

**BANK MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO
REQUEST FOR INSPECTION PANEL REVIEW OF THE
GHANA – SECOND URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL SANITATION PROJECT
(IDA Credit No. 3889-GH)**

Management has reviewed the Request for Inspection of the Ghana – Second Urban Environmental Sanitation Project (UESP-II) (IDA Credit No. 3889-GH), received by the Inspection Panel on August 16, 2007 and registered on August 22, 2007 (RQ07/06). Management has prepared the following response.

CONTENTS

Abbreviations and Acronyms	iv
I. INTRODUCTION.....	5
II. THE REQUEST.....	6
III. PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	6
IV. SPECIAL ISSUES	10
V. MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE.....	15

Annexes

Annex 1	Claims and Responses
Annex 2	Minutes of Public Consultations (2001-2003) and Summary Table
Annex 3	Chronology of Correspondence between the Bank, the Requesters and Others
Annex 4	Correspondence and Notices from the Requesters and Others about the Kwabenya Landfill
Annex 5	Correspondence from the Bank to the Requesters and Others about the Kwabenya Landfill
Annex 6	Minutes of the Meeting between the Bank and the Agyemankata Kwabenya Community – February 27, 2004
Annex 7	First Letter from COHRE regarding the Project
Annex 8	Executive Instrument
Annex 9	Letter from the Borrower of September 13, 2007 confirming its commitment to advance the project in compliance with Bank policies

Maps

Map 1	GHA 35710 – Proposed Kwabenya Sanitary Landfill Site
Map 2	GHA 35711 – Proposed Kwabenya Sanitary Landfill Site (magnified)

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AKC	Agyemankata Kwabenya Community
AMA	Accra Metropolitan Assembly
AWP	Accra Waste Project
BP	Bank Procedure
COHRE	Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions
DCA	Development Credit Agreement
DfID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
EIS	Environmental Impact Study
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
ESA	Environmental and Social Assessment
FY	Fiscal Year
GDA	Ga District Assembly
IDA	International Development Association
IPN	Inspection Panel
ISDS	Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet
MA	Metropolitan or Municipal Assembly
MLGRD	Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
MTR	Mid-Term Review
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OMS	Operational Manual Statement
OP	Operational Policy
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PBF	Performance Based Fund
QEA	Quality at Entry Assessment
RAP	Resettlement Action Plan
RPF	Resettlement Policy Framework
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
UESP	Urban Environmental Sanitation Project
UESP-II	Second Urban Environmental Sanitation Project
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WMD	Waste Management Department

CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

(Exchange Rate Effective September 10, 2007)

Currency Unit = Ghana Cedis (GHS)

1 USD = 0.937016 GHS / 1 GHS = 1.06722 USD

FISCAL YEAR

January – December

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On August 22, 2007, the Inspection Panel registered a Request for Inspection, IPN Request RQ07/06 (hereafter referred to as “the Request”), concerning the Ghana: Second Urban Environmental Sanitation Project (UESP-II), financed by the International Development Association (IDA Credit No. 3889-GH).

2. After careful review of the Request, it is Management’s position that the technical work during preparation and appraisal as well as the due diligence required under the Bank’s environmental and social policies were adequately carried out and appropriately reflected in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD). Management also wishes to point out that no Bank financed bid tendering or construction activities have taken place in the Kwabenya sanitary landfill. This absence of bidding or tendering is consistent with the conditions established in the Development Credit Agreement (DCA – Section 3.03 (c)). Those conditions require the existence of a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) acceptable to the Bank, prior to commencing work and prior to displacement of any affected persons. Management also wishes to emphasize that in addition to the consultations carried out during the preparation of the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), the preparation of the project-specific RAP will involve additional consultations with the affected communities and its implementation should ensure that appropriate mitigation activities are in place to address impacts on communities as a result of the construction of the sanitary landfill in Kwabenya.

3. The Management Response also provides evidence that the Bank has met on several occasions with, and responded to correspondence from, the Requesters. Also, in compliance with Bank policies and procedures, the Bank has disclosed to the public the Environmental and Social Assessment and the RPF in a timely manner.

4. **Structure of the Text.** The Management Response has been divided into five sections as follows: Section I provides a brief introduction, Section II summarizes the Request, and Section III includes project background information. Section IV is organized around the three key issues contained in the Request and also provides background about the origin of the Kwabenya sanitary landfill subcomponent and the reason for Bank involvement. In Section V, Management provides a brief concluding response to the Request and the action plan that has been agreed with the Government of Ghana (the Government) regarding this subcomponent. The main text is accompanied by nine Annexes. Annex 1 presents the Requesters’ claims, together with Management’s responses, in table format. Annexes 2 through 9 provide supporting materials to Management’s conclusions, including minutes of the public consultations during preparation of the RPF, a chronology of correspondence about the Project, incoming and outgoing correspondence about the Project, minutes of a meeting between the Bank and the Requesters (Agyemankata Kwabenya Community) in February 2004, the Executive Instrument issued by the Government of Ghana regarding acquisition of lands and a letter signed by the Minister of Local Government, Rural Development and Environment confirming the Borrower’s

commitment to the project and to Bank safeguards. These Annexes are referenced throughout the Management Response.

II. THE REQUEST

5. The Request for Inspection was submitted by the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE), an international nongovernmental organization, on behalf of the Agyemankata Kwabenya Community (AKC) that lives in the area known as Kwabenya in Ga District, Ghana (hereafter referred to as the “Requesters”). No further materials were received by Management in support of the Request.

6. The Request contains claims that the Panel has indicated may constitute violations by the Bank of various provisions of its policies and procedures, including the following:

OP/BP 4.01, Environmental Assessment, January 1999, Revised August 2004.

OP/BP 4.12, Involuntary Resettlement, December 2001, Revised April 2004.

OMS 2.20, Project Appraisal, January 1984, Revised August 2004.

III. PROJECT BACKGROUND

7. Over the last two decades, the key urban environmental issue in Ghana has remained poor sanitation, resulting from inadequate water supply, sanitary facilities, drainage, and solid waste management. In 1999, the Government approved its *Environmental Sanitation Policy*, which analyzed the causes of the prevailing poor sanitation conditions, established basic principles and objectives for better environmental management, and specified the institutional responsibilities in the pursuit of these objectives. The *Local Government Service Act*, passed in June 2003, provided the legal and administrative basis for decentralizing government services to better address such issues as urban sanitation.¹

8. Implementation of the first phase of the Urban Environmental Sanitation Project (UESP) between 1996 and 2003 marked a significant step in attempts to deal with environmental sanitation issues, particularly with regard to storm drainage, solid waste collection and disposal, and sanitation. However, the 2003-2005 Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy recognized that environmental sanitation and capacity to deal with solid and liquid wastes have shown little sign of improvement. Flooding, erosion and siltation of drains remain major problems, and the urban poor suffer disproportionately from such problems.

¹ The central government provides subsidies to the Metropolitan/Municipal Assemblies (MAs) for solid waste collection, and assists the MAs in establishing better institutional arrangements for the management of the urban environment. In principle, the responsibility for all urban infrastructure has been transferred to the Assemblies under a decentralized system.

9. **The Project.** The Project is a repeater of the UESP, which closed satisfactorily on December 31, 2003. In accordance with Bank procedures for repeater projects,² a Regional Review Panel was constituted and concluded that the project qualified to be prepared as a repeater. An IDA Credit of SDR 41.6 million (US\$ 62.0 million equivalent) for UESP-II was approved by the Board of Executive Directors in April 2004.

10. **Project Objectives.** The project development objective is to improve urban living conditions in regard to environmental health, sanitation, drainage, vehicular access, and solid waste management in a sustainable fashion, with special emphasis on the poor. The project is located in several sites in Ghana, including Accra, Tema, Sekondi-Takoradi, Kumasi and Tamale. The intermediate objectives for the project components are as follows:

- Reduce the frequency, severity, and duration of flooding in low-lying areas;
- Increase the accessibility for low and middle-income residents and school children to adequate latrines;
- Increase the amount of refuse collected and disposed of in an environmentally sustainable manner;
- Increase vehicular access and reduce flooding, erosion and dust in low-income communities; and
- Enable central and local government agencies to more effectively fulfill their mandate regarding the project objectives, especially the Waste Management Departments (WMDs).

11. **Project Components.** The Project has several components:

- *Component 1: Storm drainage (US\$16.5 million IDA).* This involves the lining of primary and secondary drains, construction of small bridges, and erosion control. The main target group of this component is the urban population of five towns who live and/or work in low-lying areas that are subject to flooding. Many of these neighborhoods are characterized by a high population density and low income. The expected outcome is a reduced frequency, severity, and duration of flooding in the low-lying areas.
- *Component 2: Sanitation (US\$7.8 million IDA).* This includes the following sub-components: (a) construction of household latrines and establishment of a domestic latrine delivery program; (b) rehabilitation and construction of public latrines in public places; (c) rehabilitation and construction of school latrines combined with hygiene education and the provision of water supply where needed; (d) rehabilitation or construction of sewage treatment facilities; and (e) improved sewer-

² The policy note, *Building on Success: More Efficient Processing of Repeater Projects* (SecM2003-0034), was submitted to the Board of Executive Directors on January 22, 2003 and discussed on Feb 11, 2003.

age management in Tema. The main target group is the population living in low-income neighborhoods without household latrines, users of public places (such as markets and transport terminals), and school children in schools without a safe means of excreta disposal. The expected outcome is an increased coverage with conveniently located and hygienic latrines.

- *Component 3: Solid Waste Management (US\$25.7 million IDA)*. This includes the following subcomponents: (a) construction of new sanitary landfills for Accra and Tema and completion of the one in Sekondi-Takoradi; (b) equipment for sanitary landfills; (c) closure and rehabilitation of existing refuse dumps; (d) operation of sanitary landfills, preceded by the improved operation of some; (e) private solid waste collection; and (f) supply of household bins, skips,³ and skip pads. The main target group is the urban population of the five project towns that will benefit from one or the other measures. The population residing or working near the present refuse dumps will benefit from better environmental conditions. The expected outcome is an increase in the amount and regularity of refuse collected and disposed of in a technically, institutionally, financially, and environmentally sustainable manner.
- *Component 4: Community Infrastructure Upgrading (US\$8.5 million IDA)*. Infrastructure upgrading in low-income communities will consist mainly of access roads, roadside drains, street lighting, water supply, and sanitation. The main target group is the population living and/or working in select low-income communities. The expected outcome is better access to high-density neighborhoods that have been difficult or impossible to access with a motor vehicle; less flooding, erosion and dust; better neighborhood safety at night; fewer pipe breakages; more registered water consumers; and improved sanitation.
- *Component 5: Institutional Strengthening (US\$9.6 million, financed by the Nordic Development Fund)*. This includes the following subcomponents: (a) technical assistance and training; (b) capacity building in the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD) and other central agencies; (c) capacity building in the Metropolitan Assemblies (MAs); (d) malaria vector control and HIV/AIDS prevention; (e) project-wide monitoring; (f) reconditioning of waste management equipment; (g) house numbering; and (h) a communications strategy. The main target group is the administration (Assembly staff) of the five project towns and particularly the WMDs and the Environmental Health Departments. The expected outcome is a greater ability of the Assemblies of the project towns, especially the WMDs, to more effectively and efficiently fulfill their responsibilities in regard to environmental sanitation in the long term, with their own resources.

12. The Project also includes a Project Management component (US\$1.1 million IDA), the refunding of an advance Project Preparation Facility (US\$0.6 million), and

³ A skip is a dumpster.

physical and price contingencies, which constitute the Performance-Based Fund (PBF) (US\$11.1 million). The PBF⁴ is being used to make allocations to the MAs for additional activities within the project objectives based on their achievement of the MA Performance Criteria contained in the Project Implementation Manual and specified in the DCA.

13. **Project Status.** The Project has been rated unsatisfactory for more than a year mainly due to the very slow disbursement level of the credit and the lack of progress in the solid waste management component, with the Kwabenya sanitary landfill subcomponent being the most delayed. There has been progress, however, in implementation of the sanitation and upgrading components. These two components are on track to be completed by the Project closing date (June 30, 2010). While design of major drainage works has been completed, inability of the municipalities to establish their drainage maintenance funds is affecting the awarding of drainage contracts. The Bank has been active and has maintained a continuous dialogue with the Government to restore the project to a satisfactory status during FY08. For this to happen, it was agreed to postpone the mid-term review (MTR) mission from June 2007 to December 2007 to allow the Government additional time to make substantial progress in implementing the Project and to prepare a satisfactory RAP for the Kwabenya sanitary landfill.

14. The Bank has discussed the issues affecting project implementation with the Government on several occasions and has clearly indicated in both its November 2006 and May 2007 supervision mission reports that it will likely cancel the financing of the Kwabenya sanitary landfill if evidence of further progress on the RAP was not available by the December 2007 MTR mission; the Bank also indicated that it would restructure the Project, including the possibility of canceling or reallocating some of the funds to other priority, successfully implemented subcomponents (see paragraph 33 with Government commitments).

15. The UESP-II was the first repeater project prepared in the Africa Region. This decision was supported by a Regional Review Panel composed of senior technical staff and managers – an extra review step in addition to normal Bank processing requirements. Processing of the project was in line with Bank guidelines and complied with required due diligence, including environmental and social safeguards. The Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (ISDS) was published at the Bank Infoshop and in Ghana; the RPF and the Environmental and Social Assessment (ESA) were also disclosed “in country” and at the Bank InfoShop before appraisal. Capacity assessments were conducted and the scope of activities for each municipality was designed according to existing capacity. In addition, the PBF was established to help municipalities improve their performance and the institutional strengthening component of the Project was designed to reinforce the capacity of the municipalities. A Quality at Entry Assessment (QEA) of the Project was carried out during FY04-05 as part of the 7th QEA exercise. Although the panel rated the QEA of the Project as unsatisfactory because of lack of attention to sustainability issues, weak identification and treatment of risks and lack of readiness, the panel nevertheless considered

⁴ The PBF was initially made up of physical and price contingencies, amounting to 13.7% of the total project cost.

the use of the RPF to be appropriate and in line with policy requirements to address the difficult issue of siting the Kwabenya sanitary landfill.

IV. SPECIAL ISSUES

FINANCING OF THE KWABENYA SANITARY LANDFILL – WHEN IDA TOOK OVER FROM DfID

16. Accra's need for a sanitary landfill was identified in the Strategic Plan for the Greater Accra Metropolitan Area report (December 1992), funded by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP)/HABITAT. With further growth of the city restricted by the sea in the south, and the eastern and western ends of the city already built-up by Tema and Kasoa townships, any new landfill site could only be located in the north, which was also being rapidly built up. A subsequent study by Plan Consult in 1993 identified the Kwabenya Valley as the most appropriate location for a future sanitary landfill for Accra. Feasibility studies and preliminary sanitary landfill design were carried out in 1997 with funding from the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DfID) under the Accra Waste Project (AWP). An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was carried out in 1999, and to enable completion of site investigations and designs, construction of a 2 km access road began in a first phase of works in late 2000, again with financial assistance from DfID. In early 2001, the same contractor returned to the site to construct storm water culverts, catch water drains and monitoring boreholes.

17. At the time the preliminary design was made, there were virtually no resettlement needs because there was no access to the site, and no visible encroachment of dwellings or infrastructure. However, as a result of the construction of the access road and the delay in the design work, people moved closer to the land selected for the sanitary landfill site. Land rights claims surfaced during construction, delaying the start of the landfill works. DfID eventually withdrew its support of the project due to those delays and because of the shift of its development policy from funding discrete projects to providing budget support, in accordance with the priorities set out in the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy.

18. DfID's withdrawal notwithstanding, the need to solve the problem of solid waste disposal in the Greater Accra Metropolitan Area remained urgent. The local government authorities had reached a tentative agreement with the chiefs for the acquisition of land and, at around the same time, IDA was preparing a repeater of its UESP, which had financed sanitary landfills. In that context, the Government requested, and the Bank agreed to finance, the construction of the Kwabenya sanitary landfill from the proposed UESP-II, under certain conditions. Those conditions included: (i) reviewing the three design options that were originally identified, including the adequacy of the design in addressing seismic activity in the Accra area; and (ii) most importantly, preparing a RAP with the requisite stakeholder consultation, once selection of the final landfill site was finalized. These requirements were included in the PAD, agreed during negotiations and set as conditions in Section 3.03 (c) of the DCA, which called for receipt of a RAP acceptable to

the Bank prior to commencing any works in Kwabenya or other sanitary landfills and prior to any displacement of any affected persons.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

19. Management considers that the Government and the Bank have fully complied with OP 4.01. In 1999, DfID financed an EIS, which included a comprehensive review of design, impacts and mitigation. The EIS was used as basis for the 2003 ESA prepared by the Government for the UESP-II, as required under OP 4.01. The ESA also included an updating of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and the RPF. The ESA was reviewed at appraisal and deemed satisfactory. Further, during supervision, it has been agreed to recruit consultants to update the EMP and prepare the RAP in accordance with the final design of the Kwabenya sanitary landfill.

20. The environmental issues related to the Kwabenya sanitary landfill include both general construction issues and issues that are site-specific. The former include choice of liner, mitigating infiltration of polluted water into groundwater, management of leachate to prevent leaks into surface water, management of landfill gas, management of access/transport, and steps to be taken when the landfill is closed. Site specific issues include revision of the design in accordance with final layout and review of the design parameters to make sure that they comply with current standards.

21. The EMP prepared as part of the 2003 ESA provided an overview of all environmental issues and how they would be managed, including impacts and risks, mitigation provisions, management actions, monitoring requirements, training requirements and the responsible institutions. The EMP was considered "...as a dynamic plan report and will be updated and further elaborated based on ongoing process of preparation, construction and operation."⁵

22. A significant amount of analysis has been undertaken related to environmental impact, and the results have been publicly disclosed. As with all infrastructure development, monitoring of environmental impacts before, during and after construction is required, and this has also been taken into consideration for the Kwabenya sanitary landfill component to date.

RESETTLEMENT POLICY FRAMEWORK

23. The RPF was prepared in December 2003 as part of the ESA, with the objective of establishing guiding principles and objectives governing resettlement preparation and implementation. It includes eligibility criteria for various categories of displaced and affected persons, methods for valuing affected assets and organizational arrangements to be applied to RAPs. The RPF was reviewed at appraisal and found to be a satisfactory resettlement instrument in accordance with the Bank's resettlement policy. The criteria defined in the RPF for determining eligibility of affected persons for compensation and other resettlement assistance was developed on the basis of field visits and consultations

⁵ See page 27 of the ESA.

carried out at the Kwabenya sanitary landfill site and also on information from an Environmental Impact Study prepared in 2000 for DfID. The RPF states: “*The existing information on the social safeguards situation at the Kwabenya landfill site are described in this report to provide the basis for the preparation of a RAP for Kwabenya and to serve as an illustration of the application of the RPF.*” A significant effort was devoted to the Kwabenya sanitary landfill site during the preparation of the RPF, which defines resettlement principles and describes the process of preparing and implementing RAPs acceptable to the Bank.

24. The RPF further states that:

“The construction was started in 2000 with financial assistance by DfID. Following the preparation of detailed designs and an environmental impact assessment and resettlement plan, Phase I of the Kwabenya landfill was constructed, consisting of an access road and a covered conduit for storm water drainage. In spite of prior consultations with various stakeholders, claims of land rights resurfaced during construction, and some nearby residents put up strong resistance, delaying the start of Phase II of the construction, and DfID ultimately withdrew its support. The local government authorities have recently reached a tentative agreement with the Chiefs for the acquisition of land. The three design options that were identified by the original designers will be reviewed in light of the risk of seismic activity at this site.⁶ [...]”

“Displaced and compensated persons should be meaningfully consulted and should have opportunities to participate in planning and implementing resettlement programs.”⁷

It is Management’s view that the RPF was satisfactory and in full compliance with OP 4.12.

25. The Government and the Bank were aware that more information was needed to meet the requirements of the Bank’s policies and procedures. This was confirmed in the RPF, which notes that existing information on the social safeguards situation at the Kwabenya landfill site is “in part taken from the [DfID’s financed] Environmental Impact Study. It was deemed, however, that this information, and the consultation process with the affected population, are insufficient to present an adequate RAP for Kwabenya, which remains to be done, with adequate exploration of alternatives.”⁸ Hence, it was clear that the Government would need to conduct further site-specific consultations for the RAP for the Kwabenya sanitary landfill.

26. Furthermore, the DCA in Section 3.03 (c) states: “...for the sanitary landfill at Kwabenya, the sanitary landfill in Tema, rehabilitation of refuse dumps at Mallam, Oblogo, Kpone, and Essipon, and community infrastructure upgrading in all Project Cities,

⁶ See page 19 of the RPF.

⁷ See page 26 of the RPF.

⁸ See page 5 of the RPF.

prepare and furnish to the Association, a detailed resettlement action plan acceptable to the Association documenting the implementation arrangements for resettlement arising from such works, including compensation, relocation and rehabilitation of Affected Persons.”⁹ Accordingly, in compliance with OP 4.12, the Bank has not proceeded with the Kwabenya subcomponent of the project because the RAP has not yet been prepared and this component of the Project will not proceed without the RAP.

COMMUNICATION WITH AFFECTED COMMUNITIES

27. As indicated above, consultations carried out during the preparation of the RPF were considered sufficient. Further consultations will take place as part of the preparation of the RAP. In addition, following the publication in the press in late 2003 of the Bank’s agreement to finance the Kwabenya sanitary landfill and the public dissemination of the RPF in early 2004, the Bank received a letter from the AKC requesting that the Bank not finance the landfill. The AKC also visited the World Bank Office in Accra on four occasions since January 2004, preceded by protests outside the Bank office. The Bank has responded to the letters and thoroughly explained during the meetings the obligation to implement a full RAP before commencing civil works at the site. The Bank also explained the importance it placed on the prevention or mitigation of any negative impacts on the community and the Bank’s willingness to support community upgrading projects in the Project area.

28. The Government has indicated to the Bank that it undertook numerous efforts to reach out to and consult the local communities about the Project, including the AKC. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was established by the Minister of Local Government and Rural Development in June 2004 to address concerns of property owners. In July 2004, the TAC issued a press release inviting the general public to submit concerns regarding the sanitary landfill project. The TAC then held a three-day brainstorming session with land agencies, social groups, traditional authorities, other Kwabenya residents, Government and project officials. The AKC declined to participate in these discussions. The Government further indicated to the Bank that when officials from the MLGRD and Accra Metropolitan Assembly (AMA) delivered letters to members of the Community in June 2004 inviting them to a meeting, they were detained for several hours, confronted with death threats should they ever return, and the letters were returned unopened. Since that incident, Government delegations, project staff, surveyors and valuation staff have visited the site under the protection of armed security personnel. As some of the attached letters show (Annexes 3 and 4), AKC communications frequently include the following: *“We Agyemankata community the immediate residents living on Kwabenya landfill site will never honor any invitation or discussions on a dump (landfill) at Agyemankata Kwabenya. We have the right to protect our environment. Anybody who enters here does so at his/her own risk.”* This reflects the complex social situation the Government is dealing with and the difficulties in undertaking field visits.

⁹ See Article 3, Section 3.03, Point (c) of the DCA.

29. The TAC reviewed the records of the several meetings and fora that had been held since 1999 and especially between 2001-2002, to inform the public about the proposed Project and solicit views and concerns. Key meetings and consultations are summarized in Annex 2. Following its review, the TAC recommended that:

- As much as possible, the boundary of land required for sanitary landfill should be revised to exclude lands presently occupied. All such lands would therefore lie outside the land to be used for landfill operations, as well as the buffer zone required for minimizing negative impacts.
- The survey department should be requested to undertake survey and mapping of unencumbered land.
- A consulting firm should be appointed to review available designs to suit the revised boundary and identify any new structures that may have been constructed.
- All the steps required for acquisition and compensation payment should be completed in the shortest possible time. An oversight committee should be appointed to ensure sustainability of effort.
- The AKC should be included in the community infrastructure upgrading component of UESP II to facilitate the provision of basic infrastructure facilities to the community.
- Serious efforts must be made to put in place efficient and effective management of the proposed sanitary landfill. With proper Operation and Maintenance (O&M) of the sanitary landfill, most of the concerns expressed by some sections of the public would be addressed. If possible, management of the landfill should be privatized and funded by central government to assure effective O&M.
- Education and sensitization campaigns should be promoted and sustained in all communities.

30. All of the above recommendations of the TAC have been followed or are under consideration, except for the last, because of the continued opposition to the siting of the sanitary landfill in Kwabenya. Due to the difficulties in advancing the consultations required for valuation of the affected assets and preparation of other studies related to the Kwabenya sanitary landfill, an Executive Instrument was issued by the Government on January 26, 2007 (see Annex 8) allowing a period of six months for persons claiming a right or having an interest in the land to submit particulars of the claim and request compensation. As the six-month period was coming to a close, AMA issued a notice in mid-July 2007 reminding citizens to submit their claims by July 30, 2007 and noting the possibility of forfeiture of compensation if the claim was not submitted by the deadline. The Government has subsequently communicated to the Bank that it has no intention of requiring the forfeiture of compensation and has reiterated its commitment to abide by Bank Operational Policies in preparing the RAP.

V. MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

31. The Requesters' claims, accompanied by Management's detailed responses, are provided in Annex 1.

32. Management takes seriously the Requesters' concerns that the Bank was not in compliance with its policies and procedures. However, following an extensive review of the facts and available information, it is Management's position that the Bank is in compliance with OP/BP 4.01, Environmental Assessment; OP/BP 4.12, Involuntary Resettlement; and OMS 2.20, Project Appraisal. Management notes again that no Bank financed bid tendering or construction activities have taken place in the Kwabenya sanitary landfill, in accordance with the conditions indicated to the Board of Executive Directors in the PAD and as established in Section 3.03 (c) of the DCA, which requires the existence of a RAP acceptable to the Bank, prior to commencing civil works for the landfill and prior to any displacement of any affected persons. Management is also aware of Government's urgent need to construct a sanitary landfill to dispose properly of solid waste and proceed to close down existing open dumps. Following recent consultations with the Government, the Bank has confirmed the authorities' commitment to:

- Prepare an acceptable RAP not later than March 31, 2008;
- Not resettle any affected people prior to the approval of the RAP by the Bank;
- Take all the necessary measures to avoid new occupation of the lands already acquired by the Government;
- Develop a public communication campaign;
- Organize bi-monthly progress review meetings on the preparation status of the RAP until December 2007 and monthly meetings thereafter; and discuss progress reports on the preparation of the RAP; and
- Update the Environmental Management Plan, specifically for the Kwabenya sanitary landfill.

33. The Bank has reinforced the project supervision team with a seasoned social safeguards expert and will have another social scientist based in Accra. These two, together with the senior environmental specialist in the project team, will follow up closely the preparation of the RAP and the EMP and will provide the Government with technical support.

34. The Bank will support the implementation of a communication campaign to explain its role as the Project financier and the role and responsibilities of Borrower and the members of the community, especially in regard to safeguards policies. As part of the December 2007 MTR, the Bank and the Borrower will make an in-depth assessment of compliance with the agreed action plan by the Government. Based upon the results of this evaluation, which will pay particular attention to progress made in preparing an accept-

able RAP for the Kwabenya sanitary landfill, and the progress made on the other components, a decision will be made in regard to the extent of project restructuring.

35. **Management Position.** It is Management's view that the Bank has applied consistently its environmental and safeguard policies and carried out the technical work for the project in a satisfactory manner with the requisite due diligence. Consequently, it is Management's view that the Requesters' rights or interests have not been, nor will they be, directly and adversely affected by a failure of the Bank to implement its policies and procedures.

36. Management believes that construction of a sanitary landfill at Kwabenya is important to address the safe disposal of growing quantities of solid waste generated in the Greater Accra Metropolitan Area; this need has become more acute with the closure of an open dump site in Mallan and the planned closure of the dump in Oblogo. Management understands that failure to address the need for appropriate disposal of waste produced daily in the area will have detrimental impacts on the health of the population and on the prevailing environmental conditions. Management also recognizes that construction and operation of sanitary landfills, if not conducted according to the appropriate technical standards and without due consideration to environmental and social safeguards, can have detrimental impacts on affected population and, thus understands the concerns of the communities initiating the Inspection Panel request. Management is determined to continue to work with the Government and the communities to ensure that the Government implements the agreed action plan adopted in September 2007 and that affected communities will not be negatively impacted should the Bank agree to finance the construction of the sanitary landfill under the conditions originally established under the Project.

37. Management considers the decision of the Government to implement the action plan as a welcome development and the Bank will monitor the implementation of this action plan to ensure it materializes (see Annex 9). Management would like to reiterate that while it is committed to support the financing of the sanitary landfill, lack of progress in preparing an acceptable RAP according to the agreed action plan and in full compliance with the relevant Bank policies will preclude its financing. This decision will be made at the time of the MTR.

ANNEX 1

CLAIMS AND RESPONSES

No.	Claim/Issue	OP/BP	Response
Environmental Impact Assessment			
1.	<p>The Agyemankata Community is detrimentally affected by the sanitary landfill proposed in the context of the World Bank funded Second Urban Environmental Sanitation Project (UESP-II)</p> <p>Indeed the World Bank's Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet states, "those living near the landfill will be negatively affected" and that "surface and groundwater pollution could extend 5 to 10 km downstream."</p>	<p>OP/BP 4.01</p>	<p>Management considers that the technical work for preparation and appraisal as well as the due diligence required under the Bank's environmental and social policies were adequately carried out and appropriately reflected in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD). In accordance with the conditions established by the Development Credit Agreement (DCA), no Bank financed bid tendering or construction activities have taken place to date in the Kwabenya sanitary landfill. Section 3.03 (c) of the DCA requires the existence of a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) acceptable to the Bank, prior to commencing work and prior to any displacement of any affected persons. As required by Bank policy, preparation of the RAP will involve detailed consultations with the affected communities and implementation of the RAP should ensure that appropriate mitigation activities are in place to address impacts on communities as a result of the construction of the sanitary landfill.</p> <p>The need for an engineered landfill site for Accra was confirmed in 1992 and the Kwabenya site identified in 1993. Feasibility studies and the landfill design were carried out in 1997 with funding from the UK Department for International Development (DfID). An environmental and social analysis was carried out in 1999 and a first phase of construction works began in 2000 with financial assistance from DfID. This phase of works included the construction of access roads and a covered conduit for storm water drainage. In spite of prior consultations with various stakeholders, claims of land rights surfaced during construction, delaying the start of the landfill works. DfID eventually withdrew its support of the Project.</p> <p>Given the urgency of resolving solid waste disposal in the Greater Metropolitan Area of Accra and the fact that the local government authorities had reached a tentative agreement with the local Chiefs for the acquisition of land, the Government requested and the Bank agreed to finance the construction of the landfill from the UESP-II. As part of the requirements for Bank involvement, the Government prepared an Environmental and Social Assessment (ESA) and a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) covering the entire project, including the Kwabenya landfill subcomponent. The ESA and RPF were completed in November 2003 and involved twenty five consultations with community representatives (Annex 2). Both processes and documents served to identify potential environmental and social impacts of the landfill and the measures that would be taken under the project to minimize those potentially negative impacts to the community.</p> <p>The Integrated Safeguard Data Sheet (ISDS) for the project highlights some of the potentially negative environmental impacts of the landfill. The section of the ISDS quoted by the Requesters is a general statement that describes the environmental conditions that would prevail <i>if</i> appropriate mitigation measures were <i>not</i> taken in designing and operating the landfill facilities in all five of the towns where landfills were to be built. The preliminary design of the Kwabenya landfill, carried out in 1997 under DfID financing, includes the incorporation of an impermeable base, leachate collection and treatment as well as monitoring boreholes downstream, so as to identify and sub-</p>

No.	Claim/Issue	OP/BP	Response
			<p>sequently mitigate potential risks of groundwater pollution. As noted below, final design work needs to be completed and reviewed and approved by the Bank. Operational procedures, to be defined in the operational manual (which will be prepared as part of the final landfill design), and the specification of cover materials for the landfill cells will further ensure that surface water is not contaminated. In addition, it is important to note that for the particular case of Kwabenya, there are no surface streams in its surrounding area; thus, the focus will be mainly on issues related to protecting groundwater and properly managing landfill gas.</p> <p>The final landfill design, which will need to comply with applicable Ghanaian legislation, policies and guidelines, as indicated in the ISDS, will be reviewed by an expert on sanitary landfills to assure that it meets the above criteria and that the design takes into account international best practice. The review will also look into the operational and financial sustainability of the Kwabenya sanitary landfill throughout its useful life. More importantly, ensuring the proper operation of the landfill will be a key element for the facility not to impact the environment adversely during its useful life. This is an area that will be given focused attention during project supervision. The institutional strengthening component of the project aims at addressing capacity building and the ability of the municipality to mobilize additional financial resources for ensuring satisfactory management of the facility after the Bank project is complete.</p>
2.	Specifically, if implemented, this component of the Project will result in the involuntary displacement of much of the community and leave the remainder of the community living in conditions that pose grave risks to their health. Indeed, the Landfill has raised several potentially contentious environmental and social issues.	OP/BP 4.01 4.12	<p>Management agrees with the Requesters that the construction of the Kwabenya sanitary landfill will involve involuntary resettlement. As indicated in the PAD, the ISDS and the RPF, OP 4.12 is triggered. The RPF included a preliminary assessment of displacement needs, and provided recommendations for the preparation of the RAP. The RPF indicated that an unspecified number of people and 113 properties and structures may be removed, with an estimated cost at the time of US\$4.2 million, including compensation, relocation and transfer of displaced persons, income restoration and administrative costs. This information will be reviewed and updated as part of the preparation of the RAP for the Kwabenya sanitary landfill. Management also notes that the Bank agreed during supervision to the Government's request to include the Kwabenya township in the Community Infrastructure Upgrading component of the project, with the objective of improving access to infrastructure services for the population living in this township, as part of Government efforts to address community concerns.</p> <p>As noted above in Item 1, Management acknowledges the Requesters' concerns about the potentially negative health, environmental, and social impacts of the Project, which will be addressed and mitigated through design and implementation actions. The design work will also incorporate measures for control of potential negative impacts and to minimize risks to the communities living near the site during the construction and operation phases, which will be reflected in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) to be reviewed and approved by the Bank.</p>
3.	The Agyemankata Community was not meaningfully consulted during the planning of the Landfill. The following examples illustrate the lack of meaningful consultation as required by The Accra Metropolitan Assembly (AMA), a government agency involved in the	4.01 4.12	Based on documentation available, Management considers the level of communication to be appropriate with regard to the preparation of the RPF. Management wishes to clarify that while the Bank was not involved in the initial planning of the sanitary landfill site, once the Bank agreed to finance the Kwabenya sanitary landfill subcomponent, the consultations carried out as part of the preparation of the project RPF were considered appropriate and in compliance with Bank pol-

No.	Claim/Issue	OP/BP	Response
	<p>Landfill, often announces decisions after they have been made via publication in local newspapers such as the <i>Ghanaian Times</i> and the <i>Daily Graphic</i> or through radio announcements.</p> <p>This means of communication is insufficient as it may not reach the Community nor does it allow a process for meaningful input from the Community. The Agyemankata Community has sent several letters to the AMA over the course of several years. The AMA, however, has never replied nor acknowledged receipt of those letters and continues to issue messages to the Agyemankata Community through newspapers or radio announcements.</p>		<p>icy. As documented in the RPF, representatives of the Agyemankata Kwabenya Community (AKC) participated in focus groups and group discussions in 2001-2002. These activities were organized by the Centre for the Development of People (CEDEP), an independent nongovernmental organization working with Environ Engineering and Management Consult, the consultants responsible for helping the Government to develop the ESA and RPF. The consultants conducted in September 2003 a preliminary assessment of the properties within the buffer zone that could be affected by the proposed project, which required interaction with some of the project-affected people at the site. (See Annex 2 on public consultation during project preparation.) The consultations showed that there was broad support for the project from local residents, the local Members of Parliament and the Assemblyman for the Kwabenya communities. Minutes of these consultations indicate that most local people supported the siting of the facility once they heard and understood the difference between the existing dump sites and the operation of a sanitary landfill and how the possible negative environmental and social impacts that could be associated with the construction and operation of the sanitary landfill would be mitigated. During these consultations it was also explained that, as stated in the RPF, further consultations, data collection, and analysis would be undertaken for the preparation of the RAP.</p> <p>The Government has informed the Bank that it undertook numerous efforts to reach out to and consult the local communities about the Project, including the AKC. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was established by the Minister of Local Government and Rural Development in June 2004 to address concerns of property owners. In July 2004, the TAC issued a press release inviting the general public to submit concerns regarding the sanitary landfill project. The TAC then held a three-day brainstorming session with land agencies, social groups, traditional authorities, other Kwabenya residents, Government representatives and project officials. The AKC declined to participate in these discussions. The Government further informed the Bank that when officials from the Ministry and AMA delivered letters to members of the Community in June 2004, inviting them to a meeting, they were detained for several hours and confronted with death threats should they ever return. Subsequent letters were returned unopened. Since that incident, Government delegations, project staff, surveyors and valuation staff have visited the site under the protection of armed security personnel. As some of the attached letters show (Annex 4), the AKC communications typically include the following: <i>"We Agyemankata community the immediate residents living on Kwabenya landfill site will never honor any invitation or discussions on a dump (landfill) at Agyemankata Kwabenya. We have the right to protect our environment. Anybody who enters here does so at his/her own risk."</i> This reflects the complex social and political situation the Government is dealing with and the difficulties in undertaking field visits.</p> <p>Although Management understands that the Government may have selected alternative ways of communication due to the refusal of the Community to receive written notifications, on their own these communications via newspapers and radio will not be sufficient to meet Bank policy requirements for the preparation of an acceptable RAP.</p> <p>On March 1, 2007, the Bank's Communication Specialist in Accra and a Senior Municipal Engineer met with local representatives from the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE), which submitted the Request on behalf of the AKC and had written to the Bank (Annex</p>

No.	Claim/Issue	OP/BP	Response
			<p>7). COHRE is an international nongovernmental organization that campaigns for the protection of housing rights and the prevention of forced evictions. COHRE attended the meeting with a local journalist who has written extensively on the Project in the national newspapers. The Bank explained its involvement in the Project to date, and its obligation to receive and approve a complete RAP before civil works could commence at the site. The Bank team also explained the importance the Bank placed on the prevention or mitigation of any negative impacts on the community, as well as the Bank's willingness to support community upgrading work in the area, and to consider supporting part of the displacement and resettlement costs under the IDA Credit. The meeting was very constructive, and COHRE offered to contact the AKC and serve as mediators between the community and the Government.</p>
Involuntary Resettlement			
4.	<p>The Agyemankata Community learned about the World Bank's role in the Landfill only from a newspaper article in the <i>Daily Graphic</i> (dated 10 December 2003, page 23, para 15) in which it was stated that "S.O. Darko, former Mayor of Accra, said World Bank was to finance the Kwabenya landfill." In response to this article, the Agyemankata Community wrote to the World Bank on 16 January 2004 requesting that the Bank not support the Landfill component of the Project.</p> <p>In response, the World Bank on 30 January 2004 invited the Agyemankata Community to see the already prepared Environmental and Social Assessments and the Resettlement Policy Framework. This is the first time the Agyemankata Community was made aware of these documents and, again, was only allowed to see them after their completion. The Community is quite frustrated given this lack of transparency and lack of consultation.</p> <p>[This violates] the Operational Policy 4.12 Required Measure that "(a) the resettlement plan or resettlement policy framework includes measures to ensure that the displaced persons are (i) informed about their options and rights pertaining to resettlement; (ii) consulted on, offered choices among, and provided with technically and economically feasible resettlement alternatives." (OP 4.12, para. 6(a).) [Also see] Bank Procedure 4.12, paragraph 5(b) requiring the resettlement plan or resettlement policy framework's "adequacy with respect to OP 4.12, including the involvement of affected groups and</p>	4.12	<p>As indicated under item 3 above, several discussions were held and focus groups met during 2001-2002, as part of the preparation of the RPF, which included members of the AKC, among them the school-teacher who acted as AKC spokesperson. Therefore, it is Management's view that the community was properly consulted and informed about the proposed Project prior to the quoted article of December 10, 2003. Also, in accordance with Bank policies, the RPF was publicly disclosed following review and acceptance by the Bank prior to appraisal. The RPF was disclosed in the Bank's Infoshop on January 16, 2004 and "in-country" on January 19, 2004. The Bank also received a large delegation of 35 members of the AKC on February 27, 2004, which shared its concerns and thanked the Bank for its courtesy and clarifications (Annex 6).</p> <p>As indicated on page 4 of the project-wide RPF, RAPs were to be done at a later date for the Kwabenya sanitary landfill and the other solid waste subcomponents, as well as for the storm drainage and community infrastructure upgrading components, based on the guidance set forth in the RPF. It further noted that, "<i>The existing information on the social safeguards situation at the Kwabenya landfill site are described in this report [RPF] to provide the basis for the preparation of a RAP for Kwabenya and to serve as an illustration of the application of the RPF. This information is in part taken from the Environmental Impact Study that was printed in 2000 (2000 EIS) through funding from another donor and in part collected as part of this assignment. It was deemed however that this information, and the consultation process with the affected population, is insufficient to present an adequate RAP for Kwabenya, which remains to be done (emphasis added), with adequate exploration of alternatives.</i>" Therefore, it is Management's view that the requirements of OP 4.12 were met; the RPF (page 25) includes the Bank policy requirements, in particular the requirement that displaced and compensated persons should be meaningfully consulted and should have opportunities to participate in planning and implementing approved resettlement programs. As previously noted, an acceptable RAP will need to be submitted and found satisfactory before the Bank agrees to finance the sanitary landfill works, in accordance with Section 3.03 (c) of the DCA.</p>

No.	Claim/Issue	OP/BP	Response
	the extent to which the views of such groups are being considered." (BP 4.12, para. 5(b).)		
5.	[T]he World Bank has not abided by its Operational Policy on Involuntary Resettlement (OP 4.12) or its Bank Procedures on Involuntary Resettlement (BP 4.12). Specifically: The Agyemankata Community has yet to see any Involuntary Resettlement Action Plan on Kwabenya Landfill yet alone be able to meaningfully participate in such a plan's creation. [This violates] the Operational Policy 4.12 Policy Objective requiring that "displaced persons should be meaningfully consulted and should have opportunities to participate in planning and implementing resettlement programs." (OP 4.12, para. 2(b).)	4.12	As indicated in Item 4 above, Management notes that the RAP for the Kwabenya sanitary landfill has yet to be prepared and submitted to the Bank for its review and acceptance, and that the preparation of the RAP will require additional consultations with affected groups. Therefore, it is Management's view that the requirements of OP 4.12 have been met and the affected community will have the opportunity to participate in the preparation of the RAP and its implementation as the policy requires. The Government confirms its agreement to comply with Bank policies in accordance with the terms of the Project's DCA (Annex 9).
6.	<p>The AMA communicated to the Agyemankata Community via radio announcements on 19 and 20 July 2007 and in the 18 July 2007 edition of the <i>Ghanaian Times</i> that its residents needed to deposit all documents on their respective properties at the Land Valuation Board. A further notice by the AMA Agyemankata Community to bring all relevant documents to the AMA by 30 July 2007 or forfeit their compensation was communicated to the Agyemankata Community only in the 18 July 2007 edition of the <i>Ghanaian Times</i>. The threat by the AMA of 30 July 2007 that the residents risk forfeiting their compensation is a threat by the AMA to violate Operational Policy 4.12 Required Measure that "(g) the resettlement plan or resettlement policy framework included measures to ensure that the displaced persons are... (iii) provide prompt and effective compensation at full replacement cost for losses of assets attributable directly to the project." (OP 4.12, para. 6(a).)</p> <p>The threat by the AMA of 30 July 2007 that the residents risk forfeiting their compensation demonstrates either the inadequacy of or a threat to violate any resettlement plan's or resettlement policy framework's "criteria for eligibility of displaced persons for compensation" as required by BP 4.12, para. 5 (c).)</p>	4.12	<p>Management understands that the communications indicated by the Requesters took place. However, Management has been informed by the Government that while no compensation has yet been made, the stated deadline for forfeiture will not be imposed. Forfeiture of compensation is not in accordance with OP 4.12 and hence such actions would not be acceptable to the Bank. The Government has confirmed via letter to the Bank dated September 13, 2007 (Annex 9) its commitment to an action plan that <i>inter alia</i> includes the following actions to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare an acceptable RAP not later than March 31, 2008; • Not resettle any affected people prior to the approval of the RAP by the Bank; • Take all the necessary measures to avoid new occupation of the lands already acquired by the Government; • Develop of a public communication campaign; • Organize bi-monthly progress review meetings on the preparation status of the RAP until December 2007 and monthly meetings thereafter, and discuss progress reports on the preparation of the RAP; and • Prepare the Environmental Management Plan.
7.	As outlined above, the Agyemankata	4.12	Management acknowledges that the AKC has communicated its con-

No.	Claim/Issue	OP/BP	Response
	Community has spoken with World Bank officials in Accra on several occasions and their concerns have yet to be dealt with in a satisfactory manner. Again, those responsible for the Landfill continue to not meaningfully consult with the Community.		<p>cerns, both in writing and in meetings and protests (between January 2004 and January 2007) (See Annex 4). Management considers that it has addressed the community's concerns (Annex 5) and it has assured the community of its strong commitment to adhere to safeguards, particularly on resettlement, which will include additional and sufficient consultations during the preparation of the RAP. The AKC also has been advised on how to address grievances to the local institutions and committees handling the Project and has been assured that any negative impacts from the siting of the facility within their community will be mitigated appropriately.</p> <p>The Government has agreed to an action plan that includes a full communication subcomponent to address the concerns of the community, in addition to the requirement of full consultation with the affected communities during the preparation of the RAP. Management notes that some of the demonstrators appeared to have been misinformed about the safeguards measures under the Project. For example, despite several presentations, the community was still under the impression that the Kwabenya sanitary landfill would be similar in design and in operation to some of the existing open dumps of Accra.</p>
Project Appraisal			
8.	The actions of the AMA demonstrate a lack of commitment to implementing any resettlement instrument that meets with OP 4.12 and BP 4.12. Consequently the Project is in violation of Bank Procedure 4.12 (Appraisal), para. 10, requiring assessment of "(a) the borrower's commitment to and capacity for implementing the resettlement instrument; (b) the feasibility of the proposed measures for improvement or restoration of livelihoods and standards of living; (c) availability of adequate counterpart funds for resettlement activities; and (d) significant risks, including risk of impoverishment, from inadequate implement of the resettlement instrument." (BP 4.12, para. 10.)	4.12	<p>Management takes seriously this allegation by the Requesters and considers that the Government is fully committed to achieving the Project objectives, in line with the Bank's operational policies, per the DCA.</p> <p>The Borrower's capacity, which was strengthened during implementation of UESP, was assessed during appraisal. Although implementation arrangements similar to those under UESP were maintained, an institutional strengthening component was included in the repeater project to support the objective of further decentralizing project implementation to the Metropolitan Assemblies (MAs).</p> <p>As explained above, the RAP has not been prepared yet and, it is Management's view that the RPF correctly set out principles and procedures to be used in assessing and analyzing the social impacts and valuing entitlement eligibilities as part of the preparation of the RAP. The RPF also includes proposed mitigation measures, such as restoration of income and livelihood. Management will ensure that the Project meets applicable Bank policies for those persons displaced and resettled as a result of the Project before it commits funding for this activity.</p>
Other Issues			
9.	The above may not be an exhaustive list of all World Bank Operational Policies and Bank Procedures being violated by the Kwabenya Landfill project. Consequently, COHRE and the Agyemankata Community reserve the right to amend this Request for Inspection.		Management is fully committed to respond to the concerns raised in the Requesters' letter and to any future questions on the Bank's compliance with its operational policies. As indicated in Items 4, 7, and 8 above, Management also will ensure that the Project meets the highest standards of due diligence, including with respect to implementation of the Bank's operational policies and consultation with project-affected people. Management intends to work with the Government and with the affected communities to find a suitable solution to the urgent problem of solid waste disposal in Accra that is in full compliance with Bank policies on environmental assessment and involuntary resettlement. Management will ensure that the Action Plan in paragraph 33 of the Management Response is fully implemented.
10.	Finally, it should be noted that the Kwabenya Landfill project is based		This statement, or parts of it, is not present in the report of the Strategic Plan for the Greater Accra Metropolitan Area report (December

No.	Claim/Issue	OP/BP	Response
	<p>on an early 1990s UNDP strategic plan for the then Greater Accra Metropolitan Area. This strategic plan stated that landfill sites should be 1 km away from residential areas. While the Kwabenya site fit that criterion at the time this plan was drafted, the current Project fails to meet this plan due to changed residential patterns in the area. Indeed, the Agyemankata Community now reside within 1 km of the proposed Landfill.</p>		<p>1992), funded by the UNDP/HABITAT. Kwabenya is not mentioned in the five-volume comprehensive report, nor did the report state the distance between a landfill site and communities. As indicated in Item 1 above, the final project design will be reviewed by an expert to ensure that it meets the criteria established by the Ghana Environmental Protection Agency.</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

No.	Meeting Date	Organizer	Attendees	Purpose of Meeting	Additional Comments
1.	January 23, 2001	CEDEP – Ben Lartey Elvis Addae	Ga District Chief Executive – Mr. Attoh	To discuss a letter signed by chiefs and elders of Kwabenya township and addressed to Ga District – reminding authorities of request made on behalf of the authorities.	
2.	November 13, 2001	Linda Osafo, AMEHI Frank Chinebuah, AMA Ben Lartey, CEDEP Elvis Addae, CEDEP	Landfill site	Familiarization visit to: i) introduce terms of reference of CEDEP; ii) familiarize CEDEP with landfill project; and iii) identify various stakeholders of Kwabenya community.	
3.	November 14, 2001	CEDEP/AMA	Stone Winner's Group 1 Agyeman-Kata Residents Association – Mr. Amoakoh Mr. Smith Amo	Familiarization with Landfill Project Answering questions and comments.	Group leader wanted stone winners group to seek employment with the Project contractors.
4.	November 19, 2001	CEDEP Team	LOTTE Assemblen for Kwabenya Electoral Area – Mr. Prosper Aryee	Lotte to familiarize CEDEP with technicalities of landfills – possible hazards and mitigation measures.	
5.	November 27, 2001	CEDEP Team - Linda Asafo, Frank Chinebuah, Bernard Lartey, Elvis Addae	GDA officials – Planning Department officials Mr. Thompson (planner at DA)	Introduce CEDEP and its role as primary Community Educator/Sensitizer of Kwabenya Landfill Project.	Complaints that GDA was sidelined from deliberations/discussions on the Landfill Project.
6.	November 28, 2001	CEDEP Team: Ben Vikpeh-Lartey Elvis Addae	Mr. Attoh (DCE of GDA and legal landlord of Kwabenya)	Introduction of CEDEP to the DCE of GDA	Mr. Attoh pledged his support for the project.
7.	December 5, 2001	CEDEP (unaccompanied)	i) Mr. Amo Smith, Kwabenya Community and proprietor of Nana Saah Memorial Primary School ii) Mr. Amoakoh	First visit to community to try to hold a dialogue with the residents.	Representative's main concerns were the social, economic, health and cultural implications of the project. One of the main concerns was moving the school which would prevent children from poor homes from attending.
8.	January 8, 2002	CEDEP - Ben Lartey Elvis Addae	Youth Group (Cards Playing Stars), Kwabenya Town	CEDEP was supposed to meet with a focus group comprising chiefs, elders, and opinion leaders – but none of them attended.	Youth group were misinformed about landfill projects and not included in deliberations by chiefs and opinion leaders. They initially rejected the Landfill idea but at the end of the meeting changed their stance.

No.	Meeting Date	Organizer	Attendees	Purpose of Meeting	Additional Comments
9.	January 8, 2002	CEDEP - Ben Lartey Elvis Addae	Prosper Aryee, assemblyman of the area (Kwabenya)	To familiarize the attendee with the Landfill project.	
10.	January 22, 2002	CEDEP – Ben Lartey Elvis Addae Mr. Chinebuah Linda Osafa	Field team members at CEDEP, Accra Office Kokom- lemle	Briefing on CEDEP’s activities.	
11.	January 24, 2002	CEDEP	Nii Abbey Okanfra II (One of Kwabenya chiefs)	Courtesy call – introduction of staff and their roles in Landfill project.	<i>Chief’s main concerns:</i> i) the proximity of landfill to Accra; ii) health issues associated with landfill. <i>Outcome of Meeting:</i> Support and blessing of traditional authori- ties to go ahead with project. 70% of Kwabenya population supports the project.
12.	January 28, 2002	CEDEP	Kwabenya Chiefs Elders GA District Executive (DCE) – Mr. Atroh Kwabenya Mantse – Nii Abbey Okanfra II	To find out what the status of a re- quest which was sent to DC regarding provision of basic amenities and ser- vices (water, schools, clinics etc) which was sent to DCE.	
13.	undated		Stone Winning Group (2 groups) TAYSEC – Scott Wilson Assistants to Mr. Amoakoh	Briefing on one of the enabling works of the Project (drainage culvert; drai- nage road).	Negative effects of the project; displace- ment and compensations; formation of 5 person team to link CEDEP and the group. Ref. was made to a meeting on Nov. 17, 2001 with Agyeman-Kata residents.
14.	February 11, 2002	CEDEP Team: Ben Lartey Elvis Addae	Prosper Aryee - Assemblyman for Kwabenya	To discuss arrangements made so far in connection with impending focus group discussions and group discus- sions to be held in Kwabenya.	
15.	February 12, 2002	CEDEP Team: Ben Lartey Elvis Addae	Kwabenya Youth Association Prosper Aryee (assemblyman, Kwabenya)	To educate and sensitize Kwabenya youth association on the landfill pro- ject.	
16.	February 14, 2002	CEDEP Team: Ben Lartey Elvis Addae	Kwabenya Footballers Asso- ciation	To educate and sensitize the Kwa- benya Footballers Association	
17.	March 6, 2002	CEDEP – Ben Lartey	Mr. Ofori – Kwabenya Youth Association and Opinion Lead-	To educate and sensitize on the Land- fill project.	

No.	Meeting Date	Organizer	Attendees	Purpose of Meeting	Additional Comments
		Elvis Addae Richard Botchwey	et		
18.	March 8, 2002	CEDEP Public Educational Team - Ben Lartey Elvis Addae Richard Botchwey	Flames of Pentecost Church Congregation	Inform community members (church community) about Landfill project.	CEDEP reviewed structure of landfills.
19.	March 10, 2002	CEDEP – Ben Lartey Elvis Addae Richard Botchwey	Kwabenya Presbyterian and Methodist Churches	Briefing community members on Landfill project and listen to questions and issues raised by community members	Observation made by CEDEP: Community members were misinformed about the project.
20.	March 17, 2002	CEDEP – Ben Lartey Elvis Addae Richard Botchwey	Members of the Assemblies of God Church Assemblyman for Kwabenya Electoral Area – Prosper Aryee	Inform community members (church community) about Landfill project.	Same fears as mentioned above – particularly water contamination and how Government will deal with this (provide potable water to community).
21.	March 17, 2002	CEDEP – Ben Lartey Elvis Addae Richard Botchwey	Congregation of the Deeper Life Church Assemblyman for Kwabenya Electoral Area – Prosper Aryee	Inform community members (church community) about Landfill project.	
22.	March 24, 2002	CEDEP Public Educational Team - Ben Lartey Elvis Addae Richard Botchwey	Members of Pentecost Church, Kwabenya	Inform community members (church community) about Landfill project.	CEDEP reviewed structure of landfills, precautionary measures to be taken prior to building landfill, and the benefits derived. Community's main concerns were health hazards, possible explosion, compensation, relocation or resettlement, will the Gov't provide the community with basic amenities (e.g. potable water, etc).
23.	March 24, 2002	CEDEP Public Educational Team - Ben Lartey Elvis Addae Richard Botchwey	Members of Redemption Church, Kwabenya	Inform community members (church community) about Landfill project.	
24.	September 9, 2003	AMA	Landowners of Kwabenya landfill site. Attendees included:	Discussions on the remaining sensitive issues on compensation and other related matters.	See Annex for details on Agreements reached.

No.	Meeting Date	Organizer	Attendees	Purpose of Meeting	Additional Comments
25.	November 29, 2007	Government Coordinating Committee, RCC, Accra	CEDEP Team	Introduction of CEDEP team to Government	Topics discussed incl'd: inter-sectoral collaborations, social economic and political aspects of the project, compulsory acquisitions, payment of compensations & resettlement packages for effected people.

ANNEX 2

MINUTES OF PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS (2001-2003) AND SUMMARY TABLE

I. HIGHLIGHTS OF MEETING BETWEEN AMA AND LAND OWNERS OF KWABENYA LANDFILL SITE HELD ON TUESDAY, 9TH SEPTEMBER 2003 AT THE METRO CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S OFFICE

PRESENT

1. Hon Solomon Ofei-Darko	Metro Chief Executive
2. Mr I T Adjovu	Metro Co-ordinating Director
3. Mr K. K. Bosompem	Metro Director of Finance
4. Major T N K Awuah	Metro Works Department
5. Miss Efuah Anyaful	Metro Planning Unit
6. Mr K D Osei	Town & Country Planning Depart.
7. Mr Parker Allotey	P R O, AMA
8. Mr B M Laryea	Ag. Head, WMD
9. Anderson N. Blay	Waste Management Department
10. Nii Tetteh Ankamah II	Head of Nii Okaijah Gbeke Family
11. Seth Okaijah Lamptey	Nii Okaijah Gbeke Family
12. Asafoatse Dinsey II	Nii Okaijah Gbeke Family

1.0 INTRODUCTION: In furtherance to the efforts to develop the Kwabenya Landfill, the land owners (Nii Tetteh Ankamah II and elders) were invited for discussions on the remaining sticky points on compensation and other related matters.

1.1 BRIEF BY METRO CHIEF EXECUTIVE: Welcoming the Chief and his elders to the meeting, he said, it was unfortunate that the project had delayed unduly due to funding difficulties. Fortunately, he said, the World Bank has now agreed to fund the project.

In view of that, time was ripe to enter into negotiations with them (Land owners) on the payment of the agreed commitment fee (knocking fee) of two hundred and fifty million Cedis (₵250,000,000).

This was to enable the AMA to enter on the land and conduct survey works for preparation of the compensation and other engineering works. This will enable the AMA to fulfill the demand by the World Bank.

1.2. RESPONSE FROM CHIEF (LAND OWNERS): In his reaction, the Chief, lamented greatly on the delay of the project and the frustration he and his subjects have gone through. They would therefore expect the AMA to fulfill its promise and pay the commitment fee immediately.

2.0. AGREEMENTS: after much deliberation, the following agreements were reached;

One hundred and fifty million Cedis (₵150,000,000) out of the two hundred and fifty million Cedis (₵250,000,000) would be paid by Thursday, 18th September 2003. The remaining One hundred million Cedis (₵100,000,000) would be paid in the next month.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) would be prepared and signed by the Land Owners by Thursday, 18th September 2003 to enable AMA enter the land for work to start.

The Land Owners, Nii Okaijah Gbeke Family should write to Messrs Amoako and Smith and warn them from obstructing AMA in its work. A copy of the letter should be sent AMA.

A letter to be written to the Ga District Assembly (GDA) to take action on all encroachers on the land.

3.0 CLOSING: In conclusion, the Metro Chief Executive thanked the Chief and elders for a fruitful deliberation.

II. A MEETING WITH LOTTE ON THE 19/11/2001

The main purpose of the meeting with Lotte of Scott Wilson was for her to take us (CEDEP) team through some technicalities on the Landfill project. The team was taken through as they pertain in other parts of the world. We also looked at the problems of leachate, gas methane, vermin, dust etc and how these possible Hazards could be abated or solved when they occur. At the meeting, we also discussed the concerns of the stone winners.

A meeting with the Honorable Assemblyman for Kwabenya Electoral Area. The CEDEP team met the Honorable Assemblyman of Kwabenya electoral area in the person of Mr Prosper Aryee. He was bereaved at the time we met so the meeting with was very short and brief.

The CEDEP team briefed the Assembly of our assigned mission in the Landfill project and how we would dearly need his assistance as far as the mobilization and participation of the entire Community in the on going project was concerned. He thanked us for accepting to help in selling the Landfill concept to the people of his community and promised his unflinching support to the project and agreed to assist in the mobilization of the people in times of need.

III. VISIT TO THE GA DISTRICT ASSEMBLY on 27th November 2001

A team of four (4) comprising Mrs Linda Asafo, Frank Chinebuah, Bernard V Lartey and Elvis Addae travelled to Amasaman the district capital of the GDA. The main objective of the visit was to introduce CEDEP as the NGO that had been selected to undertake the Community Education/Sensitization of the Kwabenya Landfill project to the DCE and other GDA officials involved in the Landfill project.

The team could not meet the DCE as he was in a meeting. The team, however, met officials of the planning department who expressed their unhappiness about how the assembly had been sidelined by AMA.

The officials reiterated that Kwabenya falls under GDA, but has been excluded from all deliberations/discussions on the Landfill project. These complaints the team noted with great concern, since the team believed that such reactions were going to have negative repercussions on the Kwabenya project. In one of our meetings with the government teams we suggested that the Government team should as a matter of urgency include the GDA team in the discussion so as to enhance the smooth running or supervision of the project.

IV. MEETING WITH THE GA DISTRICT ASSEMBLY on 28th November 2001

The CEDEP team made up of Ben Vikpeh-Lartey and Elvis S Addae arrived at Amasaman, the District Capital of the GDA. The team quickly checked on Mr Thompson who is a planner at the GDA. The CEDEP team had already met Mr. Thompson a day earlier (thus, 27th November 2001) with AMA team led by Mrs Linda Osafo, and Mr Frank Chinebuah from the WMD. The purpose of the visit was to introduce the CEDEP staff to the DCE of GDA who is also the landlord of Kwabenya by law. The team briefed the DCE about CEDEP's Mission.

Mr Attoh (DCE) welcomed us and pledged his support to the project.

V. MEETING WITH THE CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE ON 29/11/2001 AT THE RCC, ACCRA

On the 29th November, 2001, there was a meeting organized by the government Co-ordinating Committee at RCC – Accra. The CEDEP team was introduced to the government team for the first time, CEDEP made a presentation on the strategies and methodology for the execution of the assignment. Members at the meeting gave constructive suggestions, which were taken on board and CEDEP was tasked to develop and present to the Government Co-ordinating Committee a set of new method and strategic objectives since, the focus of our main purpose had changed. During the meeting members also held discussions on very pressing issues such as Inter – sectoral collaborations amongst Departments, Social, Economic and Political aspects of the project, compulsory acquisitions, payment of compensations as well as resettlement packages for the victims.

VI. A VISIT TO KWABENYA on 5TH DECEMBER, 2001

Harboring the feeling that they had been sidelined and not been treated fairly, the Agyeman-Kata residents had adopted a hostile attitude towards anyone who is related to the project. This is worsened if they notice an Accra Metro van or personnel. For this reason, CEDEP thought of going to the community alone, i.e. Without the involvement of Mrs Linda Osafo and Mr Frank Chinebuah of AMEHI and the Accra Waste Management respectively. The following is a write-up on the first visit to the community that CEDEP made unaccompanied.

TARGET

The main target of the visit was Mr Amo Smith, the proprietor of Nana Saah Memorial Primary School within the buffer zone of the project. He welcomed us and demanded our identity. We were then taken round the ridge for us to see how close the project was to human habitation.

To do this, he took us to some homes of some residents who according to him had lost their spouses. These widows and widowers according to him had stayed on the ridge for over twenty years. “Now you said they should go away, where they go? He asked.

He pointed to pieces of land and on-going developments whose owners stayed in America and Europe. He took us to the top of the mountain where we could have a clear view of the beautiful landscape.

We finally got seated in the house of Mr Amoakoh, Mr Amo Smith spoke about the social, economic, health and cultural implications of the project. He spoke of the assistance his school is offering to children who stayed far away as well as the softer terms he offers to pupils from poor home.

He said, “if the school is moved away from there to another distant place, how would these children attend school?” This, he said, amounted to discrimination against those children.

The people, according to him, had stayed and farmed on the land for so many years now. Moving them from this place is an indirect way of ceasing them from living. These already aged people would just be quickened to their graves.

He was angry with the fact that they were not consulted in anyway and that none of their letters had been responded to. He said, that this confirms the stands of some political leaders who think that there are no human beings living in the area.

VII. MEETING WITH A YOUTH GROUP (CARDS PLAYING STARS) IN KWABENYA TOWN on 8TH JANUARY 2002

Mr Ben V Lartey and Mr Elvis S Addae both of CEDEP arrived at Kwabenya town to arrange for a focus group discussion with the chiefs, elders and opinion leaders but none of them was met. We however met seven young men who were members of the youth

group that plays cards. Among the groups was the junior brother of the Honorable Assemblyman for Kwabenya electoral area and who is also a close relative of the landlord of the Kwabenya Lands including the landfill project site. These guys had a lot of information to share with us, especially, the relative of the Landlord. Initially, they were against the project but after they had listened to our interventions on Landfill sites they rescinded their decision and gave their support for the project. After everything, we realized that the youth groups had been misinformed by the Amo-Smith and Amoako groups and that they also had very little information about Landfill projects in general. The youths also raised the issue of the chiefs and opinion leaders not being transparent, thus the community members had been kept in the dark as far as the whole project was concerned. The youth raised pertinent issues such as the government providing some amenities to compensate the township such amenities like: the provision of portable water, schools, access roads, clinic, compensation and relocation of the affected persons. In our response to their request from government, we made them aware that the government was prepared to provide the community with all that they were requesting for if they will accept the project. The youth said nobody had told them or organized any community form to inform them of such laudable intentions from the government. We later charged them to also go around and educate other youth groups and the community on the landfill project.

VIII. MEETING WITH THE ASSEMBLYMAN OF THE KWABENYA AREA on 8th January 2002

The assemblyman of the area Mr Prosper Aryee, later joined the meeting , which was deduced from the interaction with him that the Kwabenya community is in favor of the project. He however showed us a resolution that had been written and signed by him, the two chiefs and about eight other opinion leaders. This contained the conditions that in the AMA had to fulfill before the next phase of the project could continue. These are the provision of the following: **portable water, a clinic, compensation/relocation, upgrading of the access road and the school.** He cited instances of deceit by the Atomic Energy Unit and the ACP Estate Developers, which promised the people of Kwabenya electricity and portable water respectively but failed to fulfill them. They were, he said, in no way going to allow themselves to be cheated once more. Based on some news articles he had heard, he was going to meet the DCE of the GDA at the shortest possible time.

He then assisted us in the identification of individuals, groups and organizations that we could contact for interactions and discussions. Some of these are eight (8) churches, two (2) chiefs, Playing Cards Club, a football club, Community Committee, Landlords Association, Residents Association, teachers and students union. He promised organizing a public forum on the 19th of January to inform the community about the outcome of the resolution.

INTRODUCTION:

To enable CEDEP accomplish the terms of reference assigned by AMA and for that matter the AWP, a familiarization visit was paid to the landfill site on TUESDAY, 13TH NOVEMBER 2001.

Team Members:

Mrs Linda Osafo	-	Co-ordinator, AMEHI
Mr Frank Chinebuah	-	AMA, Waste Management Departments
Mr Bernard Lartey	-	CEDEP, ACCRA
Mr Elvis Addae	-	CEDEP, ACCRA

Objectives:

The main objective of the visit was to enable CEDEP have a clearer understanding of the landfill project and also to identify the various stakeholders of the Kwabenya community.

IX. MEETING WITH SCOTT WILSON

A supervisor of Scott Wilson, the supervising company, overseeing the works of Taylor Woodrow Construction (Taysec) gave a brief on one of the enabling works of the project. This was the drainage culvert required to carry the watercourse that sporadically flows down the valley beneath the landfill. He described the technical aspects of it and also the materials being used for the culverts. They hope to finish it by end of November 2001.

The other enabling works is an access road that had been constructed to the site. He spoke of the threats by the community and quickly adding that, things were normalizing and that work was going on steadily.

X. MEETING WITH STONE WINNING GROUPS

There are two main economic activities in the area. These are stone-winning and farming. The team learnt of the existence of four main stone-winning groups there. Two of these were identified and interacted with.

Group 1

With much assistance from one Mr Acquah, over 20 stone-winners were mobilized. About 6 staff of Taysec were also present at the meeting. This mixture of the workers of the Construction Company and the stone-winners showed the understanding this particular group had with the entire project. Time was allowed for questions from them.

Responses:

Issues on the negative effect of the projects – water, health etc. were addressed further explanation on the structure of the project was given.

Compensations: the AMEHI co-ordinator commented on it, she however could not say exactly what would be done/given to the affected people.

On Taysec, the team promised to carry those concerns to the management of the company.

A five-man committee was formed to link up CEDEP and the group. This became necessary in that there are going to be several regular meetings hence the need to interact with a smaller group.

Group 2

The leader of the second group, Mr Amoakoh had travelled however, his assistants were there to meet us. The reactions of the three men after we had made our mission known to them demonstrated their unhappiness of the project, in no uncertain terms they made it clear that they detest the project based on social and economic factors.

Due to the stand of the leaders, the team suspended the intended meeting with the larger group to avoid chaotic and possible harmful situations.

They equated the project to the social security scheme, which was described nicely but has now become a bitter pill that workers are swallowing.

Example of landfills in other countries, which had not be stopped or are causing harm to health of the residents, was cited. This information, according to them were gathered from the internet and also from literature sent to them by relations and friends outside Ghana.

They were also not happy about the awarding of the contract for the construction to a company from the country, which granted the loan to Ghana for the project.

Displacement and compensations: they spoke at length on their understanding of the negative effects the project would have on their economic activities (stone winning) and also of the education of their children.

There was also the expression of the fear that compensations (if any) to the affected persons might be very small.

Responses:

Reacting to the above concerns above, it was made known to them that landfills could be harmful depending on the type of waste being deposited. It was explained to them that the wastes of the developed (industrialized) countries are mainly toxic unlike that of Ghana

which are mainly domestic or food waste. This, it was said if properly managed, will pose no problem at all.

AWARD OF CONTRACT: Awarding a contract to a company from the same country from where a loan for the project was secured had been seen as not the best, however, it was said to be one of the 'strings' (conditions) attached to the loan. Subsequent stages of the project, according to the AMEHI coordinator, would be put to tender for open bidding...

SOCIO-ECONOMIC: Attempts were made to assure them of proper arrangement for resettlement and other compensation packages for those of who might be affected by the project.

The leader of the group informed us about a meeting of the Agyeman-Kata Residents Association on Saturday, 17th November 2001 at 10:00 AM. We promised to attend this meeting.

XI. GROUP DISCUSSION WITH THE KWABENYA YOUTH ASSOCIATION AT KWABENYA on 12th February 2002

PRESENT:

BENARD V LARTEY, ELVIS ADDAE (CEDEP)

PROSPER ARYEE (ASSEMBLYMAN, KWABENYA)

TIME: 8.55 am

PURPOSE OF DISCUSSION: To educate and sensitize the Kwabenya youth association on the Kwabenya landfill project.

The group was fairly a large one, numbering about 25 members. Our initial plans of organizing a focus group discussion (FGD) had to be changed to a general group discussion because of the large size of the group. After the usual exchange of pleasantries, the Honorable Assemblyman and his elders, thus executive members of the Kwabenya Youth Association, asked us of our mission. We started by informing them that we had had several Public Educational discussions with some other groups including their chiefs and elders etc. and that it was their turn today. The group informed us that they have heard about the on going Public Education on the landfill project and that they were happy we have met them today. We then asked the Assemblyman to briefly give account on progress reports so far received from the Government side concerning the community's demand for some basic amenities. He briefly, informed the meeting that so far the government has been responding positively to their request made. He mentioned specifically, Water, Clinic and Market which the government has agreed and has started to tackle at the same time. The Honorable Assemblyman said the rest of the amenities namely, Schools, roads, toilets etc. the Government has promised to tackle in phases. He went further to inform the meeting that he has had several meetings with Government officials from both AMA and GDA where CEDEP was present in some of the meetings to pressurize for these amenities, and

now the government has backed its promise with actions. He intimated that a community to inspect the pipelines etc. and said hopefully the water project may start in a few weeks time.

The Honorable Assemblyman, said he was again invited by the GDA chief executive to his office yesterday to discuss the site selected for the community Clinic aside these action points he has also been charged to look out/locate a 20 acre plot where those who have been affected by the landfill project could be resettled as well. After the Assemblyman's briefing the group members were happy that at long last the government has started yielding to their request for some basic amenities to the Kwabenya community. This brought CEDEP team into the scene where we took our time to educate all the group members thoroughly. We took them through the numerous stages of the landfill project using pictures to illustrate our education. After the intensive lecture/education, the floor was opened for questions. There were numerous questions that were disturbing peoples minds which we tried to provide answers to. Finally, by the close of the discussion, participants were convinced that they had been misinformed about the effects and hazards of landfill sites and that the information they had were not enough and that they have now understood the nitty gritty of what is a landfill and how a landfill does look like?

Emerging Issues:

Another major concern of the youth groups was the problem of unemployment in the area and that they have a lot of qualified artisans e.g. masons, carpenter, steel-benders etc. amongst the youth so their plea was for the government to give them a promise to employ some of their youths who have the requisite skills and are qualified to do the job when the second phase of the Landfill project starts.

Another concern expressed by the youth group was whether the Clinic to be built would meet international standard which could take care or handle any adverse situation whenever there is any outbreak of epidemic as a result of the landfill site. The last concern of the youths was whether the government would give the Kwabenya community and their surrounding villages concessionary charges/bills/rates when the clinic starts operating.

The discussion ended at 10.47 am.

**XII. MEETING WITH THE ASSEMBLYMAN FOR KWABENYA HON.
PROSPER ARYEE on 11th February 2002**

PRESENT:

BENARD V LARTEY, ELVIS ADDAE (CEDEP)

PROSPER ARYEE (ASSEMBLYMAN, KWABENYA)

TIME: 11.47 AM

PURPOSE OF DISCUSSION: To discuss arrangements so far made in connection with the impending focus group discussions (FGDs) and group discussions to be held in Kwabenya

The meeting was brief and focused. After serious discussions, the team agreed to meet tomorrow morning at 9.00 am (12/02/2002) at Kwabenya at the Assemblyman's house so as to move out to meet the church, leaders/secretaries and other youth leaders to arrange or fix the dates and times for the impending focus/group discussions.

The Honorable assembly man took the opportunity to brief the CEDEP team about progress so far made towards the provision of the basic amenities requested by the Kwabenya Chiefs, elders and opinion leaders.

Amenities:

The assemblyman informed the team that so far, some progress has been made in connection with the provision of the said amenities. He intimated that a team of experts from the Ghana Water Company Limited have visited the Kwabenya Township to have a first hand look at the situation. The team has made their estimates, recommendation and had written their reports. He said another team had also inspected the site earmarked for the community clinic as well as the community market and had submitted its reports to the authorities. The Assemblyman said he was in Amasaman this morning to meet with the GDA chief executive to discuss how best and fast the area could be surveyed and the layout plans drawn to meet the required standard. He said the DCE called in to his office the district's structural Engineer and charged him to get the surveyors to move to the site with him to undertake the surveying work. At the time of leaving Amasaman, the assemblyman and the engineers were still waiting for an official vehicle to convey them to Kwabenya to do the zoning and surveying of the earmarked plots for the projects.

**XIII. MEETING WITH THE KWABENYA FOOTBALLERS ASSOCIATION
AT KWABENYA on 14th February 2002**

PRESENT:

BENARD V LARTEY, ELVIS ADDAE (CEDEP)

MR CHINEBUAH (WASTE MANAGEMENT)

PROSPER ARYEE (ASSEMBLYMAN, KWABENYA)

TIME: 5.30 PM

PURPOSE OF DISCUSSION: To educate and sensitize the Kwabanya Footballer Association on the landfill project

The Public Education team made up of Bernard V Lartey, Elvis Addae all from CEDEP and Mr Chinebuah from the Waste Management Department of the AMA arrived at the Kwabanya Assemblyman's house at 4.39 pm

Since, the Honorable Assemblyman knew of our impending group discussion, he was already waiting for us. He led us unto the football field near the JSS School in the Kwabanya town. He asked for a few minutes to organize the footballers for the discussion to begin.

By 5.30 pm, there were about 32 footballers made up of all the three categories of age groups thus, the under 12, 17 and 21 years groups.

The Honorable Assemblyman, opened the floor by first introducing the Public Education team members to the footballers. After the introduction, he then gave a brief account of how the landfill project came about by looking at the trend of events from the past, present and the future.

He informed the youths that the idea of this landfill project was conceived as far back in the late eighties (80s) by the former government and that there have been enough studies carried on the landfill sites worldwide and that the type to be constructed at Kwabanya is about the best in whole of Africa, and its is engineering cantered. The Honorable Assemblyman reminded the youth groups not to forget the fact that the government has got the full powers given it by the constitution to acquire those lands compulsorily and that if it so happens, then it means the whole Kwabanya township and its surrounding villages are going to be the losers, since those amenities requested for by the Kwabanya chiefs, elders and opinion leaders would not be provided by the government, any more, because the inhabitants have proved recalcitrant. So in short, he impressed upon the youth groups to accept the project since the government has started providing those amenities requested for e.g. Water, market and Clinic for the start. At this juncture, the educational team members took turns to educate the youths on landfill site, the different types of landfill sites etc. after the sensitization, there were lots of questions from the floor which we tried to provide answers to.

Emerging issues:

Some major concerns that the group shared with us were: The health hazards associated with landfill sites, whether the youths in the Kwabenya community would be given some jobs to do at the landfill site; whether the government would allow the inhabitants of Kwabenya and surroundings, to attend clinic free of charge or not etc. Another pressing concern for the youthful footballers was the state in which their goal posts were in, they pleaded with the AMA to come to their aid by replacing the wooden posts with metal posts for them.

The educational team assured the footballers that their concerns would be forwarded to the authorities concerned to see how best they could help in assisting them with their concerns. Finally, the youth group leader thanked the educational team for taking the trouble to travel all the way from Accra to educate them on what is landfill and how a landfill site looked like? By closing time their number had risen to about 45 footballers. We provided two (2) crates of minerals to them to refresh themselves after a heated discussion.

The meeting closed at 6.47 pm.

XIV. INTERACTION WITH CHURCH OF CHRIST CONGREGATION

Date: 06/03/2002

Time: 7:30 – 8:30 pm

Attendance: 25 members

Present: Ben V Lartey, Elvis Addae, Richard Botchwey (CEDEP) and Mr Ofori (Kwabenya Youth Association)

The public education team met Mr Ofori who is an opinion leader as well as an executive member of the Kwabenya Youth Association. He joined our vehicle and asked us to drive to the premises of church of Christ. When the team got there we were received warmly since they had received our letter requesting for an interaction with them. After a brief introduction, we were given the floor to address the congregation. Mr Elvis Addae set the ball rolling at the project was through what is a refuse dump e.g. The Mallam type and the different types of Landfill sites, e.g. Landfill site for domestic waste and landfill, site meant for “Toxic Waste”. Pictures of the different types of landfills and refuse dumps were used to illustrate as well as support our presentation.

Question time was allowed for the congregation.

Emerging issues:

During question time, church members asked questions that had been bothering their minds ever since the project began. Below are some of the issues that emerged: Health hazards associated with landfill sites, e.g. Flies, vermin, methane gases emitting from the site, diseases etc. Public nuisance to be created by the numerous trucks of refuse that

would be plying their roads, the long and medium term health hazards to be expected, job openings for the youth of Kwabenya and surrounding, land acquisition after the landfill site have been reclaimed, who becomes the owner of the land, government or the original land owners etc.

The team members one after the other tried their best to provide answers to the numerous questions asked by the congregation. In the end, members were very satisfied with the explanations and answers provided to their questions. Church members requested for our postal address and telephone numbers with the view of getting back to us in case they would need further clarifications on landfill sites. Team members were also satisfied with the general conduct of the interaction with the congregation.

The meeting ended at about 8.36 pm.

XV. INTERACTION WITH MEMBERS OF THE PENTECOST CHURCH, KWABENYA

DATE: 24-03-2002

TIME: 10.00 AM

ATTENDANCE: 58 MEMBERS

PRESENT: BEN V LARTEY, ELVIS ADDAE & RICHARD BOTCHWEY (CEDEP)

At exactly, 9.00 am the CEDEP Public Educational Team arrived at the school premises. The team leader approached the head pastor to inform him of our presence and readiness. At about 10.00 am the head pastor invited the team members into the church room, We were introduced to the congregation, thereafter we were given the floor to educate the congregation on the Kwabenya landfill project. We started the education by first defining what is a refuse dump? How does a refuse dump look like? We also introduced the congregation to landfill and how they look like, their composition, and how they are constructed and the necessary pre cautionary measures put in place as far as the designing of the Kwabenya Landfill site is concerned so as to forestall its explosion in the near future. We also looked at the benefits to be derived from the Kwabenya Landfill and the reasons why there is even the need for a sanitary landfill site for the capital and not a refuse dump. After the lecture by the team members, time was allowed for questions from the congregation.

Emerging Issues:

That they have been informed from reliable sources that there would be an explosion later on at the landfill site, that there are serious health hazards associated with landfill sites etc. The question of compensation for the affected residents also came up, Re-location or Resettlement of the affected residents, the question of who acquired the lands at Agyeman-Kata first also came up for discussion. Also the congregation wanted to know whether the Government will provide residents of Kwabenya and surrounding with some

basic amenities like portable water, schools, clinic, roads etc. Responding to the numerous questions asked by the congregation, the team members in turn provided answers as well as clarification to the questions bothering the minds of the church members. At the end of the interactions, most members seemed satisfied with the general conduct of the interaction. They agreed that the meeting was participatory and also members felt at ease and freely asked questions that bothered their minds. Honestly speaking, we can confidently conclude that most participants left the church room more satisfied than before.

The meeting ended at 12.00 noon.

XVI. INTERACTION WITH MEMBERS OF THE REDEMPTION CHURCH, KWABENYA

DATE: 24-03-2002

TIME: 12:30 PM

ATTENDANCE: 52 MEMBERS

PRESENT: BEN V LARTEY, ELVIS ADDAE AND RICHARD BOTCHWEY (CEDEP)

The meeting started at 12.30 pm, thus after their usual church service. Although, a few members who were very hungry could not wait for the interaction but we were lucky to have met at least three – quarters of the day's congregation who listened to us.

After the usual introductory ceremony, the team members went straight into the day's business of educating the congregation on the different types of refuse dumps, landfill sites, the characteristics associated with each of them, and the benefits etc. These lectures were supported with piratical pictures on refuse dumps as well as Sanitary Landfill sites and the proposed Sanitary Landfill designed for the Kwabenya Valley. The team also educated the congregation on the reasons why there is the need for a sanitary engineered landfill sited at Kwabenya. During question time, the issues that came up were about the same old issues that cropped-up during our previous interactions with the other churches already visited. After providing answers to all the questions posed to us by the congregation, most of them seemed more satisfied because things had been made clearer to them now.

They also seemed to be informed now as far as landfills are concerned. Anyway, there were a few who still believe that there would be a disaster in the near future.

The meeting came to a close at 2:47 pm.

XVII. INTERACTION WITH FLAMES OF PENTECOST CHURCH CONGREGATION

DATE: 08-03-2002

TIME: 7:30 - 9.30 PM
ATTENDANCE: 29 MEMBERS
PRESENT: BEN V LARTEY, ELVIS ADDAE AND RICHARD BOTCHWEY (CEDEP)

The meeting started with a prayer from one of the church members, there after the pastor gave a brief account of our mission to the congregation. Then the Public Education Tema members were asked to introduce ourselves to the congregation as well. The team leader then took the floor by first giving detailed talk on Refuse Dumps and Landfill Sites. The difference between a Refuse Dump and landfill sites. We again took congregation through the different types of landfill sites thus, domestic waste landfill site and Toxic Waste Landfill Sites. Pictures of a typical refuse dump and the different types of landfills were also shown to the congregation. Presenters/Educators also laid bare to the church members, the numerous benefits as well as some few effects that may be gotten from landfill projects like the one to be sited at Agyeman-Kata, Kwabenya.

After the Team's presentation, time was allowed for questions and clarifications from the congregation. During question time, the following issues emerged: Health Hazards associated with landfill projects, underlying stream to be contaminated, Bole holes and hand dug wells also to be contaminated because of the dumping of the garbage, displaced people at the landfill sites, re-location of the affected people, job openings for the youth, the future of the stone winners, whether portable water and clinic would be provided as alternate by the government etc. After, listening to the issues enumerated by the congregation, the team members tried to provide answers and clarifications to the issues raised. By the close of the discussions the team realized that a greater percentage of the congregation were satisfied with the answers provided to their questions. A few of them continued shaking their heads, which signified disagreement to the answers that we provided. But generally speaking, most of them left the meeting grounds with their fears eroded.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm.

XVIII. INTERACTION WITH MEMBERS OF THE ASSEMBLIES OF GOD CHURCH

DATE: 17-03-2002
TIME: 10:00 AM
ATTENDANCE: 47 MEMBERS
PRESENT: BEN V LARTEY, ELVIS ADDAE AND RICHARD BOTCHWEY (CEDEP), PROSPER ARYEE (ASSEMBLYMAN) FOR KWABENYA ELECTORAL AREA

The CEDEP Public Educational Campaign Team arrived at the church premises at 9.30 am. The team leader quickly got in touch with the Pastor in-charge of the church to arrange for the team's interaction with the congregation. The team was finally invited into the church room at 10.00 am. Prayers were offered by the Head Pastor after which he asked the team members to introduce ourselves and where we were coming from and finally our mission. After all the necessary pleasantries, we set the ball rolling by first asking the congregation whether they have heard of the new landfill site being built in the Kwabenya valley near Agyeman-Kata Community. Their response was positive. We then took the congregation through what is a refuse dump and how it looked like, as well as what is a landfill site and how landfill site looked like and the different types of landfill sites. The team members including the Honorable Assemblyman took turns to explain issues on landfill site to the congregation. The lectures were buttressed with picture illustrations of refuse dump sites as well as landfill sites for them to understand issues properly.

At the end of the lecture, question time was allowed and the following were some of the issues that kept coming from the congregation.

Emerging Issues:

Health hazards and the long term effects of continuous dumping of refuse at the site, the general nuisance to be created by the heavy duty trucks to the citizens of Kwabenya, job opportunities for the energetic youths (both males and females), they also asked that there should be an agreement between the Government, the chiefs and elders that if the government fails to adhere to the tenets of the original design of the project, the government be taken to court or prosecuted, whether the government will provide the community members with portable water since they believe strongly that their hand dug wells and bore-hole water will definitely be contaminated. There were also issues such as resettlement of the affected people, whether compensation packages have been prepared for the victims, others even wondered whether the government has money at all to handle such a complex situation? In responding to the numerous, questions, the team members tried their best to provide answers to these questions. Also, clarifications were provided by the team members to issues that the congregation did not understand or had been misinformed on.

At the end of the interaction period both parties were satisfied with the fruitful deliberations that took place. In the nutshell, the team members were satisfied that yet a bunch of community members have been schooled enough on the landfill project.

XIX. INTERACTION WITH THE CONGREGATION FROM THE DEEPER LIFE CHURCH, KWABENYA

DATE: 17-03-2002
TIME: 11:30 AM –12:49 PM
ATTENDANCE: 57 MEMBERS

PRESENT: BEN V LARTEY, ELVIS ADDAE AND RICHARD BOTCHWEY (CEDEP), PROSPER ARYEE (ASSEMBLYMAN) FOR KWABENYA ELECTORAL AREA

The CEDEP campaign team was ushered into the Deeper Life Church building at exactly 11:30 am to begin our Public Education on the Kwabenya landfill project. After the usual pleasantries e.g. Greeting, introduction, team's mission etc. We went straight into the programme by giving a brief account what necessitated for the construction of a landfill site this time round, and idea muted by Government. After, giving the background, the team members in turns delved into what constitutes a refuse dump, and landfill site. The differences between the two(2) and finally the types of landfill sites. Photographs were used by the Public educational team members as illustrations to support the theoretical aspect of the education. After the presentations by the team members, including the Honorable Assemblyman for the Kwabenya Electoral Area. Some time was allowed for further clarifications and questions that were bothering the mind of congregation members

Emerging Issues:

When the floor was opened for questions and clarifications the following issues emerged: The faith of the stone winners in the valley where the project has been sited? Since time immemorial stone winning has been the sole bread wining or means of livelihood for most of the youths in the Kwabenya town and its surrounding villages. How long or how many years can the project be sited at Kwabenya? Health hazards associated with landfill sites, and any remedial measures taken by Government in case of an outbreak of epidemic in the short and long term. Also if there would be some job openings for the youth of the communities. The question of who to consider first in case of any job opportunities springing up at the project site.

There was also the question of Government building the Landfill site as per the original design so that other major components are not left out so as to make the project a complete and complex one. Some congregation members' major worry was who manages the project and who supervises the work to make sure the right job is done. The question of Government providing alternative source of portable water for the people was also raised. Other basic amenities such as market, clinic school and expanded road were some request put by the church members for the authorities to consider appeasing the community with.

The team members did their best to provide reasonable and convincing answers to the numerous questions asked as well as the clarifications sought by the congregation. The team members also used the opportunity to inform them that the Government is not providing those basic amenities such as clinic etc. because it was bringing diseases and sicknesses to the community but rather it was an opportunity for the chiefs and elders to use this time to demand for certain basic amenities for their citizens. The meeting ended at 2.00 pm with both parties very much satisfied but with a few doubting Thomas's.

XX. INTERACTION WITH KWABENYA PRESBY AND METHODIST CHURCHES ON SUNDAY 10TH MARCH, 2002

DATE: 10-03-2002
TIME: 8.00 - 11:00 AM
ATTENDANCE: 54 PRESBYTERANS & 48 METHODISTS
PRESENT: BEN V LARTEY, ELVIS ADDAE AND RICHARD
BOTCHWEY (CEDEP).

As part of CEDEP's Public Education Campaign on the Kwabenya Landfill project, a three-member team went to the Presbyterian and the Methodist churches at Kwabenya for the purpose on Sunday March 10, 2002. The following is the report on the proceeding of the day. A team member gave an overview of the project after which the drawings as well as the technical designs of the "highly engineered" landfill was discussed with the congregation. Time was allowed for the members of the churches to seek clarifications on the issues raised. The issue of the harmful nature of the entire project featured prominently at both places. "If you say the landfill project is not going to be harmful, why then are you asking those who stay around the area to quit"? someone wanted to know. To this, the need to create a buffer zone was explained to the effect that, though not harmful, it is a safety precaution not to stay very close to a project of that nature.

Again, some members harbored the fear that the beautiful description given and shown may not be the same when it comes to implementing the project. Machines would be broken down, insecticides and other forms of managing the rubbish as described might not be followed. When it happens like that, the unexpected would arise. As a follow-up to this, they wanted to find out who would be responsible for making sure that the right thing was done.

The CEDEP team then introduced an element of the project, which seeks to the formation of a task force from amongst the inhabitants of the Kwabenya community. The task force would serve as watchdogs over the project and liaise between the community and the Accra Metro Authority. Issues on the offer of employment to the youth, the economic potentials for those who win offer of employment to the youth, the economic potentials for those who win stones within the site and provision of social amenities were brought up. However, it would depend on the skills that the people possess and their relevance to particular jobs available.

On the stone winners, it was explained that they could go on with their work for the next fifteen years till the project gets to that area. According to the team, plans were far advanced for the supply of pipe-borne water, clinic and a market for the community. The people were asked to seek more information on the amenities from the Honorable Assemblyman.

OBSERVATION:

It was observed from the reactions of the congregation that, they had been misinformed about the project. This was due to the delay of the public education. While some vehe-

mently opposed to the project, a few who were convinced assisted the team in responding to some of the issues raised.

The leadership of both churches were very grateful for the explicit manner in which the team had explained the project to them. They advised their members to seek more information about anything they don't understand through the proper channel instead of resorting to vandalism.

We also thanked them for the time and attention they had given us. We left our contact addresses and telephone numbers to enable them do necessary follow-up.

XXI. A MEETING BETWEEN THE KWABENYA CHIEFS, ELDERS, CEDEP STAFF AND THE GA DISTRICT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (DCE), MR ATTOH

DATE: 28th January 2002

TIME: 11.30 am

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr Attoh	DCE, Ga District Assembly
Nii Abbey Akanfra II	Kwabenya Mantse
Mr Tetteh Mensah	Okyeame to Nii Abbey Okanfra II
Enoch Ashiley	Rep for Nii Oboabisa II
Patrick Ashiley	Rep for Nii Oboabisa II
Mr Ashiley	Rep for Nii Oboabisa KK
Ben Vikpeh Lartey	CEDEP
Elvis Addae	CEDEP
Prosper Aryee	Assemblyman

The meeting started at 11.37 am at Amasaman in the Ga District Chief Executive's Office. After exchange of pleasantries, the DCE, Mr Attoh, asked for our mission.

MISSION

The Kwabenya Mantse, Nii Abbey Okanfra II opened the floor by informing the DCE that sometime back they wrote a reminder letter to the DCE concerning some request the chiefs, opinion leaders and elders of the Kwabenya Township made to the Government on the landfill project. Their demand centered on the provision of some basic amenities, like potable water, toilet facilities, roads, schools, market and clinic for the people of Kwabenya before the take-off of the Kwabenya landfill project. In short, the delegation has come to find out where the government (AMA) has reached with the provision of the above mentioned amenities.

RESPONSE

In response, the DCE said he did forward their request to the appropriate authorities, that is the AMA mayor for redress and on Friday January 25, 2002, he did send a reminder

letter concerning the provision of the amenities, which he delivered personally to the mayor. For the delegation to believe his words, the DCE picked his mobile phone, called the AMA mayor and held discussion again on their request. In response, the AMA mayor asked to be given two days so that he could give the delegation a positive feedback. The DCE once again reiterated his support for the project and promised to fight to get the AMA to provide those amenities requested by the Kwabenya chiefs and elders. The delegation was also satisfied with attempts so far made by the Ga District Chief Executive in getting those amenities for the Kwabenya communities.

Our replacement and relocation, the DCE asked the Assemblyman to look for a parcel of land measuring between ten and twenty acres for that purpose.

XXII. SECOND VISIT OF THE CEDEP/AMA TEAM MADE TO THE KWABENYA on 14TH NOVEMBER 2001 to:

Meet the delegates of stone winners group 1 (Ben's group)

Meet Mr Amoakoh and Mr Smith Amo of the Agyeman-Kata Residents Association.

A MEETING WITH BEN'S GROUP

The group was commended for the great patience they had so far demonstrated and were urged to explain issues about the project to their colleagues of the other side.

Demonstration

Members present were taken through the drawings of the project. To do this, sheets of papers with the designs of the project at different stages were given out. Members examined and asked questions and/or made comments on them. This made the understanding of the project very clear to all present.

Concerns

The leader of the group expressed the desire of the stone winners to seek employment with contractors on the project. He said that most of the members there had various skills other than cracking stones. Some are drivers, auto-mechanics, carpenters etc. He therefore appealed that the contractors that win the bid for the subsequent stages of the project should be reminded to consider employing those who have the relevant skills.

The team promised to carry their concerns to the appropriate quarters for consideration. Deliberations ended with the team providing some refreshments to the members, which had risen to 13 at the time of closing.

XXIII. MEETING WITH THE FIELD TEAM MEMBERS AT CEDEP, ACCRA OFFICE KOKOMLEMLE

DATE: 22ND JANUARY 2002

TIME: 15 HOURS GMT

ATTENDANCE: 47 MEMBERS

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ben V Lartey, Elvis Addae CEDEP
Mr Chinebuah Waste Management
Linda Osafo (AMA)

The meeting started at exactly 15 hours GMT. It was chaired by Ben V Lartey of CEDEP. The Chairman started by first welcoming members to the meeting and also wishing them a happy and prosperous New Year since it was the team's first meeting in the year.

Mission

Ben briefed the group about CEDEP's last activities just before the Xmas holidays and post Xmas. The chairman however, raised the issue of inclusion of the other team members, that is, Mr Chinbuah and Mrs Linda Osafo back into the team. It Became necessary to drop the two project staff after the team's preliminary community entry, because of the hostile reception given the team by the community members. Members agreed to the suggestion. A letter purported to have been written and signed by the chiefs and opinion leaders of Kwabenya to the Government through the Chief Executive of the GDA was discussed.

Content of Letter

The content of the letter was a request for some amenities made by the people of Kwabenya to the Government. The request included potable water, clinic, schools, roads etc. Mr Chinebuah said he had not seen such a letter and therefore requested for a copy to be shown to his boss, Mr Laryea. The Chairman then informed the team of some planned focus group discussions to be organized the following day by CEDEP. Other team members were invited to the FGDs but Mr Chinebuah said because the notice was too short and he had committed himself to some equally important programmes he could not avail himself. Mrs Osafo who joined the meeting at a later time also said she was already occupied. They however promised to avail themselves in the subsequent focus group discussions. The team agreed to visit the Ga District Chief Executive the following day to find out about the letter written by the Kwabenya chiefs. The meeting came to a close at 17.30.

XXIV. A MEETING WITH THE GA DISTRICT CHIEF EXECUTIVE, MR. ATTOH

Date: 23rd January 2001

Time: 11.00 am

A two man CEDEP team comprised of Ben V Lartey and Elvis S Addae travelled to Amasaman to meet with the Ga District Chief Executive in the person of Mr Attoh. Fortunately for the team, we met the DCE and informed him of our mission.

MISSION

The team's mission was to discuss a letter signed by the chiefs and elders of Kwabenya Township and addressed to the Ga DCE. In the letter, the chiefs and their elders reminded the authorities of some request they had made on behalf of the communities. When the letter was shown to the DCE, he confirmed receiving it and forwarding it to the AMA for redress or further action. The DCE expressed shock that the AMA had not responded to the request made by the chiefs and people of Kwabenya. The team then pleaded with the Honorable DCE for his intervention to speed up the process, since the Government's perpetual silence on the Kwabenya chiefs and the people's request for some basic amenities was generating a lot of anger, anxiety and mistrust amongst youth groups and some community members. Again, the government's silence was also impeding the smooth public education that CEDEP is undertaking in the community. This is so because the question of the government providing some basic amenities requested by the community kept coming up at almost all the discussions that we have held with the youth groups.

Blessings

At this juncture, the DCE thanked us for the good work that CEDEP is doing and promised his unflinching support for our good cause.

The meeting came to a close at 11.52 am.

XXV. MEETING WITH NEE ABBEY AKANFRA II, KWABENYA MANTSE on 24TH JANUARY 2002

The CEDEP field staff on the Kwabenya Landfill Project paid a courtesy call on one of the chiefs of Kwabenya, Nii Abbey Okanfra II at his palace. Being the first time of meeting him after several attempts, a brief introduction of the staff and of CEDEP and its role in the Landfill project was made.

Mission

Our mission was to listen to the reactions of the traditional authorities and for that matter the chief's personal views on the project based on misinformation. He said he attaches greater importance to the project due to the proximity of Kwabenya to the city of Accra. He was of the view that any outbreak of cholera or any other disease that befalls Accra can easily spread to Kwabenya. "We go to Accra everyday, our children attend schools there, so the cleanliness of the place should be our concern too", he said.

The chief acknowledged the powers that the government has when it registers its interest in something. The government could easily pass a Legislative Instrument (LI) to compulsorily acquire that land, he remarked. He was therefore of the view that the people of Kwabenya should reason with the government and negotiate for a better deal before any bitter action was taken against them. He also did not understand the Agyeman-Kata community on their refusal to accept all the good deal the government was prepared to

offer then namely, potable water, schools, clinics, roads and compensation in the forms of relocation and replacement of whatever one may lose to the project.

Blessing

On our ‘focused group discussion’ strategy to reach as many individuals and groups in the community as possible, the chief registered his support and the blessings of the traditional authorities to go ahead. He pledged his total support in whatever form it would take.

Lessons

It was deduced from the interactions with the chief that

A prompt action by AMA to provide the amenities being requested by the community would put whatever tensions at stake for a successful and speedy completion of the project.

About 70% of the population of Kwabenya are in support of the project, therefore, intensive educational activities would just be enough for total acceptance of and co-operation from the community

With frantic efforts CEDEP could easily identify allies to work with in the community.

Conclusion

The meeting ended with both parties pledging support and hard work to the project.