. This was arrived at by a Steering Group including a regional minister. • Experiences with micro-credit at Gold Fields have been very negative: people who have been affected believe that any money given is somehow rightfully theirs, and do not pay back (also possibly the use of District Assembly staff to organise which may have been problematic). • Janet Fishlock (ex resettlement advisor/community facilitator) works for JVA (John Van Norstrom Associates), a Canadian Company (response to question as to her whereabouts). She has been in Tanzania after Ghana, but Gold Fields has not been contact with her for some time. Should speak to the Land Valuation Board. Their main offices are in Sekendi, although there is a minor office in Tarkwa too. 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Teberebie Farmers & community leaders		DATE: 06.03.03 TIME: 10h25 – 12h45
Held at: Chief's 'Palace', Teberebie Village		
Purpose: Provide feedback to affected farmers and community leaders		NOTE TAKER: Dr Agyemang-Mensah
PRESENT <i>Name/Organisation:</i>	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
<p>Teberebie Leadership James Amafuafu, Unit Committee Chairman Martin Gyimah, Chairman, Farmers Association (Chief's representative) Nicholas Nkrumah, Safohene Emmanuel Appiah Opanin Mensah Kyi Approximately 70 affected farmers and community leaders</p> <p>Resettlement Team Dr Agyemang-Mensah, University of Ghana Justin Pooley Albert Quansah, CARE Joseph Sowah, Interpreter</p>	<p>Pooley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarised what had been undertaken by the team during this phase of resettlement planning. Noted that the next phase would entail processing of all data collected, analysis, and compilation of a draft resettlement planning report. Once this report had been compiled, the team would return to discuss their draft findings with both GAG and affected farmers. Noted that a number of issues had been repeatedly raised, and opened the floor to take any additional issues and to answer questions which might arise. <p>Community questions and issues raised / response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue 1: <i>What will happen to those people who lost lands before enumeration was undertaken? How will they be compensated?</i> Pooley: it is our understanding that the owners of the affected lands approached GAG when this happened and were duly compensated. Agyemang-Mensah: However if some have not been compensated, they should put their case in writing so that it can be taken up with the Environmental Department. Issue 2: <i>Can you stop me from developing my land when after assessment you fail to pay on schedule?</i> Agyemang-Mensah: we will impress on GAG to accelerate the compensation process to prevent speculative development. Issue 3: Compensation should be quoted in dollars and paid out in cedis. Agyemang-Mensah: the concern is noted, and will likely be dealt with at a later stage. Issue 4: Not all affected people have been interviewed: what will happen to them?. Pooley: we have interviewed all of those identified as having access to land. However, people should understand that interview data is not used to calculate compensation or support, but rather that this will be based upon GAG's enumeration process.. Issue 5: <i>What will happen to those who have lost land elsewhere?</i> Pooley: Previously it wasn't the practice to give land for land. The Ghanaian Mineral Code does not provide for this. What we are trying to do at Teberebie is to impress on GAG that following World Bank procedures is the best option. <p><i>At this stage Pooley took time to expand on the issue of compensation (past and present) and suggested among other things that the team's preliminary feeling was that compensation should be packaged to include:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Compensation for crops Land so that farmers can continue to farm Little cash for preparation of the new land or GAG will assist in clearing the land Ensuring that those who lost their land do get alternative land – (with the involvement of the community and the Farmers Association). <p>The Community assembled expressed full support for the ideas expounded by Pooley and assured him that in anticipation the Chief and people will ensure a more vibrant Farmers Association. Pooley ended the meeting with a hint that a comprehensive community development program was in the offing perhaps as a recognition by GAG the need to make life better for residents within the mineral concession area.</p>	

MEETING HELD WITH: Key Tarkwa NGOs		DATE: 07.03.03 Friday
		TIME: 10h00 - 11h30
Held at: CARE offices, Tarkwa		
Purpose: Provide feedback to NGOs and obtain associated issues and views.		NOTE TAKER: Justin Pooley
PRESENT Name/Organisation:	MAJOR ISSUES / CONCERNS RAISED:	
<p>Peter Yeboah, Director of Programme, WACAM</p> <p>Hannah Owusu-Koranteng, Director of training & research, WACAM</p> <p>Daniel Owusu-Koranteng, Executive Director, WACAM</p> <p>Yaw Aboagye, Executive Director, FACT</p> <p>E.A. Fletcher, Project Manager, CARE</p> <p>Maud Ojori-Myang, IEC Technical Assistant, Project Concern International</p> <p>Resettlement Team</p> <p>Justin Pooley</p> <p>Dr Agyemang-Mensah, University of Ghana</p> <p>Albert Quansah, CARE</p>	<p>Pooley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided an overview of what the resettlement planning team had done over the past three weeks, what the issues had been to date, and what the future of the process would be, including opportunities for the NGOs to provide inputs as well as possibly become involved in implementation/monitoring at a later stage. Opened the floor for discussion and issues. <p>NGOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue 1: WACAM noted that the organisations did not all have the resettlement team’s Terms of Reference (TOR), without which it was difficult to comment on the team’s work, and requested copies. <i>Pooley responded by noting that the WACAM team did in fact appear to have received a copy of the TOR (had a hard copy at the meeting), and suggested that it be photocopied immediately and provided to the other NGOs present (which was subsequently done).</i> • Issue 2: There was a concern over the short timeframe for resettlement planning, given the complex issues involved and the fact that community concerns often take some time to be expressed and understood. <i>Pooley agreed that the timeframe was indeed short, as described in his overview, but noted also that the process of waste rock dumping was an ongoing process and that planning had started very late, hence that there was an urgent need to get plans in place. He also noted WACAM’s concern over obtaining community viewpoints, and noted that over the course of the past three weeks – involving a series of community, farmer and focus group meetings – it seemed that the same key issues had been raised repeatedly and had been discussed with the team from various angles. After the final meeting had been held, two days previously, a preliminary consensus seemed to have been reached that plans were in place to address the farmers’ key resettlement related grievances. Also, the process was far from over, with five remaining weeks at least of planning to come, hence additional issues and concerns would almost certainly arise and be dealt with as planning progressed.</i> • Issue 3: WACAM also noted that with regards to compensation issues, ‘all mines’ tended to exploit local people’s lack of knowledge of their rights and negotiation powers, and tended to use minimum Land Valuation Board (LVB) rates as a basis for compensation. These rates are very low, and are not a true reflection of the value of crops lost. People’s lack of financial awareness was also a problem as money was squandered; it is necessary to provide some form of training as to how people should use compensation payments if money is to be paid out for lost farmlands. WACAM made it known that the organisation’s credibility was on the line, as local people weren’t knowledgeable about such issues and WACAM was there to ensure that they got a better deal. <i>WACAM reported that people had complained to the organisation (from Teherahie) about the very low rates applied during their</i> 	

MEETING HELD WITH: Key Tarkwa NGOs	DATE: 07.03.03 Friday TIME: 10h00 - 11h30
Held at: CARE offices, Tarkwa	
	<p>better deal. WACAM reported that people had complained to the organisation (from Teberebie) about the very low rates applied during their compensation. Pooley responded to some of these points. Firstly, he noted that the notion of mines sticking to LVB rates was perhaps a simplification of the issue at hand, and that as a point of fact the LVB does not give out its rates to mining companies or the Chamber of Mines, albeit required to do so under the Mining Environmental Regulations. Pooley had tried on several occasions to access current LVB rates but had been told that these were not available, for several reasons. What in fact happens is that the mines negotiate with local people as to the value of local crops. Until recently, GAG had negotiated on a one-to-one basis with farmers at Teberebie, which from an independent point of view was a sub-optimal solution; however, Teberebie Farmers Association have recently insisted on collective bargaining, and a new rates schedule was developed between them and the mine in February 2003. Pooley noted that as a result of this collective bargaining process, none of the farmers had raised the issue of low compensation rates at meetings with the team, although a series of other problems with the compensation procedure had been raised and would be dealt with. He noted however that the fundamental problem with existing compensation regimes was that compensation was not paid for land, but only for crops, hence the money obtained was clearly not enough to sustain people's livelihoods for any length of time. This had been a central matter of concern to the team, who were looking seriously at land-for-land solutions whereby compensation for crops would still occur, but be accompanied by a search for new land as well as assistance in the clearing/preparation of new lands for people. Cash for land solutions would be avoided if possible when dealing with local farmers, as lessons had to be learned from previous episodes where this solution had patently failed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue 4: WACAM noted that the current situation regarding cash crop compensation was unfair, as these crops could remain productive for many years (up to 40 for cocoa), yet people were only being compensated for one year. There are economic means of working out what the true value of such crops are, and these should be used this time in order to ensure fair compensation. Pooley indicated that this issue would certainly be looked into during the study, as it had already come to the attention of the team and was a valid question which needed a firm answer and, if necessary, action. The team's role was to ensure that people's livelihoods were restored to at least an equal situation after resettlement as before. • Issue 5: Several NGOs wanted to know what would happen re historical compensation problems, involving the large number of people previously affected by mining in the area (especially those affected by GAG). Although it is entirely understandable that people are concerned about past episodes, it is simply not practicable to investigate these in the current planning study. For one, there is generally insufficient data upon which to base any compensation or land claims. Secondly, there are a great many claims by a great many communities in this area, so that if we started such a process it could go on for several years and never be resolved. Thirdly, Teberebie Goldfields Limited were responsible for previous resettlement episodes affecting Teberebie Village, for example, but they no longer operate this mine: it would be unfair to expect one company (GAG) to compensate people for the historical practices of another. Fourthly, one must remember that GAG, along with other mining houses, are currently compensating people according to Ghanaian law: thus, the fact that they are reviewing their practices with a view of possibly making them more equitable should be encouraged. Community leaders and NGOs have a choice of working together to ensure that current and future generations are dealt with fairly, or of obstructing the process and ending up with nothing at the end of the day. This exercise is aimed at, possibly for the first time, establishing a transparent and comprehensive set of planning principles to safeguard people's livelihoods, and establishing a socio-economic baseline to inform this process. This baseline is generally absent for previous situations, making retrospective planning all but impossible. It is my (Pooley's) understanding that the issue of

MEETING HELD WITH: Key Tarkwa NGOs	DATE: 07.03.03 Friday TIME: 10h00 - 11h30
Held at: CARE offices, Tarkwa	
	<p><i>historical resettlement is going to be dealt with via the mechanism of a Community Development Plan, which will be initiated within the next few months, and which will aim to promote sustainable development within the communities on GAG's concession, including Teberebie.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue 6: WACAM noted that little attention was often paid to the cultural dimensions of land, water and other resources, and that these might have a bearing on how people's lives were affected by resettlement. How would this be dealt with? <i>Pooley replied that Dr Agyemang-Mensah, being a Ghanaian sociologist, and having spent a considerable amount of time with the affected farmers both in this study and in previous mining-related studies in the area, was being relied upon to highlight such issues. He also asked whether WACAM had any specific issues in mind (none were forthcoming).</i> • Issue 7: The issue of alternative land was raised. Questions were asked about access and quality, referring to existing problems at Wangarakrom (whose access was previously blocked by TGL). <i>Pooley responded that GAG had been requested to investigate land-for-land options actively, and to involve farmers association leaders in the process. Clearly, the ideal would be to find land a similar distance away from Teberebie, and possessing a similar quality (for farming purposes); however, until such time as potential land had been identified, issues such as access could obviously not be incorporated into planning (this did not imply that they would not be dealt with, however). It was noted that any option involving very long distances and any form of transport for people to reach their fields was highly unlikely to be adopted, given the need to develop sustainable solutions which would not compromise farmers once GAG had closed down.</i> • Issue 8: The issue of dealing with post-closure land-use was raised. How would GAG rehabilitate the waste rock dump and other areas for use after mining activities had been completed? <i>Pooley noted that although this issue (i.e. rehabilitation) was clearly an important one locally, it did not fall within the team's brief and would not be addressed in detail in the report. The need for the mine to make as much land available for local farmers as possible would however be highlighted, as it had already been in several key reports in the past. He suggested that advocacy groups such as WACAM might continue to take such issues up with authorities such as the EPA.</i>

Appendix 5 – GAG’s revised compensation procedure

CROP COMPENSATION

1. PURPOSE

This procedure describes how crops and structures affected by the operations of the Iduapriem Gold Mine are enumerated, processed and compensated for.

2. SCOPE

The procedure applies to areas affected by operational activities of the mine and covers only developed areas in terms of crops cultivation and other structures

3. RESPONSIBILITY

The Environmental Superintendent of the Mine is responsible for maintaining and implementation of this procedure.

4. DEFINITIONS

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|
| 4.1 | Enumeration | = numerical counting of individual items or affected area determination |
| 4.2 | Compensation rate | = negotiated rate for crops based on age and size |
| 4.3 | Compensation schedule | = document containing name of farmers, area or location, itemized rates of crops, date of enumeration, signature/thump print and declaration of the farmer on accuracy of every detail |
| 4.4 | Farmer | = person cropping or developing the affected area regardless of title to the land. |
| 4.5 | Community Relations Officer | = staff of Iduapriem Gold Mine charged to co-ordinate matters involving the local people. |
| 4.6 | Crop compensation | = compensation for crops cultivated and structures established |

5. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

5.1 Identification of Areas to be Affected

Step No.	Activity	Who
5.1.1	Physically identify developed areas within the area earmarked for mine operations	Chief Mining Engineer
5.1.2	Provide a survey grid of the entire area to be affected	Chief Mining Engineer
5.1.3	Invite affected land developers/farmers and inform them about the decision to acquire the area for mine development	Community Relations Officer
5.1.4	Schedule date for enumeration, which should be at least two days notice.	Community Relations Officer
5.1.5	Invite a representative of the local farmers group to be witness to the enumeration process	Community Relations Officer

5.2 Enumeration of crops and Structures

Step No.	Activity	Who
5.2.1	Start enumeration of crops and any structures in the presence of the owner of the farm (farmer) and farmers' group representative	Community Relations Officer
5.2.2	Document every item or measurement taken at the site	Community Relations Officer
5.2.3	At the completion of enumeration, make a signed copy of measurements and counting undertaken at the site for the farmer and indicate the date enumeration was completed	Community Relations Officer
5.2.4	Schedule a date for compensation rate negotiation with the affected farmer and the farmers' representative	Community Relations Officer
5.2.5	Submit copy of the enumerated items to the Environmental Superintendent	Community Relations Officer
5.2.6	Submit plan and area of the farm to the Environmental Superintendent	Chief Mining Engineer
5.2.7	Negotiate and agree on the rates to be paid for individual items enumerated with the farmer and farmers' representative.	Environmental Superintendent

5.3 Preparation of Compensation Schedules and Payment

Step No.	Activity	Who
5.3.1	Prepare the compensation schedule for the items enumerated, negotiated and agreed upon with the farmer	Environmental Superintendent
5.3.2	Submit compensation schedule to affected farmer	Community Relations Officer
5.3.3	Sign/thump print compensation schedule, affix passport photograph and have the schedule witnessed before returning to the Community Relations Officer	Affected farmer
5.3.4	Remaining portions of the compensation schedule signed and payment cheques prepared for the affected farmers	Environmental Superintendent Financial Controller Managing Director
5.3.5	Inform affected farmer about when to collect payment cheque. This will occur within 8 weeks of the end of the enumeration process.	Community Relations Officer
5.3.6	Collect payment cheque and cash it the appropriate bank	Farmer

6. APPENDICES

6.1 Crops enumeration form

7. RECORDS

In the course of implementing this procedure, the following records have been generated and maintained.

No.	What Record	Where Kept	Retention Period (yrs)
7.1	Plan of areas and farms compensated	Mine Draftman's computer	10
7.2	List of farmers compensated	Environmental Superintendent Office	10

8. REFERENCE

6.1 PNDCL 153: 1986

CROP COMPENSATION FORM

1. Name of Farmer.....
2. Location of farm.....
3. Name of Enumerator.....
4. Name of local Farmer's Representative.....
5. Date enumeration started.....

No.	Type of crop	Size/age	Quantity		Remarks
			Stands	Area	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					

Date enumeration completed.....

Signature of Enumerator.....Date.....

Signature/thump print of farmer.....Date.....

Signature/thump print of local farmers' representative.....Date

Appendix 6 – Revised compensation rates for key crops

Crop	Small		Medium		Mature / Large	
	Old rate	<i>New rate</i>	Old rate	<i>New rate</i>	Old rate	<i>New rate</i>
Tree crops						
(rate per tree)						
Cocoa	5 000	19 380	10 000	24 735	20 000	40 885
(per tree)	(0.59)	(2.28)	(1.18)	(2.91)	(2.35)	(4.81)
Oil palm	8 700	74 970	17 500	78 795	35 000	105 570
(per tree)	(1.02)	(8.82)	(2.06)	(9.27)	(4.12)	(12.42)
Coconut	11 500	81 600	22 500	86 870	45 000	99 960
(per tree)	(1.35)	(9.60)	(2.65)	(10.22)	(5.29)	(11.76)
Seasonal crops						
(rate per acre)						
Cassava	350 000	2.74 m	700 000	2.86 m	1.4 m	3.51 m
	(41.17)	(322.84)	(2.35)	(336.95)	(164.71)	(412.80)
Cocoyam	300 000	3.21 m	700 000	3.33 m	1.4 m	3.75 m
	(35.29)	(377.69)	(82.35)	(391.80)	(164.71)	(441.18)
Yam	500 000	11.23 m	1 m	11.36 m	2 m	12 m
	(58.82)	(1321.80)	(117.65)	(1335.91)	(235.29)	(1411.76)
Maize	250 000	2.01 m	500 000	2.13 m	1 000 000	2.39 m
	(29.41)	(236.50)	(58.82)	(250.61)	(117.65)	(282.35)
Pineapple	-	3.59 m	-	3.71 m	-	4.03 m
		(421.90)		436.01		473.63

Notes: Values provided in Cedis (US dollars)

: Exchange rate used – 1US \$ = 8500 Cedis

: Old rates as agreed by Teberebie Farmers in January 2003

: New rates established during the recent crop valuation survey (refer to Appendix 7)

: Compensation values (new rates) provided per tree / acre are **replacement** values

: GAG previously had no *per acre* compensation rate for pineapple

Appendix 7 – Assessment of crop replacement value

**ASSESSMENT OF REPLACEMENT VALUE PER ACRE OF CROPS IN THE CONCESSION AREA OF
GHANAIAN – AUSTRALIAN GOLDFIELDS LIMITED**

BY J. OWUSU-AYIREBI
JOWUSA CONSULTANTS
P.O. BOX AH 9437
AHENSAN, KUMASI.

JULY 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations

Executive Summary

Chapter 1

Introduction

The Aim of the study

The objective of the Study

Justification

The scope of the study

The Methodology

Presentation of the Report

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Ashanti Goldfields Company Limited (Iduapriem / Teberebie Mines)

The concession of GAGL

Physical and climatic features of the area

Crop production

Replacement value of crop

Chapter 3

Study result and discussions

The Socio-economic characteristic of the area

Crops grown in the area

Annual crops

Tree crops

Recommendation

Conclusion

Tables and Appendices

Table 1 Age Distribution of Respondents by communities

Table 2 Membership of Associations by communities

Table 3 Major crops grown in the study communities

Appendix 1 Cassava crop budget

Appendix 2 Cocoyam crop budget

Appendices Pg 49

Appendix 3 Maize crop budget

Appendix 4 Plantain crop budget

Appendix 5 Yam crop budget

Appendix 6 Rice crop budget

Appendix 7 Pineapple

Appendix 8 Oilpalm crop budget

Appendix 9 Oilpalm Replacement Value

Appendix 10 Cocoa Replacement Value

Appendix 11 Coconut Replacement Value

Persons Contacted

References

ABBREVIATIONS

AGCL – Ashanti Goldfields Company Limited

CEMP - Comprehensive Environmental Management Plan

CMB – Cocoa Marketing Board

CSIR – Council for Scientific and Industrial Research

EIA – Environmental Impact Assessment

EMP – Environmental Management Plan

ESRS – Emergency Social Relief Services

md – Man Day

MoFA – Ministry of Food and Agriculture

PPMED – Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Department

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study was conducted to assess the replacement value of per acre of crops likely to be directly or indirectly affected by mining operations of the Ghanaian – Australian Goldfields Ltd (GAGL). The concession of GAGL covers 136.74 km² and is located south of Tarkwa in the Wassa West District in the Western Region of Ghana. The area is rural and the main economic activity is subsistence farming. GAGL carries out surface mining. Operations commenced in June 1992.

Surface mining affects or destroys crops. Farmers whose crops are so affected have to be paid fair compensation. This study was conducted to determine and recommend to GAGL satisfactory compensation or replacement value equivalent to the amount of money invested by the farmer plus expected profit margin from an acre of each crop.

Questionnaires were used to source primary data from farmers in six communities in the concession. Informal interviews were also held with representative staff of Tarkwa District office of MoFA, Benso Oilpalm Outgrowers Association, Quality Control Division of the GCMB, Coconut Research Station at Secondi and GAGL. Secondary data were also obtained from production and market price records of MoFA, GAGL Visitors' Handbook and other documents. The information gathered from the study showed that the main farming systems are slash and burn and mixed cropping. Major crops are oilpalm, cocoa, cassava, plantain, cocoyam, coconut and others.

The replacement value per acre of annual crops varied from \$148.28 for rice to \$1411.70 for yam. In the case of tree crops, the value depends on the age of the crop. However, the maximum replacement value is estimated at \$796.28 for oilpalm, \$906.04 for cocoa and \$687.93 for coconut. It is recommended that compensations are paid promptly to enable affected farmers enjoy the full replacement value of their farms. They also need to be counselled to invest their benefits in alternative ventures to continue to earn income for a living.

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Introduction

This study was commissioned by the Ghanaian-Australian Goldfields Limited (GAGL) to assess the replacement value per acre of crops likely to be affected by its mining activities in the concession. GAGL's concession covers about 136.74 km² and is located south of Tarkwa in the Wassa West District of the Western Region of Ghana. The area is rural and the main economic activity of the communities is subsistent farming. Major crops produced in the area are oilpalm, cocoa, cassava, plantain, cocoyam, pineapple and others.

Aim of the study

This study was conducted to identify and determine replacement value of crops likely to be affected by the operations of the Company.

Objective of the study

The objectives for the study were to

- identify potential crops grown in the area and are likely to be affected by the mining activities
- assess costs of establishment (including nursery if applicable), gestation and production periods;
- estimate production per acre of each crop;
- estimate the revenue per acre; and therefore
- determine the profit margin; and
- assess the replacement value per acre of each crop.

Justification

Surface mining involves clearing of vegetation, including crops and absorbs farmlands for the actual ore extraction dumping of waste materials and location of physical structures of the mining Company. The destruction of farms or crops implies an economic loss to the farmers. The study will enable the Company to pay affected farmers satisfactory compensation for crops likely to be affected.

Scope of Study

This study covers the concession of the GAGL in the Wassa West District in the Western Region of Ghana. The target crops to be assessed are oil palm, cocoa, cassava, cocoyam, maize, etc. The replacement value

will be determined on the basis of cost of establishment, gestation and productions, the revenue and profit margin per acre of each affected crop.

The Methodology

Selected farmers and representative staff of the District Office of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) at Tarkwa, Benso Oilpalm Growers Association at Benso, Quality Control Division of the Ghana Cocoa Marketing Board (GCMB), Coconut Research Station of the CSIR at Sekondi and GAGL were interviewed in the case of farmers and involved in discussions in the case of the staff of the above mentioned institutions to complement the data collected. Questionnaires were administered by enumerators to a random sample of 30 farmers from six communities in the concession. Informal interviews were also held with the representative staff. A few issues were also clarified during brief discussions with some market women at Tarkwa.

Secondary sources were also used to collect data on the physical and climatic features of the area, crop yields and produce prices, and the formula for the calculation of net present value of profit margins for tree crops. The data presented by all the secondary sources were limited at the level of desegregations. For this reason, data collected from the district office of MoFA were adapted where applicable for the report.

1.6 Presentation of Report

This report is presented in four chapters. Chapter One gives the background information to the study, the aim, the objectives, the scope and the methodology for study. Literature review is discussed under Chapter Two. Chapter three discusses the Company's plans to address environmental issues and the Company's relationship with the communities. The data analysis and the results are presented under Chapter Four. The Chapter is concluded with some recommendations.

CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

Ghanaian-Australian Goldfields Limited (GAGL)

GAGL is a subsidiary of the Ashanti Goldfields Company Ltd (AGC). AGC owns 80% whilst IFC owns the remaining 20% of GAG AGC is a publicly listed Ghanaian Company with listing on the London, New York, Toronto, Ghana and Zimbabwe Stock Exchanges.

The Concession of GAGL

The GAG concession is located south of Tarkwa in the Wassa West District in the Western Region of Ghana (Map 1) and covers total land area of about 136.74 km². The lease period is 31 years but the economic mining period is estimated at 8 - 10 years. The area had previously been mined by Europeans small scale and galamsay miners over the past 90 years. Renewed interest began in the 1980's and actual mining operations by GAG commenced in June 1992. GAG is a gold mining company.

Physical and Climatic Features of the Area

The concession lies within the rainforest zone of the Western Region and is bounded on the south by the Neung Forest Reserve. The topography is dissected plateau with generally undulating terrain. The mean annual rainfall is 187.83 cm with double maxima in April and May. The humidity is high (70-80%) in the dry season and (75-80%) in the wet season. Temperatures average between 30°C in February-March and 26°C in August. These conditions favour production of both tree and food crops but not livestock which is substantial because of tsetse flies infestation. The area has a potential for rice and fish production in the valleys.

Crop Production

Farming in the area is subsistent with farm sizes averaging 2.5 acres per farmer. Farmers employ slash and burn for land preparation for crop production. Mixed cropping is the rule for most annual crops and in the early stages of tree crop development. However, old tree crops tend to be monocultured.

Replacement Value of Crops

Replacement value of crops is the satisfactory market value of mature crops per acre of land including nursery where applicable. The calculation of the replacement value of crops is based on the principle that "private property shall not be taken (or destroyed) for public use" or for the use of another individual or group of individuals or an organisation "without just compensation". In the present instance the satisfactory

compensation shall cover the total up-to-date investment in the affected crop, less the amortization of the investment plus the present value of the expected profit margin on the investment. All values are based on the current market prices.

The Replacement Value = Cost of Production + Expected Profit Margin + Amortised Cost of Establishment (including Nursery if applicable) and Gestation Period + Net Present Value from the age when the crop is destroyed + Terminal Value (if applicable).

Note that the Net Present Value (NPV) = $X / (1+r)^t$

Where X is the amount of profit margin, r is the applied interest rate, and t the time horizon.

In the present calculation the Bank of Ghana interest rate of 32% is used.

Unfortunately the Land Valuation Board officials were not prepared to release any information on their method of land valuation and replacement value of crops, the reason being that the Board is the final arbiter and that such information is confidential.

The conversion rate is \$1.00 = ₵8,500

CHAPTER 3 - RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The six communities selected for the study included Teberebie, Nkwantakrom, Abompuniso, New Takyikrom, Mile 7 and Mile 8. Five farmers were randomly selected and interviewed from each community. Information from the questionnaires was reconciled with that obtained from other people through discussions as mentioned earlier on and data from other documents.

Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Area

TABLE 1 - AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY COMMUNITY

Age Group	No. of Respondents	21-50 yeas	50 years & Above
Teberebie	5	3	3
Nkwantakrom	5	2	3
Abompuniso	5	3	2
New Techiman	5	2	3
Mile 7	5	3	2
Mile 8	5	1	3
Total	30	14	16
% Distribution	100	46.7	53.3

Source: Survey Data

The summary of the data from the questionnaires showed that over 93.4% of the respondents employ slash and burn and bush fallow/shifting cultivation systems, using hired labour for almost all (96.7%) farm activities. Only 1.6% practise crop rotation and 5% agro forestry. Most of them employ mixed or relay cropping during the establishment of tree crops. Over 88.4% of farm production is financed from farmers' own resources. None of the respondents enjoys financial support from any formal financial institution.

The information from the questionnaire showed that 53.3% of the farmers interviewed are over 50 years old and all the others between 21 and 50 years. Table 1 shows the age distribution of the respondents by community. Also over 66% of the farmers have been farming in the past 20 to 39 years, 16.7% and 16.7% for 10 and 10-19 years respectively. With the exception of New Techiman and Mile 7 communities people are aware of the existence of farmer associations. With proper animation associations can be used as a tool for economic development. About 47% of the respondents belong to farming associations. Distribution of membership of association is shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2 MEMBERSHIP OF ASSOCIATION BY COMMUNITY

Community	No. of Respondents	Yes	No
Teberebie	5	5	1
Nkwantakrom	5	1	4
Abompuniso	5	5	-
New Techiman	5	-	5
Mile 7	5	-	5
Mile 8	5	3	1
Total	30	14	16
% Distribution		46.7	53.3

Source: Survey Data

Crops Grown in the Area

The data further revealed that each respondent has more than one farm and produces more than one crop at the same time each year. Farm sizes average 2.5 acres. The main crops produced in the area include oilpalm, plantain, cassava, cocoa, coconut and pineapple. Others are maize, citrus and assorted vegetables. The distribution by study communities is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: MAJOR CROPS GROWN BY THE SAMPLE FARMERS

Crops	No. of Respondents	Oilpalm	Cocoa	Plantain	Cassava	Cocoyam	Pineapple	Vegetables	Citrus	Coconut	Maize
Teberebie	5	4	-	2	4	2	5	2	2	1	1
Abompuniso	5	5	3	4	6	1	-	1	-	2	-
New Techiman	5	2	2	4	2	1	4	-	-	1	-
Nkwantakrom	5	3	-	5	5	4	1	1	-	-	-
Mile 7	5	4	-	2	5	-	3	3	1	-	1
Mile 8	5	4	1	1	2	1	3	-	1	2	-
Total	30	22	6	18	24	9	16	7	4	6	2
% Distribution		19.3	5.3	15.8	21.1	7.9	14.0	6.1	3.5	5.3	1.8

Pear production is quite substantial but the crop is actually scattered as single stands on the farms of other crops. Farmers harvest fruits valued up to \$6.00 per tree per year.

Annual Crops

The annual crop cultivated by farmers within the concession includes cassava, cocoyam, maize, plantain, rice and pineapple. The crop budgets and therefore the **Replacement Values** are based mainly on average MoFA production figures and market information.

a) Cassava

This crop is produced in all the communities under study. Farmers do not apply any fertilizer. The crop survives only one cropping season of 9-16 months. It costs about \$191.18 to crop an acre of cassava. Production is estimated at 3.4 mt per acre. Produce is sold mainly on the local markets at farm-gate prices. However MoFA average market price of \$0.12 per kilogram of tuber was used in the calculation. The revenue expected will equal \$412.80, making profit margin of \$212.81 per acre. The **Replacement Value will equal \$412.80** (Appendix 1)

b) Cocoyam

Production of this crop is going down in all producing areas of the country. Planting materials are therefore becoming scarce and expensive. The scarcity has made production relatively profitable. Sometimes it sprouts as volunteer crop when secondary forest lands are cleared for the production of other crops. The crop goes through one cropping season of 6-12 months. There is no application of fertilizer by the farmers under the study. Production is estimated at 2.5mt per acre. Farmers make profit margin of \$268.25 over their production cost of \$172.93 per acre (Appendix 2). **Replacement Value** is estimated at \$441.18.

c) Maize

Contrary to expectation, maize is not a popular crop among the farmers who were interviewed (Table 3). The few farmers who go into maize cultivation, plant them in lines and apply some measure of fertilizers (NPK and ammonia). Production is estimated at 0.56 mt of dry grains (10,000-12,000 cobs) per acre if the recommended planting distances are used. The problem with maize production is that the grains go mouldy when sun-dried because of high humidity. As a result, farmers usually sell the mature cobs green at farm-gate. Producers make average profit margin of \$82.60 over production cost of \$199.75. The **Replacement Value** is therefore put at **\$282.35** per acre (Appendix 3).

d) Plantain

As a staple food crop, most farmers grow plantain. The crop survives only one cropping period up to about 18 months. This unusual phenomenon is attributed to depletion of nutrients in the soils, pest infestation and the sigatoka disease. The disease organisms are transferred through the planting materials (suckers). At the recommended planting distance of 10 feet x 10 feet an acre of land takes 174 suckers. Farmers do not apply any fertilizer. The average production is estimated at 2.6 mt. (174 bunches) per acre. The cost of production is estimated at \$141.53. Revenue averages \$286.59 for Apantu and \$409.41 for Apem, making profit margins of \$145.06 and \$267.88 respectively. The **Replacement Values** are therefore estimated at **\$286.59 for Apantu and \$409.41 for Apem** (Appendix 4).

e) Yam

Yam was not a crop of interest among the respondents. But MoFA Officials indicated that there are cases of yam production in the area. The problem is that the extensive rooting system in the forest soils makes mount making difficult. Production is estimated at 1.6 mt (4000 tubers) per acre. Farmers do not apply any fertilizer. Production costs \$1160.00 per acre. Total revenue is estimated at \$1411.76, making profit margin of \$251.76 (Appendix 5). The **Replacement Value** is estimated at **\$1411.76**

f) Rice

Rice was not a popular crop among the respondents. But further enquiries showed that few farmers grow rice in the area. Apparently it is because the profit margin is not attractive as shown in the analysis (Appendix 6). Like maize the problem of sun-drying also affects paddy rice. The common method of sowing the seed is by broadcasting. Not all farmers apply fertilizers. Production costs about \$110.00 per acre and the revenue is estimated at \$148.24 making profit margin of \$38.24. The **Replacement Value** is estimated at **\$148.24**.

g) Pineapple

Many farmers produce pineapple in the area. But they do not follow any common planting distance. As a result plant population varies from farm to farm, varying between 1000 and 6000 per acre. The crop is grown for local consumption only. For export however plant population can go as high as 12,000 to 15,000 plants per acre to produce sizes accepted for export. The plant population used for the crop budget was 2000 per acre. In this case it costs \$297.65 per acre. Production is estimated at 2000 fruits and revenue at \$470.62, making profit margin of \$172.97 (Appendix 7) The **Replacement Value** is put at **\$470.62**

3.2.2 Tree Crops

The important tree crops produced in the area include oilpalm, cocoa and coconut. After establishment these crops go through gestation periods varying from 3 years for oilpalm, 4 years for cocoa to 7 years for coconut. Technically, production continues for indefinite number of years.

Oilpalm

The concession is located in the West African oilpalm belt and according to experts both local and improved types do equally well if properly maintained. Practically, all producers plant according to the recommended planting distance of 30'x30' on triangular basis. They also apply some amount of fertilizer at least during the establishment stages. Plant population is 60 plants per acre.

Farmers nurse their own seeds or buy from seedling producers. Fruiting starts at 3½ to 4 years and the crop continues to produce until it is too high to harvest at 25-28 years. Production rises from 0.2 mt to 5.2 mt at the age of 9 years. The plant is felled for the production of palm wine and or Akpeteshie. Experts claim that performance does not depend on the variety. Only the improved ones come into bearing earlier than the local type. In estimating the replacement value therefore, there was no difference between the local and the improved types.

According to the Estate Manager of Benso Oilpalm Outgrowers Association the cost of establishment (including nursery) and gestation period is \$480.00 per acre of the crop. Production cost is estimated at \$152.37 and revenue at \$305.88, making profit margin of \$155.84 per acre at the peak of production at 10 years old. Farmers also realise terminal value of \$211.80 at 15-20 years and \$352.80 beyond the age of 20 years on felling the trees. The **Replacement Value** depends on the age of the crop (Appendix 9).

Cocoa

It is assumed in this analysis that farmers purchase seedlings for planting. The common type in the area now is the improved one, which comes into bearing at 4 years after 3 years of gestation period. Production declines after 30 years but may continue for indefinite number of years if properly maintained. An acre costs \$398.40 to establish and maintain through the 3 years gestation period. Thereafter, maintenance costs between \$121.18 and \$181.20 per acre a year. Maximum production of 10 bags is attained at the age of 10 years when revenue is estimated at \$ 623.50. Cocoa has no terminal value. Cocoa is sold to the Ghana Cocoa Marketing Board through Buying Agencies at prices fixed by the Government yearly. The **Replacement Value depends on the age of the crop. The period** is pegged at **30 years**. See Appendix 10 for the value per year.

It will however be fair if the Company pays some amount of compensation to farmers equivalent to replacement value levels when the crop is 7 – 8 years.

Coconut

Farmers grow the West African tall type, which produces for indefinite number of years after initial gestation period of 7 years. According to an official of the Coconut Research Station at Secondi the improved type is currently being supplied only to the areas which are infested with the Cape St. Paul Wilt disease. All other areas like the Wassa West District still grow the local type. At the recommended planting distance of 25 feet by 25 feet farmers plant 64 coconut seedlings per acre of land. Peak production is attained at the age of 12 years. It however becomes too tall to harvest after 25 years when the farmer usually abandons the farm. An acre costs \$614.28 to establish and maintain during the gestation period of 6 years. Thereafter maintenance costs between \$71.78 and \$83.53 per year depending on the age of the crop. Production is estimated to increase from 640 fruits at 8years to 3840 at peak of production per acre when the crop is 12 years old. At the age of 25years, production just breaks even. This is why the farmers virtually abandon the crop. Coconut fruits are sold green in the area. The farmer however continues to collect the dry fruits (copra) as they fall when the plant is too tall to harvest. **The Replacement Value** depends on the age of the crop as shown under Appendix 11.

CHAPTER 4 - CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

To all intents and purposes, the replacement values recommended in this study (report) represent the true and satisfactory value of crops cultivated within the concession since the cost for nursery (if applicable), gestation and production periods and profit margins were taken into consideration.

The concession of the Ghanaian-Australian Goldfields Limited is rural and subsistent farming is the main economic activity. Farmers produce both annual and tree crops. The Replacement Value of these crops varies from crop to crop. In the case of tree crops the value depends on the age of the crop. The satisfactory replacement values for Cassava, Cocoyam, Maize, Plantain: Apem & Apantu, Yam, Rice, Pineapple, Oilpalm, Cocoa, Coconut are \$412.80, 441.18, 282.35, 307.06 & 204.70, 1,411.76, 148.24, 473.63, 796.38, 906.04, 687.93 respectively.

Recommendations

It is recommended that;

- Compensation is paid to farmers as soon as their farms are taken over or destroyed for mining activities. This will enable them to enjoy or benefit from the full value of the compensation.
- Even when farmers have been compensated for the crops, they should be allowed to continue to harvest the produce until the crops are eventually destroyed, especially for tree crops.
- Farmers are notified far ahead of time before the take over and final destruction. This will enable them to properly plan their future after the displacement.
- The compensated farmers are encouraged to invest their benefits in fixed assets or alternative economic ventures to continue to earn some income for a good living. In this case an Extension Officer should be engaged by the Company to work with farmers to encourage those who want to engage in farming to employ intensive methods of production, e.g. production of snails, mushroom, fish and poultry or crop rotation for annual crops.
- It will be laudable if the Company pays farmers a token compensation for fallow lands for lost of farming rights.
- Farmers who receive benefits are encouraged to form cooperatives and invest in intensive sedentary farming or any other alternative economic venture to earn adequate incomes.

APPENDIX 1 - CASSAVA CROP BUDGET

<u>Operation</u>	<u>COST \$</u>
Brushing the bush	14.12
Tree felling	28.24
Burning thrash	1.76
Planting (4 man days)	7.06
Weeding * 3	42.35
Harvesting (35 man days)	61.76
Cutlass & axe	9.41
Planting sticks (15 bundles)	35.29
Total cost	199.99
Production (mt)	3.44
Revenue (@ \$ 0.12/ kg)	<u>412.80</u>
Profit Margin	212.81
Replacement value	412.80

APPENDIX 2 – COCOYAM CROP BUDGET

<u>Operation</u>	<u>COST \$</u>
Bush brushing	14.12
Tree felling	28.24
Thrash burning	1.76
Planting (5 man days)	8.82
Weeding 3*	42.35
Harvesting (20 man days)	35.29
Planting materials	29.41
Cutlass and axe	9.41
Thinning and replanting	3.53
Total Direct Production Cost	172.93
Production (mt)	2.5
Total revenue (@ \$ 0.176/ kg)	<u>441.18</u>
Profit Margin	268.25
Replacement value	441.18

APPENDIX 3 -MAIZE CROP BUDGET

<u>OPERATION</u>	<u>COST (\$)</u>
Bush brushing	14.12
Tree felling	28.24

Appendices Pg 64

Thrash burning (1 md)	1.76
Planting (3 md)	5.29
Weeding (3*)	42.35
Fertilizer Application (2 md)	3.53
Harvesting (10 md.)	17.65
Materials – Seed (9.5 kg)	6.71
Equipment	9.51
Fertilizer: NPK	42.35
Ammonia	28.24
Direct Cost of production	199.75
Production (cobs)	12,000
Revenue (@ \$ 0.02 /kg)	282.35
Profit margin	82.60
Replacement Value	282.35

APPENDIX 4 - PLANTAIN CROP BUDGET

<u>OPERATION</u>	<u>COST (\$)</u>
Brushing the Bush	14.12
Tree felling	28.24
Thrash burning	1.76
Planting (4 md)	7.06
Weeding (3 *)	42.35
Harvesting (10 md.)	20.47
Suckers (@ \$ 0.12)	20.47
Equipment	7.06
Production cost	141.53
Production (174 bunches) mt	2.6
Apantu:	
Revenue (@\$1.18 per bunch)	204.7
Profit Margin	63.17
Replacement Value	204.7
Apem:	
Revenue (@\$1.76 per bunch)	307.06
Profit Margin	165.53
Replacement Value	307.06

APPENDIX 5 - YAM CROP BUDGET

<u>OPERATION</u>	<u>COST (\$)</u>
Bush Brushing	14.12
Tree felling	28.24
Thrash burning	1.76
Planting (30 md)	52.94
Weeding 3*	42.35
Staking (10md)	17.65
Harvesting (35 rnd.)	61.76
Planting materials:	
(4000 seed yam @ \$0.24)	941.18
Cutlass, Axe, Chisel	<u>11.76</u>
Total Production Cost	1,160.00
Production per acre	1.6 mt (4000 tubers)
Revenue (@\$0.88 per kg)	<u>1,411.76</u>
Profit margin	251.76
Replacement Value	1,411.76

APPENDIX 6 - RICE CROP BUDGET

<u>OPERATION</u>	<u>COST (\$)</u>
Land Clearing	14.12
Tree felling	3.53
Bush burning	1.76
Broadcasting Seeds	1.76
Weeding (2X)	28.74
Birds Scaring	8.82
Materials (seed)	42.35
Equipment	9.41
Production cost	110.00
Production	8.4 bags
Total Revenue	<u>148.24</u>
Profit margin	38.24
Replacement Value	148.24

APPENDIX 7 - PINEAPPLE CROP BUDGET

<u>OPERATION</u>	<u>COST \$</u>
Land clearing	14.12

Appendices Pg 66

Tree felling	28.24
Thrash burning	1.76
Planting (25 md)	44.12
Weeding 4*	56.47
Harvesting @ \$0.01/fruit	23.53
Planting materials @ \$0.06 each	117.65
Equipment	11.76
Total production cost	297.65
Total production	2000 fruits
Total revenue @ \$0.24 per fruit	<u>470.62</u>
Profit margin	172.97
Replacement value	473.63

(please note that in the electronic form of this report, the appendices pertaining to tree crops are attached as a separate Ms Excel spreadsheet, as these cannot be fitted to an ordinary A3 page in MS Word)

PERSONS CONTACTED

Nana Joe Nkrumah –Boateng, AGC - Iduapriem/Teberbie Mines, Tarkwa.
Mr. Martin Kodjo Dadzie, AGC - Iduapriem/Teberbie Mines, Tarkwa.
Mr. Emmanuel Owusu-Opong, District Director of Agriculture, Tarkwa.
Mr. John Kwofi, District Office of MoFA, Tarkwa.
Mr. Emmanuel Y. Ahiable, Estate Manager of Benso Oilpalm Outgrowers Association Office.
Mr. Andoh Mensah, Coconut Research Station of CSIR, Sekondi.
Regional Cocoa Officer of Cocoa Services Division of GCMB, Kumasi.

REFERENCES

Abosso Goldfields Ltd, Damang Conservation, 2001' prepared by MoFA District Directorate, Tarkwa.
African Mining, Vol. 8 No.3 May/June 2003.
Facts and Figures, prepared by Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Division of MoFA, 2000.
Ghanaian Australian Goldfields –Iduapriem Gold Visitors Hand Book
Resource Economics by G.A. Norton published by Edward Arnold, London, New York. 1984.
Soils and Crops Desk Top study In the Wassa West District prepared by MoFA
District Directorate, 2000.
Condemnation Appraisal Practice Vol. 11, by American Institute of real Estate Appraisers, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Illinois. 1973

Appendix 8 – List of affected farms, households & compensation paid

FARM OWNER	FARM No.	AREA OF FARM (SQ.MT.)	COMPENSATION PAID ₵	COMPENSATION PAID \$	DATE OF PAYMENT
STEPHEN NUAKOH	1	1879.92			
STEPHEN NUAKOH	2	4328.44			
STEPHEN NUAKOH	3	6607.98			
TONY ASARE	4	2771.76			
TONY ASARE	5	1500.95			
ANGELA ANKANSAH	6	2572.33	869,899.00	121.14	31/08/2001
DANIEL NKANSAH	7	2588.99	760,000.00	105.83	31/08/2001
BEN. NKANSAH	8	1701.87	1,050,821.00	146.33	31/08/2001
SETH ASARE	9	2033.08			
OBED ASARE	10	1516.34			
MAAME ABLEMA	11	2074.25	690,600.00	95.14	31/05/2001
MAAME ALUWA	12	2813.42	322,800.00	44.47	31/05/2001
YAA KONDUWA	13	1225.89	616,000.00	84.86	31/05/2001
ANTHONY KWESIE	14	2747.31	1,560,000.00	214.92	31/05/2001
ADJOA FRANKA	15	6368.88	394,200	54.31	31/05/2001
JOHN APPIAH	16	6055.21	2,905,500.00	400.28	31/05/2001
MAAMA BRONYA	17	4672.34	798,054.00	109.95	31/05/2001
KWEKU ANYAN	18	19042.98	3,840,500	529.1	31/05/2001
JOHN COBBINAH	19	2623.37	632,500.00	88.08	31/08/2001
STEPHEN NUAKOH	20	4706.88	1,528,500.00	210.58	31/08/2001
SAMUEL OCRAN	21	15621.07	1,352,291.00	188.31	31/08/2001
JOHN AWOTWE	22	4219.85	1,259,000.00	175.32	31/08/2001
ROSE BONSU	23	1450.51	1,292,476.00	179.98	31/08/2001
ROSE BONSU	24	2004.75			
HACKMAN BONSU	25	2089.54	1,340,000.00	186.6	31/08/2001
SETH ASARE	26	753.3	3,199,000.00	445.47	31/08/2001
JANET AKOSUA	27	1477.44	2,017,879.00	249.12	9/10/2002
EMMANUEL ASARE	28	2901.93			
FUSENI AHMED	29	2181.04	1,548,800.00	192.4	8/15/2002
MUSAH MOHAMMED	30	3823.5	3,508,650.00	438.58	23/07/2002
MOHAMMED AMADU	31	13529.25	26,146,092.00	3,268.26	17/07/2002
KWESI DONKOR	32	1410.63			
KWESI DONKOR	33	10006.29	7,442,930.00	870.52	3/20/2003
JOSEPH BONSU	34	2605.51	976,482.00	114.21	3/20/2003
ROSE BONSU	35	1121.41	350,000	42.68	10/4/2002
MOHAMMED AMADU	36	941.78			
MOHAMMED AMADU	37	2336.64			
MOHAMMED AMADU	38	9193.55			
OBED ASARE	39	7026.43	707,289.00	98.49	31/08/2001
MOHAMMED AMADU	40	9620.11			
JANET AKOSUA	41	2279.31	2,017,879	249.12	9/10/2002
JANET AKOSUA	42	2553.84		PAID	

FARM OWNER	FARM No.	AREA OF FARM (SQ.MT.)	COMPENSATION PAID ₵	COMPENSATION PAID \$	DATE OF PAYMENT
ABENA BLAY	43	4625.69	855,775.00	105.65	9/5/2002
ROBERT MIDLEY	44	47410.91			
MOHAMMED AMADU	45	2210.56			
MOHAMMED AMADU	46	1467.04			
MOHAMMED AMADU	47	263.97			
MOHAMMED AMADU	48	1940.31			
AGNES AMADU	49	2348.25			
AGNES CUDJOE	50	3675.95	894,500	109.09	10/4/2002
ABRAHAM KWESIE	51	1781.81	1,391,630.00	162.76	3/20/2003
KWESI AGYIRI	52	1293.71	320,000.00	39.02	10/10/2002
VIDA BLAY	53	2532.39	710,000	87.65	9/20/2002
KWAME ABEKAH	54	1341.92	3,148,200.00	388.67	9/20/2002
K. ATTAH	55	1249.59			
AMA TSRERE	56	195.54	50,000	6.1	10/4/2002
DOMINIC CUDJOE	57	2030.69	710,745.00	83.62	2/26/2003
THOMAS KOBBINAH	58	1228.97	1,600,500.00	197.59	9/10/2002
ANGO MENSAH	59	1120.11	280,000.00	34.57	9/11/2002
NKRUMAH OFORI	60	6829.03	7,449,300.00	925.84	9/27/2002
KWESI AKOME	61	2622.62	272,500	33.64	9/20/2002
CECILIA GYIMAH	62	1765.68	440,000.00	53.66	10/8/2002
ISAAC TEKYI OTTU	63	3540.79	5,910,750.00	695.38	2/26/2003
JAMES BINPONG	64	3120.28	2,158,500	253.94	2/26/2003
SYBINA ESSIEN	65	2809.96	1,663,600	205.38	9/6/2002
ADJOA BEDU	66	1149.49	479,100.00	59.15	9/6/2002
SYBINA ESSIEN	67	2695.36	(PAID - SEE ABOVE No 65)		
MOHAMMED AMADU	68	46168.1			
NKRUMAH OFORI	69	14722.15			
VIDA BLAY	70	311.28	710,000.00	87.65	9/20/2002
THOMAS ANAMANG	71	16110.26	29,920,000.00	3,740.00	23/07/02
YAA OYOBA	72	2908.33	1,470,000.00	181.48	9/5/2002
KOFI KYEI	73	4117.44	5,304,110.00	654.83	9/6/2002
ALEX ESHUN	74	2904.83			
M. AGIE	75	513.44			
K. NKUM	76	898.45			
WILLIAM K. ABEKA	77	2973.21	2,372,124.00	279.07	2/26/2003
JOSHUA DADZIE	78	302.94	8,507,350.00	1,050.29	9/10/2002
K. AKOM	79	223.52			
P. ATTA	80	1532.34			
KWESI AKOME	81	4926.99	4,588,726.00	539.85	2/26/2003
KOJO NKUM	82	2421.96	3,215,622.00	378.31	2/26/2003
PAUL QUAYSON	83	2896.94	2,806,665.00	330.2	2/26/2003
OBENG DAMPTHEY	84	2654.17	4,560,185.00	536.49	2/26/2003
JOHN ABEKAH	85	3295.83	4,774,935.00	558.47	3/20/2003
YAA OYOBA	86	879.9	1,076,975.00	126.7	2/26/2003

FARM OWNER	FARM No.	AREA OF FARM (SQ.MT.)	COMPENSATION PAID ₵	COMPENSATION PAID \$	DATE OF PAYMENT
DANIEL KPEMAKA	87	522.04	1,549,885.00	2/26/2003	2/26/2003
SAMUEL SARFO	88	8995.35	9,665,355.00	1,137.1	2/26/2003
FELICIA FORSON	89	2589.79	906,430.00	106.02	3/20/2003
GILBERT BAIDOO	90	3664.42	12,830,540.00	1,509.48	2/26/2003
DORIS AWUKUDUA	91	3262.78	4,104,000.00	499.21	3/20/2003
SAMUEL GHANSAH	92	814.29	2,168,000.00	255.06	2/26/2003
ESI ADOBAH	93	1193.5	1,181,810.00	139.04	2/26/2003
ESI ADOBAH	94	2183.06		PAID	
J. K. OCRAN	95	4652.48			
ESI AMARTEY	96	4055.78	2,370,030.00	278.83	2/26/2003
JOHN KOJO OCRAN	97	575.9	8,147,650.00	958.55	2/26/2003
AMA AYAN	98	1455.9	1,091,315.00	128.39	2/26/2003
MARY COBBINAH	99	2310.77	808,780.00	95.15	2/26/2003
EMMANUEL APPIAH	100	2345.55	4,442,960.00	522.7	2/26/2003
COJ. ASMAH	101	2084.99			
S. P. THOMPSON	102	1238.98			
C. J. ABEKAH	103	1983.17			
C. E. OCRAN	104	2361.7			
KAKRA	105	2156.85			
A. TEY	106	1027.93			
S. SARFO	107	4604.06			
J. ABEKAH	108	4983.61			
T. AMANFUL	109	1089.76			
K. BENTIL	110	2433.98			
E. A. GOS	111	1068.81			
J. ESSEL	112	1992.23			
E. A. GOS	113	8433.21			
K. NKUM	114	998.52			
S. JACKSON	115	4851.36			
J. ESSEL	116	4671.07			
J. ESSEL	117	4453.74			
M. AMOAKOA	118	959.58			
K. NIMO	119	1833.29			
E. LARBI	120	2438.61			
A. NNA	121	2698.54			
J. AMPONSAH	122	5485.03			
E. OCRAN	123	2398.47			
JOSEPH AMOAH	124	1261.07			
M. BLAY	125	1549.97			
M. BONZOE	126	1498.07			
M. BONZOE	127	1510.36			
W. K. ABAKAH	128	6718.81			
P. AYENSU	129	3227.44			
A. AGORDO	130	2767.27			
N. AGORDO	131	3334.07			
J. BIMPONG	132	3722.41			

FARM OWNER	FARM No.	AREA OF FARM (SQ.MT.)	COMPENSATION PAID ₵	COMPENSATION PAID \$	DATE OF PAYMENT
J. BIMPONG	133	1628.16			
V. GEORGE	134	464.4			
N. KANAH	135	2881.75			
AGBOSHIE	136	1340.02			
K. AGBOSHIE	137	1543.86			
Y. ALEIKO	138	509.65			
M. COBBINAH	139	5843.65			
E. APPIAH	140	1641.95			
A. A. WATSUI	141	1197.16			
M. AMOAH	142	746.84			
D. ESSIEN	143	560.91			
I. ESSIEN	144	3319.64			
J. AMANKWA	145	764.44			
R. DARKWA	146	154.39			
S. ANNORKWAW	147	766.41			
KRISTO ASAFO	148	86648.1			
T. TURKSON	149	10003.11			
F. DJAN	150	408.99			
KWABLA	151	5693.38			
W. K. ABAKAH	152	3582.66			
K. OWOO	153	6068.72			
C. AFFUL	154	11916.01			
A. ACQUAH	155	4826.2			
KRISTO ASAFO	156	4489.31			
A. ACQUAH	157	7370.14			
KRISTO ASAFO	158	896.41			
K. BARTLS	159	680.44			
N. EKUA	160	347.77			
A. NKRUMAH	161	300.06			
Y. DZAMENA	162	1105.15			
J. MENSAH	163	1625.43			
S. OTABIL	164	1303.06			
PHILLIP ATTA	165	199.21			
KOFI ABRABRA	166	2109.72			
A. AHENE	167	119.84			
T. AMANFUL	168	2015.8			
EMMANUEL LARBI	169	328.31			
A. ANKOMAHEN	170	5444.79			
NANA BLAY	171	1579.57			
DOMINIC CUDJOE	172	3711.83			
FRANCIS APPIAH	173	1063.55			
MERCY AMOAKOH	174	1074.77			
EMMANUEL AGBOSHIE	175	837.66			
KWAMENA BARTELS	176	2010.44			
CECILIA ASMAH	177	2325.98			

FARM OWNER	FARM No.	AREA OF FARM (SQ.MT.)	COMPENSATION PAID ₵	COMPENSATION PAID \$	DATE OF PAYMENT
MARTIN A. GYIMAH	178	2455.56			
FRANCIS AGBOSHIE	179	1262.97			
YAA ALEIKO	180	470.02			
EMMANUEL APPIAH	181	1874.01			
EFUA AWOTWE	182	1250.68			
MARY AMOAH	183	644.78			
DORCAS ESSIEN	184	742.79			
MARY COBBINAH	185	5966.34			
STEPHEN BUABASA	186	1048.18			
ELIJAH ANKOR	187	2388.97			
JULIANA KUNADU	188	1531.46			
FRANCIS AGBOSHIE	189	1517.05			
KUDJOE AGBOSHIE	190	1758.81			
MARTIN A. GYIMAH	191	130.2			
ANDREWS ANKOMAHENE	192	1909.77			
FLORENCE APPIAH	193	1641.61			
ANDREWS ANKOMAHENE	194	3015.63			
MARY QUARSHIE	195	807.74			
CECILIA ANGO	196	5229.88			
BOLOR MENSAKYI	197	443.65			
EKUBA MANSА	198	1010.24			
JOSEPH ESHUN	199	746.6			
FRANCIS BOLORH	200	818.48			
KWAME IDAN	201	636			
COMFORT OCRAN	202	373.92			
AMA SIKА	203	201.49			
ESTHER QUARSHIE	204	785.23			
EDWARD APPIAH	205	263.33			
COMFORT FYNN	206	1285.91			
ELIZABETH KWOFIE	207	2645.01			
SETH BONSU	208	3135.57			
KWAME KONU	209	866.11			
SARFO OLUWA	210	563.7			
JOHN ANSAH	211	447.54			
DANIEL OPPONG	212	1953.78			
PATRICK BUKRO	213	628.31			

FARM OWNER	FARM No.	AREA OF FARM (SQ.MT.)	COMPENSATION PAID ₵	COMPENSATION PAID \$	DATE OF PAYMENT
ALFRED ANNYIM	214	2550.65			
YAA TINABEBI	215	1209.14			
MATHEW BUKRO	216	553.67			
JOHN NUAKO	217	96.69			
SUMAILA ABUDU	218	659.59			
JOHN ANSAH	219	1394.24			
JOHN TECHIE	220	785.28			
HAGAN APPIAH	221	889.04			
JOSEPH AMOAH	222	2774.16			
JOHN NUAKO	223	1408.04			
JOSEPH ESSIEN	224	1877.78			
PAUL NUAMAH	225	1903.11			
DOMINIC ASUNWA	226	2891.83			
JOHN NUAKO	227	9491			
KWEKU ENNYIM	228	32044.87			
KWABENA ANKOMAH	229	1126.98			
JAMES BIMPONG	230	536.91			
JOE AIDOO	231	1913.76			
AMA POMAH	232	1400.09			
STELLA AYANFUL	233	1711.65			
OBENG DAMPTEY	234	6338.91			
OBENG DAMPTEY	235	146.89			
AMA POMAH	236	8.13			
STELLA AYANFUL	237	9.3			
JOE AIDOO	238	45.03			
JOSEPH AMOAH	*	*	568,000.00	70.12	9/6/2002
FREDERICK GRANT	*	*	354,450.00	43.76	9/6/2002
ALFRED GYIMAH	*	*	1,431,900.00	176.78	9/6/2002
JOSHUA DADZIE	*	*	8,507,350.00	1,050.29	9/10/2002
THOMAS KOBINA	*	*	1,600,500.00	197.59	9/10/2002
DORIS AWUAKUDUA	*	*	2,956,000.00	364.94	9/11/2002
ALI ROCKSON	*	*	573,000.00	70.74	9/11/2002
PHILIP ARTHUR	*	*	1,022,000.00	126.17	9/11/2002
EBENEZER ASARE	*	*	1,266,950.00	156.41	9/20/2002
KOJO KUM	*	*	1,177,500.00	145.37	9/20/2002
TOTAL		841118.84	234,154,339.00	65381.7	

AREA NOT

* *

SURVEYED.