



Payment formats for REDD+ interventions

Preferences and concerns in Aowin District, Ghana



Darley Jose Kjosavik, Rosemary Agbefu, Rosemond Agbefu and Gene Birikorang



First published by the International Institute for Environment and Development (UK) in 2013
Copyright © International Institute for Environment and Development
All rights reserved

For a full list of publications please contact:
International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH
Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399
Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055
pubs.iied.org

Citation: Kjosavik, D.J., Agbefu, R. [Rosemary], Agbefu, R. [Rosemond] and Birikorang, G. 2013.
Payment formats for REDD+ interventions: preferences and concerns in Aowin District, Ghana.
IIED, London.

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the Norwegian Government through Norad, as part of a multi-country project coordinated by IIED in partnership with UMB on Poverty and Sustainable Development Impacts of REDD Architecture, also known as POVSUS-REDD. The views expressed in this document are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the institutions involved in this project or of Norad.

Design by: Eileen Higgins, email: eileen@eh-design.co.uk
Copy edited by: Holly Ashley, email: holly@hollyashley.com
Cover photo: IIED/Maryanne Grieg-Gran

Poverty and sustainable development impacts of REDD architecture; options for equity growth and the environment

About this project...

Poverty and sustainable development impacts of REDD architecture is a multi-country project led by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED, UK) and the University of Life Sciences (Aas, Norway). It started in July 2009 and ended in May 2013. The project is funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) as part of the Norwegian Government's Climate and Forest Initiative. The project has been in partnership with Fundação Amazonas Sustentável (Brazil); Civic Response (Ghana); SNV (Vietnam); Sokoine University of Agriculture, Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation (Tanzania); and Makerere University, Faculty of Forestry and Nature Conservation (Uganda).

The project aims to increase understanding of how different options for REDD+ design and policy at international, national and sub-national level will affect achievement of greenhouse gas emission reduction and co-benefits of sustainable development and poverty reduction. As well as examining the internal distribution and allocation of REDD+ payments under different design option scenarios at both international and national levels, the project will work with selected REDD+ pilot projects in each of the five countries to generate evidence and improve understanding on the poverty impacts of REDD+ pilot activities, the relative merits of different types of payment mechanisms and the transaction costs.

Acknowledgements

The authors of this report would like to thank the local people of Aowin District for sharing their valuable time discussing the issues raised in this study. Thanks are also due to the local authorities and the local forestry officials for providing us with the necessary contact information and for facilitating the fieldwork. The authors would also like to thank Maryanne Grieg-Gran and Essam Mohammed of IIED for their constructive comments on the draft, and Arild Vatn and Synne Movik of the Department of International Environment and Development Studies, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, for their valuable inputs.

Darley Jose Kjosavik is an associate professor in development studies at the Department of International Environment and Development Studies, Norwegian University of Life Sciences. She has an interdisciplinary academic background with a PhD in development studies. Her research interests include the political economy of development with a special focus on marginalised social groups, gender and development, conflict and development, the political economy of environment and development, and climate change and development. She has published widely on these topics.

Rosemond Agbefu is currently a Master's degree student studying international environmental studies at the Department of International Environment and Development Studies, Norwegian University of Life Sciences. She holds an MA in international affairs from the University of Ghana and an MPhil in culture, environment and sustainability from the University of Oslo. Her research interests include natural resources and local livelihoods, REDD and its impact on local communities, and the role of corporate social responsibility (CSR) in the development of local communities.

Rosemary Agbefu is currently a Master's degree student studying international development studies at the Department of International Environment and Development Studies, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Norway. She holds an MPhil in peace and conflict studies from the University of Oslo. Her research interests include forest management and local communities, and conflict management surrounding the exploitation of natural resources. She has extensive fieldwork experience and is writing her thesis on REDD+ strategies in Ghana and the nexus with sustainable development.

Gene Birikorang is chief consultant at Hamilton Resources and Consulting. He is a natural resources economist, and spent a substantial part of his career as chief economist and acting chief director of the Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources in Ghana. At Hamilton Resources, Gene has worked on governance and tenure issues in forest enterprises and the EU's voluntary partnership agreement in Ghana, among many other things.



Contents

1 Introduction and objectives	1
2 Study area: Aowin District	3
2.1 Geographical characteristics	3
2.2 Socio-economic and demographic characteristics	4
2.2.1 Ethnic composition and religion	4
2.2.2 Economy	4
2.2.3 Lumber production	4
2.2.4 Mineral deposits	4
2.3 Study villages/communities	4
3 Methodology	5
3.1 Focus group discussions	5
3.1.1 Ethnic groups	7
3.1.2 Focus group size	7
3.1.3 Facilitators	8
4 Findings	9
4.1 Forest use and mitigation activities	9
4.1.1 Compensation for what practices?	9
4.2 Compensation preferences	10
4.2.1 Compensation packages/formats	10
4.2.2 Preferred in-kind compensation for individuals/households	10
4.2.3 Preferred community compensation	11
4.3 Who should be paid cash compensation?	12
4.4 Basis, levels, frequency and flow of compensation	12
4.4.1 Basis of compensation	12
4.4.2 Levels of compensation	13
4.4.3 Frequency and flow of compensation	13
4.5 Institutional arrangements for managing compensation	14
4.5.1 Institutional arrangements for managing individual compensation	14
4.5.2 Institutional arrangements for managing community compensation	14
5 Conclusions and implications for REDD+	15
References	15
Annexes	17
Annex 1. Rationale for compensation	17
Annex 2. Relevant mitigation activities	18
Annex 3. Type of compensation packages for individuals and community	19
Annex 4. Who should be paid cash compensation?	20
Annex 5. Basis, levels, frequency and flow of compensation	21
Annex 6. Institutional arrangements for managing compensation	22

List of boxes, figures and tables

Figure 1. Map of Ghana showing the western region and study area	3
Box 1. Preferred in-kind compensation for individuals/households	11
Box 2. Preferences for community compensation	12
Box 3. Institutional arrangements for managing community compensation	14
Table 1. Focus groups characteristics	7
Table 2. Mitigation activities as identified by participants	10
Table 3. Compensation preferences (according to consensus)	11
Table 4. Who should be paid cash compensation?	12
Table 5. Basis of compensation	13
Table 6. Frequency and flow of compensation	14

Introduction and objectives

Ghana is in the process of getting ready to implement REDD+ interventions, led by the Ghana Forestry Commission which is the implementing agency.

Ghana has opted for REDD+ to undertake climate change mitigation actions within, but not limited to, the forest sector. Potential mitigation actions identified include reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation; conservation of forest carbon stocks; sustainable forest management; and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (Ghana Forestry Commission 2010). Seven potential biodiversity conservation areas across the high forest (HF) and transitional forest zones (TF) have been selected as pilot areas, with a top-priority focus on two pilot objectives. These comprise managing the cocoa production landscapes in the Aowin District, located in the HF zone of the western region to reduce the risk of forest encroachment and to promote beekeeping and woodlot development to alleviate the degradation of agro-ecosystems of economic tree crops (*Dawadawa*) in the TF zone.

REDD+ is envisaged to work by compensating communities for avoided deforestation. Therefore, an understanding of communities' preferences for compensation is important to work out compensation packages that are meaningful for the community and that will enhance their livelihoods and contribute positively to their socio-economic and political conditions of existence. We believe that by seeking people's own perceptions on what kind of payment formats would be best suited to their particular conditions, the potential of people cooperating in REDD+ schemes will be higher.

Therefore, the present study was undertaken with the objective of understanding the types of compensation the community members aspire to, in return for avoiding deforestation and refraining from livelihood activities that could potentially lead to forest degradation, as well as for undertaking other positive mitigation activities. The importance of such studies in different community contexts cannot be underestimated since the successful implementation of REDD+ itself depends on the provision of compensation packages that would satisfy different sections/groups of the community – ethnic groups, women and men, young and old, indigenes, in-migrants and so on.

Study area: Aowin District

2.1 Geographical characteristics

The pilot area for the REDD+ programme is located in the Aowin District. The Forestry Commission (FC) is responsible for implementing REDD+ in this district. The Aowin District Assembly (formerly Aowin Suaman) was established in November 1988 by local government instrument LI 1392 under the then PNDCL 207 (now replaced by the Local Government Act 1993, Act 462). It has Enchi as the district capital. Other major settlements in the district include Asemkrom, Dadieso, Boinso, New Yakasi and Jema.

The district is located in southwest Ghana, and in the mid-western part of the western region. It lies between latitude five degrees twenty-five minutes and six degrees fourteen minutes North ($5^{\circ} 25'N$ and $6^{\circ} 14'N$) and longitude two degrees thirty minutes and three degrees five minutes West ($2^{\circ} 30'W$ and $3^{\circ} 05'W$).

The total population in the district is 121,186 people, with 50,474 men and 70,712 women. The population is distributed over 312 settlements (Ghana Statistical Service 2010).

Figure 1. Map of Ghana showing the western region and study area



The pilot involves managing the cocoa production landscape for increases in carbon stock and for biodiversity conservation. The aim of the pilot is to avert the potential risk of encroachment on Boin River Forest Reserve through cocoa-sector initiatives to improve yields on existing cocoa-crop lands, and at the same time introduce shade tree diversity into cocoa landscapes and achieve biodiversity conservation in primary forests.

2.2 Socio-economic and demographic characteristics

2.2.1 Ethnic composition and religion

Diverse ethnic groups are present in the district, but the Akan constitute the largest (about 64 per cent of the entire population). However, three per cent of the population consists of Ghanaians by naturalisation and foreign nationals from mostly Cote d'Ivoire, Burkina Faso and Mali. The other 33 per cent consists of migrants from other parts of the country.

There are three main religious groups in the district: Christianity, Islam and African Traditional Religion. Christianity can be said to have the most adherents in the district, about 79.8 per cent of the total population. There is peaceful co-existence among members of the various religions.

2.2.2 Economy

The district is predominantly rural, with agriculture being the most dominant economic activity. About 78 per cent of the economically active population are involved in agriculture, forestry and fishing and over 93 per cent are cocoa farmers (Ghana Statistical Service 2010).

The district is popular for producing cocoa and also produces rubber, citrus, palm oil and coffee as small-scale cash crops. The major food crops grown include cassava, plantain, maize and rice.

2.2.3 Lumber production

The rich forests of the district include many economically significant timber species such as odum, mahogany, emire, dahoma and wawa. This has drawn a lot of timber firms to the area, who primarily log and transport the logs to large-scale sawmills located in bigger cities outside the district. This has created a situation where the locally based manufacturers who use wood in their work find it difficult to access lumber for their activities. Also, the district's forests include large quantities of cane, bamboo and raffia, which form the backbone of the region's cottage industry.

2.2.4 Mineral deposits

High quantities of gold deposits abound in many of the district's towns. Achimfo, Sewum and Abokya are some of the places where large mineral deposits have been found. There are a good number of international gold mining companies located in these mineral-rich areas.

2.3 Study villages/communities

The six communities chosen for the study are Boinso, Sewum, New Yakaase, Asantekrom, Adonekrom and Jensue, all situated in the Aowin District of the western region of Ghana. Out of the six communities, Boinso is the most developed in terms of social infrastructure, and Adonekrom is the least developed, lacking electricity. These communities are highly dependent on forests for their livelihoods and the study focused on people who were engaged in forest use in one way or another. Most respondents were cocoa farmers.

Methodology

3.1 Focus group discussions

The main data collection method employed in the study was focus group discussions (FGDs). The purpose of the focus group discussions on payment formats was to elicit people's opinions and perceptions of what they believed would be suitable compensation for their loss of forest access, change of land-use practices or other mitigation activities in their community.

There are a number of issues that all need to be considered when assessing what should be the different options for compensation – what is being compensated for, the kind of compensation and temporality, distribution, sustainability and legitimacy. With respect to distribution, there is also a trade-off implicit in making things simple and making them just – fairness has to be weighed against increased complexity and rising transaction costs.

Following a formal introduction to explain the purpose of our visit and the FGDs, we sought permission from the groups as to whether they were willing and interested to discuss REDD+ with us. We started out by asking if they have ever heard about the REDD+ programme, whether someone had explained to them that their area has been selected for a REDD+ pilot and so on. All the FGs informed us that they had not heard about REDD+ and that they did not know anything about the programme. We then proceeded to explain about climate change-related issues and REDD+. The participants were largely puzzled and worried on many counts. Fears were also expressed as to whether they would lose their land forever, both for themselves and future generations. Such concerns were especially expressed by women. We had considerable difficulty in explaining to them the present and future situation vis-à-vis REDD+ given the overall lack of clarity about the programme.

As they were not aware of the REDD+ programme and that their forests had been selected as REDD+ pilots, we encountered difficulties in eliciting answers based on a correct understanding of what REDD+ entails. Therefore, the reader is cautioned that the results of this study should be read and interpreted keeping this aspect in mind.

Focus group discussions are considered appropriate when investigating motivations, decisions and priorities (Berg and Lune 2012). Our study sought to collect data on the views and perceptions of people regarding what payment formats they would prefer under the REDD+ programme.

The main idea here is that views should be sought from communities themselves, rather than offering a prescribed survey or set of categories, as this would risk missing important aspects of people's motivations and incentives to participate in the REDD+ project. Traditional surveys would miss out on a crucial aspect, which is **reason-giving** i.e. what particular reasons and motivations inform people's choices/preferred options. A focus group discussion, in contrast to a survey, provides people with more flexibility to define the categories and options and explore their advantages and disadvantages. It must, however, be acknowledged that individual/household surveys have the advantage of reducing the risk of people being influenced by others when responding. At the same time, good facilitation of the FGDs can also help to mitigate this risk. However, one must be aware that the objective of the FGDs was not to gather individual preferences in isolation, but rather the preferences of individuals in a group setting, and as part of a group they might be influenced by other group members. Obtaining a consensus is not a

defined objective in FGDs, and individuals may change their views on the basis of reasoned arguments. An important issue of concern, however, is how power dynamics influence the position and views of individuals. The facilitator has to be sensitive of this issue.

In this study, some of these issues were addressed through the selection of groups for FGDs – by having groups consisting of only men, women, specific ethnic groups, indigenes, migrant groups and so on. However, both surveys and focus group discussions may suffer from politically sensitive and strategic response behaviour. The focus groups (FGs) were selected keeping in mind the diversity of the ethnic groups living in the study area, the gendered nature of preferences and responses, existing power relations between women and men, and proximity to forest areas.

A total of 11 focus group discussions were conducted in the Aowin District of the western region, Ghana. These discussions were conducted in a total of six cocoa-farming communities: Jensuu, New Yakaase, Adonikrom, Boinso, Sewum and Asantekrom. There were three main criteria based on which participants were selected for these discussions. First and foremost, focus group participants were selected based on whether they were migrant or indigenous cocoa farmers, and secondly based on which ethnic group these participants belonged to. This was to see if there were any differences in responses given by different groups, and if there was, the extent to which their views were different or similar to others.

A third and important criteria was gender. Given the patriarchal gender relations in the communities in general, it would be more fruitful to have FGDs disaggregated by gender, as this would enable the women participants to express themselves freely without being constrained by the presence of men.

6

Following this, we selected FG participants consisting of members belonging to the same ethnic group, mixed groups with members from different ethnic groups and FGs consisting exclusively of women or men (see Table 1). As far as the study area is concerned, these were found to be the most relevant criteria for choosing groups. This is essentially a cocoa-growing area, and almost all the communities studied have a certain degree of forest dependence. Other criteria such as household income, age and so on could have been relevant as well. However, given the limitations of time and resources, we classified the groups in consultation with the local partners, according to criteria that were most likely to influence preferences. As emphasised by Holstein and Gubrium (1995), 'even the same person can hold several truths'. What this means for our study is that, even though they come from the same ethnic group, people could have different views on issues. For example, some respondents who intermarry into other ethnic groups may have their opinions about something change once they marry (probably because their partners hold the same opinions on these issues).

Second, mixed groups with members from different ethnic groups was a criterion for the FGDs due to the fact that although they may come from the same part of the country, they hold very different views on certain issues. Also, ethnic groups have their own stereotypes and preferences. For example, in the Boinso FGDs, there were eight different ethnic groups from the same part of Ghana (northern and upper regions).

FGs participants were also selected based on gender so as to capture gendered views of respondents. In Sewum, the men were more vocal in responding. Most women retreated to the background, and declined to comment on certain issues, because according to their culture, it is men who speak out, not women.

Table 1. Focus groups characteristics

FGD No.	Village	Ethnic group	Women/men/mixed	No. of participants
FG 1	New Yakaase	Brusa	Men	15
FG 2	New Yakaase	Brusa	Women	8
FG 3	Boinso	Mixed (Kusaasi, Gruma, Dagaaba, Dagaare, Frafra, Busanga, Bimoba, Wangara)	Men	17
FG 4	Boinso	Mixed (Kusaasi, Gruma, Dagaaba, Dagaare, Frafra, Busanga, Bimoba, Wangara)	Women	9
FG 5	Sewum	Ashanti	Mixed (W+M)	23
FG 6	Adonikrom	Ewe	Men	13
FG 7	Adonikrom	Ewe	Women	10
FG 8	Asantekrom	Fante	Men	12
FG 9	Asantekrom	Fante	Women	8
FG 10	Jensue	Sefwi/Brusa	Men	9
FG 11	Jensue	Sefwi/Brusa	Women	12
TOTAL				136

3.1.1 Ethnic groups

The population of the district is ethnically diverse. The Brusa ethnic group, which belongs to the Akan tribe, is the largest indigenous group in the area. As mentioned earlier, the western region of Ghana is known for its abundance of natural resources such as gold, forests and arable land for cocoa farming and other cash crops (e.g. coffee, rubber, palm oil). For this reason, people migrate from all parts of the country to engage in diverse livelihood activities and many migrate to work on cocoa farms in the Aowin District. Almost all ethnic groups in Ghana are represented. For our study, however, with regards to the migrant ethnic groups, we focused on the following ethnic groups – Ewes from southern Ghana, Fantes from central Ghana, and the Ashanti and northerner ethnic groups from the northern section of the country.

3.1.2 Focus group size

When we designed the study, a group size of 10–12 members was considered ideal. However, under the field conditions it was beyond our control to keep the ideal group size. The number of participants was determined by respondents' availability at the time when discussions were held. For example, for separate interviews with men and women, the largest focus group discussion was held in Boinso (17 men). People were generally already assembled before we arrived on the site and it would not have been polite to ask some of them to leave. Therefore, we worked with larger group sizes as well. On the other hand, the smallest number of participants was in New Yakaase (8 women), as it was not possible to get more participants.

In all, a total of 136 respondents participated in focus group discussions in six communities in the Aowin District. In five of the communities, separate FGs with men and women were conducted. However, in one community (Sewum), there was a mixed focus group discussion involving both men and women at the same time. There was a reason for this mixed interview. The time that was given by the respondents for us to conduct the discussion was late in the evening, when almost all respondents would have returned from their farms. We arrived in Sewum around 4.00pm, by which time respondents (both male and female) had already gathered and were waiting for us. The convenient thing to do was to conduct a mixed focus group discussion, as it was getting late, and some respondents had to return to their farms after the discussion. This explains why the discussions conducted at Sewum took the longest time (approximately 3–3.5 hours).

In Jensuu, there was an overwhelming number of people (over 60) who were willing to participate in the interview. Apparently, the community leaders had embarked on a massive public announcement about the discussion. Although discussions were conducted at the time, it was not quite effective in providing the information we needed and hence we had to go back another day to conduct discussions with a smaller group of people.

3.1.3 Facilitators

Two officials from the local office of the Forestry Commission – a forest guard and a range supervisor – served as our facilitators in all six communities. They knew the communities very well and helped us gain access to the chiefs and opinion leaders, who in turn directed us to the appropriate ethnic groups for the focus group discussions.

All discussions were conducted in *Twi*¹ (which is understood by one of the team members), but at times the facilitators had to translate certain terms to the respondents in the Brusa language. This helped to facilitate the discussion process. For some FGDs, translation to English was also assisted by the facilitators.

1. *Twi* is the principal native language of the Akan ethnic group in Ghana, spoken over much of the southern half of the country by about 58 per cent of the population.

Findings

The findings from the FGDs regarding people's perceptions of compensation payment formats are discussed in this section, including the types of forest practices that need compensation; the types of compensation packages preferred; the frequency, level and flow of compensation; and the institutional arrangements for managing the compensation package.

4.1 Forest use and mitigation activities

As mentioned in an earlier section, households in the region are dependent on cocoa cultivation for their livelihoods. They grow cocoa on permanent agricultural land (most of which were early forest clearings) and on land cleared in the forest areas. Most of the communities are living in close proximity to the forest areas, and there is substantial dependence on forest products such as timber for roofing buildings, and foodstuff like cassava, cocoyam and plantain. Considering aspects such as these is crucial in any study on compensation for mitigation activities.

4.1.1 Compensation for what practices?

The groups were asked about the activities they engaged in that might cause deforestation and forest degradation, and what activities they would be willing to engage in to improve the condition of the forests. The term 'mitigation' was not used in our discussions as this is an alien term for the communities. However, we use the term in this report to mean activities that could contribute to emissions reduction.

While some of the mitigation activities highlighted by the groups varied, there was plenty of overlap between the groups. Table 2 lists the mitigation activities discussed. All of the groups considered these activities, including refraining from forest-related activities, worth compensating. However, the mixed group of women migrants from northern Ghana did not think that refraining from bush-burning needed compensation. Several groups also did not mention the stopping of indiscriminate tree felling ('chainsawing') as an activity to be compensated. However, it is notable that none of the groups mentioned stopping land clearing for agriculture as a mitigation activity. It was clear from the discussions that the community depended heavily on forests for income-generating activities as well as for fuelwood collection. While almost all groups agreed that they could stop felling trees, they mentioned that they would only stop fuelwood collection if well compensated. Given the gender division of labour, it is women who are mostly engaged in fuelwood collection. However, women's groups did not mention fuelwood collection as a deforesting or forest-degrading activity.

Several participants in the FGDs were sceptical about the prospect of compensation. For example, one farmer said, 'I will never give up my cocoa farm. What if compensation is not paid to me? It is a way of cheating us cocoa farmers'. Similar sentiments were expressed by other participants as well. In New Yakaase, most of the men wanted to know exactly when the REDD+ project would start, because according to them, 'several other companies have been here, but we have seen nothing'. Given the uncertainties inherent in the REDD+ programme, such scepticism is understandable.

Table 2. Mitigation activities as identified by participants

Mitigation activities	Why compensation?
No hunting.	Loss of income.
No felling of trees.	Loss of income by farmers.
No forest use for herbal/medicinal purposes (since this results in some other forest-degrading activity).	Affects people's health, cost of medicines.
No charcoal burning, no cutting of canes.	Loss of livelihoods.
Afforestation.	Each farmer must be given a certain number of trees to plant. If he/she plants them, then compensation should be paid. This will motivate others.
No bush burning.	
No chainsawing (indiscriminate lumbering).	
Supporting forest guards by reporting offenders.	Opportunity to earn income.

4.2 Compensation preferences

4.2.1 Compensation packages/formats

The issue of compensation preferences was discussed at length in the groups. The majority of members in the groups preferred a combination of individual and community compensation (see Table 3). The argument was that because individual households would lose their incomes due to REDD+, they should be compensated. At the same time, the community as a whole lacks various kinds of infrastructure that are needed by the households in the community. Hence, they would prefer a combination of individual and community compensation. Individuals in most groups expressed a preference for a compensation package consisting of cash payments and in-kind compensation for households such as building houses and sponsoring their children's education. The preferred compensation for the community was mainly in the form of infrastructure. The answers could also be interpreted to mean that people understood REDD+ to be a project that would contribute to the overall development of the community while at the same time bringing in individual/household benefits as well.

Some groups, especially migrant groups, emphasised that cash payments for individuals should be given priority over community compensation. They were worried that if community compensation was given preference, not much money would be left for individuals. Interestingly, two FGs preferred only individual compensations, and in the form of cash. They were not interested in compensation for the community. One of these was a women's FG consisting of a mixed group of in-migrants from northern Ghana, and the other was a FG of the ethnic group Ashanti in Sewum – a mixed group of men and women in-migrants. The reason given by them was that if they did not have access to land for cocoa cultivation, there was no reason for them to stay, and they would rather return to their homelands with the cash. They also would not benefit from any infrastructure development if they were to leave. The women also expressed a concern that they would not have any say in how the infrastructure development was carried out, especially the in-migrant women.

4.2.2 Preferred in-kind compensation for individuals/households

The preferred types of in-kind compensation discussed in the different FGDs for individuals/households are presented in Box 1. There were differences in the preferred in-kind compensation for individuals/households between men and women, indigenes and in-migrants. In general, women were more concerned about future generations and as well as the elderly. While housing was a general demand from all groups, the in-migrants wanted housing built for them in their homelands. For example, as the in-migrants in Asantekrom pointed out, 'we are here because of cocoa. If we and our children cannot have land for cocoa then we will return to our home lands'.

Table 3. Compensation preferences (according to consensus)

Focus Group	Cash	Kind	Cash + kind	Individual	Community	Individual + community	Comments
FG 1			✓			✓	Men
FG 2							Women
FG 3			✓			✓	Men/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana
FG 4	✓			✓			Women/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana
FG 5	✓			✓			Mixed Ashanti (women and men)
FG 6							Men
FG 7			✓			✓	Women
FG 8			✓	Cash	Infrastructure	✓	Men
FG 9			✓			✓	Women
FG 10							Men
FG 11			✓	✓	✓		Women

While almost all groups wanted scholarships for their children’s education, a migrant women’s group in Adonikrom also emphasised that when their children had finished their education, they should be ‘put in gainful employment’. In a mixed group of Ashanti men and women in Sewum, they raised the issue of social security – e.g. pensions for older farmers. Training and support for a wide range of alternative livelihood strategies were also suggested by different groups and women’s groups wanted a supply of liquid petroleum gas (LPG) as part of their compensation package. They pointed out that forest-related activities including firewood collection was, in general, backbreaking and they would rather have LPG for cooking.

Box 1. Preferred in-kind compensation for individuals/households

- Scholarships for children’s education
- Provide gainful employment for children when they finish education (women’s groups emphasised this)
- Housing
- Housing in home towns (migrants): ‘We are here because of cocoa. If we and our children cannot have land for cocoa then we will return to our home lands.’
- Social security (e.g. pensions for older farmers)
- Provide alternative livelihoods e.g. animal husbandry
- Help build shops/stores for setting up businesses
- Supply LPG for cooking (women’s groups)
- Training in alternative livelihood activities (e.g. poultry, sheep, cattle and pig farming; fish farming; tailoring; welding and fitting; hairdressing; help to open petty trading stores, grocery shops etc.)

4.2.3 Preferred community compensation

As presented in Box 2, the communities had a range of demands for infrastructure building for the community including roads, schools, hospitals, pharmacies and market places for women and so on. One women’s group wanted a cash payment for the community as well, as ‘we all contribute to forest protection one way or other’. One women’s group pointed out that there should be more compensation for farmers and less for the community, as ‘we will not benefit much from that’. The implication was that as they were migrants they would benefit less from the community’s resources, and they were also concerned that as women and migrants, they would not have much of a role in managing the funds. The mixed group of Ashanti men and women did not want community compensation as discussed in an earlier section. They had no interest in payments to the community, saying:

We have no intention of living here permanently, we are not indigenes. The land here is bad for farming, it is best for gold mining and it has oil deposits too. We suffer before we get our cocoa yields. We will even be glad if you take the land and compensate us individually.

Box 2. Preferences for community compensation

- Providing drinking water and toilet facilities
- Building/maintaining roads and other infrastructure
- Establishing sawmills, rubber and palm oil plantations for employment
- Providing employment for community members as forest guards
- Providing free school education for children of the REDD-affected communities
- Building better schools, providing a secondary school
- Building a hospital
- Giving cash to the community as ‘we all contribute to forest protection in one way or other’
- Building a market for women (women’s group)
- Giving more compensation to farmers and less to community (women’s group) as ‘we will not benefit much from that’
- Providing a library for school students, housing for teachers, a computer laboratory, running water and street lights (women’s group – Brusa)
- Building a pharmacy

4.3 Who should be paid cash compensation?

The groups were asked to deliberate on who/which households in the community should be paid individual cash compensation. All 11 groups emphasised that cocoa farmers should be paid cash compensation (see Table 4). Six groups wanted payments to all forest users such as hunters, charcoal makers, traders, timber loggers and so on. A women’s migrant group were of the opinion that cocoa farmers should get more compensation while others who are directly affected by a loss of income from forests should also be compensated. Another women’s group (indigenes) expressed that auxiliary workers in forests such as those working with timber for a living should also be compensated. They further mentioned that all villagers should be paid cash compensation as everyone protects the forests or are engaged in forest-related work in one way or other. Once again, the women’s concerns for all members of society came through in their discussions. A mixed group of migrant men mentioned that landowners living very close to the forests should be compensated due to their heavy dependence on forests for a living.

Table 4. Who should be paid cash compensation?

Who should be paid cash compensation?	Comments
Cocoa farmers	All 11 groups
All forest users (but cocoa farmers more)	6 groups
All community members (priority to cocoa farmers)	2 (women’s groups) one migrant and one indigenous
Auxiliary workers in forests (those working with timber etc. for a living)	1 (women’s group, Brusa)

4.4 Basis, levels, frequency and flow of compensation

4.4.1 Basis of compensation

This was indeed a difficult issue in most FGs. However, after prolonged discussions, the groups came up with several proposals as presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Basis of compensation

Basis of compensation	Comments
Size of cocoa farmland	6 groups
Based on value of cocoa produced (cocoa prices vary each year and this has to be taken into account)	5 groups
Family needs should be the basis (compensation is adequate if it meets all our family needs)	One women's migrant group
According to the burden of loss	1 group (Ashanti)
Cocoa farmers should get more than others	General consensus
'It should not be less than what we get now. Otherwise we will return to cocoa'	1 women's group (Brusa)
For other forest users 'you may decide'	1 men's group (Brusa)

Six FGs were of the opinion that the size of cocoa farmland that each household forgoes for the REDD+ project could form the basis for cash compensation, while five groups were of the opinion that compensation should be based on the value of cocoa yields. They argued that cocoa prices vary each year and that this must be taken into account when calculating the compensation amount. The Ashanti group considered that payments should be made according to the burden of loss incurred by each household. Women's concerns for both families and wider society was again apparent when a mixed group of women migrants from northern Ghana claimed that meeting families' needs should form the basis of compensation. According to them, 'compensation is adequate if it can take care of all our family needs'. The indigenous women's group in Brusa were apparently concerned about a possible fall in the overall income and well-being of the households. According to them, compensation 'should not be less than what we get now. Otherwise we will return to cocoa'. It could also be read as a potential warning to REDD+ implementers that the women would not be willing to participate in the REDD+ programme if payments are not made promptly.

4.4.2 Levels of compensation

Levels of compensation suggested varied according to the farm size and/or cocoa yield. Suggestions for payments ranged from Ghs2000–12,000 per month (US\$872–5200) plus an initial lump sum of Ghs20,000–50,000 (US\$8720–21,000) depending on the cocoa area. In addition to this, the women's group emphasised the provision of housing for everyone. There was, however, a general consensus that cocoa farmers should get more compensation than others, and preference should be given to them. Most of the groups (eight) thought that compensation should be based on need, and that cocoa farmers deserved to receive more compensation.

A few of the groups said that farmers and non-farmers should be compensated equally. However, they could not decide on levels of compensation for other forest users and left it to the REDD+ planners as was the evident from their answer of 'you may decide for other forest users'. It was also clear from this response that even when we tried to explain to them repeatedly that we were only researchers studying the process of REDD+ implementation, they had difficulties in seeing us in isolation from the proponents of REDD+ in the international community or the Ghana government that is implementing REDD+. As discussed earlier, the fact that the facilitators for our fieldwork were employees of the Ghana Forestry Commission might have been responsible for this assumption, and this raises ethical dilemmas for the researcher.

4.4.3 Frequency and flow of compensation

It was evident from the discussions that the groups would prefer a lump-sum payment to begin with followed by monthly payments. There was a general consensus on this. Some pointed out that 'we get our cocoa money every month and we are used to this'. The women's group wanted an additional Ghs500 per month for buying LPG. There were also other suggestions

and opinions (see Table 6). Some groups wanted compensation to flow for 'as long as REDD+ is on our land'. For the loss of cocoa land, the migrant women's group wanted compensation for their own, their children's and their grandchildren's generations. They became emotional on this issue, emphasising the important point that 'cocoa is our life'. It is indeed not possible for us to recapitulate the richness and the emotion-laden discussions we had in the FGDs. Their fears and uncertainties regarding their own and their future generations' livelihoods were key points of discussion, especially in the women's groups.

Table 6. Frequency and flow of compensation

Frequency and flow of compensation	Comments
Monthly for 50 years (lifetime of a cocoa plant)	
Monthly for 50 years plus Ghs500 per month for LPG for cooking	Women
One-off payment plus monthly until 60 years old and then a pension like government employees	
After paying compensation we can be employed on our own land for conservation work and paid Ghs2000 per month	
For loss of cocoa land, compensation must be paid to our generation and our children's and our grandchildren's generations	'Cocoa is our life' (migrant women)
For as long as REDD is on our land	
Continuous payment preferred	
In case of death, benefits should go to next of kin	

4.5 Institutional arrangements for managing compensation

4.5.1 Institutional arrangements for managing individual compensation

For managing individual compensation, all the groups preferred payments to individual bank accounts. They believed that this was the safest way and were not in favour of transferring the money to the village authorities (either traditional or state authorities) as they feared corruption and embezzlement. From the responses, it was clear that most of them have had experiences with small-scale savings and loans schemes (called susu and common in rural Ghana) in place of 'big banks'. Moreover, most cocoa farmers have experience of using bank accounts.

4.5.2 Institutional arrangements for managing community compensation

The participants were of the opinion that a committee consisting of traditional leaders, literate people (e.g. school teachers) and farmer representatives should be constituted for managing community compensation and implementing development projects (see Box 3). Women's groups were of the opinion that there should be an equal number of men and women on the committee. All groups agreed that the process should be transparent and that literate and educated people should be in the committee so that it functions well.

Box 3. Institutional arrangements for managing community compensation

- Compensation should be managed by a committee that includes prominent leaders (chief, queen mother, assembly man, farmer representatives).
- Decision-making group should include a literate person, a democratic leader, people with good management skills, and honest and transparent people.
- Decision-making process to manage community funds should include men and women, chief, assembly man, unit committee members.
- Decision-making group should include community leaders, an equal number of men and women (all agreed), a committee chairman from the community, the school headmaster and secretary to educate the literate farmers about their rights, and a treasurer for managing funds.
- Decision makers should include affected farmers, an equal number of men and women and other leaders.
- Management should include an equal number of men and women.

Conclusions and implications for REDD+ in Ghana

This study was undertaken in a REDD+ pilot area with the purpose of eliciting information regarding people's preferences for compensation for mitigation activities. It was evident that the communities in the study area depend heavily on cocoa farming for their household incomes. There is also a heavy dependence on forests for charcoal, fuelwood, hunting and other minor forest produce such as raw materials for basket-making and other income-generating activities. There are also auxiliary wage workers engaged in forest work. Introducing REDD+ would bring about radical changes in the lives and livelihoods of these communities. Therefore compensation packages need to be well thought through and devised in close discussion with the communities.

The study based on FGDs examined the preferences of communities divided into groups on the basis of gender and ethnicity and found significant differences. The indigenous ethnic groups were mostly in favour of a combination of individual and community compensations, while the in-migrants mostly favoured individual cash compensation. They were concerned about their future as the land belongs mostly to indigenous ethnic groups. The implementation of REDD+ could have consequences for their future, both in terms of access to land as well as livelihoods. The gender-based differences also came through in the study. Women in general were concerned about the REDD+ process being inclusive of all community members as well as future generations. This also highlights the importance of taking into account future generations when thinking through REDD+ compensations.

The community's preferences for compensation were highly varied, context specific and nuanced. This must be taken account of in planning compensation packages. Conflicts and uncertainties could arise, especially where communities are heterogeneous, e.g. where migrants, indigenes and different ethnic groups with different levels of forest dependence co-exist. REDD+ programmes must be aware of the complexity of the issue of compensation and the ethical and moral dimensions of REDD+ – both at a policy level as well as at the empirical level of implementation. This is going to have an impact, in one way or other, on a large number of people, largely in the margins of the global political economy of climate change.

It is important to note that this was a small study of short duration and hence we are constrained in making any concrete recommendations to the REDD+ programme in Ghana. A much larger and thorough study of different regions and different communities is warranted for making such concrete recommendations. Through this study we were, however, able to get an overall idea of people's preferences for compensation. It was clear from the study that the communities were largely unaware of the ongoing REDD+ pilot project in their area. We are concerned that the answers from communities we studied were given without a complete understanding of the REDD+ programme and its implications. This shows the importance of the FPIC process in choosing REDD+ pilots as well as in scaling up.

References

Berg, B.L. and H. Lune. 2012. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Pearson Education Limited.

Ghana Forestry Commission. 2010. *Revised Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) Ghana 2010*. Submitted to the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) 23rd December 2010 by the R-PP Ghana Development Team. See www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/forestcarbonpartnership.org/files/Documents/PDF/Jan2011/Revised_Ghana_R-PP_2_Dec-2010.pdf, www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/sites/forestcarbonpartnership.org/files/Documents/PDF/Jan2011/Revised_Ghana_R-PP_2_Dec-2010.pdf

Ghana Statistical Service. 2010. *Population and Housing Census (PHC)*. See www.ghanadistricts.com/pdfs/2010_pop_census_districts.pdf

Holstein, J.A. and J.F. Gubrium. 1995. *The Active Interview*. Sage Publications.

Annex 1. Rationale for compensation

Focus Group	Rationale	Comments
FG 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ For providing our farmland (where cocoa is grown). ■ For not being able to enter the forest to collect ropes, timber, firewood and canes or to hunt etc. 	Men
FG 2		
FG 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Our ability to preserve forests by planting trees in place of felled ones. ■ 'I am never going to give away my cocoa farm [i.e. commit to REDD]. What if the compensation is never paid to me? It is a way of cheating us farmers.' 	Men/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Loss of cocoa farms. ■ Loss of access to food resources. ■ Loss of source of charcoal. ■ Loss of wood, canes to make baskets, and pestles and mortars etc. 	Women/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Loss of farmland. ■ For interrupting normal farming activities. 	Mixed (men and women).
FG 6		
FG 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Loss of farmland. ■ Change of land-use practices. 	Women
FG 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Loss of farmland (for afforestation). ■ Protecting forests. ■ Changing from cocoa farming to planting trees. 	Men
FG 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Loss of farmland. 	Women
FG 10		
FG 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Loss of farmland (as a result of protecting forests, inability to clear forestlands). ■ Change of land-use practices, e.g. switching from growing crops to tree plantation. 	Women

Annex 2. Relevant mitigation activities

Focus Group	Mitigation activities	Mitigation activities that need compensation	Why?	Comments
FG 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No hunting. ■ No forest use for herbal/ medicinal purposes. ■ No charcoal burning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No hunting. ■ No forest use for herbal/ medicinal purposes. ■ No charcoal burning. 		Men
FG 2				
FG 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Afforestation (each farmer must be given a certain number of trees to plant. If he/she plants them, then compensation should be paid. This will motivate other farmers to plant trees). ■ Not felling trees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Afforestation (each farmer must be given a certain number of trees to plant. If he/she plants them, then compensation should be paid. This will motivate other farmers to plant trees). ■ Not felling trees. 	Because that is the only way to motivate other farmers to conserve the forest.	Men/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Protection/conservation of forest land. ■ No bush burning. ■ No felling of trees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Protection/conservation of forest land. ■ No bush burning. ■ No felling of trees. 	Can sustain forest for generations.	Women/ mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No felling of trees. ■ No charcoal burning. ■ No hunting in forest. ■ Minimal forest usage for herbs. ■ Afforestation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No felling of trees. ■ No charcoal burning. ■ No hunting in forest. ■ Minimal forest usage for herbs. ■ Afforestation. 	Source of livelihoods for people.	Mixed (men and women).
FG 6				
FG 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No felling of trees. ■ No cutting of ropes (rope trees). ■ No hunting. ■ No chainsawing (indiscriminate lumbering). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No felling of trees. 	Source of income.	Women
FG 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No lighting fires in or near the forest. ■ No felling of trees in the forest. ■ No hunting in forest. ■ Supporting forest guards by reporting offenders to them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No lighting fires in or near the forest. ■ No felling of trees in the forest. ■ No hunting in forest. ■ Supporting forest guards by reporting offenders to them. ■ Emphasised compensation for charcoal burners as it is their main source of income. 	Source of income especially for charcoal burners.	Men
FG 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No burning of forests for hunting. ■ No indiscriminate felling of trees for timber ■ Not doing anything harmful to the forest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No felling of trees. 	It helps forest conservation, prevents soil erosion etc.	Women
FG 10				
FG 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No felling of trees for wooden pestles. ■ Stop cutting wood or timber. ■ Stop hunting for animals in order to increase species. ■ No charcoal burning. ■ No cutting of trees for canes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Pestle makers ■ Timber workers ■ Hunters ■ Charcoal makers ■ Cane workers 	Sources of livelihoods.	Women

Annex 3. Type of compensation packages for individuals and community

Focus Group	Individuals	Community	Comments
FG 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cash (about Ghc50,000 per year). ■ Scholarship for children. ■ Housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Drinking water, toilets, roads. ■ Sawmills, rubber and palm oil plantations for employment. ■ Employment as forest guards. ■ Free education from basic to tertiary levels. 	Men
FG 2			Women
FG 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Expand businesses. ■ Children's education. ■ Agriculture. ■ Cash compensation (emphasised cash payments to individuals, as compared to investments in infrastructure). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Infrastructure. ■ Schools. 	Men/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cash (emphasised cash payments to individuals, as compared to investments in infrastructure). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Drinking water. ■ Sanitation. ■ Secondary school. 	Women/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cash. ■ Housing (in hometowns). ■ Social security (e.g. pensions for older farmers). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No interest in payments to community: 'We have no intention of living here permanently, we are not indigenes. The land here is bad for farming, it is best for gold mining and it has oil deposits too. We suffer before we get our cocoa yields. Will even be glad if you take the land and compensate us individually.' 	Mixed Ashanti (women and men).
FG 6			Men
FG 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cash to individual cocoa farmers. ■ Scholarships for children's education. ■ Alternative livelihoods/income sources. ■ Building stores/shops. ■ Supply of LPG for cooking. ■ Support for alternative farming such as animal husbandry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cash for community as 'we all contribute to forest protection, farmers and non-farmers.' ■ Services. ■ Community infrastructure. 	Women
FG 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Housing in hometowns. 'We are here because of cocoa. If our lands are gone we will travel back to our hometowns.' ■ Cash for loss of cocoa lands and loss of income from cocoa. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Secondary school. ■ Hospital. 	Men (Fante migrants)
FG 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cash compensation. ■ Build and provide housing. ■ Educate children until they reach adulthood and put them in gainful employment. ■ Scholarships for children. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Build a market for women. ■ Infrastructure. ■ More compensation for farmers and less for community. 	Women
FG 10			Men
FG 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cash payments. ■ Training in alternative livelihood activities (e.g. poultry farming, sheep rearing, cattle and pig rearing, tailoring, welding and fitting, hairdressing, help to open petty trade stores, grocery shops etc.). ■ Scholarships for children's education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Building a school library for students. ■ Building a secondary school (they have a primary school). ■ Building a pharmacy. ■ Building housing for teachers and employing more teachers. ■ Providing a computer laboratory. ■ Providing running water and street lights. ■ Road construction. 	Women

Annex 4. Who should be paid cash compensation?

Focus group	Who should be compensated?	Comments
FG 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ All forest users must be compensated but cocoa farmers should get more. ■ Level of compensation should be according to the burden of loss. ■ For example, for cocoa farmers it can be based on the land area. 	Men
FG 2		Women
FG 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cocoa farmers. ■ Other forest users e.g. hunters, charcoal makers, traders, timber loggers, landowners who live very close to the forests (due to their heavy dependence on forests for a living). 	Men/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cocoa farmers (either to each member of the household or the head of the family). ■ People who are indirectly affected by the loss of resources from the forest (e.g. chiefs who are the traditional landowners). 	Women/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cocoa farmers, according to their burden of loss. 	Mixed Ashanti migrants (women and men).
FG 6		Men
FG 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ All community members (as they contribute to forest protection). ■ Cocoa farmers. 	Women
FG 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cocoa farmers (as loss of cocoa-farming land will affect them more). 	Men (Fante migrants).
FG 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cocoa farmers (more compensation to cocoa farmers). ■ Others who are directly affected by loss of income from forests. 	Women (Fante migrants).
FG 10		Men
FG 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cocoa farmers (main concern). ■ All villagers (everyone protects forests or are engaged in forest-related work one way or other). ■ Auxiliary workers in forests. 	Women

Annex 5. Basis, levels, frequency and flow of compensation

Focus group	Levels/basis	Frequency	Comments
FG 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Size of cocoa farmland can be a basis. Life span of cocoa tree (50 years). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During lean season for cocoa (May/June/July) more likely to go into forests for livelihoods. Pay cash monthly for 50 years, or until land is handed back to the community. 	Men
FG 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farm size (larger farm more money). Both for migrants and indigenes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly throughout the lifetime of the cocoa farmer and his dependents. Women Ghc500 per month to buy LPG for cooking. 	Women
FG 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Size of cocoa farmland can be a basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One-off payment to begin with, (e.g. Ghc20,000) then continue payments every month (e.g. Ghc1100). Pay us pension as well. After paying compensation, we can be employed on our own farms for conservation work and paid Ghc2000 every month. We must be paid monthly until we are 60 years old and then paid a pension like government employees. Control of land should be with us. 	Men/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Size of farmland. Based on value of cocoa yield Family needs should be the basis (compensation will be adequate if it meets all our family needs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For total loss of land we must be paid money to take care of us, our children and our grandchildren (cocoa is our life and also that of future generations). Monthly (our cocoa money is paid to us monthly and so it is not new to us). Payment should be for several generations as cocoa farms operate for several generations. For as long as our farms are under REDD. 	Women/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to burden of loss. Ghc5000 per month. Lump sum of Ghc50,000 to older farmers (above 60 years of age). Farm size. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly payment. Lump sum plus monthly payments. For as long as one lives. 	Mixed Ashanti migrants (women and men).
FG 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farm size. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ghc5000–12000 per year for cocoa farmers. Should continue for at least 50 years (cocoa-tree life span). 	Men
FG 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farm size. Cocoa yield. Ghc2000 for each farmer for 20 years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yearly payment. Monthly payments to meet day-to-day needs. Continuous payments preferred as otherwise money will be wasted if given at once. 	Women
FG 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to number of cocoa bags per year using market price. Cocoa prices vary and that has to be taken account of each year. Workers should be paid the wages they lose from work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yearly basis. For forty years. In case of death, the benefits should go to next of kin. For 50 years (life span of cocoa tree). 	Men (Fante migrants).
FG 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equivalent to cocoa money (Ghc30,000 per year plus house) for everyone. Fairest is to pay each cocoa farmer based on land area and cocoa yield (general consensus on this). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly payments (otherwise will be misused) for 50 years. 	Women (Fante migrants).
FG 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual effort. Size of land lost. Cocoa yield lost. Cocoa farmers should be paid more than others and they should get a preference. You may decide for other forest users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Divided opinion. Yearly (most). Seasonal (twice a year – major and minor seasons). Undecided about number of years. 	Men
FG 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cash payment for alternative trade (Ghc2000–10,000 per year). Should not be less than what we get from cocoa farming. Otherwise we will return to cocoa farming. In addition, all villagers should get a cash payment for forest protection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yearly basis. Monthly basis – to cater to day-to-day needs. Monthly is faster and better. For about 30 years. 	Women

Annex 6. Institutional arrangements for managing compensation

Focus group	Institutional arrangement for payments (individuals)	Institutional arrangement for payments (community)	Comments
FG 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual bank accounts (prevent embezzlement). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managed by a committee that includes prominent leaders, chief, queen mother, assembly man and farmer representatives. 	Men
FG 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual bank accounts (assembly man could embezzle our money). Consultation between farmers and REDD implementers important. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee involving government representative, assembly man, opinion leaders, chiefs, farmers. 	Women
FG 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group basis according to occupation (e.g. cocoa growers, cane cutters, hunters etc.). Leaders should be chosen from each group by people themselves to avoid cheating. Money should then be given to group leaders to be shared equally with everyone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision-making group should include a literate person and a democratic leader. All should have good management skills and be honest and transparent people. 	Men/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision-making committee should include assembly man, tribal chief, government representatives, affected farmers. 		Women/mixed group of migrants from northern Ghana.
FG 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual bank accounts (prevent embezzlement). Decision makers should include affected farmers and also chiefs as they are original landowners. 		Mixed Ashanti (women and men).
FG 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual bank accounts (prevent embezzlement). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision-making process to manage community funds should include men and women, chief, assembly man, unit committee members. 	Men (Eve)
FG 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual bank accounts, no middlemen (to prevent embezzlement). 		Women (Eve)
FG 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual bank accounts. Men and women involved in decision making. 		Men (Fante migrants)
FG 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual bank accounts. REDD should write cheques for us. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision-making group should include community leaders, an equal number of men and women (all agreed), committee chairman from community, school headmaster and secretary to educate the literate farmers about their rights, and a treasurer for managing funds. 	Women
FG 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual bank accounts (prevent embezzlement). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision makers should include affected farmers, an equal number of men and women, other leaders. 	Men (Brusa)
FG 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Men and women should get equal compensation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management – equal number of men and women. 	Women (Brusa)

iiied

International Institute
for Environment
and Development



Norad



HAMILTON
RESOURCES & CONSULTING p.l.l.c.