

# **TRAINING ON SAFEGUARDS FOR REDD+ REGIONAL AND DISTRICT SAFEGUARDS FOCAL PERSONS**



*Facilitated by:*

*The Climate Change Unit  
Forestry Commission  
P. O. Box MB 434  
Accra Ghana*

February 2018

# **TRAINING ON SAFEGUARDS FOR REDD+ REGIONAL AND DISTRICT FOCAL PERSONS**

*Date: 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018*  
*Venue: Anita Hotel, Kumasi, Ghana*

Draft

*Compiled by:*  
*Mercy Owusu-Ansah & Joseph Asante*

February 2018

## CONTENTS

ACRONYMS .....	4
SUMMARY .....	6
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1.1 Structure of Training.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1.2 Purpose of training .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.3 Scope of Report .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2.0 TRAINING METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2.1 Training delivery.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2.2 Training materials .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2.3 Training content.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.0 KEY LESSONS/HIGHLIGHTS OF THE COURSE.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>3.1 Training proceedings on day 1.....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1.1 Presentation 1: Implementation of Safeguards (Facilitated by SAL Consult) .....	16
3.1.2 <i>Presentation 2: Relevant safeguard instruments prepared for REDD+ projects – SESA, ESMF, RPF, PF, and PMP (Facilitated by SAL Consult)</i> .....	22
3.1.3 <i>Presentation 3: National environmental assessment procedures (Facilitated by EPA)</i> .....	27
<b>3.2 Training proceedings on day 2.....</b>	<b>29</b>
3.2.1 <i>Presentation 4: Modalities for Ghana’s Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) under REDD+ (facilitated by REDD+ Consultant)</i> .....	29
3.2.2 <i>Presentation 5: Legal Advice on FGRM (Facilitated by Y.B Osafo Legal Consult)</i> .....	32
<b>3.3 Training proceeding on day 3 .....</b>	<b>33</b>
3.3.1 Presentation 5: Safeguards Information System (SIS)-Safeguard Monitoring Indicators .....	33
<b>3.4 Closing Session .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>4.0 CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>5.0 WAY FORWARD.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>5.1 Next steps and responsibilities:.....</b>	<b>38</b>
ANNEXES .....	39

## ACRONYMS

ADR	Alternative Dispute Resolution
AfDB	Africa Development Bank
CAS	Country Approach to Safeguards
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DA	District Assembly
DCE	District Chief Executive
DM	District Manager
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
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
FMP	Forest Management Plan
FSD	Forestry Services Division
GCFRP	Ghana Cocoa Forest REDD+ Programme
GHS	Ghana Health Service
GNFS	Ghana National Fire Service
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
MDA	Ministries, Department and Agencies
MLNR	Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
MMDAs	Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies
MOFA	Ministry of Food and Agriculture
MTS	Modified Taungya System

NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NLE	National Legal Environment
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+	Reducing Emission from Deforestation and forest Degradation including conservation, sustainable forest management 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
SNV	Netherlands Development Organization
SRAs	Social Responsibility Agreements
TA	Traditional Authorities
TOR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
TUC	Timber Utilization Contract
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WD	Wildlife Division
WRC	Water Resource Commission

## SUMMARY

Capacity building remains core to the realization of any programme intent. This is mainly due to lack of or limited capacity of stakeholders to effectively contribute to implementation of multifaceted programme actions within a dynamic environment. It is in acknowledgment of this that the Ghana Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+) programme prides capacity development for stakeholders to ensure successful implementation.

Key among such capacity development initiatives focuses on safeguards issues targeting REDD+ focal persons and key stakeholders. The rationale is to have REDD+ focal persons across the country imbued with requisite skills and knowledge; and capable of monitoring safeguards compliance, resolving and/or reporting programme related conflicts. This subsequently translates into the establishment and institutionalization of a Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) Modalities for the REDD+ programme, thus easily accessible, recognized and used by all relevant stakeholders at all levels.

To this effect, the National REDD+ Secretariat (NRS) facilitated training on REDD+ Safeguards for focal persons and other stakeholders within the first half of 2018. This report provides perspectives on all aspects of the training including:

- pre-training activities; which principally focused on assessment of Ghana's REDD+ preparatory processes, institutional and staff capacity as well as stakeholder needs in developing and piloting the training modules on REDD+ safeguards.
- participant selection and initial training needs assessments; mainly selected Forestry Commission staff across the country,
- the training methodology which was tailored to the needs of the participants; more accessible, participatory and practical.
- actual training sessions which focused on overview of safeguards, key elements, FGRM among others. This also included avenue for question and answers.

Overall, the REDD+ safeguards training sessions were well received by focal persons and senior managers as well as key stakeholders who rated the experience as either good or excellent. Most

participants (focal persons) demonstrated capability to extend lessons learned to their wider stakeholder groups.

Owing to this and as per the training approach, excerpts of trainer of trainee's session facilitated by trained focal persons for stakeholders in their respective districts are captured in annex #. Key observations from the district level trainings were:

- Stakeholder representation: *Representation of stakeholder's including statutory bodies, chiefs, farmers, private sector, CSOs, individuals was typical of the trainings. The diversity among the groups brought different perspectives which enriched discussions for comprehensive understanding of issues, network building, experience sharing among others. This notwithstanding, stakeholder representation can be improved by considering gender and other parameters to ensure fair representation.*
- Training structure: *The training structure and flow was good. Resource persons demonstrated a lot of capacity and understanding of REDD+, and REDD+ safeguards. The challenge was communicating the information. It would improve over time as these DMs & DSFPs acquire more experience in delivering training on the subject*
- Capacity building vs. Information sharing: *The programme was intended to be a capacity building exercise but was not explicitly designed as such. Training objectives and learning objectives for the whole event, as well as for each presentation, were not clearly stated. This could, therefore, be mistaken by participants to be a usual information sharing event by the FSD. Outlining training & learning objectives and the purpose of each presentation (as it is a training) makes it easier to evaluate.*
- Training Evaluation: *An evaluation at the end of the training for each of the stakeholder groups would really help identify what progress has been made and how to design subsequent training. Some thinking needs to go into this to be useful or it would be a pointless evaluation of logistics rather than content.*
- Interactive presentation: *The areas for interactive discussion were minimal, though there was significant improvement in some respect.*
- Take home messages: *It would be better for participants/trainees to reflect on information provided and know what message and action is required of them in either REDD+*

*Safeguards or the FGRM. This serves as good entry points for future engagements by the DSFP or anyone.*

- *Post training reflection: Event training ended with reflections and feedback to the district team. It should continue.*
- *The Slides: The presentations by the resource persons (RSFP, DM and DSFP) were good and their answers to questions/explanations, even richer, except for the presentations being too wordy with few pictures. Pictures and/or videos could have provided better explanation for term such as emissions, greenhouse effect, and even the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism. A simple table could explain the hierarchy, flow, and who reports or addresses grievances.*
- *Facilitation could be greatly improved: Facilitators rarely linked breakdown of topics discussed and make sense of the presentations, provoke responses and ensure the various participants are engaged. Coherency in understanding may not be fully guaranteed as facilitators didn't broadly establish linkages within and among topics discussed.*
- *Clarifying the next steps: The next steps after the trainings did not seem clear to participants in some cases. Participants, besides being ambassadors, need to be clear on what happens next with the implementation of REDD+.*

For purposes of improving subsequent capacity development actions under the REDD+ programme, it is recommended that:

- *If not available, the NRS should liaise with the focal persons at the landscape level to set criteria for selecting stakeholders (participants) for the training. Ensure fair representation of stakeholders including but not limited TAs, Farmers, Women groups, youth groups, private sector, religious leaders, etc. by considering geography of the landscape, existing governance and power structures, interest and gender. The NRS should further follow up and ensure selected participants actually participate in the trainings. , etc.*
- *Focal persons/facilitators should endeavour to provide summary of the training content both at the beginning and end of the training to reinforce participants understanding of the training.*

- *Facilitators should fully develop, prepare and ready their materials for the training workshop in advance i.e. before the delivery time/schedule to enhance the flow of delivery.*
- *There should be a clear action plan for and after each workshop and the way forward (what FC intends to do, highlight specific roles and stakeholders to be concerned with or may be engaged and involved). This will keep participants ready and prepared for next REDD+ programme actions*
- *Make conscious effort to establish/strengthen linkages within and among topics as being discussed i.e. Forest Dependence-Human Activities-Deforestation and Degradation-Climate Change-REDD+-Safeguards-FGRM-etc.*
- *In providing answers to stakeholder concerns, facilitators or focal persons should endeavour to be more receptive and accommodating in addressing stakeholder concern in order not to create the impression that stakeholder suggestions are not worth considering by the FC*
- *Content of training presentations should be tailored to; at least equip and enhance participants understanding of technical jargons to aid trainees in their experience sharing.*
- *Training materials should be made available to serve as reference material for further learning. More especially, a training manual explaining terminologies, local language for key words, providing generic PowerPoint presentation and also providing guidance and tips to trainers on how to convey their content would really facilitate local level trainings. The NRS can link-up with and adapt manuals prepared under the Dedicated Grant Mechanism through Solidaridad, and also Rainforest Alliance.*
- *Before extending REDD+ safeguard training to other parts of the country, there is the need to evaluate uptake of the training lessons at areas/districts where the training was piloted to inform nationwide up-scaling of the training.*

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Considering the importance of forest resources to Ghana's development, coupled with its status, several attempts are being made to secure the forest for sustainable development. Owing to this, the country has committed to several interventions to achieve effective and efficient utilization of its forest resources. Most of such interventions are locally and/or sometimes internationally initiated with the latter gaining more prominence in recent times due to global importance to forest resource use and management. One of such is the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+) mechanism. It embodies some well fashioned-out interventions that seek to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation whilst integrating the role of conservation, sustainable forest management and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

As a pre-requisite for the REDD+ initiative, Ghana systematically pursued key procedural measures. These processes started when Ghana enlisted on the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) i.e. REDD+ Readiness Programme in 2008 during which same period actions were initiated to develop Ghana's REDD+ Strategy. The submission of a Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) and subsequent approval of Ghana's REDD+ Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) in 2010 enabled Ghana to secure funding from the FCPF to support implementation of readiness activities commencing from 2012. Successfully going through the procedural phase demonstrates the country's readiness for the actual execution of the programme, however, as a global initiative, it is required that actual implementation must conform to globally accepted social and environmental standards. One of such is addressing and respecting REDD+ safeguards. REDD+ safeguards specifically outlines structures and procedures that ensure that social and environmental risks emanating from programme actions are minimized, and benefits enhanced.

To this effect and, typical of any new programme intervention that cuts across several sectors coupled innovative implementation strategies, it requires that the capacity of both programme managers, implementers and beneficiaries are developed to a level that guarantees effectiveness and efficiency in implementation. In order to achieve, there is 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. Subsequently, a capacity building programme was organized for selected REDD+ safeguards focal persons who are Forestry Commission's Assistant Regional, District and Park Managers. They are responsible for ensuring safeguards compliance at the regional and district levels.

### **1.1 Structure of Training**

A two-tier training structure with one at the national level and several at the landscape level has been adopted for REDD+ safeguards training. The first training targeted the selected REDD+ Safeguards Focal Persons (SFPs) who are mainly staff of the Forestry Commissions (FC), the other was a Trainer of Trainee's (ToT) session facilitated by the focal persons for Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies (MMDAs), Local communities, Traditional Authorities, CSOs, etc.

The adoption of this structure is based on the understanding that, focal persons must be equipped to extend knowledge, lessons and experiences gained on REDD+ safeguards to wider stakeholders who are not privy to the national level trainings. This is to ensure stakeholders become familiar and offer support for implementing and meeting the safeguards requirements.

#### ***Pre-training activities***

As part of preparations to commence implementation of REDD+ activities, a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) was conducted which produced two key documents; the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF). Ghana's SESA was applied to integrate environmental and social considerations into Ghana's REDD+ readiness process in a manner consistent with Ghana's environmental laws and regulations and the World Bank's Operational Policies. The ESMF outlines training and capacity building needs, appropriate roles and responsibilities, and outline the necessary reporting procedures, for managing and monitoring environmental and social concerns related to project interventions. It also outlines the risks, benefits and mitigation measures to address the identified risks.

In order to implement the provisions in the ESMF, a detailed training plan was developed by some members of the Safeguards sub-working group in 2016. The detailed plan had six (6) training

programmes with unique modules embedded within and, also identified resource persons and participants for the various trainings.

Subsequently, the NRS organized an initial training in February 2017 for all front-line staff of the FC (FSD, WD) on key themes such as Climate Change, REDD+ and Safeguards. After the training, regional and district managers were tasked to select focal persons from their jurisdictions (regions or districts) to be specifically responsible for monitoring and reporting on REDD+ safeguards.

The NRS then identified and selected resources persons and subsequently extended invitation targeting the selected focal persons for safeguards training.

### ***Participants***

The training was attended by all sixty-five (65) REDD + focal persons drawn from all regional and district Forest Services Division (FSD) and Wildlife Division (WD) offices. The participants (focal persons) are assistant Regional, District and Park managers. This was brought to bear in the worth of experiences, comments and questions that enriched discussions during the training sessions. The trainings were facilitated by two resource persons from SAL Consult, one from Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and two others from Y. B. Osafo Legal Services.

### **1.2 Purpose of training**

The training aimed to develop the capacity of SFPs to effectively monitor and report on REDD+ safeguards issues in order to receive results based payments under the REDD+ programme and at the same time meeting all donor safeguards requirements and national environmental laws and regulations.

In more specific terms, the training was to:

- i. enhance focal persons understanding and appreciation of the key safeguard concepts, meaning and value of REDD+ safeguards and their role in managing safeguards
- ii. reinforce focal persons understanding of the REDD+ safeguards indicators and how they can be used to monitor REDD+ interventions, outcomes and impacts on people and the environment.
- iii. equip focal persons with methodologies for collecting relevant information in the monitoring and reporting of REDD+ safeguards.

### ***Expected Results***

It was expected at the end of the training that, participants (REDD+ focal persons):

- i. demonstrate clear understanding and capability to monitor, and report safeguard issues i.e. ensure safeguards compliance;
- ii. have the requisite skill and ability to independently build the capacity and sensitize stakeholders (at the landscape level) on REDD+ safeguards;
- iii. provide responses to critical safeguard questions, such as information needs to monitor REDD+ activities as well as analyses of impacts, and process them for further action taking into consideration when and how? (i.e. timeline for information flow);
- iv. use safeguard monitoring indicators to monitor safeguards compliance;
- v. understand the FGRM modalities and process and are able to effectively receive and address conflicts related to REDD+ implementation.

### **1.3 Scope of Report**

It is worth noting that, this report presents proceedings at the national level safeguard training for REDD+ focal persons held on 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018 at Anita Hotel, Kumasi in the Ashanti region.

## **2.0 TRAINING METHODOLOGY**

### **2.1 Training delivery**

Considering the number of focal persons, their knowledge assimilation capabilities and the need to impart knowledge, several approaches were employed in delivering the training. The multiple training approaches employed were further informed by the content of each subject in scope. Using PowerPoint presentations, the resource persons used instructor-led approach to introduce participants to key safeguard frameworks with a blend of interactions to keep participants engaged and receptive throughout the session.

Employing more interactive training approach in the subsequent sessions, participants in groups brainstormed and discussed case studies making the training sessions easier for both facilitators and participants. There were opportunities for questions and answers after each presentation, comments and discussions, which made the training very interactive.

### **2.2 Training materials**

Participants were given folders which contained pens and notebooks relevant for documenting key lessons from the training. Soft copies of all subjects and topics covered by the training course were also given to participants on USB memory sticks. Certificates of participation were awarded to all participants on the completion of the course.

### **2.3 Training content**

#### ***Course outline***

The training was offered within a three-day period with the intent of enabling participants comprehensively understand REDD+ safeguards issues; steps for systematic monitoring, reporting and grievance redress. Specifically, participants were taken through relevant national and international safeguard policies/ requirements, relevant safeguard instruments (SESA, ESMF, RPF, PF, and PMP). Terms of Reference (TOR) for national/ regional/ district safeguard focal persons and key elements of TOR for Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA). The

training covered other relevant areas such as national environmental assessment procedures, screening of projects/sub-projects, completion of EPA EA registration forms EA 1/ EA 2 as well as modalities for Ghana's Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) as well as indicators for monitoring implementation of REDD+ safeguards.

The broad outlines of the training course were as follows:

- Implementation of Safeguards
  - Overview of safeguards requirement/ background information and key element of each safeguard (WB, CANCEL, AfDB)
  - Linkages and differences among safeguard policies
  - Capacity building for implementing ESMF
  - TOR for safeguard focal persons
  - Key elements of safeguards documents:
    - ESMF
    - RPF
    - PF
    - PMP
    - Key elements of ToR for Regional and District Safeguards Officers
    - Key elements of ToR for ESIA
- Safeguards training for regional and district Officers (National Legal Environment)
  - Relevant Sections of the Constitution
  - Overview of EPA ACT 490
  - Key Elements of the EA Regulations – 1652 of 1999
  - Overview of EIAs
  - Key Elements of Screening Checklist
  - Key Elements of EA Registration Forms EA1 & EA 2
  - Linkages with international Safeguard Arrangements & Policies
  - Implementation of the Safeguards Requirements
- Modalities for Ghana's Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) under REDD+
  - Potential Disputants

- Potential REDD+ Related Conflicts
- FGRM Operational Modalities
  - Step-wise process
  - Flow Chart of operations & Timelines
- Modalities for Ghana's Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) under REDD+ (Legal Advice)
  - Guiding Ideas for FGRM
  - General Features
- REDD+ Safeguards Monitoring

### **3.0 KEY LESSONS/HIGHLIGHTS OF THE COURSE**

#### **3.1 Training proceedings on day 1**

##### **3.1.1 Presentation 1: Implementation of Safeguards (Facilitated by SAL Consult)**

This presentation was done by SAL Consult (the consultancy firm that produced Ghana's REDD+ Safeguards Instruments). Participants were introduced to safeguards by defining it in the context of REDD+. Thereafter key safeguard terminologies were also explained. This set the stage for taking participants through various safeguard policies and their intent.

##### ***Understanding REDD+ Safeguards***

Generally, SFPs noted safeguards in the context of REDD+ 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.

##### ***Overview of REDD+ safeguards***

Ghana among other REDD+ countries have signed onto the REDD+ mechanism to manage and conserve our forest resources while at the same time reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. Ghana has adopted a Country Approach to Safeguards (CAS) and developing a Safeguards Information System (SIS) in partnership with SNV Netherlands development Organization. The country is respecting the Cancun safeguards, World Bank Safeguards (as

Ghana's REDD+ process is funded by the FCPF of the World Bank), as well as other Donor safeguards requirements..

Ghana is respecting the following safeguards:

- Cancun/UNFCCC safeguards
- World Bank safeguards
- Africa Development Bank (AfDB) safeguards
- National safeguards (EPA 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.

- Programme/project actions complement national forest programs and relevant international conventions and agreements
- Transparent and effective national forest governance structures, taking into consideration national sovereignty and legislation
- Respect for the knowledge and right of indigenous people and members of local communities
- Full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders in particular, indigenous people and local communities in programme actions
- Actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forest and biological diversity
- Systematic actions to address the risk of reversals (e.g when cocoa prices are increased, and farmers return to BAU i.e. unsustainable production)
- 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 Safeguard Policy:** The bank attaches much important 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 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)

***Factors that triggered the WB safeguards policy***

*Environmental Assessment-* the bank requires environmental assessment (EA) of projects proposed for the Bank's 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 advises which of the assessment to be done. It was further noted that, though SESA normally goes with ESMF, ESMF can be done without SESA.

*Natural Habitats-* the bank does not support or finance projects that degrade or convert 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 exists 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

### ***Linkages and Differences Between Safeguard Policies and Laws of Ghana***

Participants were made aware of linkages that exist between the laws of Ghana concerning environmental assessment and that of the CANCEL, WB and AfDB, though the reporting format differ. It was further hinted that, in terms of content and intent, not much differences can be identified within and among these laws and policies on safeguards.

This notwithstanding, few differences are typical looking at involuntary resettlement. An example cited compared the scenario where Ghana laws favors prompt payment of compensation for displacements, the WB and AfDB opts for payment prior to any displacement. Again, whereas Ghana offers fair and adequate replacement of lost property, the WB and AfDB offer full replacement of lost property. Other minor areas of differences that are noted included measures dealing with: Vulnerable groups, Information and Consultation of PAPs, Grievances mechanism.

### **Questions/Comments/Discussions**

Below are key questions that were asked by participants and relevant responses provided by resource persons.

Q1. A participant wanted to find out if Ghana has safeguards as a country?

*Ans: It was explained that, Ghana is meeting the World Bank, Cancun, AfDB and our national safeguards (EPA regulations). However, going forward, plans are underway to develop a comprehensive (Ghana Safeguards) which encompasses all these safeguards requirements.*

Q2. Considering the WB safeguard policy on natural habitat, a participant queried if government should implement its one village one dam policy?

*Ans: Responding to this, the resource person indicated that, funds for that initiative are not secured from the bank. Therefore, the banks policy on safeguards cannot be applied and more especially considering the time required for the start of the project. However, the impact of the REDD+ project on that government initiative would come out in the EIA and addressed.*

Q3. A participant noted that, SESA mainly applies to bigger or programs /project of large scale and wanted to find out why it is categories under A or B; thus, project with minimal impact.

*Ans: It explained that, SESA is strategic level of assessment but in categorization, the emphasis is on project actions which more specific and therefore could be categorize as such. The categorization is for project whereas SESA mainly target programmes especially at the national or wider landscape level. Categorization looks more into detail within a landscape.*

Q4. Considering how safeguards policies compensates displaced person, a participant wanted to find out how such persons continuously get fair share of profits (from their earlier businesses) especially when they occupationally displaced?

*Ans: The explanation was that, this can be achieved through engagement and constant monitoring of the actions of such displaced persons. For instances, if a farmer is displaced, there is the need to ensure he/she secures land with same fertility level as his previous for him/her to cope with life. It was further reiterated that, the World Bank's Operational policy on resettlement clearly states that displaced persons (project affected persons) should not be worse off after the resettlement. Therefore, the need for documentation on support offered to such persons for constant monitoring of their wellbeing.*

Q5. Should ungazetted forests dwellers be compensated and resettled, knowing that their occupancy is illegal?

*Ans: The bank policy stipulates that, such people (legal or illegal) should be supported and resettled under the programme intervention. The other option is for the government of Ghana to address such illegal issues before the implementation of the REDD+ programme or else, have to treat them as legal settlers and compensate them if displaced.*

Q5. How are we addressing cocoa expansion into forest noting that it enhances productivity?

*Ans: One core aspect of the project is to minimize or eliminate cocoa expansion into forest reserves. With expansion into the landscape i.e. off reserve, farmers in areas under REDD+ will be trained to adopt improved practices for efficient productivity rather than mere expansion. They will be trained and their capacity built on climate smart cocoa practices so they can intensify and increase cocoa yield within their cocoa farms and not encroach into forest reserves.*

Q6. Are safeguards backed by law(s)?

*Ans: The explanation given was that, as far as Ghana is concerned, there are regulations that backs safeguards. In the same vein, the WB and the AfDB safeguard policies serve as laws for the banks as well as other corporate institutions.*

Q7. Considering the role of FC as the manager of forest reserves in the country, a participant queried if FC will not lose grip of its mandate of conservation and protection of forest reserves if illegally established farmers are compensated and resettled.

*Ans: It was explained that this applied to the programme area (where implementation is underway). Therefore, FC will not lose its mandate in anyway regarding forest protection.*

Q8: What will be implication of Ghana's adoption and use of these multiple safeguards standards?

*It was mentioned that because Ghana is receiving funding/support from these various donors, it is imperative for us to respect and adopt their safeguards in addition to our national safeguards requirements.*

Q9. What should be done if challenges seem impossible to address e.g. community resettlement?

*Ans: In this regard, continuous consultations with the affected persons is key. This will help them understand the sort of impact their activities are contributing to deforestation and forest degradation and for the need to resettle to different areas.*

### ***3.1.2 Presentation 2: Relevant safeguard instruments prepared for REDD+ projects – SESA, ESMF, RPF, PF, and PMP (Facilitated by SAL Consult)***

During this session, participants were taking 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 establish 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.

#### ***ESMF and RPF monitoring indicators and responsibilities***

After taking participant through these two instruments and what they seek to achieve, they were then introduced to ESMF and RPF monitoring indicators, means of verification and key institutions responsible. It was understood that, two main levels of monitoring i.e. ESMF level and

sub-project level exist for which their monitoring issues and indicators as well as responsibilities were shared with participants.

Thereafter, participants were taken through the potential impact issues /concerns by considering the twelve ESMF areas. Each impact area had indicators and means of verification for monitoring purposes.

**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. Participants appreciated the need and urgency to monitor pesticide use and pest issues among project participating farmers, admitted farmers and local communities considering its implications of forest and biodiversity resources. They also conceived that, PMP provides for implementation of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) if serious pest management issues arise, and/or the introduction of sustainable forest management technologies leading to significant increase in the application of pesticides where necessary.

### ***TOR for safeguard Officers***

After taking participant through safeguard frameworks and their key elements as well as impact areas, participants situated themselves in the context of REDD+ safeguard implementation after being made aware of their term of reference as safeguard officers.

Below summaries the TOR for safeguard officers:

#### ***National***

- Main contact person with overall responsibility for action and reporting on Safeguards.
- Liaise with the national safeguards sub-working group to provide direction/ guidance for all safeguard issues.

- Ensure distribution of all safeguards documents/materials to the respective participating regions and districts and other relevant stakeholders.
- Responsible for training or facilitating training of relevant FC staff and other key REDD+ actors/stakeholders.
- Ensure that all environmental and social safeguards issues are incorporated into work programmes, bids and specification documents for all sub project types.
- Ensure that the Regional and District Safeguards Focal Persons understand their roles and carry out their activities as per their TORs.
- Review and clear all safeguards reports submitted by the other Safeguards Focal Persons as input to national safeguards report.
- Liaise with the national safeguards sub-working group to clear all project safeguard reports as input into the national safeguards information system.
- Liaise with the FIP PMU at the MLNR and the FIP Safeguards Consultant to ensure that all safeguard reporting requirements and issues pertaining to the implementation of the FIP interventions are addressed.
- Liaise and collaborate with the national focal person for the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism to ensure that complaints and disputes/conflicts relating to safeguard issues are identified and addressed.
- Identify, coordinate and harmonize all safeguard related deliberations in respect of the national REDD+ processes and other emissions reduction programs by other government agencies and development partners.

#### Regional

- Main contact person with overall responsibility for action and reporting on Safeguards for the region and is to report directly to the NSFP.
- Ensure that all safeguards documents/materials required at the participating forest/Administrative districts and other relevant stakeholders and actors including plantation developers in the region are available.
- Liaise with the District Safeguards Focal Persons to ensure that safeguard teams in the districts understand their roles and carry out their activities as per their ToR.
- Liaise effectively with all other FC frontline staff and other stakeholders in the region.

- Recommend to the NFSP training of identifiable FC frontline staff and other state/private actors in the region.
- Review and clear all safeguards reports submitted by the District Safeguards Focal Persons.
- Compile all the district safeguards reports into a regional safeguard report or as specified by the NSFP for submission to the NSFP.
- Carry out any other safeguard related tasks or activity that may be assigned by the NSFP in the region.
- Liaise and collaborate with the Regional Feedback and Grievance Reporting to ensure that complaints and disputes/conflicts relating to safeguard issues are identified and addressed.

#### District

- Main contact person with overall responsibility for action and reporting on Safeguards for the district.
- Ensure that all safeguards documents or materials required by local safeguard teams, participating CSOs/NGOs, local communities, farmers and plantation developers and other relevant stakeholders to ensure that safeguard issues are addressed are provided.
- Collaborate with relevant district authorities (TAs, DAs etc.), CSOs as well as the FC frontline staff in the district to ensure safeguard issues are taken care of in all FIP activities in the forests, plantations, cocoa farms, and local communities.
- Recommend to the NFSP through the RSFP training of identifiable FC frontline staff and other state/private actors in the district.
- Ensure that local safeguard teams in the districts/local communities understand their roles and carry out their activities as per their ToRs.
- Compile and prepare safeguard reports or information in a format prescribed by the NSFP and submit to the RSFP for review and feedback.
- Perform any other safeguard related activity that may be assigned by the NSFP through RSFP in the district.
- Liaise and collaborate with the District Feedback and Grievance Reporting to ensure that complaints and disputes/conflicts relating to safeguard issues are identified and addressed.

### ***Key Elements of TOR for ESIA***

For participants to have better overview of impact assessment and actions to take, they were further taking through elements of a good ESIA. Key element of TOR of ESIA shared included:

- Description of the proposed project and identification of all activities of environmental/social concern
- Identify the relevant legal and regulatory framework
- Establish existing environmental and socio-economic baseline conditions of the project area of influence;
  - Desktop review
  - Field investigation
- Stakeholder Consultations and Public Involvement
- Determine project area of influence and impact identification
- Recommend Mitigation Measures
- Prepare a Provisional Environmental and Social Management Plan
  - Mitigation Action Plan
  - Monitoring Plan
  - Emergency Response Measures
- Develop a Decommissioning Plan

#### ***3.1.3 Presentation 3: National environmental assessment procedures (Facilitated by EPA)***

Engaging participants in interactive discussion, the resource person took them through environmental assessment procedure by highlighting relevant sections in the constitution of Ghana, overview of EPA ACT 490, key elements of the EA Regulations – 1652 of 1999, overview of EIAs, key elements of screening checklist, key elements of EA registration forms EA1 & EA 2, linkages with international safeguard arrangements & policies as well as safeguard implementation requirements.

#### ***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.

### **Group Exercise 1**

Participants were systematically taking the entire trained on the screening process to equip them with the procedures of assessing project actions and impacts. To have a practical feel of the screening process, participants in groups completed the screening report and the EA1 and EA2 registration forms using case scenarios.

The groups presented their completed assignments i.e. completed EA1 &EA2 forms in plenary session. Though some questions were asked for clarification, participants in general completed the forms to the satisfaction of the resources persons. This notwithstanding, general comments were made to improve completion of the forms. Key among the comments were that:

- When completing the EA 1 or EA2 form, it is appropriate to have one person or entity as the proponent and all others could be key actors and/or stakeholders

- Key features (physical) e.g. should be mentioned in the EA form as the proposed undertaking may impact such features and the vice-versa.
- Avoid unnecessary repetition in titles and description and pay careful attention to details and specifics
- Description of the proposal should be a breakdown of the proposed undertaking, thus what exactly to be done.
- The scope of the undertaking specifically describes what goes into the project and what comes out of it, therefore it should be context specific, accurate and precise
- Site description is a summary of direction and geographic expanse of the place of undertaking i.e. how to get to place of undertaking and how the place looks like.

### **Questions/Comments/Discussions**

Q1. When is the EA1 and EA2 used

*Ans: Theoretically, the EA1 is supposed to be filled before the project is initiated, however they two (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.)*

### **3.2 Training proceedings on day 2**

The second day of the training begun with participants sharing lessons and experiences acquired from the previous day. Each participant shared a unique lesson or experience which depicted general appreciation of issues and further served as reminder to those who might have lost key lessons.

#### ***3.2.1 Presentation 4: Modalities for Ghana's Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) under REDD+ (facilitated by REDD+ Consultant)***

Participants were taken through the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) Operational Modalities. It is pertinent to train the SFPs on FGRM to enable them:

- provide a step by step approach to establish a functional FGRM for the REDD+ Emission Reduction Program areas that makes use of a separate system to produce legally binding outcomes without using the formal court system.
- Develop stepwise, clear guidelines and procedures for the channeling of grievances for REDD+ implementation that also incorporates benchmarks for redressing grievances and resolving conflicts.
- Enhance awareness and technical capacity on REDD+ FGRM for relevant officers at the regional, district and community levels while also creating similar awareness among forest users and other key stakeholders.

After introducing FGRM, the training noted potential disputants that focal persons are likely to be working with. These disputants, as noted are mostly forest users that have access to land and forest resources. Key among them mentioned by participant included:

- timber companies
- farmers
- illegal chain-saw operators
- community leadership (including chiefs and traditional authority)
- forestry staff
- community pressure groups
- district assemblies
- illegal mining or ‘galamsey’ operators and to some extent community-based organizations (CBOs)

The training further highlighted potential REDD+ related conflicts between and among these disputants. Such conflicts were noted to center on tree tenure/ownership, benefit sharing, safeguards, stakeholder consultation and participation, capacity building, resettlement and compensation which FGRM must address.

### ***FGRM operational modalities***

It was explained that, parties seeking any REDD+ dispute resolved would have to file their complaint at the MMDA / 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, to operationalized FGRM, four steps 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 these 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

Summarizing the lesson on FGRM, the resource person tasked participants to extent their capacity and experience to all statutory bodies at the district level e.g. WRC, EPA, CSOs etc. as a form of decentralizing capacity on FGRM.

It was added that the focal persons should pilot and test the FGRM and give feedback on feasibility of the timelines proposed by the consultancy and use other FGRM tools. This is to ascertain how the FGRM is working on the ground and if there is the need for adjustments or modification to inform policy discussions/decisions.

### ***3.2.2 Presentation 5: Legal Advice on FGRM (Facilitated by Y.B Osafo Legal Consult)***

Considering the scope of ADR, a legal perspective on Ghana's FGRM was shared with participants to share their thoughts on possible options to establish strong legal basis for instituting grievance redress mechanism with binding outcomes on conflicting parties aside the normal court system. The resource person indicated challenges such as interminable delays, complexity of the legal proceedings and customs, the lack of privacy; and costs are typical of Ghana's court system; therefore, ineffective in addressing natural resource conflicts. In cases where solutions are reached, is mostly a winner takes all situation further exacerbating conflicts among disputants. therefore, the need to consider other options including FGRM.

The REDD+ FGRM; is an important component of Ghana REDD+ strategy and it demonstrates;

- how Ghana is addressing and respecting the UNFCCC's Cancun safeguards.
- how the country is transparent with its forest governance system;
- the country pursues accessible, responsive and effective mechanism that could produce legally binding and enforceable outcomes

Acknowledging the good intents FGRM offer to REDD+ disputes, it is recommended that it secures a legal backing to make its resolution outcomes more binding on disputants. To achieve this, two main options came out of the consultancy and is highlighted below: :

- Option 1: Amendments to Alternative Dispute Resolution Act, 2010 (Act 798) to cater for natural resource issues

- Option 2: Development of Regulations under Forestry Commission Act 1999 (Act 571) to give the commission the power of adjudication such as that of the labor commission to address conflicts.

### Questions/Comments/Discussions

Q1. A participant wanted to understand if the FC is given the mandate to adjudicate disputes, what will the implication on justice acknowledging the FC is in most cases a party in most conflict scenarios regarding forest resources.

*Ans: The legal advisor explained, acknowledging that concern as a major set-back for the FC to pursue that direction. However, it was suggested that, if the FC is restructured to have an independent commission to handle disputes, it is much better to go for option 2 than 1 which will take a longer period to achieve knowing that, all natural resources are vested in the state in trust for the people. It therefore requires core constitutional amendments for ADR to extent its boundaries to natural resource conflicts.*

### **3.3 Training proceeding on day 3**

The third day of the training began with participants sharing lessons and experiences acquired from the previous day. Each participant shared a unique lesson or experience which depicted general appreciation of issues. There was opportunity for participants to seek clarification on lessons from the previous lessons to which answers were provided by the resource persons which served as reminder to those who might have lost key lessons.

#### **3.3.1 Presentation 5: Safeguards Information System (SIS)-Safeguard Monitoring Indicators**

The resource person took participants through Ghana's REDD+ process and status.

Main highlights were:

- SESA conducted (Uses compound matrix to ensure all activities of various sectors align with each other)
- Scoping Study done in 6 out of the 10 regions of Ghana embracing the following:
  - Economic
  - Socio-cultural
  - Gender

- Natural resources
- Institutional Issues

As a way of formally introducing the training course for the day, participants shared their views and understanding of monitoring and what it entails. The general understanding of monitoring pointed to systematic actions to ensure work progresses as planned towards achieving intended results. To achieve this, a set of indicators must be in place to serve as a measure of progress. In the same vein, indicators are required for monitoring compliance of REDD+ initiatives and key programme elements such as:

- ESMF process
- GCFRP benefit sharing
- Co-benefits
- FGRM

#### ***Criteria for selecting indicators***

Participants were reminded that, for monitoring to be successful and effective, it depends much on the quality of set indicators. Therefore, when selecting indicators, participants should consider the listed criteria:

- Simple, easy to interpret
- Qualitative or quantitative
- Representative and responsive to changes
- Not too much localized but rather national or international in scope

#### ***Type of indicators***

Depending on the environment, indicators may vary. However, key among them are:

- Natural resources
- Economic
- Socio-cultural
- Institutional

#### ***Types of monitoring***

Participants were taking though three main monitoring types with each serving an intended purpose. The common denominator among them and worth considering by participants was to ensure monitoring of safeguards must be transparent and participatory. The main types explained included:

- Baseline Monitoring (Provides information on existing environmental and social conditions)
- Impact Monitoring (Success rate and further determine whether the interventions have resulted in changes and if there is the need for further actions)
- Compliance Monitoring (Ensure that environmental and social protection measures are complied with)

### ***Safeguard Monitoring Challenges***

Though monitoring is designed to be easy and simple when due processes are followed. However, the subject of monitoring sometimes comes with challenges which must be addressed. With focus on REDD+ safeguards, key monitoring challenges shared were:

- Harmonization (different safeguards requirements and country systems and practices that needs to be harmonized for effective monitoring)
- Capacity building (limited funding for developing the capacity of key stakeholders)
- Implementation (paradigm shift; with limited focus on planned actions)
- Data collection (poor and unreliable)
- Complementary safeguard issues

### **Questions/Comments/Discussions**

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. Which stakeholder group(s) can have access to and use monitoring results?

*Ans: It was advised that, when designing and implementing a monitoring protocol, effort must be taken to ensure the result of the monitoring is understandable and usable to stakeholders of concern ranging from the donor, government, policy makers, project beneficiaries among others. In achieving this, it is always important to involve stakeholders from the on-set of the M&E process such that they can contribute and own the process.*

### **Group Exercise 2**

Participants were divided into four groups to work on a plantation development project to be developed within a forest reserve and off-reserve area. They were to identify the main environmental issues (risk and opportunities), main mitigation measures, and indicators that may be used to monitor the plantation development project.

In a plenary session during which groups reported on their assignments, it generally depicted that participants understood how to identify indicators for monitoring safeguards compliance. General comment from the resource person perspective to participants was for them to ensure indicators are more specific; lend themselves for measuring and presented in a format (table) that can be easily appreciated.

### **3.4 Closing Session**

At the end of the course, participants were awarded with certificates for participating in the training. They were again given evaluation forms to assess the training. 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 assignments were limited.

The following were some remarks on the training by participants:

- i. The training course has served as an eye opener; having comprehensive understanding of what REDD+ safeguard concepts and procedures are. We have been imbued with capacity to deal with grievances typical of REDD+ interventions and others programmes as we must appreciate safeguards to provide the means to reduce potential disputes typical of natural resource management and governance.

- 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 inculcate in us the culture of questioning and testing assumptions critical to safeguard issues including information needs to monitor REDD+ activities as well as analysis of impacts.
- 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 thereby, affecting our performance positively.
- v. Learning from the course has revealed that, addressing grievances using FGRM is an ideal case as this prevents us from going through the court system which is time consuming, expensive and has its own complexities.

#### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Participants were satisfied as they perceived the training to be educative and that it would help promote effective and efficient implementation of their projects, more specifically REDD+ actions. They acknowledged safeguards as an integral component of the REDD+ programme and therefore should not be seen as an imposed control by the donor neither is it an optional accessory of the programme. Therefore, the training is useful and important for the successful implementation of Ghana's REDD+ programme.

#### **5.0 WAY FORWARD**

The Climate Change Department (National REDD+ Secretariat) 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 programme. The National REDD+ Secretariat (NRS), focal persons and resource persons agreed on the following:

- focal persons can contact the resource persons for coaching and advice as they develop their trainer of trainee's sessions with their new skills and knowledge for key stakeholder at the landscape level.

- the NRS, focal persons and other stakeholders will jointly explore the possibility of sourcing funding/support for further training and implementation of REDD+ initiatives.
- focal persons were encouraged to join and support their colleagues during landscape level trainings on safeguards for local stakeholders.
- awareness of safeguards issues must be high on the agenda of all actors at all levels
- the gap between safeguards awareness and implementation must be narrowed and this must be pursued by the focal persons.

### **5.1 Next steps and responsibilities:**

#### ***The National REDD+ Secretariat shall:***

- Link up with private sector for collaboration and support for effective implementation of the REDD+ programme.
- Develop proposals to address challenges of the other Emissions Reductions programmes such as the Coastal Mangroves, Transitional and Togo Plateau.
- Provide technical and financial support to focal persons to train key stakeholders on safeguards.
- Maintain contact with focal persons for effective feedback on practical aspects of safeguards mechanisms
- Monitor and ensure focal persons adapt what they have learned to suit their local context

#### ***Focal persons***

- Identify potential actors/stakeholders to form safeguards teams, share safeguards lessons with them to ensure effective monitoring and reporting of safeguards
- 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

## ANNEXES

*Annex I: Training outline*

*To be inserted*

Draft

*Annex II: Training Presentations*

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/wwlxojd7ypq3n2y/AACrxp2UGyL7kBEa2yHw2-kaa?dl=0>

Draft

*Annex III: List of participants*

<b>FOCAL PERSONS/PARTICIPANTS</b>				
<b>NAME</b>	<b>RANK</b>	<b>STATION</b>	<b>TELEPHONE</b>	<b>EMAIL</b>
<b>ASHANTI REGION</b>				
Dickson Agyei Sakyi	ARM	Kumasi	246235700	<a href="mailto:sakyiba2014@gmail.com">sakyiba2014@gmail.com</a>
Emmanuel Agyapong Donkor	ADM	Bekwai	244959543	<a href="mailto:agyapongdonkoremmanuel@yahoo.com">agyapongdonkoremmanuel@yahoo.com</a>
Anthony A. Faibil	Chief Ranger	Mampong	246578971	<a href="mailto:anthonyfaibil@15gmail.com">anthonyfaibil@15gmail.com</a>
Isaac Boamah Amanquah	ADM	Kumawu	202840995	<a href="mailto:isaacba2007@gmail.com">isaacba2007@gmail.com</a>
Dominic A. Oteng	ADM	Juaso	244473483	<a href="mailto:otengdominic90@gmail.com">otengdominic90@gmail.com</a>
Afryie Prince	ADM	Kumawu	248425603	<a href="mailto:nasprex1@gmail.com">nasprex1@gmail.com</a>
Patience Apassnaba	ADM	Kumasi	203401399	<a href="mailto:apassnaba@gmail.com">apassnaba@gmail.com</a>
Richard Antwi	ADM	Mankranso	240133558	<a href="mailto:richardantwi8686@yahoo.com">richardantwi8686@yahoo.com</a>
Nii Kwei Kussachin	ADM	New Edubiase	200122333	<a href="mailto:kweinii@gmail.com">kweinii@gmail.com</a>
Effah F. Adarkwah	ADM	Offinso	246874880	<a href="mailto:frona@yahoo.com">frona@yahoo.com</a>
<b>BRONG AHAFO REGION</b>				
Lucy Amoh Ntim	ARM	Sunyani	277019009	<a href="mailto:lucyamohntim@live.co.uk">lucyamohntim@live.co.uk</a>
Oliver Chelewura	Park Manager	Sunyani	200579502	<a href="mailto:chelwra@yahoo.com">chelwra@yahoo.com</a>
Gideon Yaw Willie	ADM	Kintampo	244138788	<a href="mailto:ozihuuza@yahoo.com">ozihuuza@yahoo.com</a>
Emmanuel Owusu	ADM	Dormaa	208277175	<a href="mailto:nana04gh@yahoo.com">nana04gh@yahoo.com</a>
Adofo Ernest	ADM	Goaso	244819978	<a href="mailto:dofoernestation@yahoo.com">dofoernestation@yahoo.com</a>
Abraham Essel	ADM	Atebubu	548572171	<a href="mailto:abrahamessel@gmail.com">abrahamessel@gmail.com</a>
<b>NORTHERN REGION</b>				
Emmanuel Yeboah	ARM	Tamale	243357138	<a href="mailto:yeboahemmanuel1964@yahoo.com">yeboahemmanuel1964@yahoo.com</a>
Hinne Paul	ADM	Bole	244934324	<a href="mailto:paulhinneh@yahoo.com">paulhinneh@yahoo.com</a>
Stephen Mwuiayelle	DM	Walewale	208888828	<a href="mailto:stephenwiayelle@gmail.com">stephenwiayelle@gmail.com</a>
Charles Ackom	ADM	Biupe	243151911	<a href="mailto:ackom66@gmail.com">ackom66@gmail.com</a>

Festus C. Agya-Yaw	Chief Manager	Mole Np	244993175	<a href="mailto:fcagya@hotmail.com">fcagya@hotmail.com</a>
Yaw Boateng Asante	ADM	Yendi	244801198	<a href="mailto:boatenasante@yahoo.com">boatenasante@yahoo.com</a>
Kofi Cheremeh	DM	Tamale	244474239	<a href="mailto:kcheremeh@gmail.com">kcheremeh@gmail.com</a>
<b>UPPER EAST REGION</b>				
Emmanuel Ntiako	ARM	Bolgatanga	244551230	<a href="mailto:emmanuelntiako@yahoo.co.uk">emmanuelntiako@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Jacob Kabanda	Senior Mgr	Bolga	205333533	<a href="mailto:cy55535@gmail.com">cy55535@gmail.com</a>
Haratius Asano	ADM	Bawku	241423950	<a href="mailto:haratius21@yahoo.com">haratius21@yahoo.com</a>
Prince Gabiel Osei Yeboah	DM	Bolga	244618120	<a href="mailto:sirpogy@gmail.com">sirpogy@gmail.com</a>
Isaac Adom Domfehh	ADM	Navrongo	248723387	<a href="mailto:isaacadodomfeh@gmail.com">isaacadodomfeh@gmail.com</a>
<b>UPPER WEST REGION</b>				
Soyiri Sebastian	ARM	Wa	244836287	<a href="mailto:soyirisebastian@gmail.com">soyirisebastian@gmail.com</a>
Peter M. Andoh	ADM	Tumu	244730892	<a href="mailto:andohpeterm@yahoo.com">andohpeterm@yahoo.com</a>
Isaac Gyekye	ADM	Lawra	244836287	<a href="mailto:isaacgyekye12@gmail.com">isaacgyekye12@gmail.com</a>
<b>GREATER ACCRA REGION</b>				
Samuel Akortia	ARM	Accra	244276801	<a href="mailto:samuelakortiah@gmail.com">samuelakortiah@gmail.com</a>
Linda Kumi- Yeboah	ADM	Accra	246688402	<a href="mailto:tabygirl4@yahoo.com">tabygirl4@yahoo.com</a>
Ohene Wiafe Winifred	ADM	Tema	244626993	<a href="mailto:winniedonkor@yahoo.com">winniedonkor@yahoo.com</a>
<b>EASTERN REGION</b>				
Irene Ewusie Wilson	ARM	Koforidua	244605992	<a href="mailto:ireneewus2010@yahoo.com">ireneewus2010@yahoo.com</a>
Micheal Boakye Amponsah	ADM	Akim Oda	244159299	<a href="mailto:michaelboakye85@yahoo.com">michaelboakye85@yahoo.com</a>
Priscilla Asomani	ADM	Mpraeso	244482450	<a href="mailto:prifasom@yahoo.com">prifasom@yahoo.com</a>
F. N. Abbey	DM	Somanya	244702515	<a href="mailto:superwhiteeagle58@gmail.com">superwhiteeagle58@gmail.com</a>
Kazaare Framan	ADM	Donkorkrom	505379060	<a href="mailto:fkazaare70@gmail.com">fkazaare70@gmail.com</a>
Emmanuel Antwi	ADM	Begoro	243151287	<a href="mailto:nuclearvalency@hotmail.com">nuclearvalency@hotmail.com</a>
Ottopa Francis	ADM	Kade	2442209915	<a href="mailto:ottopafrancis@yahoo.com">ottopafrancis@yahoo.com</a>
<b>CENTRAL REGION</b>				
Joseph Bempah	ARM	Cape Coast	244804624	<a href="mailto:akorabempah@yahoo.com">akorabempah@yahoo.com</a>
Dorothy Dampson	DM	Winneba	244527088	<a href="mailto:ddampson@yahoo.com">ddampson@yahoo.com</a>
Ernestaina Anie	APM	Capecoast	241157685	<a href="mailto:anie.ernestina@yahoo.com">anie.ernestina@yahoo.com</a>

Attah George	ADM	Dunkwa	243986048	<a href="mailto:attageorge791@gmail.com">attageorge791@gmail.com</a>
Gilbert Ampofo	ADM	Assin Fosu	205596969	<a href="mailto:gilbertampofolarley@yahoo.com">gilbertampofolarley@yahoo.com</a>
<b>WESTERN REGION</b>				
Papa Kwaw Qwansah	Snr. Mgr	Takoradi	208911179	<a href="mailto:papakwaw@yahoo.com">papakwaw@yahoo.com</a>
Alice Okyere Dankwah	HRO	Tarkwa	244625315	<a href="mailto:afuanhyirah@yahoo.com">afuanhyirah@yahoo.com</a>
Getrude Agbavitor	FRM	Takoradi	244744781	<a href="mailto:agbavitorgetrude@gmail.com">agbavitorgetrude@gmail.com</a>
Exorm Ametordu E.	Mgr	Takoradi	265039118	<a href="mailto:eaerskine@gmail.com">eaerskine@gmail.com</a>
Ishmael B. Agyemang	ADM	Enchi	249192655	<a href="mailto:iagyemang@gmail.com">iagyemang@gmail.com</a>
Nifaasoyir Chrissantus	ADM	Sefwi Wiawso	243809444	<a href="mailto:chrisantusnifa@yahoo.com">chrisantusnifa@yahoo.com</a>
John Kofi Agyapong	ADM	Asankragwa	246916063	<a href="mailto:johnagyapong9@gmail.com">johnagyapong9@gmail.com</a>
Baba Musa Iddrisu	ADM	Sefwi Juaboso	542266746	<a href="mailto:iddrisubm@gmail.com">iddrisubm@gmail.com</a>
<b>VOLTA REGION</b>				
Kingley Osei Mensah	ARM	Volta	243261932	<a href="mailto:oseimensahfc@yahoo.com">oseimensahfc@yahoo.com</a>
Benjamin Boakye	ADM	Kalakpa	248803958	<a href="mailto:benjamin-boake@rocketmail.com">benjamin-boake@rocketmail.com</a>
I.C.Y Apetorgbor	ARM	Ho	244207296	<a href="mailto:isaacapetorgbor1958@gmail.com">isaacapetorgbor1958@gmail.com</a>
David K. Appiagyei	DM	Nkwanta	244871661	<a href="mailto:app2007gh@yahoo.com">app2007gh@yahoo.com</a>
Selase Paku-Ansah	ADM	Ho	244580929	<a href="mailto:selapaku@gmail.com">selapaku@gmail.com</a>
Alhassan Karim Bukari	ADM	Jasikan	246222711	<a href="mailto:bukari09@yahoo.com">bukari09@yahoo.com</a>

*Annex IV: Photos*

**PICTURES OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE LANDSCAPE LEVEL CAPACITY BUILDING WORKSHOPS**



Cross-section of participants at the REDD+ Safeguards capacity building training - Goaso



Cross-section of participants at the REDD+ Safeguards capacity building training - Nkawie



Cross-section of participants at the REDD+ Safeguards capacity building training - Begoro



Cross-section of participants at the REDD+ Safeguards capacity building training - Juaboso

## *Annex V: Report on REDD+ Safeguards Training at the Landscape Level*

### *Background*

As part of preparation for full scale REDD+ implementation in Ghana, key capacity development initiatives targeting various stakeholders is being pursued. Key among them is training on safeguards mechanisms which among other things seeks to equip stakeholders with requisite knowledge and information on REDD+ safeguards and grievance redress procedures. The intention is for stakeholders (possibly all) to comprehensively understand and make use of requisite procedures for effective implementation of the REDD+ programme. Pursuing this, the National REDD+ Secretariat (NRS) designated and trained staff to serve as regional and district level Safeguards Focal Persons (SFPs) for REDD+ safeguards and the overall programme implementation. These SFPs are Assistant Regional, Assistant District and Assistant Park Managers of the Forestry Commission (FC).

To broaden stakeholder understanding on REDD+ processes and more especially on safeguards issues, the focal persons were tasked to extend and develop capacities of other key stakeholders within their forest districts on REDD+ safeguards. It is against this backdrop that a two-day REDD+ safeguards training was organized for each district-level stakeholders in five (5) selected forest districts in Ghana. The first phase of the trainings were conducted in Juaboso forest district (Western region), Nkawie forest district (Ashanti region), Ho forest district (Volta region), Goaso forest district (Brong Ahafo region) and Begoro forest district (Eastern region). Even though Ho forest district is an outlier and not within the Ghana Cocoa Forest REDD+ Programme (GCFRP) area, it was selected because there are plans to develop an Emissions Reduction Programme (ERP) for the Togo Plateau which has very rich biodiversity that needs to be conserved. Again, there was limited knowledge and capacity building programmes organized for key stakeholders (local communities, traditional authority, etc.) within that area.

Stakeholders targeted for the landscape level training led by the SFPs included Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies (MMDAs), Traditional Authorities (TAs), farmers, private entities, CSOs and local community members. District safeguards focal persons mainly served as trainers whereas some regional focal persons observed and provided support where necessary. Representatives from the NRS facilitated the process whereas individuals from the Safeguards Sub-working Group (mainly CSO) monitored

the training process; provided technical backstopping and recommendations for improving future capacity development actions. The CSO representatives on the Safeguards Sub-working group were invited to provide candid recommendations for future engagements.

Highlights of training sessions embracing lessons shared, questions & answers, discussions, and comments at each district is presented. It is based on the training sessions and experiences shared by the CSO representatives.

### *Report on*

#### **REDD+ Safeguards Training- Nkawie Forest District (Ashanti Region)**

##### *Proceedings at the training*

The training was held on 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 at the Nyinahin (Atwima- Mponua District Assembly Hall) in the Ashanti Region. The first day targeted forty (40) representatives from various MDAs such as Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA), Ghana National Fire Service (GNFS), Ghana Police Service (GPS), Ghana Health Service (GHS), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) among others. The second day targeted sixty-two (62) participants comprising traditional leaders, assembly members, media, farmers, key informants, youth groups, opinion leaders, etc.

Introducing the training, the focal person lamented the trajectory of forest governance and management regimes in Ghana and effects on forest resources. Conflicts between fringe communities and management authorities and lack of concern on the part of communities in forest management were few effects he mentioned. This called for innovative forest governance and management approaches that addresses stakeholder concerns and accrue more benefits to them in a win-win situation. The REDD+ programme therefore seeks to strengthen Ghana's forest governance and management. He further highlighted some negative human activities affecting forest resources including illegal logging, illegal mining, bush fires, extension of farmlands into forested areas, etc. and associated impacts especially on humans and the environment.

Participants were reminded that, it is within their capacity to address forest related challenges as part of attempts to off-set the implications of human actions which leads to climate change, global

warming, among others. The training was therefore purposely to discuss issues on deteriorating forest cover, its implications and remedies to address them with focus on the REDD+ programme.

### ***Key note by DCE***

Present was the District Chief Executive (DCE) of the Atwima-Mponua District who welcomed and thanked participants for making time to participate in the training program. He spoke on the importance of the forest highlighting its provisioning services. Participants were entreated to consider themselves as forest resource owners and therefore should own-up and take responsibility for its management. They were further charged to support efforts to curb illegal logging and mining as part of broad attempts to safeguard the remaining forest reserves. He specifically advised farmers to desist from selling their farm lands to illegal miners as that practice has the potential for causing forest degradation; leading to reduced agricultural productivity, food insecurity and poverty.

### ***Remark by the National REDD+ Secretariat***

From the NRS perspective, forest and its associated resources play important role in our lives. However, the interaction of human actions with the environment has implications on climate change and ecosystems leading to climate change and global warming which has adverse effect on human. As part of attempts to address this, the government of Ghana has entered into some global treatise on sustainable natural resource governance and management. Key among them is the REDD+ programme which seeks to reduce emissions emanating from degradation and deforestation and at the same time enhancing carbon stocks through forest conservation. Though, REDD+ has good intent, it has the potential to exacerbate conflict which has marred forest management. Therefore, the need to share information on REDD+ safeguards and grievance redress procedures. Participants were encouraged to take key lessons from the sessions and further share their experiences with others.

### ***Training sessions***

#### ***Highlights on day 1 & 2***

With participants drawn from various departments of the district assembly and statutory bodies within the landscape on the first day, they were briefed on status of the environment and more

specifically on forest related issues. They were enlightened on the benefits derived from the forest by focusing on the direct and indirect environmental, financial and social benefits with examples drawn to enrich stakeholders' appreciation on the relevance of the forest. The focal person further drew participants' attention to the status of the forest (degraded) and the need for concerted effort to remedy the situation. Similarly, day two participants including traditional authorities, farmers, informants and private businesses were taken through same lessons

The actual training sessions on both days firstly introduced participants to climate change which participants understood it as a prolonged change in weather patterns, which further implicates on humans and the environment. It was further reiterated that, climate change will have more effects and wider implications especially in developing countries. Some drivers, causes and effects were shared by participants.

This paved way for introducing the REDD+ programme as a remedy to the situation. As explained earlier, REDD+ is a mechanism that seeks to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and improve the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests for enhancement of forest carbon stocks. Background information focusing on initiation, history and purpose of REDD+ was provided while at the same time, components of REDD+ (carbon stock enhancement, biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management) were explained in detail. With focus on the cocoa landscape in Ghana, participants were made to understand more sustainable cocoa production systems including intensification, agroforestry, among others. It is intended to support farmers to integrate tree planting into their cocoa farms. Aside its environmental benefits to cocoa and food crop production, the country's timber stock may increase as a result of this intervention.

Participants understood and appreciated the importance and intent of the REDD+ programme but the focal person did not rule out the possible adverse effects of the programme. Therefore, the need for safeguards mechanism to manage such anticipated negative effects. REDD+ Safeguards was then introduced in recognition of the fact that, with the implementation of any programme, no matter its good intent may have or generate some conflicts or misunderstandings which needs to be catered for.

The focal persons guided participants to discuss some possible impacts of the programme and mitigation measures (safeguards) to address such impacts. They were further informed on the

formation of a Safeguards Team for safeguards governance and compliance monitoring. To this effect, Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) was explained with possible source of conflict and conflicting parties identified. Further discussions focused on FGRM procedures, structures and how to lodge complains to get them resolved in a more effective and efficient manner.

### ***Questions & answers***

Que: If a contractor secures a harvesting permit, is it the responsibility of the FC to follow-up and monitor his activities?

*Ans: Staff of the Forestry Commission (FC) are mandated to monitor the operations of contractors from the start of operations to the end and possibly manage the after effects of their operations. It further monitors the commodity chain until it reaches the final consumer or user. (Wood Tracking System)*

Que: Why do some chainsaw lumber crossing security barriers are not arrested?

*Ans: Though chainsaw operation has reduced within the locality, some law enforcers still connive with the illegal operators to maneuver their way out. Therefore, we entreat communities to provide information on illegalities to enable the FC arrest and prosecute them.*

Que: Can individuals cause arrest of illegal chainsaw operators?

*Ans: Yes, the FC provides incentives to individuals and communities who are able to report and arrest illegal chainsaw operators.*

Que: Can we plant cocoa in the forest (with trees) because government is encouraging us to plant trees in our own farms?

*Ans: It was clearly explained that cocoa is not forest and Ghana has a forest definition (1ha of forest, tree canopy of 15% and tree height 5m). Farmers are encouraged to plant trees on their cocoa farms in order to have benefits such as increased yields. Without trees on farms (sun loving cocoa myth), our cocoa system will not be able to produce and support cocoa production in the near future.*

Que: At what stage do the FC involve communities in allocation of permits as there are concerns of non-involvement of communities/locals in such dealings?

*Ans: It was explained that, the allocation of permits begins from the field and it required farmers or communities consent before a concession can be allocated to a contractor.*

Que: Can you update us on contractors who are working within the area and their types of permits for communities to monitor their operations i.e. expired marks?

*Ans: All marks have single expiry date June 30 for renewal, and December 31<sup>st</sup>. meaning it should be renewed twice a year therefore can't be worked with if it has expired.*

Que: What is the security guarantee for informants who report illegal activities?

*Ans: As much as possible, the identity of informants is protected. There is the possibility that, illegal operators target informants based on suspicion and speculations. Informants were asked to also remain anonymous in their operations and in their conversations.*

Que: What is the difference between a concession on farmland and on a forest land?

*Ans: There is no longer concessions in Ghana. What exist is timber utilization contract for a maximum of five years, subject to two years renewal on forest. In off-reserves, salvage permits are issued.*

Que: Do contractors have the right to arrest illegal operators?

*Ans: Yes, or they pay for the penalty if any illegality is reported within the compartments of operations.*

Que: If an illegal operator extracts timber from an allocated concession, who pays for the penalty in terms of over extraction of timber?

*Ans: It is the responsibility of the contractor to protect his/her compartment.*

Que: Who has custody of documents on tree plantation

*Ans: In a Private-Public Partnership (PPP) agreement on plantation, the documentation goes to the stool land owner.*

Que: Where do communities collect their benefit (money) from timber extracted in Modified Taungya System (MTS) areas?

*Ans: From Forestry*

Que: Are canoe cavers made to pay SRAs?

*Ans: It is the responsibility of the TUC holder sublease to canoe cavers big trees to use if only it has been approved for harvesting by the FC. However, some do carve without permit but if identified, it is auctioned as illegal lumber or timber.*

Que: How do we do with chiefs who connive with contractors to perpetrate illegalities?

*Ans: Report such activities to higher authority (FC) for further action or engage opinion leaders to resolve the situation.*

Que: What benefit do communities stand to gain from auctioning of confiscated lumber or logs?

*Ans: Communities have no benefit from auction trees or confiscated lumber. The returns go to government coffers, therefore, the need to curb illegal logging so communities can benefit from legally sources trees in the form of SRA.*

### ***Outcomes***

The training as remarked by participants is an epitome for ensuring inclusive and participatory governance of forest resources through capacity development. Participants for the first time prepared and acknowledged being part of REDD+ planning and implementation process. They attested to their renewed capacity and interest in supporting REDD+ actions in the district by playing their expected roles and responsibilities.

### ***Way forward***

Participants were entreated to share their experiences and lessons from the training within the cycles and among their close associates. Various departmental heads of the district assembly and other statutory bodies promised to use assembly meetings to share their experience with others. Focal person and key stakeholders with the support of the NRS to institute FGRM governance structures at the landscape level for effective REDD+ implementation.

***Observations and recommendation for improving future REDD+ training at the Nkawie forest district***

- *To achieve the intent of future trainings, the NRS should develop or prepare a tailor-made training (content focused and specific) i.e. a prototype in PPT for the safeguard focal persons to adapt and use in delivering their local trainings.*
  - *The training should as much as possible follow the proposed content outline to make delivery and assimilation of issues more systematic, coherent and consistent.*
  - *Make use of more pictorial and/or demonstrations in the training delivery to enhance or for easy understanding (PPT, Flip Chats, etc.)*
  - *Make available training materials for participants for easy referencing*
- *In delivering the training:*
  - *facilitators should remain focused on the content and purpose of the meeting rather than using the opportunity to address broader sector issues as this has the potential to shift attention of participants; possibility of losing-out on the anticipated outcomes of the training.*
  - *ensure that personnel assigned from the NRS to support the training at the local level (with community reps) is conversant and fluent with the medium/language of instruction to ensure better explanation and understanding of technical issues.*
  - *effectively plan and properly coordinate aspects of training to be delivered (by who and when) to enhance the flow of training process.*
  - *adopt a more participatory and participant involvement (consider gender perspectives) approach in the training workshop, and facilitators should endeavour to be more innovative to actively engage participants and move them along the training.*

**List of participants**

*Day 1*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Institution/Location</b>
Joseph Dapaah	Chief Linguist	Barniekrom
Joseph Asante	Rapporteur	Tropenbos Ghana
HON. Kofi Sarpong	Assemblyman	Chisayaalo
Nana Kwame Manu	Chief	Barniekrom
Tawiah	Chief	Serebuoso
Thomas Owusu	Okyeame	Serebuoso
HON.Aambo	Assemblyman	Serebuoso
Nana Kyeremateng Ababio	Chief	Adumasa
Nana Kwadwo Donkor	Akwamuhene	Adumasa
Kwaku Boakye	chairman unit	Adumasa
Paul.K. Badu	Akwamuhene	Abobotefekuo
Nana Kobi	Chief	Bontrampa
Sulley Isaka	chairman unit	Akantansu
Akwasi Aboagye	Chief Farmer	Akantansu
Alex Samfo	ChairmanTongo	Nyinahin
Takyi Di-graff	Chairman unit.com	Akofaa
Paul Obeng Agyemang	Kyidomhene	Akanfansu
Emmanuel.K-Danyu	Chairman unit .com	Nagole
Owusu Manfiri	Opumusu leader	Namsaumunse
Hon. Anthony osei	Assemblyman	Aduima Takoradi
Peter Dwomfour	Chief	Akanfansu
Osei Kwadwo (Hon.	District Assembly. NADMO Dir.	Nyinahin
Okyeame Nimo	Okyeame	Nyinahin
Nana Oti Boduah	Akwamuhene	Nyinahin
Nana Doku	Chief	Akofaa
Kingsley Azuma	Tongya Headman	Akanfansu
Francis Nkrumah	Information( Assembly)	Assembly
Kwabena Awuah	DPO/ Planning Officer	AMDA
Nana Appiah Kubi	Chief	Nagooiley
Appiah Frank	Linguist	Nagooiley
Osei Owusu	Chief	Baakoriaba
Nana Kwaku Bobie	Chairman Unit.com	Nyinahin
Joyce Ellen Amoah	Assembly member	Nyinahin
Kofi Adu	Tongya Headman	Chirayaaso
Yaw Krah	Chairman Unit.com	Chirayaaso
Dankwah Sampson	Assemblyman	Abobofekuso
Hon. William Duodu	DCE	Atwima Mponua
Afia Ataa Sefaah Bekoe	Acct Forestry Nkawie	Nkawie

Rachel O. Banahene	FSD.Nkawie	Nkawie
Bridget Mensah	Attachment FSD	Nkawie
Mavis Serwah	FSD.Nkawie	Nkawie
Mensah Georgina	FSD.Nkawie	Nkawie
Jephthah Kwame Sarfo	Information Service	Nyinahin
Richard Adjei Benfo	FSD.(Administration )	Nkawie
Enoch Owusu Boateng	F.S.D (Range manager)	Nkawie
Kwasi Nimoh	Farmer	Atraso
Hon.Baba Yaro	Assemblymember	Nyinahin
Ofori Manu	Opinion Leader	Atraso
Alhaji Mohammed	Chief farmer	Nyinahin
Salifu Kankam	Chief farmer	Nyinahin
Adubofour Kofi	Unit Committee	Atraso
Samuel N. Appiah	Range manager (F.S.D)	Nyinahin
Mohammed ABASS	DISTRICT ENGINEER	Nyinahin
Bernard Bekoe	Media	GNA

Day 2

NAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE	E-MAIL
Asante Joseph	Tropenbos Ghana	543852742	<a href="mailto:kotokoa94@yahoo.com">kotokoa94@yahoo.com</a>
Mercy O. Ansah	Tropenbos Ghana	208252799	<a href="mailto:mercyouwusuansah@yahoo.com">mercyouwusuansah@yahoo.com</a>
Philip Adakah. Akumah	Immigration	242549882	<a href="mailto:Bonesbally@yahoo.com">Bonesbally@yahoo.com</a>
Obeng Gyamfi Isaac	FSD	244432105	Obengyamfi. ike874@gmail.com
Richard O. Amoateng	FSD	243689180	<a href="mailto:amoateng2@yahoo.com">amoateng2@yahoo.com</a>
Enoch Owusu Boateng	FSD	208446297	<a href="mailto:pinocchios@yahoo.com">pinocchios@yahoo.com</a>
Samuel K Asumadu	FSD	547237127	<a href="mailto:samuelasumadu74@yahoo.com">samuelasumadu74@yahoo.com</a>
Edward Nyawaah	FSD	243462897	<a href="mailto:eddynyawaah@yahoo.com">eddynyawaah@yahoo.com</a>
Samuel Owusu Mensah	DPO	208157834	atromampoma2004yahoo.com
Richard Adjei Benah	FSD	243370860	<a href="mailto:efobubenfro@yahoo.com">efobubenfro@yahoo.com</a>
Andrews O Bediako	Fire service	244245932	<a href="mailto:owubadi@yahoo.com">owubadi@yahoo.com</a>
Jephthah Kwame Sarfo	Information service	264186134	<a href="mailto:sirjeph@yahoo.com">sirjeph@yahoo.com</a>
Amuzu Yaw Prince	Dept Agric	244029711	<a href="mailto:amuzuprince96@gmail.com">amuzuprince96@gmail.com</a>
Nana Poku Bosompin	FSD	243343516	<a href="mailto:nanabosompim@yahoo.com">nanabosompim@yahoo.com</a>
Rachel O Banahene	FSD	241818070	<a href="mailto:rachaelawaa@yahoo.com">rachaelawaa@yahoo.com</a>
Mavis Afriyie	FSD	548037162	
Mohammed Abass	Dist.ENG.	205133629	<a href="mailto:abass.mohammed@yahoo.com">abass.mohammed@yahoo.com</a>
Afia Ataa Sefaah Bekoe	Acct FSD Nkawie	244572109	<a href="mailto:asefaahbekoe@gmail.com">asefaahbekoe@gmail.com</a>
Henry Osei Boateng	GES	201489703	<a href="mailto:amdeo2004@yahoo.com">amdeo2004@yahoo.com</a>
Samuel. N. Appoh	FSD	207449401	
Richard Amoah	AMADA	554038874	<a href="mailto:amoah63@yahoo.com">amoah63@yahoo.com</a>
Mensah K. Georgina	FSD	553113574	<a href="mailto:karikarigeorgina@24gmail.com">karikarigeorgina@24gmail.com</a>

Prince Takyi Boampong	Nyinahin court	247554779	takyiprince8gmail.com
John Owusu	N U	556202939	N
Kwabena Ansah	Planning unit	208478599	<a href="mailto:rasobvr@gmail.com">rasobvr@gmail.com</a>
Hon.Abdul Moro	Youth employment	2492440762	
Paul Obeng Agyemang	NADMO Coordinator	502865121	
Yaw Kyeremeh	District Assembly Driver	542589553	
Osei Kwadwo	NADMO	249917922	
Jamilatu Issah	District Assembly Internal Auditor	242071428	<a href="mailto:issahjamilatu@yahoo.com">issahjamilatu@yahoo.com</a>
Harrison Atiwoto	stool lands	245720727	<a href="mailto:basanhayford@gmail.com">basanhayford@gmail.com</a>
Owusu Ansah Collin	Social Welfare	505198981	<a href="mailto:kwadwowusu99@gmail.com">kwadwowusu99@gmail.com</a>
Mary Owusu	Non-formal	242373803	<a href="mailto:maryowusu46@gmail.com">maryowusu46@gmail.com</a>
Akubia Churchill	Cocobod	24427598	<a href="mailto:churchillakub@gmail.com">churchillakub@gmail.com</a>
Felix Baidoo	POLICE	240269014	<a href="mailto:felixbaidoo1975@gmail.com">felixbaidoo1975@gmail.com</a>
Oforiwah Adelaide	District Assembly Procurement	247024565	<a href="mailto:adelo248888@yahoo.com">adelo248888@yahoo.com</a>
Eugene Frimpong	District Assembly HR unit	2422223903	<a href="mailto:eugene400@yahoo.com">eugene400@yahoo.com</a>
Emmanuel Tulasi	Revenue Head	243912060	
Francisca A.Tawia	Environmental	242833292	

## *Report on*

### **REDD+ Safeguards Training- Begoro Forest District (Eastern Region)**

#### *Workshop proceedings*

The training was held on 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 at Begoro (FSD Conference Room) in the Eastern region. Day 1 of the training targeted thirty (30) representatives from various MDAS. Day 2 targeted thirty-six (36) participants including traditional leaders, assembly members, media, farmers, informants, youth groups and opinion leaders.

#### *Welcome address by the District forest manager*

Welcoming participants to the actual training on both days, the district forest manager appreciated them for devoting time for the training. Participants were subsequently reminded of the importance of forest, their role in addressing forest related challenges which has implications on climate change, global warming, among others which adversely affects human life and the wider environment. Therefore, the need for well thought-out strategies to secure them of which the REDD+ seeks to contribute to. Recognizing the variations and multiplicity of stakeholders who will affect and/or be affected by REDD+ intervention, he lamented on the need for developing stakeholders' capacity to adopt due process as a leverage for protection against negative programme impacts. He explained that, safeguards measures are common practice to cater for anticipated impacts emanating from any intervention. The intention is that; interventions do not leave negative imprints or do not make people worse off. Therefore, the need to share and imbue stakeholders with lessons on processes for REDD+ implementation with focus on safeguards measures and grievance redress mechanisms.

He further used the opportunity to explain safeguards in relation to forest and other sectors. He was hopeful that the workshop will provide a better understanding to participants on climate change and what the REDD+ programme seeks to achieve. He entreated participants to express their views, concerns and ask questions to ensure that the programme is a success.

#### *Training sessions*

##### *Highlights on day 1 & 2*

Participants just after self-introduction shared their expectations of the training program which included the need to know the actual problem REDD+ intends to solve, have knowledge about REDD+ to share with others, know the role of stakeholders in safeguarding our forest, gain in-depth knowledge on REDD+ and to have capacity to disseminate information on REDD+ processes with other stakeholders.

A brief on the condition of Ghana's environment and more specifically on forest within the landscape was shared by participants. Their perspective pointed to a deteriorating forest condition within the area mainly driven by human actions. Situating the discussions in perspective, the focal person offered a historical overview by indicating that, Ghana had abundant forest resources with rich biodiversity. But over the past few years, there has been a dramatic depletion in quality and quantity in the once resource (flora and fauna) rich country. Participants were further enlightened on benefits derived from the forest by focusing on environmental, financial and social benefits and the consequence of losing such benefits. The second day was dedicated to participants including traditional authorities, farmers, informants and private businesses through same lessons and experience sharing on status and benefits of forest.

The actual training sessions on both days firstly introduced participants to climate change which participants understood it as a prolonged change in weather patterns, which further implicates on humans and the environment. Participants mentioned some local actions contributing to climate change such as illegal logging and mining, bushfires, agricultural expansion and others. Natural phenomenon was not ruled out however not predominant in our part of the world compared to human induced actions. The effects of climate change on humans and biodiversity in general was shared. This drew participants' attention to the urgent need to remedy the situation with support from interventions such as the REDD+. This paved way for introducing the REDD+ programme as a remedy to the situation. As explained, it basically seeks to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and improve the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests for enhancement of forest carbon stocks. Background information focusing on initiation, history and purpose of REDD+ was provided while at the same time, components of REDD+ (carbon stock enhancement, biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management) were explained in detail. With focus on cocoa landscape in Ghana, participants were made to understand more sustainable cocoa production systems including intensification, agroforestry, among others. It is

intended to support farmers to integrate tree planting into their cocoa farms. Aside its environmental benefits to cocoa and food crop production, the country's timber stock may increase as a result of this intervention.

Participants understood and appreciated the importance and intent of the REDD+ programme but the focal person did not rule out the possibility adverse effects. This he mentioned could be ascertained through procedures such as Environmental Impact Assessment, Strategic Environmental Assessment, etc. For the REDD+, these basically assessed the impact of the undertaking to plan remedies for them. The intention is to ensure REDD+ actions are safe and sound, and where negative impacts are anticipated, the need for safeguard mechanism to manage such anticipated negative effects. REDD+ Safeguards was introduced in recognition of the fact that, with the implementation of any programme, no matter its good intent may have or generate some conflicts or misunderstandings which needs to be catered for.

The focal persons guided participants to discuss some possible impacts of the programme and mitigation measures (safeguards) to address such impacts. They were further informed on the formation of a Safeguards Team for safeguards governance and compliance monitoring. To this effect, Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) was explained with possible source of conflict and conflicting parties identified. Further discussions focused on FGRM procedures, structures and how to lodge complains to get them resolved in a more effective and efficient manner.

### ***Questions & Answers***

Questions & Answers:

Que: Will REDD+ money be shared to stakeholders?

*Ans: Support for the REDD+ programme will be used for rolling-out the programme activities mainly focusing on capacity development, awareness creation and others. Aside this, individual farmers and communities will benefit from PES, tree benefit sharing (which is performance based). Focus is on non-carbon benefits such as increase yield, which are more sustainable than carbon (cash) benefits. The expectations of participants were managed to prevent them from thinking that there is money going to be shared among stakeholders.*

Que: Farmers will be involved in the programme, is the REDD+ for the Fantakwa district alone?

*Ans: It was responded that, REDD+ is a national programme but the initiatives are geographic specific i.e. on cocoa in the high forest zone, charcoal in the north and the transitions zone, etc. These programs are based on commodities that drive deforestation and forest degradation.*

Que: Do we have to tilt our actions towards the financial or monetary benefits we will get from the REDD+ programme?

*Ans: As explained earlier. The focus is on the non-monetary aspects of REDD+ that are sustainable.*

Que: What is the conservation of carbon stock?

*Ans: Carbon is an important element in plant photosynthesis and therefore stored in plants. When trees are fell/cut down, the carbon stored in them are released into the atmosphere. The excess carbon leads to depletion of the ozone layer which subsequently causes climate change. Therefore, it is important to keep our forest standing which conserves the carbon in the trees and thereby conserving and increasing our carbon stocks.*

Que: What are being put in place to ensure members of the FGRM team who are sometimes parties to conflicts are managed?

*Ans: It was agreed that sometimes conflict may arise between communities and FC officials and this may be a conflict of interest. Therefore, the aggrieved person is required to lodge the complaint in the presence of a witness. All grievamnces will be mediated upon and if not resolved a 5- member panel of arbitrators will be formed to resolve the dispute.*

Que: Can the fire service play a role in curbing forest fires?

*Ans: Some forest districts engage the fire service to help fight forest fires. The FC has also trained fire volunteers, but the number of personnel is limited. It was recommended that, such fire volunteers should be engaged only within the period during which the fires are prevalent or likely to occur.*

Que: What can TAs do to curb illegal forest activities

*Ans: The TA will liaise with the FSD to implement customary laws to fight the menace*

### ***Reflection on the training***

At the end of the training, the facilitator guided participants to reflect on lessons from the training proceedings. Through the reflection, stakeholders present shared lessons gained and further identified their relevance to the success of the REDD+ programme. Key commitments by participants included sharing training lessons with others and their willingness to contribute their quota to the successful implementation of the REDD+ programme.

### ***Observations and recommendation for Improving future REDD+ Training at the Begoro forest district***

- *Stakeholder representation (participants) not broad considering the geographic coverage of the forest district*
- *Though facilitators demonstrated understanding of the topics, the delivery of the training portrayed as if preparation for the delivery was not done in advance i.e. before the workshop leading to minor breaks in delivery*
- *Lack of clear actions on way forward after the training; participants uncertain about next steps*
- *Coherency in understanding not fully guaranteed as facilitators didn't fully establish linkages within and among topics discussed*

### ***Recommendations***

- *If not available, the NRS should liaise with the focal persons at the landscape level to set criteria for selecting stakeholders (participants) for the training. Ensure fair representation of stakeholders including but not limited to TAs, Farmers, Women groups, youth groups, private sector, religious leaders, etc. Consider the geography of the forest district in selecting participants.*
- *Facilitators should fully develop and prepare for the training workshop in advance before the delivery time/schedule*
- *There should be a clear action plan for each workshop and the way forward. This will keep participants ready and prepared for next programme actions*
- *Make conscious effort to establish linkages within and among topics as being discussed i.e. Deforestation and Degradation-Climate Change-REDD+-Safeguards-FGRM-etc.*

- *In providing answers to stakeholder concerns, facilitators should endeavour to be more receptive and moderate in addressing stakeholder concern in order not to create the impression that the FC is not welcoming, or stakeholder suggestions are not worth considering*
- *At the start of the workshop, a clear outline and content of the training should be made known to participants*

Draft

*List of Participants*

Day 1

Day 2

Draft

## *Report on*

### **REDD+ Safeguards Training- Juaboso Forest District (Western Region)**

#### *Workshop proceedings*

To prepare stakeholders for effective implementation of the REDD+ programme, the National REDD+ Secretariat (NRS) initiated capacity building activities on REDD+ safeguards for key stakeholders in some selected districts. One of such was safeguards training for stakeholders in the Juaboso Forest District in the Western region. The training was held on 24<sup>th</sup> & 25<sup>th</sup> April 2018 at Juaboso (Ghana Education Service Conference Room). The purpose was to share and imbue stakeholders with lessons on processes for REDD+ implementation with focus on safeguard measures and grievance redress mechanisms. Stakeholders targeted for the training on day 1 included twenty (20) representatives from MDAs. Day 2 targeted fifty-three (53) participants who were Traditional Authorities, Farmers, CSOs, local community members, etc.

The district safeguards focal persons served as trainers whereas a representative from IUCN Ghana (CSO representative on the Safeguards Sub-working group) acted as co-facilitate and observer of the training programme.

#### *Training sessions*

##### *Highlight of day 1 & 2*

Starting the training on each day, the facilitator led participants to share their perspectives on deforestation and forest degradation within the landscape. It was generally pointed out that, deforestation connotes cutting down of trees without replacing them, thus ultimately changing the land use type whereas degradation was explained as the reduction in quality of the forest. It was mentioned that these have implications on climate change which invariably impacts human actions. Drivers of deforestation and forest degradation mentioned included agriculture expansion, population increases, and migration which contributes to illegalities, thus logging and mining, forest encroachment, bush fires, etc.

From these revelations, participants' attention was drawn to the fact that, drivers and causes of deforestation mentioned are mainly human induced and therefore, it is within the remits of all stakeholders to reduce their negative imprints on the environment and more specifically on forest.

In furtherance to this, some actions to help remedy the situation was mentioned including the REDD+ programme. Quite an unfamiliar term among participants. The focal person however explained it as a mechanism for reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation as well as conservation of carbon stocks. It was hinted that, REDD+ is a global effort to mitigate climate change with the hope of mobilizing resources for local socio-economic development. As an incentive approach to reward receiving counties to protect and sustainably manage their forest resources, participants appreciated REDD+ intent and their responsibility to contribute to its success. Key components of the Ghana REDD+ programme and target location for implementation including the Cocoa Forest Programme were further explained to participants.

By consent, participants understood and appreciated the intent of the REDD+ programme and its importance to forest resource management. This notwithstanding, the focal person hinted of possibility of the programme to have negative imprints on livelihoods and the environment. Such negative effects he lamented are typical of major undertakings and can be ascertained through procedures such as Environmental Impact Assessment, Strategic Environmental Assessment, Impact Monitoring, etc.

Narrowing down on the REDD+ programme, some anticipated adverse effects of the programme on livelihoods, settlements, tenure issues for which remedies, thus safeguards mechanisms planned for them were shared with participants. The intention is to ensure REDD+ actions are safe and sound, and where negative impacts are anticipated, the need for safeguard mechanism to manage such anticipated negative effects. REDD+ Safeguards was introduced in recognition of the fact that, the implementation of the programme must conform to globally and locally accepted standards in dealing with people likely to be affected negatively, such that they are not worse-off because of the programme.

The focal persons guided participants to thoroughly discuss some possible impacts of the programme and mitigation measures (safeguards) to address such impacts. They were further informed on the formation of a Safeguards Team for safeguards governance and compliance monitoring. To this effect, Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) was explained with possible source of conflict and conflicting parties identified. Further discussions focused on FGRM procedures, structures and how to lodge complains to get them resolved in a more effective and efficient manner.

### ***Questions/comments and answers***

Que: Will REDD+ build on or ignore existing forest resource governance and management structures?

*Ans: REDD+ seeks to strengthen and make use of already existing governance platforms such the CREMAs, TAs and others to achieve sustainable forest management. This will ensure inclusiveness in the REDD+ process to effectively and efficiently deliver on its intent; thus sustainable forest management.*

Que: How is the REDD+ programme different from management role of forest resources by the Forestry Commission?

*Ans: REDD+ is not any new forest management structure but a well-thought-out arrangement to strengthen forest governance structures and practices for sustainable resource use. The FC as part of its core mandate already engages in conservation, sustainable forest management practices even before the REDD+ mechanism started.*

Que: How will the NRS ensure community level stakeholders effectively contribute and benefit from the REDD+ programme?

*Ans: It was explained that, capacity development for stakeholder's is core to the implementation of the programme. Capacity gaps will be identified and filled. Requisite structures and resources (technical and financial) will be made available for stakeholders to fully take advantage of and realise the full potential of the programme.*

### ***Conclusion and way forward***

The training sessions ended successfully with participants sharing insights from the training on both days. They were reminded that, the training, aside its capacity development purpose was to foster cordial relationship among stakeholders; therefore, participants were tasked to remain resolute for further engagements in the implementation of the REDD+ programme.

***Observations and recommendation for improving future REDD+ training at the Juaboso forest district***

The observations and recommendations were based on content and delivery of the presentations as well as the use of audio-visuals.

- *Content of Presentation: The presentation was very well structured and included a lot of pictures and a video to provide vivid and easy-to-follow explanation of climate change. The presentation covered every detail outlined in the training guide.*
- *Use of Audio-Visuals: The focal person had clear slides with right level of detail of information per slide. Pictures and videos were vivid.*
- *Delivery: The focal person had very good understating of the topics and was very confident in his delivery. He made the training very interactive by asking participants lots of questions. This made the program very lively and ensured that participants were very attentive, involved and vocal throughout the training. All the terminologies were clearly explained, and numerous examples were given to ensure that the participants fully understood the concepts. All questions were well addressed to the satisfaction of the participants.*

### **Recommendations**

- *Development of a Training Manual: A training manual which clearly explains REDD+ safeguards terminologies and processes in simple English language would be very helpful for continual learning by the target groups.*
- *Gender Inclusiveness at trainings: During the first day of the training which targeted the MDAs, there were no women participants. Such a trend should not recur in future training programmes as women have integral role to play to ensure that safeguards are addressed and respected during REDD+ implementation.*
- *Monitoring and Evaluation: It is very important to monitor and evaluate the uptake of the training lessons at areas/districts where the training was piloted prior to nationwide up-scaling of the training.*

*List of participants*

Day1

Draft

Day 2

<b>Name</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Position</b>
Tano Alex Nelson	Farmer	Farmer
Martha Mensah	Farmer	Farmer
Nsiah Ebenezer	Hope Alive 360	Member
Assuah James	Watershed	Member
Saidu Abdulai	Watershed	Work gang leader
Tandoh John Lee	Watershed	Work gang leader
Amoah Seth	Watershed	Work gang leader
Thomes D. K. Nkuah	Seed	Leader
Enoch Gyamfi	Seed	Leader
Richard Aduhene	Enrichment Rep	Leader
Elliot Mensah Stephen	Conservation Allowance	Project coordinator
Gladys Ataa	Nursery	Operator
Daniel Nkuah Asante	Nursery	Operator
Nana Affum Panyie II	Boinzain	Chief
Nana Aboyaa	Mantukwa	Chief
Seth Nkrumah	Farmer	Farmer
Gordan Gyasi	Farmer	Farmer
Timothy	De-beat FM	Reporter
Ofosehene Apenteng	Forestry	R/S
Desmond Evans	Watershed	Director
John Bismark Okyere		Chairman
Paulina Armah	Farmer	Farmer
Johnson Mensah	Farmer	
John Mensah	De-beat FM	Reporter
Nana Nketiah	Farmer	Chief
Nana Gyabeng	Farmer	Chief
Stephen A. Duah	FSD	ADM
Baafi Frimpong	FSD	ADM
Kwame Bomassoh	GBC	
Hanson Asamoah	FSD	
Nana Twumasi		
Kingford Amoako		
Nana Yeboah	Abrakofe	Chief
Nana Adu Yaw II		Chief
Nana kwasi Bennie II		Chief
Afukaah Kwaku Timbers		Chief
Yaw Twum	FSD	Chief ranger
Ahmed Ibrahim	Farmer	Rep
Kusi Cletus	FSD	R/S
Boah Augustine	Rainbow FM	Reporter
Ransford Nkurmah	FSD	R/S
Patrick A. Adjare	FSD	FRM
Baawaah J. Augustine	FSD	Carto
Abugri Daniel	Akwaa	Reporter
Stephen Appiah		
Baba Musa Iddinsu	FSD	ADM

Yaw Baafi	Tropenbos	Driver
Abdallah Seidu Ali	FSD	DM
Yaw Mensah		Chief
Nana Kofi Adinkra	Carpenter	Leader
Nana Yaw Gyabeng	T.A	Chief
Bright Abegko	FSD	NSP
Mensah Richmond	FSD	NSP

Draft

## *Report on*

### **REDD+ Safeguards Training- Ho Forest District-Western Region**

#### *Workshop proceedings*

The training was held on 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 at Ho FSD conference room. There were eighteen (18) participants for day 1 drawn from MDAs. The second day had thirty (30) participants who were Traditional Authorities (TAs), landowners, and forest-dependent communities, chiefs, sub-chiefs, opinion leaders, queen mothers, local community, etc. The purpose of the workshop was to raise awareness of the REDD+ Programme with focus on Safeguard issues to encourage prepare stakeholders effectively participate in the implementation of the programme.

#### *Training Sessions*

##### *Highlights of day 1&2*

Each day of the training had two sessions (morning and afternoon). Setting the stage for training, participants shared their perspectives on forest management and status of forest resources within the landscape. Revelations from the preliminary discussions pointed to depleting forest resource base; therefore, the need to remedy the situation to off-set negative impacts on livelihoods and the environment in general.

Key to this is the REDD+ programme which was understood as a mechanism intended to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation while maintaining forest carbon stocks. Throughout the workshops, presentations looked at the overview of the REDD+ Project and Environmental Impacts assignments, REDD+ Safeguards, training on safeguards monitoring indicators and finally on modalities for Ghana's Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM).

It was acknowledged that, the REDD+ programme has the potential to cause negative effects on people and the environment, conflicts between and among parties; therefore, the need for safeguards to address such negative impacts. Participants shared their perspectives on some of such potential negative impacts including displacement, tenure issues and loss of livelihoods. In acknowledgment of this, the issue of transparency at all levels of project implementation was suggested to be core to the programme implementation for it to be successful.

### ***Reflections on the training***

Participants deemed the training as important, insightful and timely for effective stakeholder participation in REDD+ programme and more especially in forest governance and management within the district. Some also appreciated the effort of the programme and their renewed commitment to support implementation of the programme.

### ***Observations and recommendation for improving future REDD+ training at the Ho forest district***

#### ***Observation***

- *Presentations were detailed but too technical and did not reflect on local examples. However, the expression of participants' indigenous knowledge on the role of forest and forest conservation was very impressive.*
- *The practical understanding of the REDD+ architecture from the context within the UNFCCC negotiation was not well elaborated by the focal person hence affected some responses provided to participants. However, this was adequately addressed by the facilitator.*
- *Participants selection was dominated by men leaving out women and the youth who largely depends on forest resources.*

#### ***Recommendations***

- *To ensure comprehensive and complete appreciation of issues, future presentations should be tailored to the understanding of target audiences. This could be done by avoiding technical jargons as much as possible while including local realities.*
- *Also, the focal persons need further training to enhance their presentation and facilitation skills in delivering trainings especially to local level stakeholders.*
- *Attention should be given to gender considerations in selecting stakeholders for future workshops. This could be done by broadly identifying such groups prior to the training rather than focusing on known stakeholders.*

***List of Participants***

*Day 1*

*Day 2*

Draft

## *Report on*

### **REDD+ Safeguards Training- Goaso Forest District (Brong Ahafo Region)**

#### *Workshop proceedings*

Ghana's Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) process is transitioning into implementation of Results-Based Actions for payment, therefore the need to build the capacity of stakeholders in this regard. The training was held on the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 at the Catholic Pastoral Centre, Goaso, purposely to engage and train stakeholders and partner on REDD+ process and safeguard mechanisms. On the first day, there were twenty-seven (27) participants from MDAs and sixty-eight (68) who were traditional authorities, farmers, opinion leaders, local community members, among others.

#### *Welcome address*

The moderator of the workshop welcomed participants and thanked them for participating in the training. The focal person in his submission succinctly gave an overview of Goaso Forest District by indicating its location and unique characteristics. He highlighted the major challenges facing the Forest District which included illegal logging, chainsaw milling, and illegal farming leading to deforestation and forest degradation. Owing to this, sustainable forest management has been a primary concern due to its potential impact on biological diversity. He expressed his fear Ghana could experience timber and fuelwood scarcity towards the end of the century. He exhorted the stakeholders at the meeting to religiously adhere to the implementation of Ghana REDD+ activities. He proffered his belief that implementation of REDD+ is essential including stakeholder participation, development of management plans, monitoring and enforcement.

#### *Training Sessions*

##### *Highlights of day 1&2*

Training presentations focused on key areas of the REDD+ programme, intercepted with questions and discussions from participants. These included overview of REDD+ programme, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), REDD+ Safeguards, Impact Monitoring and indicators, Modalities for Ghana's Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) under REDD+ and Ghana Cocoa Forest REDD+ Programme (GCFRP).

### ***Overview of REDD+ programme***

In an open forum, participants shared their experiences on marked changes on weather conditions and its effect on their activities, thus, specifically on agriculture activities. This paved way for explaining Climate Change which participants understood as a change in the statistical distribution of weather patterns over extended period. This change was noted to be mainly induced by human interaction and interference with the environment. Therefore, the need for collective action to address the situation. REDD+ as explained connotes reduction of carbon emissions resulting from forest degradation and deforestation while at the same time enhancing forest carbon stocks through sustainable forest management. Participants acknowledged their contribution to causes of deforestation and forest degradation and their role to support efforts towards remedying the situation. They were made to understand that, REDD+ is a performance-based programme, therefore REDD+ countries are mandated to prove emissions reductions before receiving payments.

### ***Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)***

It was explained that, every programme intervention or undertaking may have implications on immediate surroundings and the environment in general, therefore the need to ascertain such impacts and outline strategies to off-set the negative effects. Participants were taken through practical procedures for applying and completing EIA under the guidance of the EPA in Ghana. Considering this, the implementation of the REDD+ actions will require prior identification of impacts of programme actions on humans and the environment and plan to mitigate them.

### ***Impact monitoring***

Participants were taken through monitoring indicators for the REDD+ programme. Identification of indicators will serve as a benchmark against which progress of work done can easily be measured. This will ensure the programme stays on course and where lapses are identified, innovative measures are outlined to fill such gaps.

### ***FGRM***

Acknowledging that conflict situation are inevitable considering the multiplicity of stakeholders under the REDD+ programme, there is the need for effective grievance redress mechanism to

ensures conflicts are resolved to the satisfaction of all parties. Participants were taken through FGRM modalities and procedures for reporting and addressing the grievances. Stakeholders generally averred the potential of FGRM to reduce forest related conflict owing to unnecessary delays in the judicial (court) system and its complexities. They were reminded to effectively adhere to such grievance redress structures when they are instituted.

The focal person took the opportunity to explain the Ghana Cocoa Forest REDD+ programme (GCFRP). It was basically explained that, the GCFRP seeks to promote cocoa productivity through climate-smart cocoa practices. This mainly covers cocoa producing areas in parts of Ashanti, Brong Ahafo, Eastern and Western region with rich forest lands.

### ***Questions and answers***

*Que: If I have my own property, what screening or EIA assessment do I have to do?*

*Ans: There is the need to register your undertaking with the requisite state institution and seek advice from EPA on the required EIA to be carried out*

*Que: Who own forest carbon stocks?*

*Ans: It was reiterated that, trees occurring naturally belongs to the state but trees planted by individuals in their farms or nurtured belongs to them. However, such trees will need to be registered. However, benefit sharing arrangements exist for timber extraction in the country. Further, the process of determining the title to emissions and benefit sharing is still on-going.*

*One tradition leader (representative of Akrodie chief) bemoaned that the powers of Traditional Authorities (TA) to enforce sanctions have been curtailed under current democratic dispensation.*

### ***Reflection on training and closing remarks***

Participants on both days of the training demonstrated capability with lessons and experiences gained from the training. Much emphasis was on enhanced capacity to effectively participate in the REDD+ processes.

Offering final words to end the training, the Akyeamehene of Goaso acknowledge the relevance of the REDD+ programme to forest endowed areas such as Goaso and its environs. He then pleaded

with stakeholders to endeavor and take keen interest in actions to help protect the remaining forest resources.

Draft

## List of Participants

### Day 1

Evans Anane	E.T. Ventures	542081434
John Herman Antwi	Kataban Timbers	243336952
Thomas Antwi	Assembly Ltd	249646928
Thomas Antwi no. 2	Assembly Ltd	547613268
Augustine Peprah	Asunafo North MA	202368407
Andrews Akafo	Asunafo North MA	502006256
Francis Awuku Ofori	SPD- Cocobod	243634269
E. O. Aduamah	MOFA	208511357
Hon. Theo		
Daniel Amponsah G.	1/C CREMA	248209861
Ebenezer Larbi	Div. Police HQ	241506128
Emmanuel Davidson	Municipal fire -OPTS	549262499
Gertrude Tetteh	FC-CCU	247714079
Rhoda Donkor	FC-CCU	542546427
Raymond K. Sakyi	FC-CCU	201424410
Samuel Dotse	HATOF	506679055
Agnes Bananzi	Asutifi North Dist. DPO	243475496
Eric Gyamfi	UNDP-Goaso	247436524
Peter Kofi Beyeseh	Forestry	244686552
Charity Darko	FSD	244646692
Alex Oduro Kwarteng	FSD	244778967
Sylvester Agyemang Prempeh	FSD	504841799
Evelyn A. Konadu	FSD	244966062
Faustina Asante- Boateng	FSD	244025212
Francis Sarfo	FSD	241207451
Emmanuel Boateng	Asutifi South Planning off.	206644289
Paul Osei	Parks * Gardens	244247124
Sylvia Amoah	FSD	240581660
Grace Gyabaah	FSD	244990296
Ernest Adofo	FSD	244819978
Joseph Abilla	FSD	243224731
Lucy Amoah Ntim	FSD,Sunyani	277019009
Gertrude Bempong	FSD Goaso	244960990
Ntiamoah Micheal	FSD Goaso	208217705
Albert Awuah	FSD Goaso	246277977
Solomon Tengey	FSD Goaso	244748377

Day 2

NAME	COMMUNITY	CONTACT
Loverth Kusi Nuaku	FSD - Goaso	243755500
John Atta	CHED - Goaso	207333464
Ameah Jocab	Kukuom	243378287
Adomdar Kwadwo	Ayonso	545253911
Opoku Gabriel	Goaso - FSD	241047611
Kwabena Sarpong	Goaso - FSD	249757127
Paul Boateng	Bediako - Chief	542817261
Amuzu Daniel	Goaso	249761976
Kofi Nsia K'dua	Goamu - K'dua	
Nana Kwasi Appiah	Chief - Nkensere	544349892
Nana Owusu Stephen	Nkobeahene - Nkensere	245747212
Nana Oduro Mensah	Nkyidomhene - Nkensere	559977626
Toffic Agyei	Nkensere C'ttee Chairman	20306698
Owusu Abraham	Nkensere	243715029
Agartha Afriyie	Bediako - Ass member	242909068
Nana Gyamena	Abuasupanin - Bediako	27699788
Teye Daniel	CREMA SEC - Bediako	274684587
Ababio Yeboah Emmanuel	Ayomso -Assemblyman	249131930
Yakubu B. B. Adams	Assemblymen Gambia 2	54155108
Kwaku Bonsu	Community Member Gambia 2	551978266
Nana Karim Saaina	Comm. Chairman Gambia 1	542846797
Hon. Kwabena Dausa	Assemblyman Akrodie	545873919
Hon. Issahaku Iddrisu	Assemblyman Mim	242883912
Hon. Thomas Obeng Twumasi	Assemblyman Goaso	243988872
Gabriel Baafi	Comm. Ch. Mim	243858349
Nana Kofi Karikari	Chief Gambia 1	222467783
Nana Bofuo Baah	Gyasehene - Kasapin	241299985
Hon. Benard Nti	Ass.Man -Biaso	236051937
Thompson Addo	C'ottee Chairman-Biaso	-
Nana Osei Kwabena	Dwatoahene- Asumura	209391290
Kofi Awuah Brobbey	Kenyasi No.1 T/C	244521061
Nna Adututu Forkuo	Dominase-Kyidohene	547730493
Nana Agyapong	Dominase-Kontihene	242688771
Nana Awuah Asibru	Akrodie-Akomhene	242849593
Nana Poku Kumah	Akrodie- Atipemhene	273439883
Nana kwame Opoku	Gambia NO.2 Hene	243711738
Nana Yaw Bofah	Mim - Nkobeahene	242254079
Nana Boakye Dankwah	Fawohoyeden-Chief	244149616
Nana Opoku Acheamfoh	Fawohoyeden- Nkobeahene	206303517
Nana Kofi Yeboah	Kenyasi I - Omanhene Kyeame	242135273

Nana Wireko Ampem	Kukuom -Kontihene	246909197
Nana Yaw Agyei	Kukuom-Mawerehene	243969877
Hon. Theophilus K. Adu	Assemblyman -Kensare	556930679
Antwi Mustapha	Akrodie	556646429
Kwasi Bio	Ayomso-comm.member	243722117
Raymond Kofi Sakyi	CCU-FC	201424410
Gertrude Tetteh	CCU-FC	247714079
Rhoda Donkor	CCU-FC	542546427
Enerst Adofo	F.S.D	244819978
Sylvester	F.S.D	504841799
Else Lossou	F.S.D	265331951
Lucy Amoh Ntim	F.S.D	277019009
Nana Kwabena Sarpong	Goaso -Omanhene rep	245772411
Samuel Dotse	HATOF	506679055
Sylvia Amoah	FSD	240581660
Kwame Asirifi	Asumura	508707739
Samuel Owusu	Asumura	209603422
Benard A. Otchere	FSD	248985455
Mashud IBN Salam	FSD	505005003
Rashida BABIE	FSD	546553615
Awarf K. Douglas	FSD	249462447
Solomon Tengey	FSD	244748377
Amankwah Jemima	FSD	242664475
Kofi Asiamah	Kenyasi	248993978

## *Report on*

### **REDD+ Safeguards Training- Kakum Forest District- Central Region**

#### *Workshop proceedings*

The training was held on 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> July, 2018 at Kakum District Wildlife office. Day 1 of the training ninety nine (99) participants including traditional leaders, assembly members, media, farmers, informants, youth groups and opinion leaders. Day 2 had representatives from the District Assembly, Ghana Cocobod, FC (FSD-WD), Police, Fire Service, Schools and the media. The two day- training workshop was facilitated by a representative from IUCN Ghana (CSO representative on the Safeguards Sub-working group).

#### *Welcome address by the Kakum Park manager*

The kakum Park manager welcomed participants to the training workshop on both days, the Park manager thanked participants for devoting time for the training. Participants were subsequently reminded of the importance of forest, their role in addressing forest related challenges which has implications on climate change, global warming, among others which adversely affects human life and the wider environment. Therefore, the need for well thought-out strategies to secure them of which the REDD+ seeks to contribute to. Recognizing the variations and multiplicity of stakeholders who will affect and/or be affected by REDD+ intervention, he lamented on the need for developing stakeholders' capacity to adopt due process as a leverage for protection against negative programme impacts. He explained that, safeguards measures are common practice to cater for anticipated impacts emanating from any intervention. He entreated participants to express their views, concerns and ask questions to ensure that the programme is a success.

#### *Training sessions*

##### *Highlights on day 1 & 2*

The Kakum Safeguards led the two-day training workshop with support from the Regional Safeguards Focal Person. The actual training sessions on both days firstly introduced participants to climate change which participants understood it as a prolonged change in weather patterns, which further implicates on humans and the environment. Participants mentioned some local actions contributing to climate change such as illegal logging and mining, bushfires, agricultural

expansion and others. Natural phenomenon was not ruled out however not predominant in our part of the world compared to human induced actions. The effects of climate change on humans and biodiversity in general was shared. This drew participants' attention to the urgent need to remedy the situation with support from interventions such as the REDD+. This paved way for introducing the REDD+ programme as a remedy to the situation. As explained, it basically seeks to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and improve the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests for enhancement of forest carbon stocks. Background information focusing on initiation, history and purpose of REDD+ was provided while at the same time, components of REDD+ (carbon stock enhancement, biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest management) were explained in detail. With focus on cocoa landscape in Ghana, participants were made to understand more sustainable cocoa production systems including intensification, agroforestry, among others. It is intended to support farmers to integrate tree planting into their cocoa farms. Aside its environmental benefits to cocoa and food crop production, the country's timber stock may increase as a result of this intervention.

Participants understood and appreciated the importance and intent of the REDD+ programme but the focal person did not rule out the possibility adverse effects. This he mentioned could be ascertained through procedures such as Environmental Impact Assessment, Strategic Environmental Assessment, etc. For the REDD+, these basically assessed the impact of the undertaking to plan remedies for them. The intention is to ensure REDD+ actions are safe and sound, and where negative impacts are anticipated, the need for safeguard mechanism to manage such anticipated negative effects. REDD+ Safeguards was introduced in recognition of the fact that, with the implementation of any programme, no matter its good intent may have or generate some conflicts or misunderstandings which needs to be catered for.

The focal persons guided participants to discuss some possible impacts of the programme and mitigation measures (safeguards) to address such impacts. They were further informed on the formation of a Safeguards Team for safeguards governance and compliance monitoring. To this effect, Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) was explained with possible source of conflict and conflicting parties identified. Further discussions focused on FGRM procedures, structures and how to lodge complains to get them resolved in a more effective and efficient manner.

## ***Questions and answers***

*Que 1: Does the FGRM resolve issues of criminality?*

*Ans: No. The FGRM does not resolve issues of criminality. It is a mechanism designed to address conflicts that are not criminal in nature. It will address grievances such as; gender discrimination, boundary conflict, bias benefit sharing arrangement among others.*

*Que 2: How would people at the community access the Safeguards Information System (SIS) when there is no internet access in the communities?*

*Ans: There are plans on having an offline system in order for community members to access the SIS on their phones. This is currently on-going. Also, the Safeguards focal persons will be available to provide all the information and assistance on safeguards.*

*Que 3: How secured are we of tree ownership in cocoa farms?*

*Ans: When you plant your own trees, it belongs to you however, a tree registration form has been developed under the FIP and it is now undergoing verification and validation for subsequent adoption by for implementation.*

*Ques 4: What role can I play as an educational institution in reducing climate change?*

*Ans. By way of educating and sensitizing students/pupils on climate change issues since it is a global concern. The REDDEye campaign was launched to increase the interest of the youth in climate change, REDD+ and environmental issues and that can be adopted by educational institutions.*

*Ques 5: Do we have any training schedules for farmers with respect to pesticides application?*

*Ans. There is a farmer to farmer extension services provided by MOFA and Ghana Cocobod.*

## *Report on*

### **REDD+ Safeguards Training- Kade Forest District- Eastern Region**

#### *Introduction*

The training was held on 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> July, 2018 at Kade Pentecost. The stakeholders targeted for this training programme include staff from Municipal and District Assemblies (MDAs), Traditional Authorities, farmers and other community members. The district safeguards focal persons served as trainers whereas some members of the National REDD+ Safeguards Sub-working Group were engaged as facilitators to monitor the training programmes and provide recommendations for improvement of future safeguards-related training programmes. Consequently, IUCN, which has a representation on the safeguards sub-working group, was tasked to facilitate and observe the training programme.

#### *Workshop proceedings*

The training begun with an opening prayer followed by an introduction of the chairperson. The chairperson entreated all stakeholders to be ambassadors for the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) Programme. He mentioned that Climate change is a worldwide issue and therefore there is the need to come together as stakeholders to effectively manage our forest resources.

There was a welcome address delivered by the Kade District Manager. He welcomed everyone to the meeting. In his address he mentioned that the capacity building workshop on REDD+ Safeguards was key as every citizen of Ghana has a role to play in effectively management of our natural resources. He entreated participants to take full participation in the discussions and wished them a fruitful deliberation.

#### *Training sessions*

##### *Highlights on day 1 & 2*

The Kade Forest District Manager presented on Climate Change, REDD+ Programme and the Ghana Cocoa Forest REDD+ Programme whereas the REDD+ Safeguards focal person at the district presented on REDD+ Safeguards, Safeguards Information System and Feedback Grievance Redress Mechanisms (FGRM) for the two days.

Each day of the training had two sessions (morning and afternoon). Setting the stage for training, participants shared their perspectives on forest management and status of forest resources within the landscape.

The REDD+ programme which was understood as a mechanism intended to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation while maintaining forest carbon stocks. Throughout the workshops, presentations looked at the overview of the REDD+ Project and Environmental Impacts assignments, REDD+ Safeguards, training on safeguards monitoring indicators and finally on modalities for Ghana's Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM).

It was acknowledged that, the REDD+ programme has the potential to cause negative effects on people and the environment, conflicts between and among parties; therefore, the need for safeguards to address such negative impacts. Participants shared their perspectives on some of such potential negative impacts including displacement, tenure issues and loss of livelihoods. In acknowledgment of this, the issue of transparency at all levels of project implementation was suggested to be core to the programme implementation for it to be successful.

### ***Questions and answers***

*Ques 1. How would benefits accrued from the REDD+ Programme go down to farmers?*

*Ans. A Benefit Sharing Plan is being developed for the GCFRP which would detail out how farmers would receive their benefits.*

*Ques 2. How would the program address livelihood problems within the ER Programme areas?*

*Ans. There is a livelihood enhancement component in the GCFRP which intends to leverage on existing government, private and other initiatives towards livelihood enhancement for the community's benefit.*

*Ques 3. Which institution is responsible for ensuring effective protection of the water bodies?*

*Ans. Institutions such as Water Resources, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) among others.*

### **Recommendations**

- The Kade District Safeguards Focal Person requires further capacity strengthening on climate change, REDD+ and REDD+ safeguards to enable him effectively carry out his assigned safeguards-related tasks at the district level.
- Development of a Training Manual: A training manual which clearly explains REDD+ safeguards terminologies and processes in both English and local languages would be very helpful for continual learning by the target groups.
- Duration of Training: Participants felt that the time allotted for the training was inadequate due to the voluminous information in the training package. Future trainings should be undertaken in at least two days to enable participants grasp the concept well.
- Gender Inclusiveness at trainings: At the first day of the training which targeted the MMDAs, there was only one-woman participant. Such a trend should not recur in future training programmes as women have integral role to play to ensure that safeguards are respected during REDD+ implementation.
- FGRM: There is the need to clarify sanctions for culprits.
- Monitoring and Evaluation: It is very important to monitor and evaluate the uptake of the training at the landscapes where the training was piloted prior to nationwide up scaling of the training.
- Urgent Need for the establishment of the District Level Safeguards Focal Team. As a result of the multiple tasks being undertaken by staff of Forestry Commission at the district offices, it is important for the district safeguards team to be constituted as soon as practicable to ensure that more people can contribute some time and expertise for the effective monitoring of REDD+ Safeguards issues regularly at the district level.