REFRESHER TRAINING ON SAFEGUARDS FOR REDD+ REGIONAL AND DISTRICT SAFEGUARDS FOCAL PERSONS ACROSS THE GHANA COCOA FOREST REDD+ PROGRAMME (GCFRP) AREA



Facilitated by: The Climate Change Directorate Forestry Commission P. O. Box MB 434 Accra Ghana

Date: 3rd-5th March, 2020 Venue: Golden Bean Hotel-Kumasi

TABLE OF CONTENT

| ACRONYMS | . ii |
|---|------|
| | iv |
| INTRODUCTION | . 1 |
| 1.1 Background | . 1 |
| 1.2 Proceedings | . 1 |
| 1.3 Objectives of the Training | . 2 |
| 1.4 Scope of Report | .3 |
| 2.0 TRAINING METHODOLOGY | .4 |
| 2.1 Training Materials | .4 |
| 3.0 KEY LESSONS/HIGHLIGHTS OF THE TRAINING | . 5 |
| 3.1Training Proceedings for Day 1 | . 5 |
| 3.1.1 Presentation on the overview of REDD+ and GCFRP by the CCD-FC (Mr. Thomas Gyambrah) | . 5 |
| 3.1.2 Presentation on REDD+ Safeguards Instruments by the CCD-FC (Ms. Rhoda Donkor) | . 7 |
| 3.1.3 Presentation on the FGRM by the CCD-FC (Mr. Raymond Sakyi) | 13 |
| 3.1.4 Presentation on Safeguards Principles Criteria and Indicators (PCIs) by the Director RMSC -FC (Mr. Alex Asare) | 16 |
| Presentation on the Development of Safeguards Action Plan (SAP) by the CCD-FC (Mr. Thomas Gyambrah)1 | 17 |
| 3.2 Training Proceedings on Day 21 | 17 |
| 3.2.1 Presentation on Environmental Impact Assessment/Screening of Projects by EPA (Mr. Samuel Oteng)1 | 18 |
| 3.3 TRAINING PROCEEDINGS ON DAY 32 | 20 |
| 4.0 CONCLUSION | 22 |
| 5.0 WAY FORWARD | 23 |

ACRONYMS

| ADR | Alternative Dispute Resolution |
|-------|---|
| AfDB | Africa Development Bank |
| CAS | Country Approach to Safeguards |
| CSOs | Civil Society Organizations |
| DA | District Assembly |
| DM | District Manager (Forest/Wildlife) |
| EA | Environmental Assessment |
| EIA | Environmental Impact Assessment |
| ERPA | Emission Reductions Payment Agreement |
| ESIA | Environmental and Social Impact Assessment |
| ESMF | Environmental and Social Management Framework |
| FC | Forestry Commission |
| FCPF | Forest Carbon Partnership Facility |
| FGRM | Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism |
| FIP | Forest Investment Programme |
| FSD | Forest Services Division |
| GCFRP | Ghana Cocoa Forest REDD+ Programme |
| GNFS | Ghana National Fire Service |
| IPM | Integrated Pest Management |
| MDAs | Ministries, Departments and Agencies |
| MLNR | Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources |
| MMDAs | Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies |
| MOF | Ministry of Finance |
| MOFA | Ministry of Food and Agriculture |
| MTS | Modified Taungya System |
| | |

| NGOs | Non-Governmental Organizations | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| NRS | National REDD+ Secretariat | | | | | |
| PAPs | Project Affected Persons | | | | | |
| PES | Payment for Ecosystem Services | | | | | |
| PF | Process Framework | | | | | |
| PMP | Pest Management Plan | | | | | |
| PMU | Project Management Unit | | | | | |
| PPP | Private – Public Partnership | | | | | |
| REDD+ including | Reducing Emission from Deforestation and forest Degradation | | | | | |
| | conservation, sustainable management of forest and carbon stocks | | | | | |
| | enhancement | | | | | |
| RPF | Resettlement Policy Framework | | | | | |
| R-PIN | Readiness - Plan Idea Note | | | | | |
| R-PP | Readiness Preparation Proposal | | | | | |
| SESA | Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment | | | | | |
| SFPs | Safeguards Focal Persons | | | | | |
| SIS | Safeguard Information System | | | | | |
| SRAs | Social Responsibility Agreements | | | | | |
| ТА | Traditional Authorities | | | | | |
| TOR | Terms of Reference | | | | | |
| ТоТ | Trainer of Trainees | | | | | |
| TUC | Timber Utilization Contract | | | | | |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change | | | | | |
| WB | World Bank | | | | | |
| WD | Wildlife Division | | | | | |
| WRC | Water Resources Commission | | | | | |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Continuous capacity building is imperative to achieve a successful Ghana Cocoa Forest REDD+ Programme (GCFRP) implementation. This is the core reason why the National REDD+ Secretariat (NRS) of the Forestry Commission with support from the World Bank through the AccelRedd+ Project organized a refresher training for Regional and District Safeguards Focal Persons (SFPs) across the GCFRP area. The training focused on safeguards instruments respected in Ghana's Country Approach to Safeguards (Ghana's Environmental Regulations, Cancun, World Bank Operational Policies, African Development Bank Safeguards and other donor safeguards requirements. The rationale was to equip SFPs with the requisite skills and knowledge on Ghana's Country Approach to Safeguards (CAS). SFPs would then have the ability to develop safeguards action plans, monitor safeguards compliance, resolving and/or reporting programme related conflicts using the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM).

This report provides perspectives on all aspects of the training including:

- The training methodology which was tailored to the needs of the participants; more accessible, participatory and practical approach.
- Actual training sessions focused on overview of REDD+ and the GCFRP, REDD+ Safeguards instruments and FGRM, Safeguards Principles Criteria and Indicators (PCIs), Development of Safeguards Action Plan, Environmental Impact Assessment/ Screening and field demonstration on Safeguards Monitoring. This also included sessions for questions and answers.

Overall, the REDD+ safeguards refresher training went well and the SFPs through the evaluation done at the end of the training attested to that. The evaluation was undertaken to identify whether SFPs objectives for the training were met, new things learnt and for the SFPs to provide a general overview of the training and how to improve upon subsequent trainings. A total of thirty-four (34) SFPs were trained.

Achievements

At the end of the training, the following were achieved:

i. SFPs demonstrated clear capability and understanding of Ghana's Country Approach to Safeguards and the application of the Safeguards PCIs developed for Safeguards monitoring

ii. SFPs understood the FGRM modalities and process to be able to effectively receive and address conflicts related to REDD+ implementation.

iii. SFPs demonstrated capability to use safeguards monitoring template to monitor safeguards compliance and report appropriately at the project level.

iv. SFPS demonstrated ability to develop Safeguards Action Plans (SAPs) for projects within their landscapes

v. SFPs acquired the needed skills and ability to independently build the capacity and sensitize stakeholders on Safeguards at the landscape level.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+) is one of the mechanisms designed to reduce the impact of climate change and achieve a sustainable forest estate. Ghana has put in place five strategic programme options which are; (Ghana Cocoa Forest REDD+ Programme (GCFRP), Ghana Shea Landscape REDD+ Programme (GSLRP), Togo Plateau, Transitional Zone REDD+ Programme and Coastal Mangroves REDD+ Programme designed to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation across the country. The GCFRP has been accepted into the portfolio of the Carbon Fund for possible payment of Emission Reductions. As GCFRP is fully developed and implementation has begun, there is the need to adhere to social and environmental safeguards as it is a core output of the Warsaw framework for results-based payment under REDD+ and a key requirement of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF).

REDD+ safeguards specifically outlines structures and procedures that ensure that social and environmental risks emanating from programme actions are minimized, and benefits enhanced. In order to achieve a successful programme implementation there was the need for institutional strengthening, policy re-alignment and capacity development for key actors to appreciate measures to minimize, mitigate or treat otherwise the anticipated adverse impacts associated with proposed programme activities. A capacity building programme was organized for selected REDD+ safeguards focal persons who are Forestry Commission's Assistant Regional, District and Park Managers in 2017.

Subsequently, as implementation of the GCFRP has begun there was the need to undertake a refresher training for all Regional and District safeguards focal persons within the GCFRP area to ensure safeguards compliance at the regional and district levels.

1.2 Proceedings

The training program began at 10:30am on Tuesday, 3rd March, 2020 with an opening prayer and self-introductions for participants to familiarize themselves. There was a

welcome address by the Ashanti Regional Manager (Mr. William Baah) of the Forest Service Division (FSD) - Forestry Commission (FC). He challenged SFPs to look at the bigger picture of what REDD+ seeks to achieve and collectively work to achieve the Forestry commission's sustainable forest management goal. There was a Statement of Purpose by the GCFRP lead (Mr. Thomas Gyambrah) who spoke on behalf of the Director, Climate Change. He mentioned that, one of the elements under the Warsaw framework to achieve results-based payment for the REDD+ Programme is meeting Safeguards requirements, and more especially, under the GCFRP, the World Bank safeguards. He further explained that there could be positive and negative effects whiles implementing the REDD+ Programme. There is therefore the need to put in measures to minimize the negative impacts and increase social and environmental benefits. The expectations at the end of the program is to build adequate capacity to independently sensitize and train other stakeholders within the GCFRP landscape on Safeguards.

This was followed by a brief Statement by the Director Resource Management and Support Centre (RMSC) of the FC (Mr. Alex Asare). He also encouraged members to take the training very serious since acquiring knowledge on safeguards is very necessary in our day to day engagements. The knowledge acquired should be extended to other staff of the FC and the stakeholders we work with.

Participants

The training was attended by 34 SFPs drawn from the regional and district Forest Services Division (FSD) and Wildlife Division (WD) areas within the GCFRP Area. The participants (focal persons) are assistant Regional, District and Park managers. The trainings were facilitated by the Forestry Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

1.3 Objectives of the Training Specific Objectives:

i. To train Safeguards Focal Persons on the application of Safeguards Principles, Criteria and Indicators (PCIs) developed for the GCFRP Safeguards monitoring as part of the SIS;

ii. To train SFPs on operationalizing the GCFRP Feedback Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM);

iii. To guide SFPs on how to conduct REDD+ Safeguards monitoring and reporting (taking into consideration the Country Approach to Safeguards);

iv. To guide SFPs on the development and application of Safeguards Action Plan, (SAP).

Expected Results

It was expected at the end of the training that, SFPs:

i. Demonstrate clear capability and understanding on the application of the Safeguards PCIs developed for Safeguards monitoring;

ii. To understand the FGRM modalities and process to be able to effectively receive and address conflicts related to REDD+ implementation;

iii. Use safeguards monitoring template to monitor safeguards compliance and report appropriately at the project level;

iv. To develop SAP for projects within their landscape;

v. Acquire the needed skills and ability to independently build the capacity and sensitize stakeholders on Safeguards at the landscape level.

1.4 Scope of Report

This report presents proceedings of the safeguard training workshop for REDD+ SFPs scheduled from 3rd- 5th March, 2020 at Golden Bean Hotel, Kumasi in the Ashanti region.

2.0 TRAINING METHODOLOGY

Multiple approaches were employed in delivering the training. PowerPoint presentations, videos, right based landscape approach, Pictures, group work and illustrations were employed for the training. There were opportunities for questions and answers after each presentation, comments and discussions, which made the training very interactive.

2.1 Training Materials

Participants were given folders which contained pens and notebooks and relevant documents for the workshop. Soft copies of all subjects and topics covered by the training course were also given to participants on Pen drives and also sent via email for their records. The training outline is found in Annex I.

3.0 KEY LESSONS/HIGHLIGHTS OF THE TRAINING

3.1Training Proceedings for Day 1

3.1.1 Presentation on the overview of REDD+ and GCFRP by the CCD-FC (Mr. Thomas Gyambrah)

The resource person mentioned that REDD+ is an incentive-based mechanism that seeks to reward tropical countries for their efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. REDD+ is fully represented in Article 5 of the Paris Agreement and also captured in Ghana's Nationally Determined (NDCs). Ghana is implementing REDD+ strategically across the various ecological zones of the countries with five main programme which are; (Ghana Cocoa Forest REDD+ Programme (GCFRP), Ghana Shea Landscape REDD+ Programme (GSLRP), Togo Plateau, Transitional Zone and Coastal Mangrove REDD+ Programme.

The REDD+ Process started in Ghana from 2008 with the development of the Readiness Idea Note (R-PIN) and in 2010 the Readiness Preparatory Proposal (RPP) was sent to the FCPF and was approved. In 2014 there was a mid-term review and submission of the Emission Reductions Payment Idea Note(ER-PIN). The National REDD+ Strategy was launched in 2016 and in 2017 the Emission Reduction Programme Document (ERPD) was submitted and included into the Carbon Fund Portfolio. In 2018 the GCFRP started implementation with its first sub-project dubbed Partnership for Productivity, Protection and Resilience within the Cocoa Landscape (3PRCL) led by Touton Ghana. Also in 2019 the Emissions Reductions Payment Agreement for the GCFRP was signed between the WB (acting as trustee for the Carbon Fund) and the Government of Ghana (represented by MoF & FC)



Figure 1 (Ghana's REDD+ Trajectory)

Details of his presentation can be found in Annex II

Questions & Answers

Q1. One of the components under the GSLRP was wildfire management, is there a way to add fire management to the GCFRP?

Ans. Fire management was incorporated as a component in the GSLRP because the savannah landscape is fire prone and the prevalence of fire is not as high as the High Forest Zone (HFZ). The GCFRP will however rely on the measures the FC has put in place to reduce wild fire.

Q2. What is the criteria for measuring emissions?

Ans. Having a Forest Reference Level in place is one of the ultimate ways of measuring emissions. First of all, a map will be produced for a particular year and that will serve as your baseline for measurement subsequently another map would be produced and superimposed on the base map to know the impact caused therefore the net effect becomes your emissions factor. The mapping is however not the only approach. Ghana's approach is currently being reviewed using a different methodology. SFPS shall be updated as appropriate.

Q3. What is the essence of the local governance structure under the GCFRP?

Ans. The reason for putting in place a local governance structure at the GCFRP Landscape is to ensure sustainability of projects within the landscape and also warrant a sense of local ownership of projects.

Q 4. Why was Atiwa considered as an HIA but not Mount Afadjato?

Ans. Mount Afadjato is found within the Togo Plateau REDD+ Programme area but not within the GCFRP area.

Q5. Why has the FC not received any carbon payment since Private companies such as Miro Ghana has received Carbon Payment?

Ans There are two forms of carbon market and they are; compliance and voluntary market. The regulated market is what the FC has signed an emissions reduction Payment Agreement for a period of 7-years (2019-2025) with the World Bank under the REDD+ programme whiles the voluntary market is where any organization an example is Form Ghana could sell their carbon to the carbon market space.

3.1.2 Presentation on REDD+ Safeguards Instruments by the CCD-FC (Ms. Rhoda Donkor)

Participants were introduced to safeguards by defining it in the context of REDD+. Thereafter key safeguard terminologies including Rights, Responsibilities, and Power were explained. REDD+ safeguards was explained as measures to minimize, mitigate or treat otherwise the anticipated adverse impacts or risks related to implementation of proposed REDD+ activities/interventions. Safeguards are therefore in place to help address the anticipated social, economic and environmental impacts. They are actions put in place to do no harm to people, the environment and the project itself, and also enhance positive benefits.

Overview of REDD+ safeguards

Ghana is respecting the following safeguards in its Country's Approach to Safeguards:

- Cancun/UNFCCC safeguards
- World Bank safeguards
- Africa Development Bank (AfDB) safeguards
- Environmental Assessment Regulations

CANCUN Safeguards: this presents a set of principles which country's willing to adapt to their country situation provide meanings and clarification to.

The seven (7) Cancun safeguards (listed below) were explained thoroughly.

- a. Programme/project actions complement national forest programs and relevant international conventions and agreements
- b. Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into consideration national sovereignty and legislation
- c. Respect for the knowledge and right of indigenous people and members of local communities
- d. Full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders inparticular, indigenous people and local communities in programme actions
- e. Actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forest and biological diversity
- f. Systematic actions to address the risk of reversals (e.g when cocoa prices are increased, and farmers return to BAU i.e. unsustainable production)
- g. Actions to reduce displacement of emissions (leakage of emission within a landscape) (these two are specific to REDD+ and might be difficult to apply in different areas)

World Bank Operational Safeguard Policy: The Bank attaches much importance to its safeguards policies and adherence to it remains a prerequisite for securing funding for

programmes and projects supported by the Bank. Key areas covered by the policy but recently reviewed include:

- Environment (Environmental Assessment, Natural Habitat, Forest, Pest management, Safety of Dam
- Social (Involuntary resettlement, Indigenous people, Physical cultural resources
- Legal/ international law, Projects on International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50; 2001), Projects in Disputed Areas (OP/BP 7.60; 2001)
- New policies (Access to Information Policy (2010), Piloting the Use of Borrower Systems (2005)

The WB Operational safeguards policies

Environmental Assessment- the Bank requires environmental assessment (EA) of projects proposed for the Banks financing. Instruments include SESA, ESIA, ESMF and ESMP. It categorizes proposed projects into categories A, B, C or FI based on the extent of adverse impacts anticipated from the project. It was made known to participants that, depending on the scale and nature of the project, the Bank advices which of the assessment to be done. It was further noted that, the SESA produced the ESMF and the RPF

Natural Habitats- the Bank does not support or finance projects that degrade or converts critical habitats. It supports projects that affect non- critical habitats only if no alternatives are available and if acceptable, mitigation measures are in place. It was noted that, results from the EIA will inform the Bank in taking decision on projects of such nature.

Pest management- the Bank opts for integrated approaches to pest management, identify pesticides that may be financed under the project and develop appropriate Pest Management Plan (PMP) to address this.

Forest- aim is to reduce deforestation, enhance the environmental contribution of forested areas, promote afforestation, reduce poverty, and encourage economic development. Support sustainable and conservation-oriented forestry. The instrument required is a FMP.

Physical cultural resources-identify and inventories cultural resources potentially affected. E.g. cemeteries, shrines, water bodies etc. The need to engage locals on rights to be performed before work can progress. There should be mitigation measures as such places are culturally sensitive.

Involuntary resettlement- assist displaced persons in their effort to improve or at least restore their standard of living. The person affected should not be worse off. Such displacement could be physical or economic

African Development Bank Safeguard Policies: the policy governs the process of determining a project's environmental and social category and the resulting environmental and social assessment requirements. It mainly dwells on the use of a SESA and ESIA, and where appropriate; ESMP; climate change vulnerability assessment; public consultation; community impacts; appraisal and treatment of vulnerable groups; and grievance procedures.

It was learnt that; no much difference exits between the WB and the AfDB policy on safeguards. Main differences are that, the AfDB use operational policies that are mainly based on SESA and ESIA and further pays more attention to climate change compared WB safeguards policy. Key areas covered by the policy include:

- Environmental and social impact assessment
- Involuntary resettlement, land acquisition; population displacement and compensation
- Biodiversity and Ecosystem services
- Pollution prevention and control, greenhouse gases, hazardous materials and resource efficiency (this was noted not to be explicit in the world Bank safeguard

policy on the assumption that, when preparing EIA for any programme or project, issues related to pollution should be addresses).

• Labor conditions, health and safety

During this session, participants were taken through the Safeguards instruments developed under the first phase of REDD+ readiness. These included Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA), Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF). Two other key documents were prepared under the Forest Investment Programme (FIP). These are the Process Framework (PF) and Pest Management Plan (PMP). The SFPs were also taken through a Terms of Reference (ToR) to enable them clearly know their roles and responsibilities as focal persons.

Description of ESMF: Participants were made aware that ESMF basically establishes clear procedures and methodologies for the environmental and social assessment, review, approval and implementation of interventions. It further specifies appropriate roles and responsibilities, and outline the necessary reporting procedures for managing and monitoring environmental and social concerns related to project interventions. Finally, the ESMF determines the training, capacity building and technical assistance needed to successfully implement the provisions of the ESMF and provide practical information on resources for implementing the ESMF.

The ESMF highlights twelve Environmental, Social and Health issues/concerns with proposed mitigation measures. The key impact areas are:

 Biodiversity, Water Resources, Soils, Air Quality, Pesticides, Land tenure and ownership, Maintaining Livelihoods, Farmers Right, Forest management, Safety and Security, Occupational Health and Safety, Cultural Heritage

Description of RPF: Acknowledging that resettlement sometimes results from project interventions, RPF is a requirement for projects that may entail involuntary resettlement. It was explained to participants that, RPF basically addresses issues of compensation, acquisition of land, impact on livelihood, or restricted access to natural resources under

the World Bank safeguard policy on involuntary resettlement. It further provides stakeholders with guidelines on how to address compensation issues as related to affected properties/livelihoods including land and income generating activities during REDD+ project implementation.

Description of PF: Participants were made to understand that, a PF is prepared when projects may cause restrictions in access to natural resources in legally designated parks and protected areas. The purpose of the process framework is to establish a process by which members of potentially affected communities participate in the design of project components, determination of measures necessary to achieve resettlement policy objectives, and implementation and monitoring of relevant project activities.

Description of PMP: It was explained that the objective of the PMP is to ensure integration of appropriate pest management techniques into agro-forestry technologies, and cocoa landscapes on farms supported under the project.

Questions & Answers

Q1. Should screening be done only when there is an establishment of plantation of 40 ha and above?

Ans. For a 40ha plantation, it is mandatory, however, below is not. In all cases, GCFRP sub projects are more than 40 ha and would mainly be a mix of species and/or agroforestry.

Q2. Why is Ghana respecting so many safeguards and not just the National Environmental Regulations?

Ans. Ghana receives funding from the World Bank, African Development Bank among other donor institutions and they have their own safeguards we need to respect and address. It is therefore mandatory for countries or institutions that benefit from their support to adhere to their safeguard's measures, hence the CAS.

3.1.3 Presentation on the FGRM by the CCD-FC (Mr. Raymond Sakyi)

Participants were taken through the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) Operational Modalities.

The resource person mentioned that Ghana has established a Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) for receiving, evaluating, and addressing project-related grievances from affected communities or stakeholders at the community or project level, region, or country.

Potential conflict sources are; Resource use and access, Land and tree tenure, Benefit Sharing, Participation and inclusiveness, among others.

FGRM operational modalities

It was explained that, parties seeking any REDD+ dispute resolved would have to file their complaint at the FC District FGRM office within the ERP project area where it will be received and processed before it is communicated to the National FGRM coordinator. Participants were thought that, the FGRM process has four steps that must be followed in resolving disputes. The steps are:

Step 1. If the parties are unable or unwilling to resolve their dispute through negotiation, fact-finding or inquiry a mediator chosen with the consent of both parties would be assigned to assist the Parties to reach a settlement.

Step 2. Where the mediation is successful, the terms of the settlement shall be recorded in writing, signed by the mediator and the parties to the dispute and lodged at the FGRM registry. The terms of the settlement will be binding on all parties.

Step 3. If the mediation is unsuccessful, the Parties will be required to submit their dispute for compulsory arbitration, by a panel of 5 arbitrators, selected from a national roster of experts.

Step 4. The awards of the arbitration panel will be binding on the Parties and can only be appealed to the Court of Appeal. All questions of law would be referred to the High Court.

In practical terms, if a complaint is made to a focal person, it is his or her responsibility to notify the defendant or the other conflicting party. The focal person will have to acknowledge receipt of the grievance. As a more pragmatic approach, there is the need for the grievance to be recorded using a complaint form to also serve as evidence of report and data base of grievances. The information must be checked if there is the need for further information or clarification. Before the processing, the focal person is required to inform the defendant. All this is to improve governance of natural resources.

Key grievance redress mechanisms to employ are negotiations, mediation and others, with the court being the last option.

FGRM timelines

-Grievance uptake, record, acknowledgement-5 days -Process, research and fact finding- 15 working day -Response- 5 working days -Implement agreed response-20 working days -Total process timeline-45 working days

Some of the Pictorial Presentations were





Questions/Comments/Discussions

Q1. When will the FGRM form be ready and shared to SFPs?

Ans. The form has been reviewed and it would be shared with all participants via mail.

3.1.4 Presentation on Safeguards Principles Criteria and Indicators (PCIs) by the Director RMSC -FC (Mr. Alex Asare)

The Resource Person took participants through the Safeguards PCIs He touched on the need for Safeguards PCIs and explained that

- A comprehensive framework of *Principles, Criteria* and *Indicators (PCIs)* is useful in providing guidance for the effective monitoring of social and environmental safeguards issues in relation to REDD+.
- Ensure that potential risks are addressed appropriately.
- Impacts (both negative and positive) of REDD+ projects/actions need to be effectively monitored in order to secure optimal benefits to stakeholders

Participants also learnt that the following PCIs terminologies and what it stands for;

- Principles (P) depict the key objectives for ensuring high level of social and environmental performance of REDD+ actions. In essence, these principles need to be aligned with mandatory and voluntary safeguards standards/ frameworks, specifically the Cancun safeguards and the World Bank OPs.
- Criteria (C) define the conditions, processes, impacts and policies required in order to deliver the principles. They are the 'pre-requisites' for the delivery of each principle.
- **Indicators (I)** are the quantitative or qualitative information needed to show progress in achieving a particular criterion.

Details of the Safeguards PCIs presentation is attached in Annex II

Questions and Answers

Q1. Why is it that the Safeguards PCIs did not focus on the GCFRP?

Ans. The PCIs looks at the bigger REDD+ Programme not only the GCFRP.

Presentation on the Development of Safeguards Action Plan (SAP) by the CCD-FC (Mr. Thomas Gyambrah)

The Resource Person took participants through how they can develop Safeguards Action Plan on their own which he explained to take the below format;

• Introduction giving a general description of the REDD+ Programme

Background of the Ghana Cocoa Forest Programme

Purpose of the SAP

Scope of the SAP

- General description of Project being implemented within a landscape
- Synergies with other initiatives /projects within the landscape
- Safeguards Action Plan Matrix
- Way Forward

Details of the Presentation are found in Annex II

Participants were put into four (4) groups to develop Safeguards Action Plan on day 2 of the workshop with a hypothetical case.

Questions & Answers

Q1. Will there be the need to develop a Safeguards Action Plan (SAP) where there are no projects within the GCFRP programme area or HIA?

Ans. The NRS anticipates to have projects across the HIAs. However, SAP could be developed for the Forestry Commission's existing projects activities such as the Modified Taungya System (MTS), Enrichment planting among others)

3.2 Training Proceedings on Day 2

The second day of the training begun with recap of Day one's activities by the participants. Each participant shared a unique lesson or experience which depicted general appreciation of issues discussed in day 1.

3.2.1 Presentation on Environmental Impact Assessment/Screening of Projects by EPA (Mr. Samuel Oteng)

The Resource Person took participants through the key elements of EIA, Registration, EA 1, EA2, Screening, Environmental Management Plan and Audit/ Monitoring as well as Group work on the filling of EA1 forms and GCFRP Screening checklist.

Constitutional provisions

Backing the claim that the country has procedures for environmental assessment, key constitutional provisions such as Article 36 (9), 36 (10), 41 (k) and 257 (6) were cited and discussed. Generally, the constitution provides for safeguarding and protecting the environment for posterity, safeguarding the health, safety and welfare of all persons and further entreats all citizens to own it a duty to protect and safeguard the environment.

EPA Acts

Elaborating on the practicalities of environmental assessment procedures in the country, EPA Act 490 of 1994 and LI 1652, 1999 was mentioned. It was explained that, the term environmental impact assessment' or 'EIA' as used in the Ghanaian context; EPA Act 490 Of 1994 and LI 1652,1999 serves as a planning, management and decision tool applied to proposed and existing "Undertakings".

The act further stipulates the functions of the EPA including EIA. It further highlights the power of the sector minister and environmental protection inspectors. Key elements of EA and that of screening are also addressed by the Act.

Elaborating further on screening as a first stage of EIA, participants were made to understand that screening is a process to decide which projects out of all those proposed at the planning stage need environmental consideration and at what level of assessment. The screening is intended to mainly ascertain the negative impacts of projects on the environment and to exclude aspects of the project for further environmental consideration. It is mainly done by the proponent of any undertaking and/or by the proponents' consultant.

Details of his presentation can be found in Annex II.

<u>Group Exercise 1</u>

- ► The Commission plans to develop two plantations of 50ha and 20ha separately at Kofikrom near Atiwa Forest. There are three major rivers that pass through the land. The development would involve the use of agro-chemicals and heavy equipment. The boundaries to the west and south are cocoa farms and to the north and East are fallow lands. There are three hamlets located in each of the planned plantation.
- ► As an Officer of the Commission;
 - ▶ What are the key issues to be considered with regards to
 - Impacts Prediction
 - Mitigation Measures
 - Monitoring
 - Assess and conduct screening to determine the level of EIA and complete the process for the attention of the Environmental Protection Agency if applicable

The groups presented their completed assignments i.e. completed EA1 & REDD+ Screening checklist forms in plenary session. General comments were made to improve completion of the forms. Key among the comments were:

- Provision of alternatives are very necessary in the EIA process
- Mitigation measures should be different from monitoring activities.
- Site description is a summary of direction and geographic of the place of the undertaking

Questions& Answers

Q1. Does the country have any law on Noise pollution?

Ans. Noise is a major concern to the nation especially the EPA. EPA Act of 1994 (Act 490) mandates the EPA to prescribe standards and guidelines relating to the pollution of water, air, land and **noise** in the country.

Q2. When are the EA1 and EA2 used?

Ans: Ultimately, the EA1 is supposed to be filled before any project is initiated, however the (EA1&2) could be completed concurrently. The law mandates that, one should be charged for undertaken an activity without the EA1 (schedule 1 projects). However, small projects will require the completion of only EA1 to get permit. EA2 provides more details of the project i.e. site plan, scope of the project, business registration, land titles, tax returns, etc. (schedule 2 project). This is further supported by a scoping report which details the infrastructure, activities, baseline (air quality, water quality, soil text etc.)

Q3. Would one need permit to undertake cattle rearing?

Ans. Yes. Permit is site specific and there is therefore the need to inform the EPA when you want to embark on any undertaking.

3.3 TRAINING PROCEEDINGS ON DAY 3

The Resource Persons from the CCD-FC led the field monitoring training. Day 3was dedicated for field work, evaluation of workshop and drawing of next steps. The Safeguards field monitoring happened at Juaso Forest District. The team paid courtesy call on the Juaso FSD District Manager (DM). This was followed by field demonstration on how to undertake safeguards monitoring with the use the Safeguards Monitoring Plan template. The template has columns for institutions implementing REDD+ projects, the activities undertaken by the institutions and how they involve communities, community's response, means of verification and remarks. Find copy of the Monitoring plan in Annex IV.

The below proceedings were observed during the monitoring exercise;

The FC was used as a test case for the for the monitoring exercise

- All participants were given a copy of the monitoring template to record the DMs responses as one of the resource persons ask him questions on the FC's activities such as (MTS, Enrichment planting and Wildfire management).
- The Team after interacting with the FSD DM set off to the field to meet some Taungya farmers at Kwaso community to find out how the FC has been engaging them on the MTS. Twenty MTS farmers were engaged made up of 9 females and 11 males.

A copy of a detailed monitoring plan with responses from the FSD DM and Taungya farmers is attached in Annex IV.

Questions& Answers

Q1.Should monitoring always be done at the end of the project?

Ans: It was explained that, monitoring should be an on-going process throughout the entire project life with intermittent and final reporting documenting progress on activities towards achieving set targets

Q2. How will the District Safeguards Training get sponsorship?

Ans. The World Bank has secured funds for accelerating REDD+ activities (Accell Redd) and funds could be sourced from that for the landscape engagements, but for a limited period of the project lifespan until Upfront advance & interim Payments are received.

4.0 CONCLUSION

At the end of the training Programme, participants were requested to indicate their general observation, the new things learnt and suggest improvement of future trainings. Hitherto, at the beginning of the training, participants listed their expectations/objectives for coming to the training. Selected responses of some participants are attached as Annex VI

Generally, it emerged that the training was very successful and that most of their expectations were met. They however hinted that, it will be more effective if more time is allocated for subsequent trainings as duration for group work were limited especially for the Environmental Impact Assessment and Screening process.

The following were observations made by SFPs on the refresher training:

- i. The training program was very interactive, informative and had very good resource persons.
- ii. With lessons and experiences gained from the training, they were in a better positioned to independently develop and build the capacity of other stakeholders (landscape level) in reporting and addressing safeguard issues.
- iii. The training has been able to broaden our understanding on all safeguards issues and how to monitor its compliance.
- iv. The course has created awareness on how to undertake internal monitoring of safeguard indicators. The knowledge acquired will go a long way to improve upon how we implement REDD+ initiatives.
- v. The program is very educative and refreshing, presentations were well understood.

5.0 WAY FORWARD

The CCD (National REDD+ Secretariat (NRS)) of the FC responsible for the REDD+ programme will continue to build the capacities of the focal persons and key stakeholders to ensure effective and efficient implementation of the GCFRP.

6.1 Next Steps;

The National REDD+ Secretariat through the support of AccellRedd+ funds shall:

- Provide financial support to focal persons to train key stakeholders within the GCFRP landscape on safeguards.
- Maintain contact with focal persons for effective feedback on practical aspects of safeguards mechanisms.
- Assist SFPs with the development of the Safeguards Action Plan
- Assist SFPs with the formation Safeguards teams in their Landscapes
- Monitor safeguards compliance periodically within the GCFRP area.

Focal persons

- Identify potential actors/stakeholders to form safeguards teams.
- Prepare a tentative budget for undertaking landscape level training on safeguards and share with the NRS
- Effectively participate in REDD+ related projects in their respective landscapes
- Develop Safeguards Action Plan
- Monitor and report Safeguards compliance.

ANNEXES

Annex I: Training outline

<u>AGENDA</u>

REDD+ SAFEGUARDS REFRESHER TRAINING WORKSHOP

3RD-5THMARCH, 2020 AT GOLDEN BEAN HOTEL, KUMASI

<u>DAY 1</u>

| Time | Activity | Responsibility | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <u>9:30-10:00am</u> | Registration of Participants | Climate Change Department (CCD) | | | |
| 10:00-10:05 | Opening Prayer | SFP | | | |
| 10:05-10:15 | Self-Introductions | Moderator | | | |
| 10:15-10:20 | Welcome Address | Regional Manager, FSD Ashanti | | | |
| 10:20-10:25 | Statement by Human Resource Unit | Ag Human Resource Director | | | |
| 10:25-10:30 | Statement of Purpose | Director Climate Change | | | |
| 10:30-10:40 | Group Picture | All | | | |
| 10:40-11:25 | Overview on REDD+ and GCFRP | Mr. Thomas Yaw Gyambrah/ Mr. Raymond Sakyi | | | |
| 11:25-11:55 | Questions & Answers | Moderator | | | |
| 11:55-12:40 | Presentation on REDD+ Safeguards Instruments & FGRM Modalities | Ms. Rhoda Donkor/ Mr Raymond Sakyi | | | |
| 12:40-1:10 | Questions & Answers | Moderator | | | |
| 1:10-2:10 | Lunch | All | | | |
| 2:10-3:00 | Safeguards Principles Criteria and Indicators | Mr Alex Asare / Mr Thomas Gyambrah | | | |
| 3:00-3:30 | Questions & Answers | Moderator | | | |

| 3:30-4:15 | Development of Safeguards Action Plan | Ms. Rhoda Donkor / Mr. Thomas Gyambrah |
|-------------|--|---|
| 4:15-4:45 | Questions & Answers | Moderator |
| 4:45-5:00pm | Group Participants/ Close of Day 1 | Moderator |

DAY 2

| Time | Activity | Responsibility | |
|--------------|--|------------------|--|
| 9:30-10:00am | Registration of Participants | NRS | |
| 10:00-10:05 | Opening Prayer | Moderator | |
| 10:05-10:15 | Recap of Day 1 Activity | Moderator | |
| 10:15-11:00 | Environmental Impact Assessment/ Screening of Projects | Mr. Samuel Oteng | |
| 11:00-11:45 | Group Work | SFPs | |
| 11:45-12:00 | Snack | All | |
| 12:00-12:45 | Presentation of Group Work | SFPs | |
| 12:45-1:15 | Undertake Safeguards Monitoring & Reporting | Moderator | |
| 1:15-145 | Questions & Answers | Moderator | |
| 1:45-2:45 | Lunch | All | |
| 2:45-3:45 | Group Work on developing a SFPs Safeguards Action Plan | | |
| 3:45-4:45 | Presentation of Group Work SFPs | | |
| 4:45-5:00pm | Evaluation/ Close of Day 2 | | |

DAY 3 (SAFEGUARDS FIELD MONITORING AT JUASO FOREST DISTRICT)

| Time | Activity | Responsibility |
|---------------|--|---|
| 8:00-9:00 am | Travel to Juaso FSD office | Event Organizer |
| 9:00-9:20 | Pay Courtesy call on the District Manager (FSD- Juaso) | NRS/ SFPs |
| 9:20-12:00 | Field Demonstration on Safeguards Monitoring | Mr. Raymond Sakyi/ Ms. Rhoda Donkor/ Mr Thomas Gyambrah |
| 12:00-12:30pm | Next Steps | NRS |
| 12:30pm | Closing/ Lunch | |

Annex II: Training Presentations

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1aTIozGE_mgUvUDdh-wuInfUt_ScA5FzB

Annex III: List of participants

| NAME | RANK STATION | | TELEPHONE | EMAIL | |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 1Augustine Gyedu | ARM | Kumasi | 0208170822 | | |
| 2Emmanuel Agyapong | ADM | Bekwai | 0244959543 | agyapongdonkoremmanuel@yahoo.com | |
| Donkor | | | | | |
| 3Faustina Animah | ADM | Mampong | 0244630336 | faustitinafc@gmaiol.com | |
| 4Annobil Newton | ADM | Juaso | 244473483 | newtonia88@yahoo.com | |
| Atuahene | | | | | |
| 5Emmanuel Owusu | ADM | Kumawu | 0208277175 | nanao4gh@yahoo.com | |
| 6Patience Apassnaba | PM (WD) | Kumasi | 0203401399 | apassnaba@gmail.com | |
| 7Alfred Yabepone | ADM | Mankranso | 0244522914 | alfyab@yahoo.com | |
| 8Nii Kwei Kussachin | ADM | New Edubiase | 0200122333 | kweinii@gmail.com | |
| 9Francis Effah Adarkwah | ADM | Offinso | 0246874880 | franadark@yahoo.com | |
| 10Rose Adwoa Gyau | ADM | Nkawie | 0202333843 | Amankwaa.rose@yahoo.com | |
| Amankwaa | | | | | |
| 11Lucy Amoh Ntim | ARM | Sunyani | 0277019009 | lucyamohntim@live.co.uk | |
| 12Adofo Ernest | ADM | Goaso | 244819978 | dofoernestation@yahoo.com | |
| 13Wilson Owusu Asare | ARM | Koforidua | 0244204791 | wowusuasare@yahoo.com | |
| 14Jamila Abdul-Rahman | ADM | Akim Oda | 0242617457 | abdulrahmanjamilla@gmaiol.com | |

| 15Baafi Frimpong | ADM | Mpraeso | 0244428251 | baafrimpong5@gmail.com |
|------------------------|----------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| 16Emmanuel Antwi | ADM | Begoro | 0243151287 | nuclearvalency@hotmail.com |
| 17Ottopa Francis | ADM | Kade | 0242209915 | ottopafrancis@yahoo.com |
| 18Joseph Bempah | ARM | Takoradi | 0244804624 | akorabempah@yahoo.com |
| 19Adjei Dickson Sakyi | ARM | Cape Coast | 0246235700 | sakyiba2014@gmail.com |
| 20Exorm Ametordu | APM | Kakum | 0265039118 | eaerskine@gmail.com |
| Erskine | | | | |
| 21George Atta | ADM | Dunkwa | 0243986048 | attageorge791@gmail.com |
| 22Gilbert Ampofo | ADM | Assin Fosu | 0205596969 | gilbertampofolartey@yahoo.com |
| 23George Kingsley | ADM | Cape Coast | 0544550414 | kgeorgeboateng@gmail.com |
| Boateng | | | | |
| 24Victor Owusu Adade | ADM | Tarkwa | 0243053507 | vowusuadade@yahoo.com |
| 25Richard Kofi Kyei | ADM | Enchi | 0557150505 | Kyeirich30@live.com |
| 26Daniel Owusu | ADM | Asankragwa | 0244521622 | Dokkwartt@gmail.com |
| Kwarteng | | | | |
| 27Alex Tweneboah | ADM | Sefwi Juaboso | 0248590510 | Atkodua65@gmail.com |
| Kodua | | | | |
| 28Maxwell Otengt | ADM | Bibiani | 0557879980 | maxweollotengagyekum@gmail.com |
| Agyekum | | | | |
| 29Kingsley Osei Mensah | ARM (WD) | Koforidua | 0243261932 | oseimensahfc@yahoo.com |
| 30Vincent Appiah | ADM | Sefwi Wiawso | 0208158782 | appiahv1972@gmaiol.com |

| 31Yaw Boateng ADM Sefw | oso 0244801198 | boatenasante@yahoo.com |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|
|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|

Annex IV: Safeguards Monitoring Plan Template

GHANA COCOA FOREST REDD+ PROGRAMSAFEGUARDS MONITORING PLAN TEMPLATE

| INSTITUTION | ACTIVITY | ACTIVITY INSTITUTION'S RESPONSE | | | COMMUNITY | | |
|------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|----------|
| | | QUESTIONS | RESPONSE | MEANS OF VERIFICATIO N | QUESTION | RESPONSE | COMMENTS |
| FORESTRY COMMISSION | Modified Taungya System (MTS) | How do you engage communities on the MTS? | Radio announceme nt, farmer engagement, one on one interaction | Monthly reports, Pictures | How did you hear about the MTS? | FC officials approached us to form groups to be given degraded portions of forest reserve for planting of trees and certain food crops. Group of farmers sent in application forms | |
| | | Which tree seedlings are supplied to farmers under the MTS? (Exotic/Indige nous) | Exotic tree species (Teak, Cedrella, potted seedlings, Ofram and Prekese | Monthly reports, Seedlings request and supply contract forms | Which tree seedlings are supplied to you for planting? | Cedrella, Teak | |

| | What is the benefit sharing plan under the MTS? | Farmers are given free degraded forest reserve lands to farm on. When trees are harvested farmers are entitles to 40% benefit, FC 40%, land owner 15% and 5% for the community. | MTS Benefit Sharing Plan Document | List the benefits you acquire from the MTS? Food benefits: | We get fertile lands to farm on whiles we plant trees to reclaim degraded forest reserves. We are also aware of the 40% benefit we would accrue from the trees when they mature. | |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | Do you build farmers capacities on MTS management? YES/NO EXPLAIN | Yes. Farmers capacity is built on the job. Farmers are taught how to undertake pegging, pruning and other silvicultural practices | Monthly reports Pictures | Have your capacity been built on MTS managem ent | Yes mainly on silvicultural practices. | |
| Forest Protectio n and | Do you involve communities in Forest protection and | Yes. Farmers are involved in they | | Are you involved in forest protection | Yes. We are taught how to establish fire belt and also assist in forest protection by | |

| Conserv ation | conservation? YES/NO If YES/No explain. Do you provide training and sensitization on Forest protection and conservation to farmers? YES/NO If yes explain | Setting up of forest committees and fire volunteers in forest fringe communities Yes. Farmers are trained on the establishmen t of firebelts | Annual reports | /Conservat ion in your landscape ? YES or No If Yes/No explain Have you received any training/Se nsitization on forest protection (fire managem ent etc.) by the Forestry | reporting illegalities to the FC. Yes We have been involved in series of trainings on forest protection and how to ensure sustainable forest management from the FC. |
|------------------|--|--|-------------------|---|---|
| Forest | Have you | Yes. | Monthly | Commissio n, Fire service or any institution or any other institution ? Have you | |
| reserve | undertaken | | reports | been | |

| rehabilita tion and restoratio n (Enrichm ent Planting) | any enrichment planting within degraded forest reserves? YES/NO | In 2018, compartmen t 6 within the Prakaw Forest Reserve was enriched with trees. In 2019. Compartmen t 5 125 ha of forest reserve was enriched. | Time sheets | engaged in any enrichmen t planting in degraded Forest Reserves in the landscape ? | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------|--|---|--|
| | Do you use community members to undertake enrichment planting | Yes. Community members are used for enrichment planting | Monthly reports | Have you been engaged in any enrichmen t planting in degraded Forest Reserves in the landscape ? | Some of us have been engaged in enrichment planting. Our engagement depends on our closeness to the degraded reserves where the activity is being carried out. | |
| | What is the area of reserve that has been rehabilitated | 250 ha within 2 compartmen ts. | | What is the acreage of land you planted | | |

| rese with land have und enri | w many 1 reserve which is the which is the Prakaw dscape forest ve you reserve. dertaken richment nting | Monthly report | Which reserve are you working in | Prakaw FR | |
|---|---|-------------------|--|--|--|
| som grie you from How addi grie | hat are mostly used to address some of these grievances are reported to the these grievances are reported to the police brock | | Do you report forest related grievances to the FC? How are they addressed ? | Yes Mostly through negotiations however the illegal ones are taken to the police then to the court. | |

Annex V: Photos



Welcome address from the Ashanti Regional Manager

Presentation on overview of REDD+

FGRM presentation



Safeguard's Presentation

Safeguards PCIs Presentations

EIA/Screening Presentation



Safeguards PCIs presentation

Group discussion



Group work presentations.



Field inspection

Field interaction with MTS farmers



Group picture with farmers A hard working aged MTS farmer



Hands on training on the filling of the Safeguards monitoring template

Practical safeguards training



Courtesy call on the Juaso FSD District Manager