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ABSTRACT
This thesis is an investigation into the structures and process of Ghana’s dam displacement and resettlement project in improving the livelihoods of displaced people. It is premised on the fact that displacement and resettlement failures are largely as a result of poor governance structures and processes that inhibit displaced people who are the primary beneficiaries of the resettlement process from making inputs and authentically participating in the process. The study is a single case study of the Bui Dam with the adoption of an actor-oriented approach anchored on political ecology with a focus on displaced persons as the main actors. Data was collected from BPA Resettlement Township B near Bongase in the Banda District between March, 2017 and March, 2018. In all, data were collected with 119 semi-structured questionnaires, in-depth interviews and 12 focus group discussions. It argues that there were suitable structures for delivery of good governance but these were flawed with procedural bottlenecks, which barred displaced people from making significant inputs in the process. Displaced persons’ capacities in exercising their rights in displacement and resettlement processes was poor. There was little interest and low participation by CSOs as watchdogs in the process. As a result, governance as in voice, accountability and participation was poor. It noted that displacement centred more on relocation and, as such, emphasis was laid on providing shelter and social amenities at the resettlements rather than on livelihood restoration measures. The inability of BPA to implement its own Livelihood Enhancement Project (LEP) over five years of resettlement has resulted in the impoverishment of resettled people far below pre-resettlement levels contrary to best practices in resettlement projects. Consequently, resettled people have resorted to massive outmigration to more resource endowed destinations; whilst other have ventured in scrap dealings and illegal mining. Farming in the resettlement area is now more intensive with the reduction of land sizes allocated to resettlers. Social and
parental control of children and youth also low and immoral activities are on the rise. The study recommends the promulgation of a development-induced resettlement policy with emphasis on displaced people’s livelihood enhancement measures. It advocates for more civic education of displaced people on their rights during displacement; and the training and resourcing of more civil society organizations to act as ombudsmen during displacement and resettlement.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background

Forced displacements that result from the need to build infrastructure for new industries, irrigation, transportation highways, power generation, or for urban developments such as hospitals, schools, and airports are inevitable. They have however resulted in not only asset and job losses but also the breakdown of social and food security, credit and labour exchange networks, social capital and kinship ties (Baviskar, 1995; Cernea, 2000; Dwivedi, 2002). Cernea sums the net effect of displacement as follows:

“Like becoming a refugee, being forcibly ousted from one’s land and habitat by a dam, reservoir or highway is not only immediately disruptive and painful, it is also fraught with serious long-term risks of becoming poorer than before displacement, more vulnerable economically and disintegrated socially” (Cernea, 1996, p. 304).

Large dam development perhaps is the main culprit of development induced displacement, displacing between 40 and 80 million people to 2000 (World Commission on Dams, 2000). Opponents of large dams argue that government and dam sponsors in their quest to meet their dam needs often under-estimate the social cost of dams as well as alternative sources of energy and execute dam projects with little or non-participation of stakeholders (Cernea, 2000). Many proponents believe that decisions about the broader social and environmental effects of dams are political decisions that should be resolved through the political process and not through the specific project's decision-making process (Christophe & Neiland, 2006). The environmental and social costs of dams is manifested in displacement, loss of assets
and misery. The adversaries of large dam development on the environment and displaced people have led to the questioning of the dam-financing and dam construction decisions the world over (Moore, Dore, & Gyawali, 2010; Terminski, 2013a; World Commission on Dams, 2000). This has restricted the financing of large water resource development by the World Bank and regional banks like the Asian Development Bank.

However, this work opines that much of the inadequacies in the outcomes of displacement and resettlement schemes lie more in the structures and processes of resettlement schemes itself. It holds that the displacement and resettlement process governance system does not allow for adequate stakeholder participation, accountability and transparency hence the poor outcomes. Using an actor-oriented approach anchored on political ecology theory, it explored the governance situation in development caused displacement and resettlement processes from the perspectives of actors using the development of large dams in Ghana.

Ghana, since independence in 1957, has relied heavily on the development of her water resources to generate energy for her much needed socio-economic transformation. This has led to the construction of large hydroelectric power dams in Akosombo and Kpong in 1965 and 1981, respectively. Although these dams have been very instrumental in meeting the energy needs of Ghana for decades (Coyne & Bellier, 2005; Ministry of Energy/Bui Development Committee, 2007), the past one-and-half decades have seen the country plunged into a situation of a net importer rather than exporter of energy to neighbours such as Togo and Ivory Coast.

Large dams for hydropower development have been the main cause of development-induced displacement in Ghana after independence. Planned development-induced displacement and resettlement started in then Gold Coast with the relocation of people
from present day Upper East Region to Damongo in the then now Savannah Region for the purposes of agricultural development under the then Gonja Development Project and the construction of the Tema Harbour in the Greater Accra Region in the 1950s (Grischow, 2001; Mettle, 2011).

To fill her energy needs gap, the Ghana National Energy Plan (2006-2025) proposes further development of hydroelectric dams along the Volta River as the most reliable and cheaper sources of electricity for the country (Ghana, 2006). This is especially true in the light of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which seeks to end all forms of poverty by 2030. SDGs 7 and 9 especially call for clean and affordable modern energy for all to promote industrialization. Hydropower sources of electricity such as dams are one of the sustainable ways of sourcing clean and cheaper electricity if the displacement and environmental issues are managed well.

The construction of the Bui Dam is the first among other strategies earmarked by the Ghana National Energy Plan. It is, however, widely acknowledged that one characteristic of hydroelectric dams as a cheaper source of electricity is the accompanying livelihood displacement (WCD, 2000; Cernea, 1997, 2000; Dwivedi, 1999, 2001; Tsikata, 2012). Already studies show that the Volta Dam has caused considerable livelihood displacement and continuous misery for displaced persons since the commencement of its construction in 1961 (Adu-Aryee, 1993; Diaw & Schmidt, 1990). This is as a result of poor planning and management of its displacement and resettlement process (Chambers, 1970; Kalitsi, 2008; Tsikata, 2012). Similar outcomes are reported in the case of hydroelectric dams the world over like the Narmada dam in India and the Ilisu Dam in Turkey (Dwivedi, 1999; Morvaridi, 2004).
The construction of the Bui Dam began not only after these adverse studies and reports on the effects of the Volta and Kpong dams in Ghana but also against the backdrop of similar adverse reports by the World Commission of Dams since 2000. Given the past experiences, the extent to which governance issues around the Bui Dam project are so far managed must be of paramount importance. This thesis is an ex-post assessment of the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement outcomes on affected people.

1.1 Problem Statement

Population displacements caused by large infrastructural development such as large dams have often been met with resistance from project affected persons. This culminated in the World Commission for Dams (Bartolome, De Wet, Mander, & Nagraj, 2000) recommendations and other national and international legal and normative frameworks based on governance and human rights issues. What are the implementation challenges of the plethora of these protocols at the national level? Are there appropriate structures at the national level for the realization of these frameworks? Are all stakeholders or actors assertive and enough to exercise their rights and responsibilities in the displacement process?

This study investigated the above questions in the context of the governance of dam-caused displacement and resettlement in Ghana. It focused on the extent to which the displacement and resettlement structures promoted or inhibited the various actors in ensuring participation, accountability and equity in the dam-induced displacement at the national level using Ghana’s Bui Dam’s process as a case.

Even though large dams like Ghana’s Akosombo Dam, the Aswan Dam in Egypt and the Narmada Dam in India have made an important and significant contribution to human development, and the benefits derived from them have been considerable; in too
many cases an unacceptable and often unnecessary price has been paid to secure those benefits, especially in social and environmental terms, by people displaced, by communities downstream (Owusu, Asiedu, Yankson, & Boafo, 2018), by taxpayers and by the natural environment. Moreover, the lack of equity in the distribution of benefits has called into question the value of many dams in meeting water and energy development needs when compared environmental and social consequences (Biswas & Tortajada, 2001; Isaacman & Isaacman, 2013).

In most cases, in the development of large dams, huge tracts of land are forcefully acquired by the state from chiefs and traditional landlords using the eminent domain for the public interests or the common good (Larbi, 2008). The enactment of good governance policies and implementation structures could go a long way to improving the livelihoods of displaced people, who are mostly already peasant farmers and herdsmen, to new settlements.

Given that displacement is inevitable in most cases of development, it is prudent that displacement and resettlement schemes be made core components in large dam development planning. The adverse social impacts of displacement and resettlement could be averted with good policy, legislation, social planning and financial targeting (Cernea, 2008; Cernea & Mathur, 2008). In most developing countries, including Ghana, negotiating land and resettlements in development-induced displacement and resettlements (DIDR) is denied by the state use of the eminent domain and other legal instruments to forcibly acquire, expropriate, or convert land for developments “in the public interest” (Larbi, Antwi, & Olomolaiye, 2004; Price, 2015). For example, Nyarko (2014, p. 14) notes that
“...compulsory land acquisition in Ghana is essentially completed upon the publication of an Executive Instrument (EI) by the President, subsequent to which all previous interests in the land are extinguished. There is no requirement for prior consultation or even notification of the land owners much less informed consent. The land owners only become involved in the process after the acquisition instrument has been published, where compensation is payable.”

Affected people do not participate in the land acquisition process nor in the compensation process. In most cases, very little compensation is paid and usually many years after the land has been compulsorily acquired.

The World Bank’s Involuntary Resettlement Sourcebook, 2004 noted that:

Well-designed and well-implemented resettlement can, however, turn involuntary resettlement into a development opportunity. The challenge is to not treat resettlement as an imposed externality but to see it as an integral component of the development process and to devote the same level of effort and resources to resettlement preparation and implementation as to the rest of the project. Treating resettlers as project beneficiaries can transform their lives in ways that are hard to conceive of if they are viewed as ‘project-affected people’ who somehow have to be assisted so that the main project can proceed. (Gill, 2004, p. xvii)

The extent to which DIDR affects the livelihoods of displaced persons depends on the amount of resources committed to it, the timeliness and planning, viewing settlers as beneficiaries and indeed the importance attached to the process. Specifically, Cernea (2004) notes that, unless the negative social impacts of dams especially are pre-empted by governments through explicit policy, legislation, social planning and targeted financing, hydropower expansion and overall development in developing countries will be retarded by increasing social tensions and growing political and environmental opposition.

This means the calamities of displacement and resettlement can be remedied with good governance that ensures stakeholder participation, mutual accountability and transparency. The WCD Report (2000) has recognised, as core, the principles of equity, efficiency, participatory decision-making, sustainability and accountability. Dam financiers, such as the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, as well as human rights groups have outlined similar principles and protocols in displacement planning and implementation.

A review of Ghana’s Akosombo and Kpong resettlement programmes have called for the need for transparency, adequate participation, and equity in benefit sharing among various social groups of displaced people (Chambers, 1970; Diaw & Schmidt-Kallert, 1990; Tsikata, 2012; Second Ghana Dams Forum, 2006).

In the light of the above, it is of interest to investigate the manner in which Ghana’s Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process was carried out in terms of participation, equity and social accountability. Using Long’s (1992; 2000) actor-oriented approach, the study sought to ascertain the perspectives of the various actors such as the State/Bui Dam Association, Chiefs and Elders of displaced and resettlement communities, local non-governmental organization and perspectives from social groups displaced, such as men, women and youth.

Ultimately, the study made contributions to displacement and resettlement process frameworks by critically examining the governance issues of participation,
accountability and transparency from an actor-oriented perspective of Ghana’s Bui Dam’s process.

1.2 Study Research Questions
The main research question is;

- How has the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process promoted good governance among and between displaced people and the Bui Power Authority?

The work operationalized the following sub-questions in the study areas in finding answers to the main research question:

- How did the structure and strategies promote the participation of displaced people in the displacement and resettlement process?
- What were the strengths and weaknesses of displaced people under the structure in seeking governance?
- To what extent were displaced peoples’ worldviews on resettlement and wellbeing incorporated in the process?
- How did the displacement and resettlement governance affect the livelihood outcomes of the various social groups of displaced people?

1.3 Research Objectives

1.3.1 Main Objectives

The main objective of the study is to ascertain the extent to which the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement processes promoted sound governance among stakeholders and the effects on the livelihood outcomes of the various social groups of displaced persons.

1.3.2 Sub-Objectives

The following four specific objectives were explored to:
• Examine the extent to which the displacement structures and strategies of the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process promoted good governance between displaced people and Bui Power Authority (BPA);
• Assess, from an actor-perspective, the enabling and inhibiting factors of displaced people in ensuring good governance in the displacement process;
• Analyse the extent to which displaced peoples’ worldviews of resettlement and wellbeing were incorporated in the displacement process; and
• Analyse the effects of the governance outcomes on livelihood of social groups of displaced persons.

1.4 Significance of Study

Large-scale, capital-intensive projects convert farmlands, fishing grounds, forests, and homes into reservoirs, irrigation systems, mines, plantations, and tourist resorts, all in the name of regional and national development. Aimed at generating economic growth and thereby improving general welfare, these projects have all too often left local people permanently displaced, disempowered, and destitute. Resettlement has been so poorly planned, financed, implemented, and administered that these projects end up being ‘development disasters’ (Cerneea, 1996, 2000; Dwivedi, 2002). Evaluation of displacement and resettlement projects processes have revealed that the plight of displaced people could have been improved with good governance tenets such as stakeholder participation, accountability and transparency (WCD, 2000; Price 2015).

This study provides recent empirical data on how the structures and processes of displacement can affect resettled people’s livelihoods and wellbeing. The study is a contribution towards the development of a governance framework for the displacement and resettlement process. Using an actor-oriented political ecology approach, the study
seeks to unearth the strengths and inadequacies of various stakeholders’ endeavours in accessing good governance in displacement and resettlement processes. Theoretically, the thesis contributes to the application of the political ecology theory on the displacement and resettlement process. The study identified gaps that can serve as pathways to endogenous development.

1.5 Scope of the Scope

The study is a case study of Ghana’s Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process carried out between 2006 and 2013. It investigated the extent to which governance issues of participation, transparency and accountability were applied in the Bui Dam’s displacement process.

The study concentrated on the displacement and resettlement process of Township B located near Bongase in the Banda District only. This is because about two-thirds of the Bui Dam’s displaced people were settled there. Resettlement communities in the township include Bator-Akanyakrom, Bui, Dokokyina and the Bui Camp. The Bui Camp community consists of staff of the Ghana Game and Wildlife Division of the Forestry Commission who were affected by the displacement.

The study centred on the implementation structures and processes of the Bui Dam’s process. It examined spaces for participation and accountability, the displacement and resettlement structures, and how various actors worked within those structures in their quest for seeking or delivering governance. The main stakeholders contacted were those directly involved in the displacement and resettlement of people. These include displaced persons (men, women and youth), the Bui Power Authority Resettlement Officials, Chiefs and both displaced communities and host communities of Resettlement Township B in the Banda area.
The study adopted an actor-oriented approach to political ecology in its investigations with the examination of the governance and livelihood issues of the displacement and resettlement process. The study examined the governance relationship between BPA and displaced people in the displacement and resettlement process. Displaced people’s perspectives formed the bulk of the empirical data of the study because of the difficulties of getting clearance from BPA to engage their officials. The study is therefore be described as a single actor perspective. However, within displaced people as an actor group, opinions were sought from traditional authorities, men, women and the youth to ascertain their various sub-groups’ perspectives before a holistic analysis was made of the entire group of displaced people as actors.

1.6 Organization of Thesis

This thesis is organized into seven chapters. The opening chapter comprises the background information of displacement and resettlement, the problem statement, research questions and objectives. It also entails the significance of the study.

Chapter two consists of the literature review. It begins with the conceptualization large dam development, displacements and resettlement. It underscores that dams are instrumental in providing water for both domestic and industrial purposes, for hydropower and agriculture. However, their environmental and social consequences should be managed in a manner that improve the livelihoods of displaced people. The rest of the chapter then focuses on various approaches, debates and challenges of mitigating the social impacts of large dams. It then discusses the Scudder-Culson four stage resettlement model and Cernea’s impoverishment risks and reconstruction (IRR) models of resettling people displaced from development-induced displacements like a large dam construction. The thesis adopts the IRR model for its analytical model for
the livelihood change analysis of the displaced and resettled people of the Bui Dam area. Some international protocols and recommendations of the United Nations, the World Commission on Dams and the World Bank were reviewed in this chapter.

In chapter three, the thesis concentrates on the central governance in displacement. Governance is central in the thesis and, as such, the chapter overviews the need to ensure sound governance principles in development-induced displacement and resettlement processes as a way of mitigating the adverse effects of the displacement. It discussed the principles of good governance, the conditions necessary for good governance and the role of actors in ensuring sound governance. The chapter concludes with adoption of participation, transparency and accountability as the main governance principles to be examined in the thesis.

Chapter four continues with some theoretical perspectives of the study. It reviews the political ecology as a concept and described its suitability and therefore adoption as the theoretical underpinnings of the thesis. It describes Long’s (2003) actor oriented approach to development evaluation and how it was applied to the concept of political ecology in the study. It mapped out the actors in the Bui Dam’s project and reviewed Bird et al.’s (2004) 3Rs (Rights, Risks and Responsibilities) model. It concludes with an analytical framework for analysing the governance issues in the thesis.

Chapter five covers a detailed discussion of the research design, research questions, the methodology and related methods employed in the thesis. A brief history of the Bui Dam’s planning process since the discovery of the Bui Gorge in 1925 until its present state is presented together with a brief profile of the Bui Dam’s catchment area. The second segment of the chapter elaborated the research methodology employed by the study. It discussed the research strategy, sampling techniques and methods of data
collection employed in the field, and how data was analysed and presented. The chapter concludes with how data was managed to ensure reliability and validity as well as the ethical considerations observed.

Chapter six presents the empirical data collected from the field in the form of narratives, tables and figures. In line with the study objectives, the chapter highlighted and discussed the displacement structure and actors’ powers, roles and relationships in the structure in terms of sound governance. The capabilities of actors to demand and deliver accountability, voice and participation and transparency were likewise discussed in the chapter. Displaced people’ livelihoods effects of the displacement and resettlement were also discussed there.

The thesis concludes with Chapter Seven’s summaries, conclusions and recommendations from the data analysis. It contains the contributions of the thesis to theory, policy and endogenous development studies and suggested areas for further research on the topic.

1.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter is an introduction to the thesis. It underscores that displacement and resettlement processes do not yield the desired results; not necessarily because of under-financing but largely as a result of bad governance approaches. The chapter puts the study in perspective by outlining the problem statement and research questions as well as the limitations that stood in the way of the thesis and how they were overcome to ensure the validity of results. The ensuing chapter gives some literature review of the main concepts of the study to further clarify the stance of the thesis from existing secondary data.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter reviews concepts for a better understanding of the study problem. Conceptual reviews help us to think about phenomena, order material and to reveal patterns, which may eventually lead to models and theories (Cuthill & Warburton, 2005). This chapter crystalized the interlinking concepts of dams and development, displacement and resettlement issues for a better appreciation of the problem under study.

The discussions are organised into four sections. In the first section, I discuss the concepts of large dams and development. The study underscores that the role of dams in ensuring flood control, agriculture and energy is unparalleled, but inherent in these giant technological development are issues of environmental and social consequences, which must be managed effectively from the conception of the dam project (Biswas, 2012; Brown, Tullos, Tilt, Magee, & Wolf, 2009).

In the second section, the thesis discusses the concepts of displacement generally, with specific discussions on development-induced displacement and resettlement issues. The thesis opines that dam development could cause land and livelihood displacement of displaced people and therefore the need to adopt a displacement and settlement model that emphasizes good governance and livelihood enhancement. The adoption of good governance principles in displacement projects ensures the incorporation of displaced persons views, worldviews and perceptions in the process which could result in more accepted and livelihood enhancing outcome for them.
2.1 Types of Dams

There are various mechanisms for classifying dams. Nuera (2005) classifies dams according to shape, material used, structure, height and intended purpose. In terms of material used, dams may be classified into embankment and masonry dams.

Embarkment dams are built of loose rock, earth or a combination of these materials without the application of mortar as adhesive for the materials. The history of the construction of embankment dams is older than masonry dams. In fact, about 75% of all dams worldwide are embankment dams. Some of the most common embankment dams are earth-fill, rock-fill and zoned-embankment dams (Nuera, 2005).

The most common classification of dams is by their height and size. According to this criterion, there are three types of dams, namely small, large and major. A major dam, according to Nuera (2005), is one that is more than 150 metres in height. A small dam, on the other hand, has a height of between 2.5 metres to 15 metres above river bed level to maximum crest level, and a storage volume of less than or greater than 100,000 cubic metres (Lempérière, 2006). A large dam is described by the International Commission on Large Dams (ICOLD) as one whose height exceeds 15 meters. A dam whose height is between 10 and 15 meters and meets at least one of the following conditions is considered as a large dam:

- the crest length of the dam should not be less than 500 metres;
- the spillway discharge potential should exceed 2,000 cubic metres per second; or
- the reservoir volume should not be less than 1 million cubic metres (ICOLD, 2011).
The WCD (2000) used the above definition in its report and deliberations. Scholars such as Asmal (2001), Nüsser (2003), Lempérière (2003; 2006), Nuera (2005) and Namy (2007) all use this definition in their works. For the purposes of this thesis, the definitions of large dams given by the ICOLD and the WCD were adopted. By the above definition, Ghana has had three large dams consisting of Akosombo Dam, Kpong Dam and Bui Dam, which is being understudied by this study.

2.2 Large Dams and Development

Dams have always played crucial roles in the creation of waterways, transport, flood control and provision of water for agricultural activities, especially in drought-prone regions (Biswas, 2012; Obour, Owusu, Agyeman, Ahenkan, & Madrid, 2015; Yüksel, 2009). This has resulted in improved livelihood and development to many people across the world since the beginning of human civilization.

However, population growth, technological advancement and industrialization have changed the face of dams from domestic and irrigation purposes to that of hydropower generating dams. Technological advancement has affected not only the number and sizes of dams constructed around the world but also the purposes of dams more for hydropower generation than for domestic uses and agriculture. This has resulted in the construction of large dams, thanks to the technological advancement and the industrialization drive embarked upon by many developed and developing countries after the Second World War and independence.

Scudder (2012) notes that these large dams are needed to store and transfer water to rapidly expanding urban populations; to provide electricity to those populations and to the industries that must employ them if poverty is to be alleviated; to increase irrigation
in countries such as India where small reservoirs dry up during periods of drought; and to provide foreign exchange for development purposes by exporting hydropower.

As a result, more than half (172 out of 292) of all large river systems have been fragmented by human dam building, with more than 45,000 large dams worldwide obstructing two-thirds of all freshwater flows, and with reservoirs capable of holding back more than 15% of the annual global river runoff (Baghel & Nüsser, 2010; Nilsson, Reidy, Dynesius, & Revenga, 2005).

The construction of large dams has increased in both numbers and spread in the last century. It is estimated that 45,000 large dams were constructed across the world, which increased from 5,700 in 1950 to approximately 50,000 in a period of 50 years to the year 2000. The five (5) nations that do the most dam-building are China (22,000 dams), United States (6,390 dams), India (about 4000 dams), and Spain and Japan with between 1,000 and 1,200 large dams each (Moore et al., 2010; Scudder, 2012).

According to the WCD (2000), approximately 48% of these dams are for irrigation and therefore contribute greatly to food production; 20% generate electricity, 15% of single-purpose dams serve the domestic and industrial water supply, while flood control and recreation amounted to 8% and 4%, respectively. In addition, multiple-purpose dams account for a large proportion, nearly 30%, of the total. Multiple-purpose dams are increasingly important for regional economic development.

Most of these dams were built with financial support from the Western countries and institutions who are proponents of the modernization school of development. The modernization or structural theories that call for the modernization of agriculture, health care and economic growth fuelled the development of physical infrastructure such as dams, modern roads and factories to boost economic growth in developing countries.
As such, multilateral institutions like the World Bank and developed countries including United States of America (USA) and Western European countries as well as some Transnational Corporations, supported developing countries to develop their physical infrastructure like hydropower dams to augment their industrialization and economic development. Ghana’s Volta River Project, for instance, was financed by USA Government. The USA Government support was not just because it believed in the growth through industrialization but also ‘to increase its influence in Africa as part of its cold war considerations and expand the market for US goods, services and companies’ (Tsikata, 2012).

The World Bank was at the forefront of this modernization drive and sponsored over 600 projects in over 93 countries. Other financiers included The Inter-American Bank and Asian Development Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) (Isaacman & Isaacman, 2013). Many of the beneficiary countries include countries in Africa and Asia. By the end of the 20th century, over 1000 dams, including large dams like The Aswan Dam in Egypt/Sudan, Ghana’s Akosombo Dam, Kainji and Bakolori Dams in Nigeria, the Kossou Dam in Ivory Coast and the Masinga Dam in Tanzania as well as the Lesotho Highlands Water Project were constructed in Africa (Isaacman & Isaacman, 2013).

Ghana, for instance, after achieving independence in 1957, considered the Akosombo Dam as the most readily available and effective way to initiate and support the energy requirements for the industrialization of the country (Arp & Baumgärtel, 2005). The Akosombo Dam was perceived as the major booster to modernizing newly independent Ghana and was a mark of nationhood and pride. The then President, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, was quoted to have reiterated that:
Newer nations, such as ours, which are determined by every possible means to catch up in industrial strength, must have electricity in abundance, before they can expect any large-scale industrial advance. That basically, is the justification for the Volta River Project...scheme which transcends any political consideration, and which is, in the truest sense, an expression of our national unity and of our national purpose and aspiration (Tsikata, 2012, p. 43)

Similar nationalistic statements and attachments were noticed of the Aswan Dam of Egypt and other African states with hydroelectric dams. Despite these achievements, the environmental and social impacts of these large dam projects began to manifest in the project areas. The Akosombo Dam displaced about 80,000 people, representing 1% of the then population of the country (Arp & Baumgärtel, 2005; Kalitsi, 2004).

Isaacman and Isaacman (2013) argue that both financiers and dam-building nations ignored the fact that these dams brought severe and intense suffering to between 30 and 60 million people worldwide; many of whom are already poor and marginalised. Similar sentiments were expressed by scholars such as Scudder (2012), World Commission on Dams (2000), Cernea (2000; 2004) and the World Bank (2004). This underscores the fact that large dams have adverse environmental, social and economic consequences. Most serious of these problems associated with large dam projects include the loss of agricultural and forest lands through submergence; displacement of people; loss of livelihoods by the communities losing land; dislocation of wildlife and possible disappearance of rare species; as well as public health problems arising from impounding water (Fink, 2005).

The Akosombo Dam submerged 3.6% of Ghana’s landmass, displaced about 80,000 people (1% of the then population), of which 70,000 were resettled in 52 newly constructed communities and the remaining compensated with cash. As much as 8,515
hectares of land was compulsorily acquired by the Volta River Act, 1961 (Act, 46) and spanned through five regions (Arp & Baumgärtel, 2005; Larbi et al., 2004). The livelihood impacts of these resettled people have been adverse even after decades of resettlement (Kalitsi, 2008; Tsikata, 2012). Kalitsi (2008), for instance, note that after 25 years of resettlement, most resettlement sites of Akosombo Dam lacked basic amenities such as schools, health centres and electricity. The sites were inhabited by the aged because many of the younger resettled people emigrated to other settlements in search of better livelihoods (Kalitsi, 2008; Sjaak, 1998).

Similar research findings across the globe, coupled with activities of Civil Society Organizations, forced the World Bank to establish the International Commission on Large Dams (ICOLD) in 1998 to evaluate World Bank financed large dams. The result is the World Commission of Dams report (2000), which found very disturbing displacement and resettlement improprieties, made recommendations to remedy them in future dam building projects.

The negative consequences of large dams have been attributed principally to the role of state, and poor planning and implementation processes. State-initiated development projects are often human and environmental disasters because of one or a combination of the following:

- States have engaged in the administrative ordering of nature and society, simplifying ground-reality (and ignoring local knowledge) for the purposes of planning, and in doing so effacing or radically transforming that ground-reality;
States have adopted a high modernist ideology, putting their faith in the legitimacy of scientific and technical progress, which has often been embodied in certain forms of planning such as huge dams;

- States have often engaged in authoritarian and coercive practices to ensure that such high modernist plans come into being; and

- There has often been a weakly developed civil society, lacking the capacity to resist such planning (Scott, 1998, pp. 3–5, cited in Routledge, 2003, p. 3).

The role played by the state in initiating and planning, fund sourcing and negotiating of contracts makes it a key player in determining the outcome of these projects and therefore cannot escape culpability in these state initiated development-caused disasters. In many cases, project financiers and construction engineering firms tactically negotiate out the displacement and resettlement process and cost to host countries (Hensengerth, 2011; 2013). Similarly, Cernea and Mathur (2008) observed that most governments have stated that (1) compensation alone is not sufficient for restoring the income and livelihood of those displaced; and (2) resources to supplement compensation with additional financing are not available and, as such, there is over-reliance on compensation for livelihood restoration, which has always failed (Cernea, 2003, 2008; Cernea & Mathur, 2008). It means the outcome of displacement and resettlement largely depends on government’s management strategies. Therefore, properly implemented resettlement programmes can be an element of a nation’s strategy to promote development and reduce poverty (Dwevidi, 2002; Scudder, 2012).

This study agrees with the above propositions and, therefore, sets out to examine the content, processes and outcomes of Ghana’s Bui Dam displacement and resettlement.
Even though displacement and resettlement have a wide range of environmental and social consequences, this thesis concentrates on the governance issues of resettlement processes. As such, my main research question is:

How were the governance issues of participation, accountability and equity managed in the Bui Dam’s Displacement and Resettlement process?

This main question was examined in the context of good governance tenets like participation of displaced persons, and their right to information and equity in the distribution of resettlement benefits among the various social groups at the empirical phase.

2.3 Population Displacement

Displacement is the forced or involuntary migration of population caused mostly by adverse climate, conflict, natural disasters like earthquakes and landslides or a development project like mining or large dam development. These conditions force people to involuntarily migrate to other places for refuge.

These involuntary displacement situations are mostly named after the given causal effect e.g., environmental-induced displacement being involuntary displaced caused by environmental factors such as drought and floods; and conflict-induced displacement being caused by conflicts such as civil wars. Details of development-induced displacements are described in the ensuing section.

2.3.1 Development-Induced Displacements

“…Too often the viewpoints of people displaced to make room for the dam are lost or silenced by the efforts of the powerful to construct its meaning to narrow terms of development or technological success. Yet, the voices of the displaced
Development-induced displacement is primarily a socioeconomic issue associated with loss or significant reduction of access to basic resources on which communities depend. Physical abandonment of the existing residence shall, therefore, be secondary to the loss of access to material resources such as land, pastures, forests and clean water as well as intangible resources such as socio-economic ties (Terminski, 2013b). It is involuntary as displaced persons don’t have an option to stay, as they are compelled to relocate.

The cause of development-induced displacement is development itself. It is displacement caused by the development of infrastructure such as dams, highways and airports (Terminski, 2013b). Cernea (1998) and Terminski (2012) outlined eight of the most substantial forms of development-induced displacement: (1) the construction of dams, hydroplants, and large irrigation projects like the Sardar Sarovar complex on the river Narmada in India and the Akosombo Dam in Ghana; (2) the building of roads, highways, bridges, and railroad networks like the expansion of railways in Manila, Philippines; (3) urbanization and social services (e.g. urban transport, water supply); (4) the development of agriculture (e.g. creation of monoculture plantations); (5) exploitation and transportation of mineral resources; (6) conservation of nature (the establishment of national parks, reserves, or other protected areas); (7) population redistribution schemes; and (8) other causes (Cernea, 1988; Fratkin, 2014; Terminski, 2013b). Although these projects are necessary projects for the socioeconomic development of their respective countries, they caused the uprooting of people (often poor peasants) from homes and livelihoods, some of whom have to be resettled in unfamiliar lands and cultures.
Large dam construction is by far the highest cause of development-induced displacement and resettlement in the world. The World Bank has calculated that roughly 40 per cent of development-induced displacement every year – over 4 million people – is as a result of dam projects (Stanley, 2004; Terminski, 2013a).

A survey of World Bank funded projects that caused displacements; necessitating resettlements are categorized and shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Types of Development-Induced Displacements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of Displacement</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dams, irrigation, canals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1,304,000</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban infrastructure, water supply, transportation</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>443,000</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal, including mining</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other causes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,963,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Terminski, 2012

Large dam construction as part of development projects causes more than 50% of displacement the world over. For example, the Three Gorges Dam – the world’s largest hydroelectric dam, completed in 2012 – displaced at least 1.3 million people (Neef & Singer, 2015; Wilmsen, Webber, & Yuefang, 2011). The high overall level of dam displacement is a product of the speed with which dams have been built since 1950.

The International Commission on Large Dams (ICOLD) reports that the world had 5,000 large dams in 1950 and over 45,000 by the late 1990s (World Commission on Dams, 2000) and there would be more, with more dam financing countries like Brazil and China. Ghana’s third hydroelectric dam, the Bui Dam, was financed by China through sole sourcing initiated by the Chinese government (Hensengerth, 2011).

Although Africa hosts only 5.8% of the World Bank funded dam-induced displaced persons (Bank, 2008), this could increase significantly with the support of China for
the construction of large dams in Africa (Hensengerth, 2011). Africa is the continent with the least large dam’s development potential.

The African continent is a promising investment market for hydroelectricity generation projects. Currently, African countries are tapping only about 7 per cent of their technical hydropower potential (compared with 33 per cent in South America, 69 per cent in North America and 75 per cent in Europe). As a fifth of African households are not electrified and more than 30 countries suffer from frequent power cuts... (Hensengerth, 2011, p. i)

Africa’s turn to develop her untapped hydropower potential may be now because of the availability of technology and concessional loans from China and other institutions. However, cognisance must be taken of the social and environmental consequences of these large dam developments and how to avert them. The displaced population must be supported in a manner that would enhance their livelihoods and therefore should be a concern to project implementers.

Cernea (2004, p. 7) notes that forced population displacement has engaged the world’s attention because of:

- The magnitude of human impacts: large groups of people are adversely affected, profoundly and enduringly, by imposing material losses and social disruptions;
- The absent or weak regulation frameworks: policies and laws for socially responsible resettlement are still missing now, as at the start of the 21st century, in most developing countries. Human rights violations bedevil most displacements; and
- Under-financing: Classic economic theory regards “cost externalization” as an unsound and unacceptable practice. Yet most dam-building projects practice externalization with no restraint and morality, flying in the face of economic theory and policy discourse. They underestimate the losses caused by
These views are but characteristic of displacement and resettlement projects in developing countries and result in negative livelihood changes of displaced people (Neef & Singer, 2015; Asthana & Cheney, 2012; Owusu et al., 2018). Displacement affects large numbers of people on a prolonged basis if not managed properly. As mentioned earlier, Ghana’s Akosombo Dam displaced about one percent of the population at the time of construction in the 1960s and till date the impact of displacement is still felt with displaced peoples’ families (Tsikata, 2012). Legislative frameworks for protecting displaced persons and ensuring their livelihood restoration are weak and sometimes absent. For example, compulsory acquisition of lands for development in Ghana is done by the use of the public domain. Affected people or persons are not informed to give their consent, and in most cases would not know when the project is about to commence (Anim-Odame, 2011; Nyarko, 2014). Displacement and resettlement financing are mostly borne by the project beneficial country and are characterised by poor financing and delayed payments, and done in a non-participatory manner, which does not benefit displaced persons much.

Dwivedi (2002) categorized the two main models of displacement as the ‘Reformist-Managerial approach’ and the ‘Radical Movementist’ approach. Reformist Managerialists perceived displacement to be unavoidable in large scale infrastructure development and therefore must be managed. Displacement is perceived as the painful and unavoidable consequence of development and therefore should form part of the integral development planning process. This approach is typical of governments, managers and planners. Typically, the displacement and resettlement process is handled
by a professional recognised body that plans and implements the process for the affected persons. This planning is mainly top-down; and mostly by consultants outside the project countries in the case of developing countries. Views of dam-affected people in selecting sites, forms of compensation, time schedules and many critical issues concerning their displacement and resettlement are not solicited. The main objective is more on making sure that there are impediments in the construction process. Planning and implementation process in most cases do not involve displaced persons. As such, timing, resettlement sites and facilities may not be acceptable to displaced persons and, as such, may be met with resistance (Dwivedi, 1999; Patwardhan, 2000). In most cases, displacement planning by this approach focuses more on ensuring that the projects precede according to schedule rather than ensuring displaced persons’ livelihoods are restored or improved.

The Radical-Movement group perceives displacement as a result of development failure to share its benefits and losses equitably. They question the structures and practices that deny people their rights to lands, livelihoods and social ecology. Their main stance is therefore that there is no development if it causes displacement or if it disempowers some of its citizens. It raises issues of rights, governance and negotiation (Dwivedi, 2002). Proponents of this school of thought do not concur to displacement at all and where it occurs more attention should be focused on not just the displaced but the complex situation of all affected people (Choi, 2015; Price, 2015). Displacement by this approach should be seen as ensuring the development rights are accrued to all affected persons. As such, it calls for an extensive participation of affected persons in the planning and implementation of their own new development agenda under the development project. This is the view of most Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) like the International Rivers Network and many local NGOs in host countries.
They dwell on building the capacities of project affected persons in negotiating for better deals in the project displacement process or resisting the implementation of the project altogether.

Contributing to the development-displacement debate, DryDyk (2015) distinguishes between ‘maldevelopment’ and development through the notion of empowerment. Displacement would be a ‘maldevelopment’ if it does not empower affected people to earn higher incomes through livelihood restoration and sharing of benefits schemes. Dwelling on Pentz’ (2011) ethical values and rights in ensuring ‘good’ displacement and resettlements, DryDyk (2015) notes displacement and resettlement could be development if these values and rights are applied diligently in the displacement and resettlement process. The seven ethical development values are well-being, equity, empowerment, environmental sustainability, human rights, cultural freedom and integrity to fight corruption (Pentz, 2011), while the rights are:

1. **Right of good reason:** Everyone has a right to be free (and hence protected) from forced displacement except in the case of demonstrably responsible development (except in fair deliberation as a reasonable effort to realize the values that distinguish worthwhile development from “mal-development”)

2. **Right to non-victimization:** Everyone has a right to be free from net losses resulting from displacement for development, including inadequately compensated losses of individual or community assets and losses in living standards.

3. **Right of equitable sharing of benefits:** Everyone who is displaced for development has a right to share equitably in the benefits of the development that displaced them. Equity gives priority (but not exclusive concern) to reducing the worst inequalities and to redressing any past victimization by displacement in the area.
4. **Right of equitable empowerment**: Everyone who is displaced for development has a right to become sufficiently empowered to achieve outcomes that are equitable (in terms of rights 1 and 2) (Penz et al., 2011, p. 211; Drydyk, 2015, p. 101).

The right to reason is the recognition of displaced people’s social and political rights and, as such, should be adequately participating in the entire displacement process. It is by recognising the rights of dam-affected people that they can participate effectively and contribute their opinions in the displacement and resettlement process. Deliberating with affected persons on cost of displacement, compensation forms and costs, relocation choices and sites and time schedules if done rightly can ensure displacement and resettlement with development. Authentic participation by project affected people is, therefore, key to ensuring development. If the purpose of the resettlement is to benefit the displaced people, then their world views on displacement and resettlement must be incorporated into the displacement process.

The second and third rights deal with the rights to development benefits and the equitable sharing of benefits. Development related displacement could be a ‘mal-development’ if benefits are not shared equitably and if affected people do not benefit from the project itself. Logically, hydroelectric dam-caused displaced persons should have electricity, maybe at a more reduced rate than the rest of the citizens. But in most cases, it is a delusion as they may not have access to electricity at all or pay the same rates as other consumers of electricity. Some resettled communities of Ghana’s Akosombo Dam constructed in the 1960s for the purposes of electricity did not have electricity as of the year 2000 (Tsikata, 2012). Access to basic necessities such as potable water, basic schools, access roads and health services should be a right and not a privilege. It should be noted that displacement impacts differently on social groups –
men, women, youth among others - and therefore cognisance should be taken of the most affected people, lest intervention could worsen the deprivation of the worst affected.

These conventional standpoints are not exhaustive and many scholars have various combinations of them in terms of conceptual and policy approaches and implementation strategy. These constellations are summarized in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Area</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Conceptual focus</th>
<th>Policy focus</th>
<th>Implementation Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ill-planned resettlement</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>Balancing of Interest</td>
<td>Proper Resettlement</td>
<td>Top-down: Making Planners sensitive to local needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of agreement and credible governance</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Establishing norms</td>
<td>Negotiated decision-making</td>
<td>Level Playing field: Involving all decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill-conceived development</td>
<td>Movementist</td>
<td>Prioritizing values</td>
<td>Rights-based Development</td>
<td>Bottom-Up : Prioritizing community needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dwivedi, 2002

The Institutional approach to displacement and resettlement, for instance, is an all-inclusive venture where all stakeholders are involved in a fair and transparent manner.

The WCD’s recommendations, for example, call for the participatory planning process between and among all stakeholders in projects involving displacements. These institutions are categorized by Fink (2005) as key primary and secondary stakeholders. Key stakeholders consist of influential institutions like the funding and host institutions. They include the World Bank, China Exim Bank and DFID as well as key host nations’ institutions like Ministry of Finance, Energy and Power. Secondary stakeholders include the media, and research and religious institutions. These institutions serve more as intermediaries between the key and primary institutions. Their roles are mainly advisory and education. They are expected to play professional and fair roles in
ensuring that the displacement process benefits all equitably. The primary institutions or stakeholders are those directly affected by the displacement or involved in the displacement process. These include affected persons, displacement and resettlement authority, host resettlement communities, local community leaders and local NGOs or Community-Based Organizations (CBOs). Environmental NGOs, for example, would have an interest in ensuring that the displacement process has minimal effects in conserving the environment. This was typical in Ghana’s Bui Dam because the dam was to displace 21% of the Bui Natural Reserve, which hosts the rare hippopotami (Environmental Resources Management, 2007; Raschid, Koranteng, & Akoto-Danso, 2008). The institutional approach calls for a mutually transparent dialogue between and among these institutions in constructing acceptable norms and rules that are fair and beneficial to all institutions affected by the displacing-caused project.

The continued and widespread misery of displaced persons has attracted the attention of major financiers like the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. The World Bank for instance had to suspend funding the construction large dams and commissioned the International Commission for Large Dams (ICOLD) to research into the social impacts of large dams. This research resulted into WCD (2000) report which has recommended of guidelines to improve the livelihood of displaced persons. Earlier, the World Bank (1990) in its operation directive 0D 4.30 acknowledged the livelihood consequences of their projects and directed that displacement should be avoided as much as possible but where it is unavoidable, then displaced persons should be:

(i) Compensated for their losses at full replacement cost prior to the actual move;
(ii) Assisted with the move and supported during the transition period in the resettlement site; and
Assisted in their efforts to improve their former living standards, income earning capacity and production levels, or at least to restore them. Particular attention should be paid to the needs of the poorest groups.


These acknowledgements by the World Bank confirms the miseries of displacements, inequality in the burdens and benefits of displacement people. The World Bank, through the World Commission of Dams recommendations, takes the Institutional approach by advocating authentic participation of all stakeholders at all levels of the displacement process (World Bank, 2001; World Commission on Dams, 2000).

The above discourse gives a wide range of ideas to consider to ensure that displacement has limited adverse impact. This thesis agrees with the World Bank (2004: P xviii) that

*Development-induced displacement provides a unique opportunity for the project team to systematically plan and implement the resettlement program on the basis of consultations with the DPs, along with making adequate provisions for funding, implementation arrangements, monitoring, and redress of grievances. Failure to capitalize on the tremendous potential of development-induced displacement to improve the lives of resettlers would impose a high opportunity cost on the development process.*

However, managing this development-induced displacement to become development opportunities is complex because the issues are not confined to the design, construction, and operation of dams themselves, but embrace the range of social, environmental and political choices on which the human aspiration to development and improved well-being depend (Biswas, 2012; Yüksel, 2009). There is simply no ‘one size that fits all’. Each large dam is unique: it has its own sets of benefits and costs. In the final analysis, the decision to construct a new dam should be based on its overall benefits to society.
Each dam-causing displacement requires a specific strategy which should be contextual to displaced peoples’ being (Biswas, 2012).

Managing the livelihood impacts of development-induced displacements and resettlements requires an integrated approach and the commitment of all stakeholders involved in the development agenda. Using the political ecology theory (Bloomer, 2009; Nüsser, 2003; Robbins, 2011), I would analyse power relations between these institutions and the interactions and relationships in the management of the displacement and resettlement process of the Ghana Bui’s Hydroelectric Dam.

2.4 Compensation

The impoverishment and misery of displaced persons are the results of poor resettlement schemes. However, most often these displacements and their accompanying resettlement schemes are not perceived as development opportunities but more as obstructions to the impending project. Apart from the critique of poor planning and implementation of resettlement schemes, perhaps compensation is the most controversial issue in the displacement and resettlement discourse. Compensation has been argued to be inadequate in ensuring development in resettlement because compensation costs do not include social costs like leaving home, networks, jobs and social capital (Kanbur, 2003). It is vehemently argued variously that cash compensation alone is inadequate in restoring pre-displacement livelihood standards because it only compensates assets like land and houses lost, to the neglect of ensuring equity between project gainers and losers. Compensation is also flawed in its computations based on the cost-benefit analysis and implemenal challenges like delays and corrupt practices (Cernea, 2003, 2008; Cernea & Mathur, 2008; Kanbur, 2003).
Apart from the above, Cernea (2003, p. 12) catalogued the most commonly published research forms of under-compensation to displaced persons, which are shown in the Box 1 below.

**Box 1: Forms of Under-Compensation**

- Under-counting of condemned assets for which compensation is due, and thus not paid.
- Arbitrariness and market-defying subjectivity in the valuation of assets, with consequent partial- or non-replacement of lost assets.
- Un-recognition of non-physical losses, difficult to measure, and failure to account for non-market income and costs.
- Under-compensation resulting from the late disbursement of compensation to those who are left asset-less for an unacceptable time period.
- Subtraction by corrupt officials of part of the compensation money before it reaches those rightfully entitled.
- Under-compensation because of lost consumer surplus from existing assets. Pre-emptive exclusion of some common assets from consideration.
- Asset-price upward changes occurring after the determination of compensation, which diminish the purchasing power of compensation recipients.
- Recipients unaccustomed to handling cash tend to misdirect compensation money and are soon left both asset-less and cashless.

*Source: Cernea (2003, p.12)*

Compensation is, therefore, an immediate measure to enable displaced persons attend to some immediate issues, but not a livelihood restoration measure; especially with these flaws identified in Box 1. There is, therefore, the need for livelihood restoring programmes to ensure investment financing to reconstruct and build the livelihood strategies of displaced people.

Other issues, among the many concerns that the World Commission on Dams (2000) has raised about dam-related displacement are that:

- Displaced and affected people rarely receive complete and adequate information on the dam project, the nature and extent of displacement and provisions for resettlement and reconstruction;
Displaced and affected people normally have no role in generating baseline information or in developing resettlement plans;

- The relocation process is often traumatic, involuntary, and prolonged; and

- Compensation is inadequately assessed and monitored. Resettlement sites are plagued by poor infrastructure and problematic relationships with host communities.

In the light of the above, the roles of national governments, policy, funding and commitment to the cause of displaced persons’ fair share of compensation cannot be over-emphasized.

2.5 Resettlement

Involuntary resettlement is an essential and historically underappreciated aspect of development. Unsuccessful resettlement has often been the result of both a lack of sensitivity to this issue and a deficiency of operational guidance on the “how to” of resettlement design and implementation. - Ian Johnson, 2004 (World Bank, 2004, p. xix)

Resettlement activities should be conceived and executed as sustainable development programmes, providing sufficient investment resources to give the persons displaced by the project the opportunity to share in project benefits (World Bank, 2001). This is because properly implemented resettlement programmes can be an element of a nation’s strategy to promote development and reduce poverty. However, this requires not only sound policies and adequate resources, but also major changes in the minds-sets of the officers concerned, to ensure that the re-settlers receive their fair share of the benefits from the projects that are directly responsible for their displacement (Scudder, 2012). In practice, however, most cases of development-induced displacements:
Project appraisals tend to ignore displacement costs. Compensation packages are extremely inadequate. Resettlement policies are at best ad hoc, and at worst absent. Resettlement sites lack basic amenities. Project authorities tend to view displacement and resettlement as project bottlenecks to be removed rather than as social engineering challenges that need to be addressed. Promises of compensation and resettlement made to affected people before displacement remain unfulfilled. In practice, displaced communities experience acute marginalization. (Dwivedi, 1999, p. 44)

The World Bank tends to concur with Dwivedi (2002) on the analysis of the failures of funded resettlements, as shown in Box 2.

**Box 2: Causes of Resettlement Failures Outlined by the World Bank**

- Project planners (including Bank staff) do not recognize all adverse impacts, or they recognize them only at a late stage, when mitigating them is far more difficult;
- Plans may focus only on narrow mitigation, overlooking resettlement created opportunities to improve local incomes or living standards;
- Plans and options may be developed without meaningful consultation with displaced persons, which can make the plans difficult to implement;
- Project agencies may lack the technical, organizational, or financial capacity to implement resettlement plans;
- Project agencies may lack the legal authority or political commitment to implement the plans;
- Plans do not elicit the behavioural responses from project-affected people that are necessary for successful resettlement;
- Resettlement plans become inappropriate, ineffective, or obsolete because of changing conditions in the project area; and
- New projects—and new kinds of projects—produce unanticipated problems requiring innovation in resettlement methods and strategies.

*Source: World Bank (2004)*

These setbacks have made most involuntary resettlement schemes, particularly dam-induced resettlement schemes, into development disasters rather being propellers of development. For example, for over four decades of resettlement, Ghana’s Akosombo Dam-affected people are experiencing acute deprivation and non-payment of compensation (Kalitsi, 2008; Tsikata, 2012). Most of the settlements had major
problems, including poor design, inadequate water supply, slow clearance of farmland and poor soil (Arp & Baumgärtel, 2005; Biswas, 2012).

Resettlement would only qualify as development if it focuses on the enhancement of capabilities of displaced persons and the expansion of social opportunities by addressing the social and personal constraints that restrict people’s choices. This would mean that resettlement with development entails questions of resources and rights that would affect the quality of life of the people (Bartolome et al., 2000; Bennett & McDowell, 2012). As such, the World Bank (2004) in its operational manual, OP 4.12, wishes to turn the bleak pictures of sponsored projects into havens of livelihood enhancements and development by striving at the following objectives:

- To avoid or minimize adverse impacts and to conceive and execute resettlement activities as sustainable development programmes;
- To give displaced persons opportunities to participate in the design and implementation of resettlement programmes; and
- To assist displaced persons in their efforts to improve their livelihoods and standards of living, or at least to restore these to pre-project levels.

Resettlement evaluations on livelihood and development have been done across the world by various scholars (Vandergeest, Idahosa, & Bose, 2010). The ensuing is a review of the lessons learnt from their studies.

Scudder (2012), in his survey of fifty (50) World Bank funded large dams, identified five flaws that make World Bank sponsored dam-induced resettlements livelihood impoverishing. The flaws are:
First, planners assume wrongly that a compensation policy alone can restore living standards rather than a balance between compensation and development initiatives. Second, a restoration approach fails to take into consideration the fact that living standards for a majority of resettlers tend to drop during the long planning process (often over 10 years) that precedes construction of a large hydro project and during the initial years immediately after physical removal.

Third, pre-project surveys carried out to establish a benchmark against which restoration can be measured are known to underestimate income and living standards, which have already been lowered due to project-related cessation of investments in the area.

Fourth, the Bank’s safeguard policies deal only with direct economic and social impacts. Ignored are a wide range of socio-cultural effects associated with forced removal from a preferred homeland, the psychological stress affecting the elderly and women, and increased rates of illness and death that have been reported in resettlement areas.

Fifth, resettlement tends to be associated with increased cash expenditures because rural resettlers, who remain the majority in connection with large hydro projects, are moved to less fertile soils, which require costly inputs to provide equivalent yields, and they have less access to common property resources.

With the above perceptions, resettlement schemes are characterised by the lack of staff numbers and expertise, lack of finance, and lack of political will on the part of implementing agencies: for those being resettled, there is a lack of compensation and development opportunities and lack of participation.
Wilmsen and Wang (2015) compared involuntary and voluntary resettlements in China and their effects on resettled peoples’ livelihoods. They revealed that, while voluntary resettlement sites were given priority attention and were people-focused in terms of provision of social amenities and resources, development induced resettlements were handled as non-prioritized aspects of development projects. As such there were less funds and attention given to the holistically resettle displaced people development of settlers. Table 3 is a summary of differences between involuntary and voluntary resettlement schemes.

**Table 3: Difference between Voluntary and Involuntary Resettlement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involuntary Resettlement</th>
<th>Voluntary Resettlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate to construction process and schedules</td>
<td>Central focus and treated as an integral part of a long-term regional development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated as an economic externality</td>
<td>Costs internalised as line items in project budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly identified costs and no defined benefits</td>
<td>More financial and physical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not treated separately of environmental impacts</td>
<td>More flexible to resettlement problems and unconstrained by time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation of problems addressed during project cycle rather than ahead of time</td>
<td>Primarily sponsored by government agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored by government and other agencies</td>
<td>Resettled population is not forced to move by government decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion used to move people</td>
<td>Aimed at solving pressures and conflicts over scarce resources and as an instrument of poverty reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves the interest of the state and powerful groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adopted from Wilmsen and Wang (2015, p. 614)*

Wilmsen and Wang (2015) findings underscore that it was not the supposedly voluntary nature of resettlement in the case of poverty alleviation resettlement that contributed to its relative success, but rather its people-centred practices and long-term commitment to establishing sustainable communities. People-centred involves restoring living standards through capacity building and livelihood opportunities. Compensation packages alone are insufficient in ensuring enhanced livelihood with displacement and
should be followed by livelihood restoration measures and enhanced community resources such as markets, access roads, social networks and other social amenities.

For Mariotti (2015), resettlements have failed because they could not adequately incorporate displaced persons spatially, socio-culturally, politically, and economically by (1) a broadening of land-for-land compensation schemes, (2) the replacement of all material losses (for example, including lost access to communal forest resources) in the case of cash compensation, and (3) connecting resettlement policies with broader political goals of poverty alleviation through benefit-sharing and employment creation schemes. Broadening land-to-land schemes with enhanced facilities like irrigation and extension services, improved seeds and secured land ownership services would be a boost to development. Aside from this, resettled communities should benefit fairly from all other poverty enhancing programmes that other non-displaced persons benefit from.

Price (2015), in her study in Indonesia, highlighted the need for comprehensive strategies emphasising: (1) transparent and fair negotiations; (2) extensive consultations and impact assessments; (3) the offer of a “no-displacement” option; (4) grievance redress mechanisms; and (5) extensive entitlement packages for resettlers – to ensure that land transfers and resettlements are truly voluntary and provide a basis for sound social and economic development of affected communities.

The following conclusions can be made from the above discourses on displacement, compensation and resettlement.

First, large dam development is a major cause of displacement the world over. These unintended effects have long impoverishment impacts on displaced persons. The impoverishments caused by the large dams last generations over generations (Isaacman and Isaacman, 2013).
Second, management of displacement caused by large dams have not been able to restore the livelihoods of displaced people to pre-displacement levels. Through the managerial top-down approach, the poor or no participation of dam-affected persons has been largely blamed for the displacement and resettlement failures. Other causes include the dominance of the Cost-Benefit Analysis of calculating displacement costs to include assets only, poor financing and commitment by displacing authorities as well as poor institutional capacities of implementing bodies.

Third, evaluative studies on development-induced displacements and resettlements reveal similar managerial flaws. Resettlement schemes could be development ‘blessings’ if:

a. Both economic and social costs of displacement and resettlement are carefully computed and budgeted for as part of the project.

b. The affected are treated as owners and therefore treated as true partners in the displacement and resettlement planning and implementation process. Decisions should be open and transparent not just between displaced persons and the state, but also other stakeholders like NGOs and the general public.

c. Displacing authorities recognize that displacement affects social groups – men, women, landowners, settlers - differently and tailor-make policies are needed to address their various vulnerabilities. This will promote equity in resettlement benefits.

d. Resettlement is not a one-shot affair but continuous reintegration of displaced people into their new environment through training and livelihood enhancing programmes.

e. Finally, the inadequacies of development-induced displacement and resettlements are management failures.
With this view that development-induced displacement and resettlement are management issues, I review some competing models in managing the negative impacts of displacement and resettlement.

2.6 Frameworks for Displacement and Livelihoods Changes
Displacement disruptions affect peoples’ capital stock causing them to be vulnerable in their livelihoods. Peoples’ livelihoods comprise the capabilities, and assets (including material and social resources) required for a means of living (Scoones, 1998). The DFID Sustainable Livelihood Framework (1999) is one of the most common frameworks used to assess changes in livelihoods because it is people-centred and assesses the trends and shocks that affect the capital stocks of vulnerable people and how these vulnerabilities can be transformed by organizational structures and institutional processes (Scoones, 1998; DFID, 1999). It examined how displacement structures and institutions impacted on the livelihood outcomes of displaced people. Institutions are those regularised practices or patterns of behaviour structured formally or informally by rules and norms and are often the sources of power for action (Scoones, 2009; North 1991). An understanding of the underlying working relationships of these institutions, the power dynamics embedded in these institutions, and how people mediate their livelihood within these structures are important (Scoones, 1998). These institutional and structural relations are examined by this thesis in the context of governance especially using the governance principles of participation and transparency.

However, the Improvement Risks and Reconstruction Model (IRR) is the livelihood assessment framework adapted by this thesis to assess the changes in displaced people’s livelihood. This framework is specific to development-induced displacements and
resettlements and how it affects livelihood changes DIDR communities and therefore found most suitable for this study.

2.6.1 Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) Model

In the 1990s, the Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) Model was developed by Michael M. Cernea (Cernea, 1997; McDowell, 1996), a then World Bank Sociologist/Anthropologist. The IRR was designed to pre-empt the social risks in displacement and how these risks could be mitigated and reconstructed. It suggests a shift in mind-sets towards ex-ante pre-emption and the institutional mobilization and financial action resources for ex-ante pre-emptive planning and targeted implementation support in order to reduce the size and scope of adverse ex-post social impacts (Cernea, 2000; 2004). The aim of the model is (a) to explain what happens during forced displacements - a task very important in itself; and (b) to create a theoretical and safeguarding tool capable of guiding policy, planning, and actual development programmes to counteract these adverse effects.

The risks and reconstruction framework can perform the following four distinct functions, depending on the purpose for which it is used:

1. A predictive function, to anticipate risks to be expected in programmes entailing displacement and resettlement;

2. A diagnostic function in the field, to guide operational project preparation in assessing the likely presence, absence, and intensity of each specific impoverishment risk;

3. A problem-resolution and planning function - to help select project measures commensurate with each identified risk, for its pre-emption or mitigation; and
4. A research methodology function - to guide the study of displacement, to generate hypotheses, and to organize, conceptualizes and interprets the findings.

These four key functions have made the model popular and adopted as a planning model for most planned displacement and resettlement schemes.

The first is that it directs towards impoverishment measurements not only in terms of income, but also in terms of employment opportunities, health care, nutrition and food security, commonly owned assets, education, shelter, or social capital. Indeed, the eight most common impoverishment risks captured in the IRR model are: (a) landlessness; (b) joblessness; (c) homelessness; (d) marginalization; (e) increased morbidity and mortality; (f) food insecurity; (g) loss of access to common property; and (h) social (community) disarticulation.

These are briefly explained below.

**Landlessness**
Expropriation of land removes the main foundation upon which people’s productive systems, commercial activities, and livelihoods are constructed. This is the principal form of de-capitalization and pauperization of displaced people, as they lose both natural and man-made capital.

**Joblessness**
The risk of losing wage employment is very high both in urban and rural displacements for those employed in enterprises, services, or agriculture. Yet, creating new jobs is difficult and requires substantial investment. Unemployment or underemployment among resettlers often endures long after physical relocation has been completed.

**Homelessness**
Loss of shelter tends to be only temporary for many resettlers, but for some, homelessness or a worsening in their housing standards remains a lingering condition. In a broader cultural sense, loss of a family’s individual home and the loss of a group’s cultural space tend to result in alienation and status-deprivation. For refugees, homelessness and “placelessness” are intrinsic by definition.

Marginalization

Marginalization occurs when families lose economic power and spiral on a “downward mobility” path. Middle-income farm households do not become landless, they become small landholders; and small shopkeepers and craftsmen downsize and slip below poverty thresholds. Many individuals cannot use their earlier acquired skills at the new location; human capital is lost or rendered inactive or obsolete. Economic marginalization is often accompanied by social and psychological marginalization, expressed in a drop in social status, in resettlers’ loss of confidence in society and in themselves, a feeling of injustice, and deepened vulnerability. The coerciveness of displacement and the victimization of resettlers tend to depreciate resettlers’ self-image, and they are often perceived by host communities as a socially degrading stigma.

Food Insecurity

Forced uprooting increases the risk that people will fall into temporary or chronic undernourishment, defined as calorie-protein intake levels below the minimum necessary for normal growth and work. Food insecurity and under-nourishment are both symptoms and results of inadequate resettlement. During physical relocation, sudden drops in food crop availability and incomes are predictable. Subsequently, as rebuilding regular food production capacity at the relocation site may take years, hunger or undernourishment tends to become a lingering long-term effect.
Increased Morbidity and Mortality

Massive population displacement threatens to cause serious declines in health levels. Displacement-induced social stress and psychological trauma are sometimes accompanied by the outbreak of relocation-related illnesses, particularly parasitic and vector-borne diseases such as malaria and schistosomiasis. Unsafe water supply and improvised sewage systems increase vulnerability to epidemics and chronic diarrhoea, dysentery, etc. The weakest segments of the demographic spectrum - infants, children, and the elderly - are affected most strongly.

Loss of Access to Common Property and Services

For poor people, particularly for the landless and asset-less, loss of access to the common property assets that belonged to relocated communities (pastures, forested lands, water bodies, burial grounds, quarries, etc.) results in significant deterioration in income and livelihood levels. Typically, losses of common property assets are not compensated by governments. These losses are compounded by loss of access to some public services such as schools and sources of water. Common pool resources such as wild fruits, game and fuel wood losses that can be grouped within this category of risks that are unaccounted for.

Social and Spiritual Disarticulation

Forced displacement tears apart the existing social fabric. It disperses and fragments communities, dismantles patterns of social organization and interpersonal ties, and kinship groups become scattered as well. Life-sustaining informal networks of reciprocal help, local voluntary associations, and self-organized mutual service are disrupted. This is a net loss of valuable “social capital” that compounds the loss of natural, physical, and human capital. The social capital lost through social
Dismantled social networks that once mobilized people to act around common interests and to meet their most pressing needs are difficult to rebuild. This loss is greater in projects that relocate families in a dispersed manner, severing their prior ties with neighbours, rather than relocating them in groups and social units.

These risks are common in displacements but not all be applicable in every displacement. They could be useful in assessing the potential impoverishment to be caused by a certain development project or dam or even certain aspects. For example, specific risks such as the potential impacts of downstream resettlements, risks associated with livelihood options, risks associated with women and children.

In fact, these risks could be averted through sound planning, good costing, and budgeting and implementation process. These are the risk reversals. Turning the model on its head shows which strategic directions should be pursued: (a) from landlessness to land-based resettlement; (b) from joblessness to re-employment; (c) from homelessness to house reconstruction; (d) from marginalization to social inclusion; (e) from increased morbidity to improved health care; (f) from food insecurity to adequate nutrition; (g) from loss of assets to restoration of community assets and services; and (h) from social disarticulation to networks and community rebuilding.

A good evaluation of the risks, sound costing (not just based on Cost Benefit Analysis) and genuine consultation and participation of resettled persons could lead to good risks diagnosis and eventually averting them through prudent planning, financing and targeting.
The IRR model is however not without limitations in its use as assessing the social and livelihoods impacts of large dams as some scholars have brought to the surface some inadequacies of the model for assessing the social and livelihood impacts of dams.

Gizachew (2017) in his study of impacts of the Tekeze Dam in north east Ethiopia noted that Cernea’s IRR model gave more prominence to crop rather than cattle economy. The study noted compensation was not given to cattle rearers for their loss of grazing lands but compensation was paid to crop farmers: this adversely affected their livelihoods, especially in the area of education of their children. Implementation of model strictly and without displaced peoples’ participation therefore could lead to the poor incorporation of some specific risks that local people face.

Other inadequacies of the model include the risks of resilience, loss of human rights and migration among others (Downing, 1996; Kassahun, 2001; Scudder, 1997). Similarly, Kirchherr and Charles (2016) and Scudder (2012) criticise the model as being oblivious to the spatial dimensions of upstream and downstream dam effects limited in inculcating the larger political economy of dams.

Despite these limitations, the study still finds the IRR model a useful tool in analysing the livelihood effects of the Bui Dam’s process. This is because it allows for greater detail into the various aspects that effect livelihoods. Its inadequacies were augmented with discussions of other livelihood issues.

2.7 Frameworks for Displacement and Resettlement

2.7.1 World Commission on Dams’ (WCD) Framework for Decision-Making

The World Commission on Dams (WCD) was established in 1997 with the support of the World Bank, governments, the private sector, international financial institutions, civil society organisations and people affected by dams. Its mandate was to:
• Review the effectiveness of large dams as a development option, and assess alternatives for developing water resources and energy; and

• Develop internationally acceptable criteria, guidelines and standards, where appropriate, for the planning, design, appraisal, construction, operation, monitoring and decommissioning of dams.

The Commission, after a two-year thorough study, came out with the following principal findings, which forms the basis of its newly developed approach. That:

• Dams have made a significant contribution to human development, and considerable benefits have been derived from them;

• An unacceptable and often unnecessary price has been paid to secure those benefits, especially in social and environmental terms, by displaced people, communities downstream from the dam, taxpayers and the environment;

• Compared with other alternatives, the value of dams in meeting water and energy development needs is questionable, particularly in view of the lack of equity and uneven distribution of benefits;

• By bringing to the table all those whose rights are involved, and who bear the risks associated with different options for developing water and energy resources, it should be possible to address competing interests and resolve conflicts in a positive manner; and

• Negotiation can be used as a tool to increase the effectiveness of water and energy development projects, by eliminating inappropriate projects at an early stage and offering only those options that key stakeholders agree are the best for meeting the needs in question.

The Commission recommended, as core values for decision-making in large dams’ construction, equity, efficiency, participatory decision-making, sustainability, and
accountability. The values were to guide the planning, implementation and monitoring of all large dam projects.

The Commission finally advances an Integrated Institutional Approach by requiring that all players in the large dam industry have clear roles and responsibilities to ensure that dam projects become ‘more of a blessing’ to dam-affected people than being project dooms for them. The suggested roles are: a) planners to identify stakeholders through a process that recognises rights and assesses risks; b) States to invest more at an earlier stage to screen out inappropriate projects and facilitate integration across sectors within the context of the river basin; c) consultants and agencies to ensure outcomes from feasibility studies are socially and environmentally acceptable; d) the promotion of open and meaningful participation at all stages of planning and implementation, leading to negotiated outcomes; e) developers to accept accountability through contractual commitments for effectively mitigating social and environmental impacts; f) improving compliance through independent review; and g) dam owners to apply lessons learned from past experiences through regular monitoring and adapting to changing needs and contexts.

2.7.2 Dam Financiers – The World Bank and ADB Guidelines

The main financiers of large dams and development projects causing displacements are the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank (ADB), as well as other International Banks like the Export-Import Bank (EXIM) of China that sponsored Ghana’s Bui Dam.

In 1980 the World Bank adopted an Operational Manual Statement on involuntary resettlement, with a primary focus on resettlement associated with large dam construction. In 1990 the policy was reviewed for the first time (and it became Operational Directive 4.30); the last major review was conducted in December 2001,
when the Operational Directive was converted into an Operational Policy on involuntary resettlement (OP 4.12). With regards to resettlement, the bank notes that the challenge is not to treat resettlement as an imposed externality but to see it as an integral component of the development process and to devote the same level of effort and resources to resettlement preparation and implementation as to the rest of the project. The OP 4.12 outlines as follows:

- To avoid or minimize adverse impacts and to conceive and execute resettlement activities as sustainable development programmes;
- To give displaced persons’ opportunities to participate in the design and implementation of resettlement programmes; and
- To assist displaced persons in their efforts to improve their livelihoods and standards of living, or at least to restore these to pre-project levels.

Although perceived as a bold step, the World Bank has come under criticisms for merely restoring displaced people’s livelihoods and for emphasizing the physical displacement or relocation of people and not the enclosures or the dispossessions of their land on which they depend for their livelihoods (Robinson, 2003).

Similarly, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the Inter-American Bank and African Development Bank followed the World Bank’s policy. The ADB’s policy depicts a participatory, transparent and accountable displacement and resettlement process. The ADB (2014) adopted a new accountability mechanism whereby people adversely affected by ADB-financed projects could express their grievances, seek solutions, and report alleged violations of ADB’s operational policies and procedures, including safeguarding policies. These plans and policies are indications of improved governance in the planning and execution of displacement and resettlement processes.
2.8 The Bui Dam Resettlement Framework

Resettlement of the Bui Dam affected persons was to be done by the Ghana Government as stipulated by the BPA Act, Section 24, in that:

The Government shall take reasonable measures to assist in the resettlement of the people inhabiting lands liable to be inundated and lands adjacent to those lands which are needed by the Authority for the performance of its functions, and the Minister shall ensure that so far as is Practicable, a person does not suffer undue hardship or is deprived of necessary public amenities, as a result of the resettlement.

Bui Dam’s resettlement was informed by the World Commission on Dam (WCD) Recommendations (2000) and the World Bank’s 2004 Operational Manual 4.12 standards, based on which the Bui Dam’s Resettlement Planning Framework (RPF) and Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) were designed. These plans emphasized the participation of displaced persons throughout the resettlement process to ensure that resettlement outcomes.

Main objective of the RPF is to ensure that the Bui Dam project improves people’s economic opportunities and living conditions and minimises adverse impacts of displaced people. In doing so, it recommended two main approaches to the realization of this main project that is of interest to this work. First, the need for an institutional structure to monitor and evaluate activities of the process and ensure that all stakeholders have access to timely information to make informed decisions and that there should be appropriate capacities of all agencies at all levels of the process to ensure that the relocation and livelihood restoration proceeds as successfully as possible. Second, the RPK notes that

“The integral participation of the resettlers and host populations is vitally important to the success of the project. The negotiation of indemnisation, the design of new housing and commercial areas, the physical relocation itself, and
the implementation of new productive systems to support improved livelihoods, all affect the population directly and in the most basic of ways. Therefore, public information dissemination, consultation and participation are critical to project success throughout the process of project design and implementation (RPK, 2007, p.14)

These two recommendations in the Bui Dam’s resettlement process are the basis of this thesis.

2.9 Chapter Summary

The chapter discussed the types and uses of dams for agriculture, flood control and hydropower generation. It underscored that the construction of large dams cause considerable displacement by the compulsory acquisition of lands resulting in land livelihood displacement of people.

The concept of development-induced displacement as well as Dwevidi’s (2002) “reformist Managerial” and “Radical Movementist” and Drydyk (2015) and Penz’s (2011) Rights and Ethical values development of displacement, were discussed.

The chapter also discussed the inadequacies of compensations as a way of remedying the advocated for an improved resettlement strategy. Scudder and Colson’s (1981) four stage resettlement model was reviewed together with Cernea’s Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction Model (Cernea, 1997; 2000). In spite of the inexhaustiveness of the Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction Model, was used as an analytical model in assessing the effects of the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement on resettled people.

The chapter concluded with some international protocols and recommendations made by international bodies and institutions to augment resettlement. These protocols
essentially call for good governance between and among actors to ensure resettlement with development. The next chapter is a detailed discussion of the governance issues in displacement and resettlement.
CHAPTER THREE

GOVERNANCE AND DAM-INDUCED DISPLACEMENT AND RESETTLEMENT

3.0 Introduction

This chapter is a discussion on governance in displacement and resettlement. Displacement and resettlement processes involves various actors at different levels, with different power levels who must work in tandem to ensure sound displacement and resettlement outcomes for displaced people. Governance is essentially the relationship between and among these different actors and there is the need for it to be discussed more elaborately in this chapter.

3.1 Governance in Displacement

Governance is a broad concept that touches on the power relations, actor roles and interactions in the processes of development. It involves the provision of means to engage individuals and organisations outside government through structures and arrangements, which support effective relationships across the public, private and community sectors as they collaborate in decision-making (Aulich, 2009; Edwards, 2005).

Dwivedi (2002) perceives governance as a representation of the values, policies and instruments by which society manages its economic, political, and social affairs through interactions within and among the state, civil society and the private sector. Other scholars like Olowu and Wunsch (2004) and Ostrom (2014) conceive governance as the processes that lead to the development and operation of regimes, or the fundamental rules that structures and regulates the relationships among the populace in the management of their public affairs.
Governance entails the establishment of transformative partnerships; establishing system-wide information exchanges and knowledge transfers; decentralizing decision making and inter-institutional dialogue; and embracing relationships based more on reciprocity and trust (Reddel & Woolcock, 2003, p. 93).

Governance encompasses the creation of accepted ordered rules and collective action. Stoker (1998, p. 18) outlines five aspects of governance as follows:

- Governance refers to a set of institutions that are drawn from, but also beyond, government;
- Governance identifies the blurring of boundaries and responsibilities for talking social and economic issues;
- Governance identifies the power dependence involved in the relationships between institutions involved in collective action;
- Governance is about autonomous self-governance networks of actors; and
- Governance recognizes the capacity to get things done, which does not rest on the power of government to command or use its authority. It sees government as able to use new tools and techniques to steer and guide.

Stoker (1998) further notes that the above propositions are complementary rather than contradictory.

There have been shifts from government to governance issues in development because of the understated reasons outlined by Davidson et al. (2006, p. 3):

a. increasing complexity, diversity and dynamic change (Kooiman, 2000) such that no single actor has the resources or knowledge to respond to the complexity of current problems and/or opportunities;
b. non-linear or threshold effects in complex environmental systems that are a consequence of industrial activities and result in instability and unpredictability in global systems;

c. reduced abilities of central governments to capitalize on opportunities or to solve so-called ‘wicked problems’ – that is, those distinguished by definitional difficulties, persistence, ubiquity, complexity and irreversibility (Rittel & Webber, 1973);

d. shifts in power and authority from national to supra-national scales as is apparent in the use of international agreements and conventions and downwards to sub-national and local scales via the devolution of formerly central government responsibilities (Pierre, 2000); and

e. Simultaneous but contradictory tendencies to change/complexity and stasis/simplicity, the ‘dynamics of which promote integration, centralization, and globalization on one hand, and … disintegration, decentralization and localization on the other’ (Rosenau, 2000, p. 177).

These reasons have put governance on the pinnacle of all development agenda. Development-Induced Displacements and Resettlement projects especially have under scrutiny by civil society organizations mainly over governance issues (WCD, 2000; Cernea, 2000; Chamber 1970; Dwevidi, 2002).

In the context of this research, governance involves the creation and use of spaces for active, transparent and accountable constructive interactions between stakeholders of the Bui displacement and resettlement project for equitable distribution of resettlement benefits.
Governance actors in this regards would be the Bui Power Authority and Displaced Persons at Resettlement Township B at Bui. These actors have various levels of power of influence. Their modes of influence and perceived outcomes were analysed. This study assesses how these actors interacted to build consensus in the Bui Dam’s Displacement and Resettlement (D & R) processes and the contribution by each actor to an equitable distribution of D & R benefits among affected people.

3.2 Good Governance

There are many types of governance such as territorial governance, participatory governance and organizational governance, and many levels such as international, national and local levels. This research adopts a good governance approach to the assessment of the Bui Dam’s Displacement and Resettlement (D & R) in Ghana.

Defined by the World Bank, Good Governance is epitomized by predictable, open and enlightened transparent processes; a bureaucracy imbued with professional ethos; an executive arm of government accountable for its actions; and a strong civil society participating in public affairs; and all behaving under the rule of law (World Bank, 1994). It entails more democratic ideals of participation of affected people and institutions, transparency of dealings and equity and fairness to all involved in order to achieve a consensus. Although widely used in national and international political dispensation, the term has become ubiquitous with development activities at the regional and local levels.

This research defined good governance in displacement and resettlement as the transparent and accountable process that has spaces for dam-affected persons and other stakeholders to actively participate in decisions of displacement and resettlement.
In its policy paper, *Governance for Sustainable Human Development*, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) defines good governance as, among other things, participatory, transparent, and accountable as well as effective, equitable, and as promoting the rule of law with the following as key elements: (1) Accountable; (2) Transparent; (3) Responsive; (4) Equitable and inclusive; (5) Effective and efficient (6) Follows the rule of law; (7) Participatory; and (8) Consensus oriented.

Similarly, the World Bank outlined the principles of good governance as Legitimacy and Voice, Direction, Performance, Accountability and Fairness (Graham, Amos, & Plumptre, 2003). These principles are identical to the UNDP’s principles of development as illustrated in Table 4.
Table 4: World Bank and UNDP Governance Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Governance Principles</th>
<th>The UNDP Principles and related UNDP text on which they are based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Legitimacy and Voice    | **Participation** – all men and women should have a voice in decision-making, either directly or through legitimate intermediate institutions that represent their intention. Such broad participation is built on freedom of association and speech, as well as capacities to participate constructively.  
**Consensus orientation** – good governance mediates differing interests to reach a broad consensus on what is in the best interest of the group and, where possible, on policies and procedures. |
| 2. Direction               | **Strategic vision** – leaders and the public have a broad and long-term perspective on good governance and human development, along with a sense of what is needed for such development. There is an understanding of the historical, cultural and social complexities in which that perspective is grounded. |
| 3. Performance             | **Responsiveness** – institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders.  
**Effectiveness and efficiency** – processes and institutions produce results that meet needs while making the best use of resources. |
| 4. Accountability          | **Accountability** – decision-makers in government, the private sector and civil society organizations are accountable to the public, as well as to institutional stakeholders. This accountability differs depending on the organizations and whether the decision is internal or external.  
**Transparency** – transparency is built on the free flow of information. Processes, institutions and information are directly accessible to those concerned with them, and enough information is provided to understand and monitor them. |
| 5. Fairness                | **Equity** – all men and women have opportunities to improve or maintain their well-being.  
**Rule of Law** – legal frameworks should be fair and enforced impartially, particularly the laws on human rights. |

*Source: Graham et al. (2003, p. 3)*
The essence of good governance is to ensure public trust and confidence as well as justice. Dwevidi (2002, p. 42) posits the following elements as conditions that would facilitate the achievement of good governance:

i. **Democratic pluralism**: equality, empathy, tolerance for cultural diversity and draws on three basic ideals: fundamental freedom for all, equality of all, and universal participation in the governing process.

ii. **Legitimacy**: (of the governing process) allows those who govern to derive authority and power from legitimate constitutional instruments of governance.

iii. **Consensus**: among different and differing interests in society and equity assures all individuals the opportunity to improve their wellbeing.

iv. **Public participation**: in decision making.

v. **Rule of law**: that is impartially enforced.

vi. **Responsiveness**: of institutions to the needs of all stakeholders.

vii. **Effective and efficient responsibility and accountability**: of institutions and state craft that meet the basic needs of all by using state controlled resources to their optimum accountability.

viii. **A strategic vision**: of the leaders for broad–range, long term perspectives on sustainable human development.

ix. **Transparency**: for access to governing institutions and state information sources.
Moral governance: that reflects such values of common good, cultural diversity, public service ethics controlling corruption, seeking spiritual guidance, and dedication.

Irrespective of how governance is conceived, it borders on Accountability, Participation, Equity sharing of development benefits and consensus building at various levels. Whilst the World Bank and USAID target state institutions to ensure that good governance is attained in partner states through the strengthening of institutions and rule of law, the UNDP focusses more at the micro or local level and project level.

This research situates good governance at the state-community space in respect of displacement and resettlement in Ghana. It examines how the Bui Power Authority, acting on the power of the State, related with dam-affected persons and civil society organization during the displacement and resettlement process. The research interrogates whether the displacement system was characterized by the good governance tenets of Participation, Accountability and Transparency and Equity of sharing resettlement benefits. The study correspondingly investigated the roles played by CSOs, dam-affected persons, and displacement officials in terms of consensus building.

This research examines three of these elements in the Bui Dam displacement and resettlement process. They are:

a. Participation
b. Transparency and Accountability
c. Equity

These elements or principles are inextricably linked and core in this research, and need a conceptual review.
3.3 Stakeholder Participation

Legitimacy and voice are key democratic principles that ensure citizenship participation in their governance process. Legitimacy is conceived as the free and unconstrained deliberation of all about matters of common concern (Dryzek, 2001). It is a right given to stakeholders to actively participate in the decision-making process. Legitimacy and Voice are conceived by this research as stakeholder participation. Klijn (2011, p. 1) argues for stakeholder participation as follows:

a. Stakeholders have to be involved because governments are dependent on their resources (‘veto power’ argument);

b. Stakeholders are involved because they have specific knowledge and can enhance the quality of the problem definition or even more so the quality and innovative character of the solutions (‘quality’ argument); and

c. Stakeholders have to be involved to enhance the democratic quality of decision-making in modern network societies (‘democratic legitimacy’ argument).

In the context of the Bui Dam, the Bui Dam Authority (BPA) acts on behalf of government in the implementation of the resettlement. The active participation of displaced people as primary stakeholders and beneficiaries is a needful strategy to make the outcome of the process align with their livelihood expectations.

Apart from the above justifications for stakeholder participation, the benefits of participation to both the project implementers and beneficiaries are listed as:

- Leads to project effectives (Narayan, 2004);
- Efficiency and equitable distribution of results (Narayan, Patel, Schafft, Rademacher, & Koch-Schulte; Ostrom, 2014);
Empowerment of citizens and the sense of ownership and control of project benefits (Chambers, 1995);

- Enhances project acceptability and the inculcation of indigenous knowledge in the project (Ostrom, 2014); and

- Enhances trust and accountability (Bebelleh & Nobabumah, 2013)

Irvin and Stansbury (2004, p. 56) agree that participation is a win-win situation by both government and citizens or stakeholders in the decision-making process and outcomes because both learn in the process and outcomes are acceptable to both. Authentic participation of displaced persons would lead to the reaping of benefits for both BPA and displaced people as actors. This is summarized in Table 5.

**Table 5: Advantages of Stakeholder Participation in Displacement and Displacement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making process</th>
<th>Advantages to Displaced persons</th>
<th>Advantages to BPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education of D &amp; R processes from state agencies</td>
<td>• Gain local knowledge and perceptions on D &amp; R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Make local perspective inputs in the process</td>
<td>• Persuade stakeholders; build trust and allay anxiety or hostility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gain skills for activists citizenship</td>
<td>• Build strategic alliances; complementarities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gain legitimacy of decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>• Gain mutually acceptable outcomes</td>
<td>• Achieve mutually acceptable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gain some control over policy process</td>
<td>• Avoid litigation costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Better policy and implementation decisions</td>
<td>• Better policy and implementation of decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from Irvin and Stansbury (2004, p. 58)*

Displacement and resettlement processes need to be negotiated by both displaced persons and resettlement agencies. Dam-affected people would like to participate meaningfully in order to be educated about the need to be resettled, resettlement packages and options, timelines and sharing of benefits. In order to gain legitimacy of its decisions, the resettlement agency would have to educate dam-affected persons on
the advantages of the displacement to them and the entire economy, compensation packages and displacement timelines. This is necessary to avoid litigation, resistance, violence and misery associated with most displacements. Participation makes policies, processes and outcomes easily acceptable by affected people and enables them to inculcate indigenous knowledge into the system (Michener, 1998).

Reaping the above benefits of participation in displacement and resettlement processes depends on the form and dimension of participation employed. Participation is categorized by the extent to which participants have power and control in the process as:

- **Pseudo participation**: occurring where professionals consistently and intentionally manipulate beneficiaries to meet donor or elite needs. This form of participation is the least in terms of beneficiaries having control and voice in the process. In many cases, options and decisions are not discussed at all with beneficiaries; and where they are, beneficiaries have no option but to accept the professional’s decision or to forfeit the benefits.

- **Genuine participation**: where participation leads to empowerment and/or where communities have control over programme policy and management. Genuine participation recognizes beneficiaries as important partners in the process. They are therefore adequately informed, and given training if need be to enable them to contribute meaningfully in the process. Genuine participation is characterized by transparency, trust, mutual respect of stakeholders’ views and a great sense of responsibility and accountability.

- **Weak participation**: where participation is via consultation or receiving information.

  In weak participation, beneficiaries or community members do not have the power to
alter the process but to accept. Decisions are taken without beneficiaries but beneficiaries are informed of the outcome of the decisions and are being directed their roles.

- **Strong participation:** This is replete with partnerships where control is ceded to ordinary community members or beneficiaries (Béné & Arthur, 2006; Bhatnagar & Williams, 1992). Community members are active partners and ultimate beneficiaries of the outcome of the process.

Similarly, according to Bhatnagar and Williams (1992) and Sanyare (2013), participation could be in the form of *Information Sharing, Consultation, Decision-Making* and *Community Action Initiation* among and between stakeholders or actors of a programme or policy.

The descriptions, levels and effects of participation on stakeholders are summarised in Table 6 below:
Table 6: Types and effects of participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Participation</th>
<th>Description of type of participation</th>
<th>Level of participation</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>Operations managers and managers share information with beneficiaries in order to facilitate individual and collective action</td>
<td>Lowest level of participation useful at managerial or administrative level activities</td>
<td>Minimal, not suitable for or intended for community level participatory development task oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>People are not only informed but are consulted on key issues. Level of popular participation increases</td>
<td>Agency retains control of design and implementation</td>
<td>Opportunity for disadvantaged people to interact and provide feedback. Upstream and downstream issues accounted for in the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>People especially disadvantaged groups hold extensive decision making abilities and can decide on their own projects</td>
<td>Community or the poor hold extensive decision making abilities and can decide on their own projects</td>
<td>Popular participation ensured to the extent of decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating action</td>
<td>The poor are able to take initiatives in terms of actions and decision making</td>
<td>People centred, community based. Different from capacity to act or decide on issues or task proposed or assigned by external development organisations</td>
<td>Popular participation peaks. Proactive capacity and confidence to carry out their going projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Bhatnagar and Williams (1992) and Sanyare (2013)

3.4 Conditions for Strong and Authentic Participation

Writing on the participation and citizenship engagement in Poverty Reduction Papers, Eberlei (2007, pg. 2) underscored that authentic participation is institutionalized only if it is rights-based, has been integrated into the political structures, and has legitimacy. He noted that participatory processes without these four elements run the risk of being no more than ad hoc, one-off participatory events, staying tentative and fragile.

- **Rights-Based Conditions for Participation** include human rights and safeguards.
The freedom of expression, association and freedom of the media and press freedom need to be enshrined in the constitution and made enforceable. Rights such as the right to assembly, information and association should be supported by legal frameworks.

In Ghana, these rights are enshrined in the national Constitution. However, there still exist many laws that empower the executive to override rights or could be used to circumvent these rights. The use of the eminent domain to acquire property without the prior consent of landowners is a case in point.

- **Structural Conditions for participation:** There would be meaningful participation if there exists laid down structures and procedures to be followed by organizations. Tested and proven stakeholder dialogue structures need to be established and used.

  In the case of displacement and resettlement procedures in Ghana, there is no formal stakeholder participation framework. Each displacement and resettlement process is treated peculiarly (Kalitsi, 2004).

- **Capable Stakeholders** are required for meaningful participation. Participation can develop its full effectiveness only if the participants in political processes are able to represent their interests adequately. This requires knowledge of the rules, resources for defining and articulating political positions and experience with political negotiation processes, advocacy skills, access to information, and specific knowledge in areas such as displacement and resettlement.

  Beneficiaries and CSOs should be educated if need be to enable them to scrutinize policies and suggest useful alternatives if need be.

**3.5 Equity in Citizenship Engagement: Gender and Vulnerable Groups Participation**

Much as participation of stakeholders is important to ensure good governance and social accountability, conscious efforts must be made to include women and other
vulnerable groups in the process. Displacements have more consequences over men and women than boys and girls with women and men bearing the largest proportional consequences (Asthana & Cheney, 2012; Gururaja, 2000).

Their experiences are also different. It is therefore morally right and justifiable to include women at all levels of the displacement and resettlement planning. Asthana and Cheney (2012, p. 1) further articulate that

‘… women experience displacement and relocation in a particularly gendered way. This occurs due to the gendered division of labor that has arisen from socio-historical processes of men’s traditional incorporation in wage earning and performing labor-oriented tasks while women remain on the land jobs and its management on a daily basis” …that “Resettlement and rehabilitation (R&R) policies expose the male biases inherent in the insensitivity of the governments towards the needs of women”.

Women’s participation in decision-making is therefore core in development deliberations. It is democratically prudent to include women in deliberations especially in matters concerning them. It involves engaging all stakeholders in the displacement process irrespective of colour, sex or race. What qualifies one to be inclusive is of interest to the project.

Equity refers specifically to the right of all citizens to have an equal say in governance processes and to benefit equally from their outcomes. This means ensuring that decision-making is informed by all voices, including those of the most vulnerable, and that resources are shared in ways that meet everyone’s needs. Equity is a goal as well as a principle of governance (Brody & Victa-Labajo, 2009)

Broader citizen engagement has the advantage of gaining greater equity and shared power in the local political process, as well as about gaining greater equity in terms of
service delivery, and the improvement of material conditions that affect poor groups (Gaventa, 2006; Gaventa & Barrett, 2011).

3.6 Transparency and Accountability

Transparency is the degree to which information is available to outsiders that enables them to have an informed voice in decisions and/or to assess the decisions made by insiders. According to the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (2007), decisions taken and their enforcement are done in a manner that follows rules and regulations. It means that information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. It means that enough information is provided and that it is provided in easily understandable forms and media.

Accountability has a number of features: it is other-oriented in that the account is given to some other person or body outside the person or body being held accountable; it involves social interaction and dialogue, in that one side is calling for the account, seeks answers and remedies while the other side that is being held accountable, responds and accepts rectification; it implies rights of authority, in that those calling for an account are asserting rights of authority or ownership over those who are accountable, including the rights to demand answers and, where appropriate, to impose sanctions (Mulgan, 2001, p. 5)

Broadly speaking, accountability refers to the process of holding actors responsible for their actions. More specifically, it is the concept that individuals, agencies and organizations (public, private and civil society) are held responsible for executing their powers according to a certain standard (whether set mutually or not) (Tisné, 2010, p. 2). It is a broad concept that can be perceived at various levels like the state-citizenship...
relations, managerial and social levels with the essence of fostering fairness, equity and mutual understanding of situations.

Accountability is popularly categorized into social accountability, political accountability and managerial accountability (IDS, 2006) as shown Box 3:

Box 3: Types of Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of accountability</th>
<th>Social accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focuses on citizen action aimed at holding the state to account using strategies such as social mobilization, press reports and legal action;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addresses issues such as citizen security, judicial autonomy and access to justice, electoral fraud, and government corruption; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides extra sets of checks and balances on the state in the public interest, exposing instances of corruption, negligence and oversight, which horizontal forms of accountability are unlikely or unable to address.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Political accountability | Consists of checks and balances within the state including over delegated individuals in public office responsible for carrying out specific tasks on behalf of citizens; |
|                         | The state provides an account of its actions, and consults citizens prior to taking action in order to enforce rights and responsibilities; and |
|                         | Mechanisms of political accountability can be both horizontal and vertical. The state imposes its own horizontal mechanisms, such as ombudsmen and parliamentary audit committees. Citizens and civil society groups use vertical mechanisms, such as elections and court cases. |

| Managerial accountability | Focuses on financial accounting and reporting within state institutions, judged according to agreed performance criteria; |
|                         | Mechanisms include auditing, to verify income and outgoing funds; and |
|                         | New trends in managerial accountability are moving towards incorporating different indicators of financial integrity and performance such as social and environmental audits. |

Source: IDS Policy Briefing, Issue 33, November 2006

Accountability in the displacement and resettlement process is more social accountability, and is defined by Malena and Forster (2004)

...as an approach towards building accountability that relies on civic engagement, i.e., in which it is ordinary citizens and/or civil society organisations who participate directly or indirectly in exacting accountability. Mechanisms of social accountability can be initiated and supported by the state, citizens or both, but very often they are demand-driven and operate from the bottom-up. (Malena & Forster, 2004, p. 3)
Social accountability, which is closely associated with citizen-led accountability and voice and accountability, gives premium to affected citizens holding development implemented more responsive and accountable for their actions through the properly resourced pro-poor networks and coalitions that would be able to negotiate changes with anti-change actors to bring about coercion to enforce laid down rules, co-optation and collaboration in varying degrees of new social contract (Goetz & Gaventa, 2001; O'Meally, 2013). The concept of social accountability has been a focus because it is believed to make development more effective by being more accountable to beneficiaries, promotes empowerment of poorer groups of people and improves governance generally (Goetz & Gaventa, 2001; McGee & Gaventa, 2011).

Social accountability has largely been reduced to a citizen-demand and State-supply relationship. Coming from a rights-based approach, social accountability perceives that citizens have rights to express themselves in matters that affect them. As such, the concept of Voice has been developed, which refers

... to both the capacity of people to express their views and the ways in which they do so through a variety of formal and informal channels and mechanisms. Referring primarily to the efforts of the poor to have their views heard by more powerful decision-makers, voice can include complaint, organized protest, lobbying and participation in decision making, service delivery or policy implementation (Goetz & Gaventa, 2001)

The exercise of voice is successful if:

- There is empowerment, with an understanding by the individual that they have rights, and the state has an obligation to meet those rights; and

- There is the ability of people to come together with a shared agenda, progressing on to the ability to enter into arenas from which they had previously been excluded, and finally to demand and scrutinize information.
The sociocultural context, as well as the political and legal framework and citizenship awareness, are all important determinants of the extent to which voice can be exercised and yield meaningful results (Sharma, 2008). For example, the existence of individual rights like the right to assemble, press freedom and a responsive government would allow the use of voice and could make an impact.

Voice is a necessary condition to ensuring accountability but may not necessarily lead to social accountability because of the concept of ‘answerability’ and ‘enforceability’. Citizens are on the demand side of accountability and, through their voice media, demand responses from government or a higher authority. The extent to which citizens can ensure that their voices are heard and demands responded to depends on the responsiveness of the higher authority.

Social Accountability is a contextual phenomenon – macro (State) side and micro (local) side. At the macro side, one needs to take cognizance of national socioeconomic and political histories and contexts. Unsworth and Williams (2011) outline it as:

*Political economy analysis investigates how political and economic processes interact in a given society, and support or impede the ability to solve development problems that require collective action. It takes particular account of the interests and incentives driving the behaviour of different groups and individuals, the distribution of power and wealth between them, and how these relationships are created, sustained and transformed over time (Unsworth & Williams, 2011, p. 4)*

They further outlined the importance of political economic analysis in social accountability as:

- "Foundational factors" that fundamentally shape the social, political and institutional landscape, and therefore influence the scope for constructive state-society bargaining, and the institutional arrangements for organising collective
action. Foundational factors include the history of state formation, sources of public revenue, embedded social and economic structures as well as a country’s geography and geo-strategic position.

- Rules of the game or the formal and informal institutions that shape the incentives and capacity of key actors, the relationships between them, and how processes of political bargaining play out. These are critical in influencing opportunities for different groups, including those representing poor people, to mobilise and engage in collective action that promotes development.

- The "Here and now" that examines the conduct of day-to-day politics, and the way this is shaped by rules of the game as well as more contingent “events” (Unsworth & Williams, 2011, p. 9).

An analysis of this macro or national context enables one to situate the micro-level appropriately in context. Ensuring social accountability at the micro-level or context is examining the macro-context and weaving accountability strategies that would be most effective in that particular instance. Critical questions worth examining will be:

- What strategies or approaches would be appropriate in the particular context?

- What essential factors need to be in place for a successful operation of the strategies?

This thesis approaches voice and accountability as governance issues. It posits that the extent to which Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process ensured social voice and social accountability of stakeholders depended on how the process was governed. As such, critical questions worth asking are:
Were there spaces of accountability in the displacement and resettlement governance process? To what extent were stakeholders accountable to each other in the process? What were the enabling and hindering factors? The questions are examined from the perspectives of actors in the displacement process – Displaced persons, Bui Power Authority and the CSOs involved.

Joshi (2014) underscores that voice and accountability can be assessed by interrelation between three key components of Information, Citizenship Action and State Response. Joshi (2014) notes that the quality, usefulness and accessibility of information available to citizens inform their collective action. Citizens’ actions are demands for credible information, generating information and calling for remedies and sanctions if need be depending on the amount of credible information they have. The state, on the other hand, has the responsibility to synthesize information and demands of citizens by ensuring transparency, accessible information, reforms of structures and sanctioning of officials if need be.

Displaced persons as stakeholders need to demand good governance from BPA within the established structures. These are summarised in Table 7 below:
In short, the content, quality, credibility and level of accessible information to citizens about a contentious issue is a determinant of citizen action for accountability. The centrality of information in ensuring social accountability is illustrated by Kosack and Fung (2014) as a four stage ‘cyclical action’:

a. The information provided is salient and accessible to at least one group of information users. In the context of displacement, the relevant group would be dam affected persons. What information is available about this displacement, resettlement, timelines, compensation packages and payment schedules would be more salient information to them than information like cost of construction and amount of electricity to be generated by the dam after completion.
Secondly, the accessibility of information is important to ensure accountability and governance. The medium by which information is disseminated is important to ensure that it is accessible to relevant user groups. In a less literate community, for instance, if information is ‘hidden’ in electronic media like the internet or national radios, then it may be as good as not being available at all. Media like community radios and community meetings would make information more accessible to them.

a. The information causes users to change their decisions and actions. In the displacement, the information may cause the formation of groups to negotiate compensations, resist or accept resettlement, choose alternative resettlement locations, among others. These decisions and actions by beneficiaries may affect policy makers’ decisions, which could result in negotiations or confrontations between stakeholders including civil society advocates.

b. These new actions affect providers in ways that they find salient and consequential. Dam construction could be affected if citizens use information to engage in social protests or have the support of powerful civil society groups or anti-dam groups. These new actions could lead to policy reforms, better compensation packages, improved collaboration and cooperation from dam affected persons.

c. Policy makers may respond constructively by improving access to information, discussing more with dam affected persons and more accountability mechanisms put in the governance system.

There is therefore a strong relationship between voice and accountability. Voice can lead to the demand for accountability. Participation of affected people through consultation and discussions gives actors voice as they are able to have a say in the concerned development agenda.
3.7 Chapter Summary

The chapter examined the structural relationships that ought to exist to ensure that each actor group plays its expected role devoid of arbitrariness. It was noted that the right application of governance principles of participation, accountability and equity promotes quality mutual information sharing among actors, consensus and trust among stakeholders for a win-win process. This would be achievable if first, the displacement and resettlement structures and processes lend themselves to the application of good governance; and, second, all actors are assertive enough to ensure and demand mutual governance from actors.

Governance, therefore, is a component of the agency, power and the knowledge of actors. Hence the study’s adoption of the actor-oriented approach in development, which emphasizes that actors act rationally within the knowledge and power to influence development outcomes to their advantage (Long, 2003). Focusing on participation, accountability and transparency aspects of governance, the study seeks to ascertain the spaces for governance available in the displacement and resettlement structure, the capabilities of the various actors in seeking or demanding governance and outcomes for youth, women and men groups of displaced people.

It conceives governance as a politicised issue in which actors lobby, advocate, advise, appeal, confront and use other forms of politics to demand and/or deliver governance. It has, therefore, adopted the actor-oriented political ecology to critically analyse the pull-and-push issues of various actors in their demand for and against good governance in dams-induced displacement and resettlement processes using Ghana’s Bui Dam’s process as a case study. The next chapter focuses on some theoretical perspectives adopted for the study.
CONCEPTUAL APPROACHES

4.0 Introduction
This chapter situates the thesis in a theoretical perspective of political ecology. It argues that, using an actor-oriented approach to political ecology to investigate resettlement, brings out richer insights into the structural interrelationships between actors and how that affects the resettlement outcomes on displaced people as an actor group. Displacement and resettlement have political, economic and environmental interrelationships at various levels and needs to be appreciated as such. Long’s (2003) actor oriented approach was used to evaluate the relationship between these actors from the perspectives of displaced people. This was done in the displacement structure of the Bui Dam’s resettlement. Three features of Gidden’s Structuration Theory (1984) are relevant here. These are the fact that there are: firstly, the structures that regulate relationships between actors in every organization; second, there are the interactional systems with the social structures performed by actors for the allocation of resources, coercion and inducement; and thirdly, there are the modalities or meaning generating processes that mediate the generation and reproduction of relatively similar social practices across time and space (Barratt-Pugh, 2007). It underscores that actors act within given structures for production. The suitability of the structures and powers of actors are the important variables to determine the quality of outcome.

The chapter puts into perspective the concept of the endogenous development approach. It underscores that endogenous development views development as a holistic concept of the social, physical and spiritual wellbeing of people and, as such, approaches to development should be take cognizance of this holism. The extent to which local perceptions of resettlement are incorporated in the resettlement depends on the governance system employed.
4.1 Political Ecology Approach

Political ecology approach concerns the interconnections between political and economic decisions and the environment implications on society (Bryant, 1997). Political ecology can be seen as a holistic approach, which analyses linking together environmental changes, politics and economics, and explores the interactions of international, national, regional, and local actors around those interrelations (Gössling, 2003).

Political ecology is best understood in the politicized environment consisting of the dimensions, scales of interactions, and the power relations between actors. Blaikie and Brookfield (1987, p, 17) note that political ecology encompasses the constantly shifting dialectic between society and land-based resources, with particular attention to the role of ‘marginalized’ peasants and the interactions of scales – or, ‘chains of explanation’ that radiate outward from individual ‘resource users’ to peasant communities and to regional, national and global political and economic relations.

Nüsser (2003), and later Baghel and Nüsser (2010), applied political ecology to the construction of large dams and the application of the World Commission of Dam’s recommendations. Both studies underscored the interconnectedness between local, national and interactional actors as well as the different levels of power and interests.

Main actors in the Bui Dam resettlement case include state land agencies, BPA and displaced people who are primary actors. How did these actors relate and what is the outcome of the relationship between actors in displacement and resettlement process on the environment-society situation of displaced people? Political ecology takes cognizance of the distribution of risks and benefits amongst actors. Key to this study is the focus on governance issues in displacement and how that affect the outcome on the various actors. It therefore finds the actor perspective anchored on political ecology most appropriated and hence its adoption.
4.2 Actor-Oriented Approach

Long (2001; 2003) underscore that there are reciprocal interactions between knowledge, agency and power of actors in social change. It holds that actors have knowledgeability and capability to assess problematic situations and organize ‘appropriate’ responses. Further, actors appear in a variety of forms: individual persons, informal groups or interpersonal networks, organizations, collective groupings, and what are sometimes called ‘macro’ actors (e.g., a particular national government, church or international organization) (Long, 2003).

Long (2001, p. 49) identifies a number of key founding principles of an actor oriented approach. First, society is heterogeneous and is made up of diverse social and cultural forms even under homogeneous circumstances; therefore they have very varied context-specific values and beliefs. Second, given this variation it is considered important to study how social and cultural differences are ‘produced, reproduced and transformed’ beyond the structural forces. Thus, it is considered necessary to understand how actors process their own experiences and the experiences of others, and how they act upon that. Third, social relations are seen as networks of interconnections based on shared meanings, values, and power relations, with these social actions and interpretations being context specific. Fourth, the every-day actor interactions tend to be the result of broader macro-scale phenomena, while the macro-structures are in turn the result of micro-scale actor interactions (Long, 2001). These interpretations lead Long (2001, p. 50) to suggest, fifth, that social relations may be better understood by ‘the concept of 'social interface', which explores how discrepancies of social interest, cultural interpretation, knowledge and power are mediated and perpetuated or transformed at critical points of linkage or confrontation.
4.3 Application of Actor Oriented Approach to the Political Ecology of Displacement and Resettlement

The thesis adopts an actor-oriented approach to political ecology for analysis of issues. Political ecology is a widely used concept in geography for the analysis of environmental governance. Displacement and resettlement are a complicated and multi-layered phenomena involving multiple actors and driving forces with underlying power relations in a politicized environment hence the adaptation of this concept to help identify and analyze issues.

Typically, political ecology is defined by Blaikie and Brookfield (1987) as that that combines ecology and broadly defined political economy. This was within the context that local ecological issues should be analyzed with the context of global political issues and power relations between and among both localized and non-localized stakeholders. The concept has since been applied to various social issues like conflict and livelihood adaptations with varying degrees of Marxism, Dependency Theory and World Systems Theory (Bryant & Goodman, 2008; Bury, 2008; Schroeder, 2005). This is termed the ‘first generation’ political ecology and situated local ecological changes in the global power relations and the role of global capitalism has put pressure on local ecologies to produce surpluses from their environment leading to degradation. It relied heavily on essentiality of nature, external and separate from humans, in its search for structural problems (Baghel & Nüsser, 2010; Blaikie & Brookfield, 1987).

Escobar (2010) in his contribution to the International Handbook of Environmental Sociology underscored that political ecology has transcended structural levels to post-Marxism, postmodernism, post-colonialism and poststructuralism. Rather than emphasizing the essentiality of the structures, post-structural political ecologies attempt to understand how the unequal power relations amongst social groups, and the...
‘knowledge’ that mediates human-environment interactions, are reproduced as present
day ecological changes on all scales (Baghel & Nüsser, 2010; Escobar, 2010).

This thesis situates political ecology in the post-structural school and would examine
beyond the structure of governance, how the unequal power relations among and
between actor groups interact to construct present day displacement and resettlement
problems.

The application of the political ecology theory to large dam construction was used by
Nüsser (2003) and Baghel and Nüsser (2010). In both cases, studies about the impacts
of dams have been more about their functionality and effects than the causes. However,
large dam construction takes place within a politicized environment, with actors
ranging from dam affected people to state actors to dam financiers and engineers.
Therefore, the actor oriented post-structural political ecological approach was proposed
if one wants to understand the causes and effects of large dam construction holistically.

There are different interests and stakes in the displacement process as well as the
different powers between and among stakeholders, which have made displacement and
resettlement process a politicized issue.

Analysis of displacements have largely been on the effects of dams on displaced
persons’ livelihoods (Aditjondro, 2002; Asthana & Cheney, 2012; Kalitsi, 2008) or the
structure of displacement as amplified in approaches such as rights-based and top down
models. However, a holistic study of the causes and effects of this displacement has not
been missing in literature.

The actor-perspective is one of the approaches to finding holistic causes and effects of
displacement failures. Long (2003, p. 14) notes that:

*The advantage of an actor-oriented approach is that it aims to grasp precisely
these issues through a systematic ethnographic understanding of the ‘social life’
of development issues projects – from conception to realization – as well as the*
This perspective revolves around ‘Agency, Power and Knowledge’ of actors’ development. Development actors act rationally by making choices within their power as well as knowledge and resource limits to influence development activities (Long, 2003, p. 15). Similarly, Hindess (1986, p.117) elaborates as follows:

…that reaching of decisions, or social positioning vis-à-vis other actors, entails the explicit or implicit use of ‘discursive means’ in the formulation of goals, pursuit of interests and fulfilment of desires, and in presenting arguments or rationalisations for the actions undertaken. These discursive means or types of discourse …vary and are not simply inherent features of the actors themselves: they form a part of the differentiated stocks of knowledge and resources available to actors of different types.

The study concurs with Long (2003) and opines that displacement and resettlement studies involve actors, who are rational and work within their resource and knowledge limits to influence displacement outcomes to their advantage.

This actor-oriented perspective is then linked with the theory of political ecology, which places emphasis on the centrality of actors’ power in the analysis of displacement at resettlement at the national level.

Main actors in the displacement and resettlement process in Ghana include the state institutions, The Bui Dam Authority, Traditional Authorities and the dam affected persons.

The State is represented by its relevant Institutions like the Ministry of Energy, Water Resources, The Lands Commission and the Department of Social Welfare. These actors mainly take policy decisions such as the decisions to construct the dam, cost and times of construction. Displacement begins with the land acquisition and the Lands
Commission acts on behalf of the state to annex lands. Although these state institutions have a legal basis for their actions however, to what extent were these actions taken to ensure participation, transparency and accountability? Land acquisition is followed by the active relocation of affected people to pave the way for the dam construction and livelihood restoration process.

This work adopts an actor perspective approach to political ecology for its analysis because:

- Displacement governance involves many actors – State, dam affected persons and civil society organizations. These actors have varying degrees of interests and power to drive their interests – hence the politics.

- Power is central in governance. Who is accountable for what in whom in displacement? Who participates at what level and in which form in the displacement and resettlement process? Are all power relations that need to be analyzed contextually in the perspective of actors? The conflicts, resistances, contestations and debates about displacement and resettlement processes are power-based issues.

Both the sources of power and relational dimensions of power are relevant in governance. Power over relations refer to control, instrumentalism, and self-interest of the power bearer over others. In relation to governance, power over relations would involve hierarchical relationships where subordinate groups support decisions taken from above (Berger, 2005; Roper, 2005). There is therefore a top-down relationship or a hegemony and therefore may not be sound participation, voice and accountability demands from below in power over relations cases, positional or legitimate power sources from where one acts because of his/her position. Subordinates obey because they deem it legitimate (Greenberg, 2011).
Power to relationships refers to avenues or resources, process that people can use to resist or counter other interests and advocate for their interests.

In general, actor-oriented approaches focus on the interests, characteristics, and actions of different actors as they pertain to processes of social, political, and environmental change (Bryant & Bailey, 1997; Giddens 1984). In doing so it recognizes the importance of both structural factors as well as the role of human agency in determining outcomes. Consequently, actor-oriented research attempts to navigate between the over determining essentialism of structuralism and the complexity of atomized localization (Bury, 2008).

By an “actor-oriented” perspective, the thesis situates the complexes of displacement governance in the contexts of participation, social accountability and social justice needs and priorities that are informed by the concrete experiences of the particular actors involved in and who stand to gain directly from, the struggles in displacement and resettlement.

Nüsser (2003) and Baghel and Nüsser (2010) applied to concept of political ecology to the construction of large dams and noted that there are different development perspectives of the main advocates and opponents of dam-building. The actor-orientated approach of political ecology provides a framework would have dug further to unearth the character and scope of the controversy between bureaucratic state agencies and technocratic engineering companies on the one hand; and environmental, non-governmental activist groups and adversely affected people on the other from the perspectives of the actors.

Similarly, displacement and resettlement has different perspectives from different actors and the application of the actor oriented approach would help in unearthing the various controversies from the perspectives of the various actors. The displacement
and resettlement process involves the interactions of international, bilateral and state institutions and displaced people as beneficiaries (Baghel & Nüsser, 2010; Fink, 2005; Siciliano, Urban, Tan-Mullins, Pichdara, & Kim, 2016). The Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process included state institutions like the Bui Power Authority, The Lands Commission, Environmental Protection Agency and other as key actors while displaced persons or beneficiary actor groups include Chiefs and opinion leaders, women, men and youth groups.

This thesis applied the actor oriented approach to the study of the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process using displaced persons as the main actors. The perspectives of these actors in the process forms the substance of the analysis.

4.4 Actor Mapping and Interests in Bui Dam’s Displacement and Resettlement

Actors refer agencies, institutions and formal and informal groupings as well as individuals who have been said to have agency in that they possess the knowledgeability and capability to assess problematic situations and organize responses (Long, 2003). They are simply a category of people who have roles or functions to place in a given process. Actors referred to as stakeholders because all actors have stakes in process. For this thesis, the terms actors and stakeholders would be used synonymously to refer to those who are affected by the project as well as those who played a role in the process (Reed et al., 2009).

Nüsser (2003), in his application of the actor oriented approach to large dams construction, identified key types of actors in the discussion on large dams. They are national, states and governmental institutions, dam-building industry associations and engineering companies, multilateral funding institutions, environmental non-governmental activist groups, and the adversely affected people (Nüsser, 2003).
actors in the case of the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement project are shown in Table 8 below:

Table 8: Stakeholders in the Bui dam construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International and Bilateral Institutions</th>
<th>Traditional Authorities</th>
<th>State Agencies</th>
<th>Non-Governmental Organizations</th>
<th>Displaced People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Chinese Government</td>
<td>- Community leaders;</td>
<td>- Lands Commission</td>
<td>- GDD</td>
<td>- Chiefs and Elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- China Export-Import Bank</td>
<td>- Traditional authorities;</td>
<td>- BPA</td>
<td>- ActionAid</td>
<td>- Fishermen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Council of elders.</td>
<td>- Ministries of Finance, Foreign Affairs, Agriculture</td>
<td>- Synohydro</td>
<td>- Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Land owners</td>
<td>- EPA</td>
<td>- Environmental Resources</td>
<td>- Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Religious Leaders</td>
<td>- GES</td>
<td>Management Ltd</td>
<td>- Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- GHS</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Banda District Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s own construct

Stakeholders could be classified into key, primary, secondary and tertiary actors (Zimmermann & Maennling, 2007). Key stakeholders are stakeholders or core actors backed by law and authority and resourced with adequate knowledge and expertise to exert influence on the issue at stake. The number and quality of relationships to other actors is dependent on the key actor or actors. In displacement and resettlement, the key actor would be the government authority responsible for displacement.

Primary actors are beneficiaries of the project and those who are most affected by the project and have high interactivity with the project (Merrilees, Getz, & O’Brien, 2005). Primary actors or stakeholders in displacement and resettlement include dam affected people – especially displaced people and host communities; while secondary and tertiary actors may not be directly affected by the project.
Fink (2005), in his pioneering study of stakeholder participation in the Bui Dam, identified and classified stakeholders into key, primary and secondary: these are summarized in Table 9 below:

Table 9: Classification of Actors in the Bui dam project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor Classification</th>
<th>Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Actors</td>
<td>• China EXIM Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GoG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Synohydro Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Min. of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• National Regulatory Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>• Dam affected communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traditional Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• District Assemblies of Bole and now Banda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Irrigation hopefuls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>• Economic Interest Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Religious Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Researchers etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fink (2005), Gordon (2006) and Author

The roles, powers and activities of these actors vary as well as the benefits of the dam. Key stakeholders are governed by policies, laws and contractual agreements with specific mandates. Their relationship with other actors are mostly spelt out. Key stakeholder interests include implementing the law accordingly to achieve spelled out objectives and would be more answerable to the law than the other stakeholders. The powers and roles of other stakeholders may not be explicitly spelt by law but guided by their interests in the project outcomes. As such, they may rely on coalitions, lobbying and advocating for their powers and functions. Details of stakeholder relationships are discussed in the analysis of governance issues. The thesis examined the relationships amongst actors in terms of accountability, transparency and participation from the displaced people as actors.
4.5 Actors or Stakeholders in Displacement and Resettlement: The Rights, Risks and Responsibility (3Rs Model)

Displacement and resettlement involve various stakeholders who have various Rights, Risks and Responsibilities (Bird, Haas, & Mehta, 2004). The 3Rs approach is necessary because:

- Recognition that responsibilities are a fundamental component of accountability and good governance;
- Negotiating agreements around rights and risks is not feasible without consideration of responsibilities – a simultaneous consideration of the 3Rs introduces necessary checks and balances;
- Explicit articulation of responsibilities associated with the defined rights of each interest group should lead to more effective negotiations and identification of more equitable outcomes;
- The need to address the increasing emergence of policy thinking based around realizing human rights, which calls for the need to link rights and responsibilities, particularly responsibilities of the State and the project promoter to protect the rights of affected people (Bird et al., 2004, p. 13).

These actors have various rights and different responsibilities and risks in the displacement and resettlement process, which when analysed critically, can bring about a win-win situation in displacement and resettlement. It perceives every stakeholder as a right-holder with a corresponding duty-bearer (OHCHR, 2006). That is, RBA works on both the supply and demand sides of development (Gauri & Gloppen, 2012). As right HOLDERS, individuals are entitled to rights and to claim those rights. They are entitled to hold duty-bearers accountable and to respect the rights of others.
4.5.1 Rights of Actors in Displacement and Resettlement Process

Rights of actors are generally based on three international declarations. These are The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948), UN Declaration on the Right to Development (DRD, 1986) and Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (UNCED, 1992). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948) guarantees every person an entitlement to enjoy rights that specify an inalienable set of individual goods, services, and opportunities that the State and society are, in ordinary circumstances, required to respect or provide. These human rights are further supported by International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) to rights to life and livelihoods.

The Declaration of the Rights to Development (1986) asserts the right of ‘peoples’ to self-determination and their ‘inalienable right to full sovereignty over all their natural wealth and resources’ (Art. 1(2)). It recognized a State’s ‘right and duty to formulate appropriate national development policies’ for the improvement of the entire population and the fair distribution of development benefits (Art. 2(3)). The process of development therefore should not be a cause of misery to people but an opportunity to enhance the displaced persons’ sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources through careful development-oriented displacement and resettlement schemes and approaches.

The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (UNCED, 1992) calls for sustainable development, among other things, through public participation; access to information; fair compensation; and the recognition of the rights indigenous peoples
and local communities. Other actors like the World Bank have similar principles, rights
of participation, information and equitable sharing of development benefits.

Other rights are found in national constitutions and in customary laws. All in all, the
application of these laws, declarations and principles to displacement and resettlement
means actors should ensure adequate participation of all stakeholders, access to
information, and equitable sharing of displacement benefits.

The rights of actors have been emphasized in the WCD recommendations as follows:

‘We believe there can no longer be any justifiable doubt about the following:
...By bringing to the table all those whose rights are involved and who bear the
risks associated with different options for water and energy resources
development, the conditions for a positive resolution of competing interests and
conflicts are created.’ (WCD, xxviii)

Displacement and resettlement bestows rights on actors like The State, the dam building
authority, displaced persons and some concern CSOs. Table 10 gives an indication of
the rights of actors in respect to displacement and resettlement.
**Table 10: Rights and Responsibilities of Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor or Stakeholder</th>
<th>Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Governments (politicians [national and local], policy makers, regulators, planners…) | • Constitutional rights  
   • Right to development  
   • Right to sustainable development  
   • Right to develop water/energy resources and protect the environment pursuant to national laws and regulations  
   • Right to appropriate land in the name of ‘eminent domain’  
   • Rights resulting from international / bilateral agreements |
| Dam developers/owners/operators (public and private utilities….)                     | • Constitutional rights  
   • Statutes of public utilities  
   • Rights of commerce  
   • Right to exploit water resources, subject to national legislation for concession agreements, water use licenses, permits  
   • Right to develop property, subject to land acquisition legislation and planning controls, etc.  
   • Contractual rights (contract law and arbitration procedures specified in contracts)  
   • Investment rights, protection afforded by national legislation  
   • Intellectual property rights |
| Communities (adversely affected, beneficiaries, water users, CBOs, Community level representatives [political and administrative] …) | • Rights granted under national laws (right to livelihood, access to basic services, right to land etc.  
   • Customary rights  
   • Political, civil, economic and social rights in the UDHR and Constitution  
   • UN Right to Development  
   • Sustainable Development (Rio Principles)  
   • Right to prior and informed consent for indigenous peoples (for parties to ILO 169)  
   • Human right to water |
| Other interested parties (NGOs, Private sector [consultants, contractors, suppliers], professional associations, academics, …) | • Rights to freedom of expression  
   • Right of access to information  
   • Right to consultation and participation in decision-making processes  
   • Rights under commercial law  
   • Right to seek redress in case of violations of national or international laws / policies or of the rights of interest groups or contractual violations |

*Source: Bird et al. (2004)*
4.5.2 Risks of Actors

Dam development and the accompanying displacement and resettlement poses risks to each stakeholder and therefore the need to manage the risks posed. Some risks faced by the Government at the national level include:

- Risks related to the right and duty to formulate national development policies; and
- Risks inherent in undertaking dam projects against those of other initiatives and ‘do nothing’ options (given the demand for water and electricity services, or food, and the role of these services in development, and flood or drought risk).

These risks are managed by careful planning and implementation of dam projects, which includes adequate participation of stakeholders and transparency.

Dam affected communities face the risks of:

- ‘Involuntary risk bearers’, especially displaced people, face risks of civil and political rights, social and economic rights (including the right to livelihood, development), property rights, and loss of cultural identity;
- Impoverishment risks due to involuntary resettlement;
- Livelihood risks to upstream and downstream communities;
- Safety risks of dam failure or inappropriate operation;
- Risk of ecological integrity and livelihood options of future generations; and
- Beneficiaries right of access to water / electricity can be at risk if it is cancelled or delayed.

These risks are further distributed disproportionally among social groups such as women, men and youth. The management of these risks lies in the governance system of the entire dam project including the displacement and resettlement process. A genuinely open, transparent and participatory governance process will minimize the risks of each stakeholder, especially dam affected community members; and even
distribute resettlement benefits equitably among affected community members by taking into consideration the peculiarity of some vulnerable groups like women in the displacement process.

4.5.3 Responsibilities

Clear roles, duties and responsibilities of stakeholders or actors are *sine quo non* to ensuring effective governance in any project. Unambiguous responsibilities of actors create necessary conditions for constructive negotiation at different stages, as well as providing mechanisms to seek accountability and redress when rights are violated or when risks are borne disproportionately by individual interest groups (e.g. those to be displaced, the poor and vulnerable). In the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement governance, the role of Government through the Bui Power Authority (BPA) is key to ensuring a sound resettlement programme. The general roles of the State in dam project include:

- Codifying international commitments into national laws;
- Responsible for establishing an enabling framework for provision of basic services for all citizens and public safety;
- Protecting the rights of individuals under national legislation and International agreements, including customary rights of indigenous peoples;
- Enforcing national laws and agreements including environmental protection and water resources management;
- Duties defined under the UDRD (Article 2(3)) - putting in place clear policies and legal framework to meet development needs and facilitate active, free and meaningful participation of all stakeholders in development processes;
- Providing an enabling environment for information access, transparency, and explicit procedures for stakeholder interaction;
Providing an enabling environment for grievance redressal and ultimate decision-making; and

Comply with agreements reached.

The State, in the exercise of these responsibilities, needs to take cognizance of the welfare and needs of other stakeholders for whom they are exercising these responsibilities. This can only be done where stakeholders exercise their duties in a transparent, accountable and participatory manner.

Similarly, dam affected communities and people have the responsibilities to participate in, and respect the outcomes of, negotiated decision-making processes; and comply with negotiated agreements including resettlement. They are to comply with provisions of agreements for service provision and monitor implementation and notify authorities of compliance issues as well as obligations of beneficiaries and host communities towards those involuntary risk bearers that lose land and livelihoods.

4.6 Endogenous Development Approaches

Endogenous development (ED) means a process of active assessment whereby local populations can ground themselves within their own knowledge traditions, keep what is working and generative, while at the same time being open to ideas from outside that may improve ways of life, based on criteria people themselves develop (Haverkort, Burgoa, Shankar, & Millar, 2012). It a development approach that builds on local knowledge and resources with the selective external application of external resources and knowledge to make development outcomes more meaningful to local people.

The ED is built on the basis that local people are knowledgeable people who have been carrying out their development activities in the context of their knowledge systems. ED therefore considers the worldviews of the people or their indigenous knowledge system. It starts with understanding local people’s knowledge about the phenomena under
discussion. This includes the people’s understanding and meaning of the particular development agenda in terms of their physical, social and spiritual worldviews. This would give a holistic and people-centred view about their needs, capabilities and strategies of development.

Second, ED considers local people active actors or even leaders in community development. As such, indigenous or local knowledge is the entry point of any development activity. ED acknowledges that local knowledge may not be adequate in solving all problems and, as such, makes room for the selective use of external knowledge and resources to supplement local ones. This makes development outcomes most relevant and beneficial to local people. They have a great sense of ownership and attachment as development was carried out by them and with them and within their worldviews.

4.7 Conceptual Framework

This study conceptualizes displacement as a risk to displaced people as it can cause them to lose their lands, homes and other livelihoods systems. Displacement disrupts their social and physical resource base, which they have been depending on prior to the construction of the dam.

To reduce their vulnerability, resettlement structures and processes are often set up by governments to ensure that displaced peoples’ livelihood vulnerabilities are improved through compensation packages and/or resettlement. However, the structures and processes of the displacement would determine whether displaced persons can make inputs into their resettlement processes or not. The structures include the levels of government and interactional relationships established in the structures. These structures are operationalised by the laws, policies and strategies of engagement employed. This thesis conceives the structures and interactional processes as
governance procedures. Actors employ various strategies like lobbying, protests, advocacies and confrontations to ensure that their interests are addressed in the process. These push-and-pull issues by actors in furtherance of their various interests in the structure is termed ‘The politicised environment’ in political ecological studies. Whilst the state (BPA) has resettlement packages and strategies, displaced people find them inadequate to remedy their losses and, as such, would demand better and improved packages. The extent to which their demands can be effective depends on their power in relation to BPA. Common strategies of galvanizing include riots, coalition with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and boycotts. External conditions such as the availability of free and independent media, democratic rights and CSOs in vulnerable rights protection is a boost to ensuring good governance in displacement and resettlement.

This study focuses on the BPA-Displaced people relationship in the structure by examining the levels of engagement allowed and used in the Bui Dam’s displacement structures. BPA is the state agency set up to conduct resettlement of displaced people on behalf of government. Although the interests of both BPA and displaced people is necessary to have a successful resettlement, the content, time lines and strategies and forms could be different. Power differences between actors could make one ‘a tyrant actor’ forcing down decisions to other actors. However, where the structural and power relations ensure genuine participation of actors, mutually accepted displacement outcomes are achieved. Enhanced participation of displaced people as actors would lead to the impartation of their worldviews of resettlement and wellbeing for a more acceptable resettlement outcome.
Chapter Summary

This chapter explored conceptual reviews underpinnings the study. Long’s (2001; 2003) actor-oriented approach in development sociology is adopted to examine perspectives from displaced persons as an actor group. This is because reality is experienced differently by actor groups.

The actor-oriented approach is anchored on political ecology, which underscores that almost all aspects of social life are interconnected and they involve mutual relations and interdependences. At the macro-scale, international actors like the World Bank, Syno Hydro Construction Limited and the Chinese Government, have increasingly played influential roles in developing countries due to their financial resources and technological skills and know-how in large dam construction. National level policies and laws play significant roles in the displacement and resettlement process. Displaced persons on their part, play roles in ensuring that displacement packages and processes are beneficial to them. There is, therefore, a politicised environment in which various actors use various sources of power to influence their interest. The political ecology is best situated for such analysis and is thus adopted.

The actor-oriented approach was anchored on political ecology to best explore the varied interactions among diverse actors. Although macro-level structural forces are believed to be influential in both political ecology and an actor oriented approach, Long (2001) stresses the role of actors at the micro-level, arguing that the micro-level is a pre-requisite to understand the macro-level. An actor-oriented approach can suggest that actors form structures, and vice versa. It indicates that, although human agents are greatly influenced by the structural macro-forces of politics, the economy and culture, individual actors potentially shape the macro structure.
The study focuses more on displaced people as an actor group and investigates the extent to which their local knowledge systems and world views about land and resettlement has been inculcated in the displacement process. Hence, the endogenous development approach.

The actor-oriented perspective anchored on political ecology is seldom used in the study of displacement and resettlement research. Nüsser (2003) and Baghel and Nüsser (2010) applied political ecology as a concept to the construction of large dams and application of the World Commission of Dam’s recommendations. The actor-oriented approach to political ecology in the study of displacement and resettlement could be a beginning in the application of the combined concept.

Having reviewed the conceptual approaches, the next chapter outlines the methodological approaches that were employed in the study.
THE STUDY AREA AND METHODOLOGY

5.0 Introduction

The chapter provides an outline of data collection, presentation and analysis processes. A mixed research design is adapted after a brief discussion on the advantages and suitability of the quantitative and qualitative approaches to social research. A case study approach was adopted to contextually evaluate the displacement and resettlement process from an actor perspective. The various methods and techniques of data collection and analyses, as well as the rationale for their choices, are explained. The chapter begins with some background information on the planned Bui Dam resettlement strategies and a brief profile of the area of study.

5.1.1 The Bui Power Authority (BPA) Resettlement

The Bui Dam resettlement process was done by the Bui Power Authority (Act 740) established to plan and execute the Bui Power Authority. This executed the displacement and resettlement process using the Resettlement Planning Framework (RPF) and the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP). The Resettlement Action plan identified two factors that were key to ensuring that these objectives are met. These were the institutional capacity for implementing the resettlement, and public consultation and participation in the process to ensure the involvement and buy-in of all stakeholders concerned. The overall goal and objectives of the RPF are:

To ensure that the Bui Dam project improves people’s economic opportunities and living conditions and minimizes adverse impacts while also providing remedial measures for those adverse impacts that are unavoidable, particularly among the communities most directly affected by resettlement either through physical displacement or loss of economic resources (Environmental Resources Management, 2007, p. i).
Specific objectives of the RPF are to establish the framework and basis for development of a full Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) that were to:

- Carry out resettlement both in accordance with the local laws and regulations of Ghana, and in accordance with World Bank guidelines on involuntary resettlement;
- Ensure that livelihoods and standards of living are restored and where possible improved;
- Undertake resettlement in partnership and consultation with affected stakeholders including the communities to be resettled and the host communities;
- Facilitate a smooth integration with the host communities;
- Disclose the measures in the RPF to the local community prior to resettlement and conduct ongoing consultation with affected communities during the resettlement process and afterwards;
- Provide a grievance procedure whereby local people can lodge concerns and complaints regarding the resettlement; and
- Monitor the resettlement and rehabilitation components during and after resettlement, and ensure that vulnerable groups are identified and receive additional assistance as necessary.

The RPF specifically advocated for transparency, accountability and participation in the displacement and resettlement process with the following objectives:

- To provide information about the project and its potential impacts to those interested in or affected by the project, and solicit their opinion in this regard;
- To manage expectations and misconceptions regarding the project;
To agree resettlement preferences and discuss concerns; and

To ensure participation by host communities.

In addition, to ensure a continuous flow of information, a Grievance Office was created under the RAP to ensure that the resettled and host communities are able to lodge complaints or concerns regarding compensation and restoration of livelihoods, without cost, and with the assurance of a timely and satisfactory resolution of the issue.

The RPF noted the importance of relaying information to project affected persons and indicated that

Stakeholders should be publicly informed by the relevant authorities of the details of resettlement activities. The information made public and provided to each household will include cut-off dates for each affected group (if the cutoff date differs), entitlements, eligibility criteria, modes of compensation, complaints and grievance redress procedures. (Section 13.2, p 111)

5.1.2 Planning and Financing the Bui Dam Project

The Bui Dam was planned as a multipurpose dam to generate power, provide water for irrigation and to improve the tourism and fishing industries in Ghana.

The Bui Dam has a long history dating back to 1925, when Albert Kitson found the Bui Gorge suitable for the construction of a hydropower dam. Since then, many studies have been carried out in view of constructing the dam but were often truncated along the way. The dam was kick-started in 2005/2006 by an unsourced Chinese Exim Bank loan facility of US $622M to finance and construct the dam as a turnkey project that was made available to Ghana.

However, the feasibility study by Snowy Mountain Engineering Corporation (SMEC) of Australia 1978 to commence the implementation of the project with support from the Australian Government and the World Bank but this was unsuccessful due to the
1979 coup d’états that derailed the plans (Tsikata, 2010). There was yet another feasibility study by Coyne et. Bellier of France done in 1995, which could not be implemented either.

Hensengerth (2013, p. 15) notes the mandatory planning and clearance landmarks towards the realization of the construction of the dam started when Government of Ghana included:

a. The inclusion of the Bui Dam project in the 2006-2009 Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS II) by the National Development Planning Commission to increase power supply in the nation.

b. The commissioning of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) Report as a prerequisite not just to acquiring the Environmental Permit from the Ghana Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) but also to access the loan from the Chinese Exim Bank. This was followed by other mandatory permits from the Water Resources Commission, which includes Diversion Permits, Construction Permits and Water Use Permits.

A historical review of major milestones in the Bui Dam construction planning process since its discovery in 1925 are tabulated below in T:
Financing the Bui Dam construction was a big challenge till the year 2000 as the World Bank had desisted from funding large dams because of environmental problems (Kirchherr, Disselhoff, & Charles, 2016).

### 5.2 Geophysical and Social Settings of the Bui Dam

#### 5.2.1 Introduction

This section explores aspects of the Bui Dam project that borders on displacement and resettlement. It presents its location, size and content. Its objective is to give a
contextual overview of the dam project with regards to the main theme of the thesis ensuring social accountability, participation and equity of outcomes in the displacement governance.

5.2.2 Location, Size and Content

The Volta Basin covers 398 000 km² and is located in West Africa within latitudes 5°45’ N and 14°10’ N and longitudes 2°17’ E and 5°20’ W. Forty-two percent of the basin lies in Ghana, 43% in Burkina Faso, and the remaining 15% in Mali, Côte d’Ivoire, Togo, and Benin. Rainfall averages 1025 mm year-1 of which 9%, or 36 km³, becomes river flow (de Condappa, Chaponnière, & Lemoalle, 2009; van de Giesen, Andreini, van Edig, & Vlek, 2001). The Volta River is Ghana’s longest river traversing the country from north to south as its main tributaries as the white, the black and the White Volta. Another important river that drains the Volta Basin is the Oti River, which originates in Benin, then passes through Togo to join the Volta in Ghana.

A dominating feature of the basin is the Lake Volta, which is the largest man-made lake in Africa, and one of the largest in the world in terms of surface area. Ghana’s first hydropower producing dam was created out of the volta lake and was commissioned in 1966. In 1982, the Kpong dam was also constructed to meet the rapidly increasing demand for electricity by industries and populations in Ghana and neighbouring countries (Fink, 2005, 2006; Owusu, Waylen, & Qiu, 2008). It has been a source of irrigation of dams and other agricultural activities in Ghana.

The Bui Dam, which is the focus of this study, is located at the Bui Gorge on the Black Volta. It is a multipurpose dam with a reservoir volume at full supply of 12.57 billion M³ and a dam height of 108M to produce 400MW of electricity (Hensengerth, 2011). The dam components include the main dam, two small saddles at the neighbouring hill
at the Banda Hill where the topography is lower than the Full Supply Level (FSL) of the reservoir.

Bui is located on the Black Volta River at the border of Bole (Northern Region) and the then Tain (now Banda) District in Brong Ahafo Region Ghana, approximately 150 kilometers (km) upstream of Lake Volta. The central location of the gorge between the northern and Brong Ahafo made the dam to affect communities in both regions. As such, the Gyaama Resettlement Camp A is established to resettle displaced people in the Northern Region side of the gorge and those of the Banda District are resettled at the Bui Resettlement Township B in the Brong Ahafo Region. Communities inundated in the Northern Region include Lucene/Loga, and Agbegikro. While Gyaama and Banda Nkwanta experience loss of farmlands. Communities resettled in Resettlement Township B include Bator, Akanyakrom, Dokokyina and some workers of the Bui reserve (Environmental Resources Management, 2007). It is important to note that at the time of study fieldwork and write-up, the Bui Dam was located between the Brong Ahafo and Northern regions. However, as a result of the outcome of the national referendum for the creation of six new regions held in December 2018, the dam is now located between the Bono and Savannah regions since February 2019, the respective districts names remain unchanged.

The dam is designed to permanently inundate 440 km$^2$ of land including 21% of the Bui National Park at full level and 288km$^2$ at minimum operating level (Larbi et al., 2004). During construction, 240 hectares were to be required to camp workers, as contractor sites, cofferdams and river diversion (Environmental Resources Management, 2007).
Currently the Bui Dam is Ghana’s second largest hydroelectric plant with about 400 MW, after the Akosombo Dam, which was constructed in the 1960s with a capacity of 1,020 MW, followed by the Kpong Dam with a capacity of 160 MW. These three power stations together account for more than 50 percent of Ghana’s total installed capacity of 2,936 MW (Khalil, 2015).

Kirchherr et al. (2016) noted that the Bui Dam was designed to include an irrigation scheme that is expected to provide water for 30,000 hectares of land, 32 km North East of the dam, capable of feeding about 62,000 people all year round to augment the food security situation. This aspect of the dam is yet to be developed as at the time of collecting data.
5.2.3 Land Acquisition

It is noteworthy that the compulsory land acquisition processes, displacement and compensation payment are separate processes in Ghana with little participation from affected persons. Emboldened by various legal provisions, the state acquires the needed land by an Executive Instrument. Nyarko (2014, p. 14) notes that

*... compulsory land acquisition in Ghana is essentially completed upon the publication of an Executive Instrument (EI) by the President, subsequent to which all previous interests in the land are extinguished. There is no requirement for prior consultation or even notification of the land owners much less informed consent. The land owners only become involved in the process after the acquisition instrument has been published, where compensation is payable.*
This notwithstanding, previous land owners or users are often required to be hurriedly relocated for the commencement of the said infrastructure project. This situation forces people to be displaced even before the compensation process starts. Even though Article 20(2) of the Constitution requires that compulsory acquisition of property shall be made under a law that makes provision for:

I. Prompt payment of fair and adequate compensation, and

II. A right of access to the High Court by any person who has an interest in or right over the property whether direct or on appeal from any other authority, for the determination of his interest or right and the amount of compensation to which he is entitled.

Various claims of compensation for land expropriated under the State Lands Act, 1962 include market value of land taken, replacement value of land taken; and costs of disturbance, damage and grant of land value. Procedures for determining compensation payment are long, winding and, most often, not deemed satisfactory to affected persons.

In reality, compensation is paid years after displacement.

5.3 Physical and Social Characteristics of the Banda District

The Banda District was carved out of the Tain District in the Brong Ahafo Region by Legislative Instrument (LI) 2092 (Republic of Ghana, 2012) with Banda Ahenkro as its capital. Banda Ahenkro is 126 kilometres away from Sunyani, the regional capital (approximately 1 hour 47 minutes’ drive by road) (GSS, 2014)

5.3.1 Area, Size and Location

The district lies within latitudes 7° and 8° 45’ north and longitudes 2°52’ and 0°28’ west. In terms of land area, the district covers a total of 2,298.3 square kilometres out of the region’s 39,558 square kilometres. The district shares boundaries with the Bole District
(Northern Region) to the north, Tain District to the South, La Cote d’Ivoire to the East and Kintampo South District to the west.

5.3.2 Climate, Rainfall and Drainage

Average temperature is about 24.5°C (77.9°F) throughout the year and average maximum temperature is 30.9°C and minimum of 21.2°C with the hottest months being February, March and April while average annual rainfall is between 1,140 and 1,270 mm. The district has a double rainfall regime. The major rainy season occurs between April and July and the minor rainfall period occurs between September and November. Following the minor rainy season is the dry season, which starts in late November and ends in March. Relative humidity in the district is quite high averaging over 75.0 percent throughout the year.

The district is drained by the Tain, Tombe, Chin, Sidoo, Lepla, Kuhuli, Jinde, Yooloo, Fini, Seeloo and Gojongo rivers. The Black Volta marks the northern boundary of the district and that of Brong Ahafo Region with the Northern Region. This river flows throughout the year and, as a result, the second largest hydroelectric dam (Bui Dam) in Ghana has been constructed, which supports the national grid with 400 megawatt of power. The Bui Dam’s construction commenced in 2008 and became fully operational in December 2013. The dam serves as a tourist attraction site, which will attract a lot of people into the district. As a multipurpose dam, it provides water for irrigation and improves the fishing industry in Ghana. This is likely to lead to the creation of employment avenues for those within or outside the district later in the future.

5.3.3 Demographic Characteristics

The district is generally an agrarian community with almost four out of every five households (78.6%) engaged in agricultural activities including cultivation of crops,
agro-forestry (trees planting) and livestock rearing. It came out that 46.0 percent of the households undertake multiple agricultural activities. Crop farming accounts for the highest proportion of households (66.9%), followed by livestock rearing (32.3%) and tree planting (0.8%). There is no record of fishing activities as a livelihood pursued by the residents of the Banda District.

5.3.4 Archaeological Survey of Old Resettlements under Study

Three communities in the Banda District were displaced and resettled in the Resettlement Township B and are the focus of this study. An archaeological survey of them were done by the Department of Archaeology, University of Ghana in 2006 (ESIA, Annex M) and are summarized below:

Old Bui Community

The name Bui is a Mo word that means “mountain.” The ancestral home of this village is traced to Lorga (normaly spelt Loga) that is across and on the left bank of the Black Volta. Oral tradition indicates that in the past, the people of Bui operated on both sides of the river and crossed the river as quickly, easily and often as possible. Old Bui is the ancestral home of the people of present day Bongase and Banda Ahenkro, Ethnically, they are Nafanas and occupy other settlements like Makala, Dumpofie, and Sangwa in the Brong Ahafo Region.

The Bui community was sandwich by two shrines – The Mountain god and Shrine known as “Kpoloo” in Mo, which is pacified each year after the yam festival. To the people, Kpoloo was formidable in eliminating or providing directions and remedies for major natural disasters. It is said to be helpful in dealing with the problem of rainstorms (especially serious ones that rip off roofs, pull down trees and brings down houses).

---

1 This is Annex M of the final report of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment conducted by the Environmental Resources Management Ltd, January, 2007
Cows and sheep are offered for sacrifice. The meat is cooked (in water with salt only) and feasted upon on the mountain.

The second god and shrine is the Adrer or river god. The Adrer Shrine is consulted in cases of sickness, epidemics and contagious diseases such as a cough. In the case of a cough, for example, rituals (involving the use of fowls) are performed at the shrine and a quantity of water is collected from the river to be drunk and used for bathing by all the children of the village to terminate or eliminate the problem.

Perhaps, the spiritual resources accounted for the settlement of community members and they perceived success in agricultural production and life generally without modern social amenities like potable water and electricity.

**Old Dokokyina Community**

Dokokyina is believed to be founded about 200 years ago. There existed a shrine named *Senyo Kupo* (N. 36541 W2. 43129) shrine for the whole village. The shrine was in the form of a collection of stones numbering 21 pieces gathered under a Mango tree. Rituals involve the killing of sheep, goat and fowl. The meat is cooked like soup but no pepper, salt or tomato is added. Women are not allowed to eat this meat and members present are required to consume every piece of meat on site. Leftover meat is kept near the shrine under the tree for consumption the following day. Parts of the meat offered to the shrine include the liver, intestines and heart. This Shrine serves as the protector of members of the village from natural, climatic and health problems. Oral traditional has it that there was settlement even before this settlement.

**Old Akanyakrom- Bator**

The people of this village trace their homeland to the Volta Region of Ghana. The founding members led by Akyanya migrated after they were ejected from an earlier
settlement following the creation of the Volta Dam. They settled at Bator in the 1960’s and made a living by fishing on the river and doing a little farming. The people have no community gods or shrines; maybe because they were settlers and it is largely a Christian settlement.

It is evident that spirituality was a force in the settlement of the people in their previous locations. For the people of Bui, they believed the Kpoluu and Adrer gods protected them from calamities and bless them with good harvests – hence the yam festival to thank the gods for its benevolence. Similarly, the Senyo Kipo shrine was deemed a force in sustaining them. The Bator, as a community, believed in the Christian God and other private spiritual beliefs, which they believe keeps and protects them.

5.4 Research Approach

The study approaches the research with an actor-oriented approach. It investigated the governance issues from the perspectives of the various actors of the Bui Dam displacement process. Long (2003, p. 19) notes that, through the actor perspective,

(... we are dealing not only with a multiplicity of social actors but also with ‘multiple realities’, which imply potentially conflicting social and normative interests, and diverse and discontinuous configurations of knowledge, then we must look closely at the issue of just whose interpretations or models (e.g. Displaced persons, Government, Power Authority) prevail over those of others and in what circumstances (Examples are mine)

The thesis was interested in interpreting how different actors in the Bui Dam displacement and resettlement process conceive transparency, accountability and participation and how these conceptions influence outcomes. Its main task for analysis, then, was to identify and characterize differing actor practices, strategies and rationales, the conditions under which they arise, how they interlock, their viability or
effectiveness for solving displacement and resettlement problems, and their wider social ramifications.

Long (2001) argues that

“no sociological or historical study of change could be complete without: (1) a concern for the ways in which different social actors manage and interpret new elements in their lifeworlds (2) an analysis of how particular groups or individuals attempt to create space for themselves in order to pursue their own “projects” that may run parallel to, or perhaps challenge, government programmes or the interests of other intervening parties; and (3) an attempt to show how these organisational, strategic and interpretive processes can influence (and themselves be influenced by) the broader context of power and social action.

Cognizance of Long’s (2001) views was taken for this thesis. The study focused on displaced people as the actor group under study. The study ascertained the views and perceptions of the various groups of displaced people in the displacement and resettlement process. As such, the views of chiefs, men, women and youth were analysed to ascertain whether structures put in place were participatory, transparent, all-inclusive and accountable; and the effects of the process on the livelihoods of resettled people.

5.4.1 Case Study Approach

The study is a case study of Ghana’s Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process. It is aimed at understanding the peculiar governance issues of the Bui Dam from the viewpoint of displaced people as actors. It is both an extensive and intensive study of the complex governance issues associated with development.
According to Yin (2003; 2013), a case study design should be considered when: (a) the focus of the study is to answer “how” and “why” questions; (b) you cannot manipulate the behaviour of those involved in the study; (c) you want to cover contextual conditions because you believe they are relevant to the phenomenon under study; or (d) the boundaries are not clear between the phenomenon and context. The study is a contextual study of the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process and how the various actors related during the displacement and resettlement process and why they did so. This made the adoption of the case study appropriate.

Case research investigates a predefined phenomenon intensively, but does not usually (though may) define a priori constructs and relationships and aims to contribute to knowledge by relating the findings to generalizable theory (Cavaye, 1996). The study examines the issues of governance with respect to the Bui Dam project’s land acquisition processes, relocation and their effects on social groups.

The second reason for the adoption of the case study approach is because it allows for the use of multiple methods of data for the same information (Yin, 2013). Case study approaches lead to concrete, context-dependent knowledge, which can be used to build or contribute to theories.

The study studied the displacement and resettlement of the Bui Dam in terms of its goals of ensuring accountability, transparency and participation in line with its resettlement plan and recommendations from dam financiers like the World Bank and the World Commission of Dams. The essence is to contribute to formulating a framework for ensuring good governance, and to the theory and application of the political ecology theory in development-induced displacement and resettlement.
5.5 Sources of Data and Target Population

Primary data were collected from resettled persons from the Bui Resettlement Township B consisting of the Bator, Anyakakrom, Bui and Dokokyina community resettlement sites in the Banda District. The target population included active participants in the displacement and resettlement process and, as such, duty bearers such as chiefs, assembly persons, household heads, adult men and youth were interacted with through interviews and focus group discussions.

The Bui Power Authority (BPA), the mandatory state agency that implemented the displacement and resettlement, was a target as well, with the Community Relations and Grievance Officer purposefully sampled for an in-depth interview.

5.6 Research Methods

Sampling techniques reflected both features of the case study approach, which, in most cases, is qualitative. Sampling in qualitative research is purposeful because the researcher perceives particular settings, persons, or events are deliberately selected for the important information they can provide that cannot be gotten as well from other choices (Marshall, 1996; Teddlie & Yu, 2007). This is suitable for research settings where respondents are not homogenous. The study respondents include chiefs, displaced persons – men, women and youth who were involved in the displacement and resettlement process. Chiefs and elders of each resettlement community were purposefully selected to hold focus group discussions and in-depth interviews with.

On the other hand, purposeful sampling is oriented toward the development of idiographic knowledge—from generalizations and about individual cases—probability sampling is oriented toward the development of nomothetic knowledge, from
generalizations from samples to populations. Details of the various sampling techniques used are discussed in the ensuing sections.

5.6.1 Sampling for Household and Individual Interviews

Out of a total of 1216 people who were resettled by the BPA, 799 people were resettled in the Resettlement Township B in the Banda District of the Brong Ahafo region by 2013 consisting of 141 households (See: http://www.buipower.com/node/143. Retrieved April, 2017) as shown in Table 12 below:

Table 12: Bui Dam Resettlement Communities and Population in the Banda District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bui Village</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bator-Anyakakrom</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dokokyina</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
<td><strong>799</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ERM (2007)*

Another set of 36 households consisting of 100 people of the Bui National Park were settled in the same area but these do not form part of the study.

As noted by Kotrlik and Higgins (2001), inappropriate, inadequate, or excessive sample sizes continue to influence the quality and accuracy of research. As such, Yamane’s (1967, p.886) simplified formula for sample determination (Israel, 1992; Miller & Brewer, 2003) was used at 8% precision to arrive at a sample size of 130 people.

However, total number of respondents interviewed in the resettlement was 119 respondents. This includes 73 males and 46 females out of which 43 were household heads. Table 13 is an illustration of the distribution of interviews in the study communities. Sampling of respondents in each community was by simple random sampling of adults available and their readiness and willingness to participate in the interviews.
Table 13: Sex, Household and Community Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Household Heads</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bator-Akanyakrom</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bui</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dokokyina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Construct, 2017

5.6.2 Sampling for Focus Group Discussions and In-Depth Interviews

The study delved deeper into the issues raised by the surveys through focus group discussions and in-depth interviews. Sampling at this stage was purposive as the researcher identified and chose respondents he perceived to have deeper insights and experiences of the phenomenon under study. Chiefs, men, women and youth groups were purposefully sampled for focus group discussions in each study resettlement community. In each of these group discussions, discussants were requested to give lived experiences and insights of their views of the governance of the displacement and resettlement process peculiar to them as a group.

The following were the criteria used to select members for focus groups:

- Chief and elders of each of the resettled communities;
- Women leaders from all resettled communities;
- Youth leaders from all resettled communities;
- In addition, three focus group discussions were held in each of the four (4) resettled communities for the youth, women and men groups.

The study held in-depth interviews with purposefully selected persons. These persons were selected based on the roles they played during the displacement and resettlement process. All the four (3) Chiefs or heads of resettled communities were purposefully selected for the in-depth interviews because of the leadership roles they played in the process. Others include the Bui Dam Project Resettlement Officer, The Assembly
Members, and women group leaders of each resettled community. Table 14 presents the target groups contacted and the respective sampling technique and data collection technique used.

Table 14: Target Population, Sampling and Data Collection Techniques Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sampling Technique</th>
<th>Data Collection Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displaced Men, Women and Youth</td>
<td>Purposive Sampling</td>
<td>• Focus Group Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Random Sampling</td>
<td>• In-depth Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Semi-Structured Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Authorities</td>
<td>Purposive Sampling</td>
<td>• In-depth Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Heads</td>
<td>Random Sampling</td>
<td>• Semi-Structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In-depth Interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Construct, 2017

5.7 Data Collection Techniques and Procedures

5.7.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

A carefully designed semi-structured interview guide was designed and interviews held with 119 respondents. This was to estimate respondents’ views about the displacement process. Displacement governance factors and effects reviewed from secondary data review formed a substantial part of this interview guide. In terms of procedure, these interviews are the forerunners. Questions from the interview guides were explained to respondents in a language they understood well and answers recorded on paper. Data from these interviews were initially scrutinized and ensuing issues included in the focus groups and in-depth interview guides.

5.7.2 Focus Group Discussion

Focus groups are group discussions designed to learn about subjects’ perceptions on a defined area of interest. They involve as many as 12 participants and are conducted by a skilled moderator using a discussion guide (Kaplowitz & Hoehn, 2001; Krueger & Casey, 2000). Morgan (1996) adds that focus groups are a research method devoted to
data collection and not analysis. Second, it locates the inter-action in a group discussion as the source of the data. Third, it acknowledges the researcher’s active role in creating the group discussion for data collection purposes. This technique is useful, especially in soliciting group specific data and for ascertaining issues that may not be explained by the semi-structured interviews.

Focus group discussions is an invaluable technique in this study because, as noted by Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen, Guest, and Namey (2005, p. 64), they

‘…yield a large amount of information over a relatively short period of time and because it seeks to illuminate group opinion, the method is especially well suited for socio-behavioural and cultural specific research that will be used to develop and measure interventions that meet the needs of a given population’.

Focus group discussions were used to collect data from chiefs and elders, men, women and youth groups of displaced persons in the resettlement communities of Bator, Akanyakrom, Bui and Dokokyina in the Banda District. FGDs were held after the semi-structured interviews and, as such, afforded me the opportunity to probe further into some critical issues like the reasons for particular views and opinions thus soliciting data for explaining certain positions taken by respondents. Four (4) focus group discussions were held in each resettlement community. Table 15 is the distribution of focus group discussions and number of discussants in each community and group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Community group and number of participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs and Elders</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bator Akanyakrom</td>
<td>7 Men</td>
<td>12 Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanyakrom</td>
<td>6 Men</td>
<td>9 Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bui</td>
<td>6 Men</td>
<td>8 Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dokokyina</td>
<td>5 Women</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researchers’ Construct, 2017
5.7.3 In-depth Interviews (IDIs)
IDIs are deep probes into specific areas of concern. Some pertinent issues that emerged from the semi-structured questionnaires and needed further clarification were probed in these detail interviews. In in-depth interviews, relatively fewer is considered to be of greater importance to the study are selected and investigated in much greater detail. (Legard, Keegan, & Ward, 2003). In-depth interviews provide access to the meanings people attribute to their experiences and social world (Legard et al., 2003).

5.7.4 Secondary Data Review
Hart (2001, p. 1) stressed that ‘the use of literature review is to justify the particular approach to the topic, the selection of the methods, and the demonstration that this research contributes to something new’. This study made use of a variety of secondary sources, which Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2009) suggest could include documentary data, survey data and readily available external data sources such as the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) Report and the Resettlement Planning Framework of the Bui Dam Project as well as related previous academic work on the dam. Secondary, documentary analysis was extensively carried out during the study on the theories and models of displacement and resettlement as well as international protocols to minimize the effects of displacement.

It enabled the study to acknowledge the contributions of earlier works and chart a way forward in all stages. As such, many books, journals, and the internet sources among other sources on the subject matter were critically reviewed.

5.8 Data Analysis
Data analysis is summarizing data and organizing it in such a manner that research questions are answered (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2013). It involves the searching of
patterns of relationship that exist among data-groups (Karma, 1999) as well as examining for consistencies and inconsistencies between knowledgeable informants and finding out why informants agree or disagree on issues on the subject matter (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Even though, the study is a qualitative approach, it adopted some basic statistical methods. This made data analysis to encompass both breadth and depth analysis of the study in a single research (Patton, 2005; Teddlie & Yu, 2007).

Data from semi-structured questionnaires were coded and analysed with the simple statistical methods such as the Likert scale and Relative Importance Index and percentages to establish the various perspectives of participation, accountability and equity from the actors. This was supported by discussions from data obtained from in-depth interviews and focus group discussions and ensured that data was analysed holistically for optimal application to theory and practical development issues.

In terms of the process in the analysis of qualitative data, the study agrees with Patton (2002, p. 426) that:

*Unlike quantitative data in which distinction between data collection and analysis is clear, this distinction is less absolute in the collection and analysis of qualitative data. This is due to the fluid and emergent nature of naturalistic inquiry. During the field work, ideas about directions for analysis will occur. Patterns take shape and possible themes spring to mind. These give rise to the emergence of hypotheses, which intend inform subsequent fieldwork. While early stages of fieldwork are data generative in nature, later stages bring findings to closure through confirmatory data collection. This further leads to deepening understanding of issues and confirming or disconfirming patterns that seem to have appeared.*

In line with this view, data was collected in three stages and at each stage deeper probes were made into issues to ensure both internal validity and consistency of the data
The first stage being the conducting of semi-structured interview to get broad ideas about the topic from displaced persons of the Bui Dam project.

Preliminary analysis of these interviews informed the nature of probes to be made in the focus groups discussions. As such, the ensued focus group interviews and in-depth interviews with women groups, chiefs and elders and youth groups validated or clarified earlier data collected through the semi-structured interviews. Deeper explanations were obtained on some of the issues merely mentioned in the semi-structured interviews.

5.9 Stakeholder Power Analysis

Stakeholder analysis as a process that: i) defines aspects of a social and natural phenomenon affected by a decision or action; ii) identifies individuals, groups and organisations who are affected by or can affect those parts of the phenomenon (this may include non-human and non-living entities and future generations); and iii) prioritises these individuals and groups for involvement in the decision-making process (Reed et al., 2009)

Power Analysis was used to analyse the perspectives of resettlement outcomes among the various social groups of displaced persons like men, women and youth. This was to assess the effect of the structures, the process and outcomes from the perspectives of the actors in relation to the land acquisition process, the displacement process and the effects on the social groups of displaced persons.

Stakeholder Power Analysis was done by assessing the power and interests of stakeholders in seeking good governance in the structure. The power and interests of displaced groups were assessed against the power and interests of BPA in process. It involves the effects of the displacement processes among the various social groups of displaced persons. This was done by assessing the effects of participation and
accountability in the land acquisition and displacement processes on the chiefs and
elders, men, women and youth groups of displaced persons. The essence is the assess
displaced persons’ perceptions of equity in displacement benefits as well as the
perceived causes in the displacement and resettlement.

5.10 Quality Control for Data Reliability and Validity

Validity is the extent to which a measurement technique measures what it purports to
measure. It is a demonstration that the explanation of a particular event, issue or set of
data that a piece of research provides can actually be sustained by the data. That is the
appropriateness and usefulness of the specific inferences (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison,
2013)

Internal validity refers to ‘the extent to which the correct cause-and-effect relationships
have been established’ (Tharenou, Donohue, & Cooper, 2007, p. 81). The researcher’s
interpretation of data could affect the internal validity of the research in a case study
approach due to his/her own biases and assumption. Therefore, multiple sources of data
and techniques are applied to triangulate the data (Silverman, 1998). In addition, daily
recaps of the main issues and follow-up on issues of controversy in the field, as well as
validation of main findings in the case study community are all to ensure that the data
collected were valid and reliable.

The research was cognizant of the sensitivity of displacement and resettlement issues
and, as such, developed a strong rapport with respondents to enabled dispassionate
discussions of issues. Research field assistants consisted of people who know the terrain
and culture of the people in the various communities well and were trained for the tasks.

External validity refers to ‘the extent to which findings drawn from one group are
generalizable or applicable to other groups or settings’ (Tharenou, Donohue, & Cooper,
The resulting detailed understanding of the processes and their context allowed the researcher to specify behaviours that occur in certain conditions. This is because generalization in case study approaches “has to do with extrapolation to theoretical propositions and not to populations” (Tharenou, Donohue & Cooper, 2007, p. 82).

5.11 Ethical Considerations

Guillemin and Gillam (2004) note that ethics in social research include procedural ethics, which usually involves seeking approval from a relevant ethics committee to undertake research involving humans; and (b) “ethics in practice” or the everyday ethical issues that arise in the doing of research as well as (c) adhering to professional codes of various professional bodies.

In the conduct of this research due procedural ethics were observed by pre-visits to resettlement sites to be studied where I discussed the research objectives and procedures with the respective chiefs and opinion leaders of the study communities. These meetings culminating into the recruitment of community research assistants, scheduling of interviews and arrangement for accommodation of researchers. Community entry protocols were therefore duly observed.

Similarly, BPA offices at Bui was visited and a verbal clearance request made. However, a formal clearance by BPA to my formal requests sent is yet to be received. In spite of this, due ethical considerations were observed to ensure confidentiality, privacy and respect for respondents and seeking their consent in the data collection process. Professional research ethics such as avoiding plagiarism, data falsification and deceit guided the entire thesis process.
5.12 A Summary of Data Collection Process

Data collection began with the training of three (3) graduate assistants as research assistants. The 2-day training involved educating them on the types of data needed, the use of data collection instruments and community entry techniques. This was followed by a visit from March to April, 2017 to Bui Resettlement Township B in the Banda district to familiarised ourselves with the social and physical environment and pre-tested our data collection instruments. The semi-structured interviews were conducted at this stage as well with the help of three assistants who were recruited from the community. These assistants enabled us to overcome the language barriers of Ewe, Mo and Banda. The research team visited the offices of the Bui Power Authority to meet up with officials managing the dam. Further documents of introduction were requested, which were submitted via email as directed.

A review of the preliminary data collection process was done and an extensive data collection process was embarked upon in April, 2017. In each of the resettlement communities of Bui, Bator-Anyakakrom and Dokoyina; four focus group discussions were held involving the chief and elders, men, women and youth groups. In all, 12 focus groups discussions were held involving 115 discussants – 67 males and 48 females.

Respondents covered each settlement community and included both household heads and women. Heads of household were important respondents because of their involvement in the displacement process; and, as heads, they could appropriately assess the livelihood changes with the resettlement.

A summary of how these data collection techniques were used with regards to the study objectives are shown Table 16.
5.13 Chapter Summary

This chapter puts the study area into perspective. It describes the study area and gives a brief background information of the Bui Dam project.

This is followed by an illustration of methodology of the study. It outlines the sampling procedures used, and the techniques of data collection and analysis. The study is premised on the fact that making meaning in social research is co-created by respondents through interviews and discussions as they cannot be subjected to the rigours of pure research for objective reality (Rosenberg, 2008). Social arrangements and interactions between the research team and respondents helped unearth the nuances
of displacement and resettlement structural and power dynamics of actors, which form
the crux of the study. As a result, the research was largely qualitative and participatory
with tokens of qualitative data to complement. The extensive use of the qualitative
approach was due to the nature of the study.

Secondary data from relevant documents were reviewed extensively and intensively to
inform the basis and conclusions of the research. The literature review enabled me to
appreciate the gaps and inadequacies of the resettlements and the opportunities that
exist to improve resettlement schemes. It contributed to the choices of theory and
models as well as research techniques employed.

The next chapter is a presentation and analysis of the primary data collected by the
methods discussed in this chapter.
CHAPTER SIX

MAIN FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

6.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings to the research questions the perspectives of displaced people as an actor group and from relevant documentary data. The chapter begins with a demographic description of respondents as regards to their age, sex distribution and educational levels as well as their livelihood activities as background information. Data is analyzed in thematic areas in line with the study objectives to ensure clarity.

6.1 The Bui Dam’s Displacement and Resettlement Governance Structures and Policies

6.1.1 Introduction

This section presents the field data on the structures and processes involved in the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process. This thesis defines displacement and resettlement governance the overarching framework of laws, regulations, and customs, as well as the processes of designed to ensure effective engagement of stakeholders (especially displaced people) in the implementation process. Giddens structuration model (1984) outlined three components: first, there are the structures, the structural properties of the organisational social setting that form the rules and patterns that bind social systems through time and space; second, there are the interactional systems, and thirdly there are the modalities or meaning generating processes that mediate the generation and reproduction of relatively similar social practices across time and space (Barratt-Pugh, 2007). Bartolome et al. (2000) note that the best resettlement plans would fail if they are not backed by strong and appropriate institutions to implement them. In short, institutions and agents must be appropriate and have the capacity to carry out the required and intended role.
In finding answers to the objective one of the study, the structure of the Bui Dam’s displacement process, its mechanisms, as well as the interaction between actors in relation to governance, are presented.

The essence is to examine the extent to which structures or institutions set up to effect the displacement process affects the relationship between actors in the displacement process. The structure of a system could be an enabling or inhibiting factor of governance. It is the frame that shapes policy processes and governs the decision-making and implementation process of any system. In the context of the thesis, the structure around which displacement decisions are made as well as their implementation processes are discussed.

It presents findings of various stakeholders’ perceptions of the structure and process as well as an assessment of their capabilities in seeking and demanding good governance under the structure are discussed. The structural and policy arrangements of the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process gleaned from focus group discussions, in-depth interviews with displaced persons and review of secondary data are summarised in Table 17.

**Table 17: Structural and Policy Arrangements of the Bui Dam Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Laws and Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Regulatory &amp; Development Agencies e.g. EPA, LC, WRC, MoE, MoH etc.</td>
<td>Constitution of Ghana, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations &amp; Grievance Officer</td>
<td>BPA Law 740, 2007 Section 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount Chiefs of affected areas</td>
<td>Executive Instrument 70, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Chiefs of Displaced Communities</td>
<td>WB Operational Policy 04.12, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Women Leaders</td>
<td>ESIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA Officials</td>
<td>Resettlement Planning Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Heads</td>
<td>Resettlement Action Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field interviews and secondary data review, 2017.*
Structurally, BPA acted as the hub agency relating laterally with relevant mandatory state institutions like the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Water Resources Commission (WRC) and other state agencies at the national, regional and district levels.

The Paramount Chief of Banda Ahenkro as well as some family heads whose lands were compulsorily acquired were consulted for compensation and resettlement arrangements. Similarly, the chiefs and opinion leaders of the resettlement communities were involved variously to solicit their opinions and cooperation in the D & R process.

Community Chiefs of the displaced communities of Bator-Anyakakrom, Bui and Dokokyina were next in the structure. These chiefs interacted variously with BPA officials in the resettlement process. Chiefs were the liaisons persons between BPA and their community members. The community chiefs and elders were the first line contact persons with BPA during the resettlement process. Issues were discussed with them first and they would, in turn, discuss them with their respective community members.

To enable chiefs to solicit enough relevant views and get a consensus, women groups were formed in each resettlement community to get the women’s view as well. The Youth Leadership Committee (LYC) was formed to collate all relevant concerns from all displaced people. This committee met regularly, especially when there was a stalemate between dam-affected community chiefs and BPA.

To ensure that all grievances and concerns are met, a Grievance Office was established at the BPA premises where not only displaced persons but anyone could call in and lay a complaint. To complement this, BPA had an active website where affected people could lodge complaints and be updated about happenings in the displacement and resettlement processes.
These structures were put within the broader legal frameworks of the 1992 4th Republican Constitution of Ghana, The BPA Act 740, 2007 and the EI 70, 2008, which compulsorily acquired the lands causing the displacement and resettlement.

6.1.2 The Bui Power Authority

The displacement process started with the Bui Dam Development Committee (BDC), which culminated into the Bui Power Authority (BPA) by Act 740, 2007. This BPA had a wide range of powers including causing the compulsory acquisition of the needed lands for the proper functioning of the Authority by the President under Article 20 of the Constitution. The BPA is the central body coordinating with Statutory Bodies such as the Environmental Protection Agency, Water Resources Commission, Town and Country Planning and The Lands Commission to meet all regulatory requirements.

It is the Authority of the Republic, among other functions, to acquire lands necessary for the Bui Dam construction; pay compensation to dam affected people who have had lost their economic assets; and resettle people who have been displaced by the dam. Displaced persons can be described as major stakeholders in the displacement and resettlement process as spelled out in Articles 22 to 24 of the Act. The BPA was, therefore, a major stakeholder in the displacement and resettlement of the displaced people.

As such, by the opinion of the Authority, a total land area of 455,912 acres was compulsorily acquired by Executive Instrument 70, 2008 by the President causing the displacement of 1,216 persons in eight villages and parts of the Bui Game Reserve. This marked the beginning of the displacement and resettlement process by the project. The BPA Act empowers it to compensate persons affected by the lands acquired in accordance with the laws of the land.
On resettlement, Section 24 of the BPA Act specifically outlines that:

_The Government shall take reasonable measures to assist in the resettlement of the people inhabiting lands liable to be inundated and lands adjacent those lands which are needed by the Authority for the performance of its functions, and the Minister shall ensure that so far as is practicable, a person does not suffer undue hardship or is deprived of the necessary public amenities, as a result of the resettlement._

The BPA acted on behalf of Government and therefore settled affected persons on behalf of the State. BPA had the responsibility to ensure that it works closely with other state institutions like the Lands Commission, Environmental Protection Agency and other relevant governmental institutions at the national level as regards the compulsory land acquisition. These national institutions had constitutional mandatory roles pertaining to resettlement. The Land Valuation Division of the Land Commission has the constitutional mandate to determine the values of land and land related resources, while the Environmental Protection Agency must ensure that BPA activities are environmentally sound. Displaced communities are not involved at all in this stage.

Backed by the Act and acting on behalf of the Government of the Republic, BPA had considerable power in planning and implementing the resettlement process. It is answerable to the President of the Republic and to other state authorities like the Environmental Protection Agency and the Ministry of Finance in seeking clearance for the project. Essential documents like the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, Resettlement Planning Frameworks and the Resettlement Action Plan can be described as conditionalities to meet national and international standards and best practices for development-induced displacement and resettlements.
6.1.3 National Policy and Regulatory Frameworks

The Bui Dam project needed to work closely with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Water Resources Commission (WRC) and The Lands Commission (LC), Town and Country Planning for various permits and clearance. To meet some of the conditions of the EPA, it had to produce various policy frameworks. With regards to resettlement, the World Bank’s Policy on forced resettlement was adopted.

An official of BPA noted that

*We wanted the best for our stakeholders; as such, we adopted the World Bank’s standards on forced resettlement. By that were determined not to let any displaced person become worse off because of the dam. We also adopted a stakeholder participatory approach to solicit views from affected Chiefs and opinion leaders, displaced persons, District Assemblies etc. All such of resettlement policy frameworks were developed with various inputs from all our stakeholders (BPA Official, Bui, 2017)*

The Bui Power Authority adopted the World Bank Standards for its resettlement. The World Bank in its “Involuntary Resettlement Sourcebook 2004” Operational Policy (OP) 4.12 has the following overall policy objectives:

**Box 4: Summary of World Bank Resettlement Policy; OP 4.12**

(a) Involuntary resettlement should be avoided where feasible, or minimized, exploring all viable alternative project designs.

(b) Where it is not feasible to avoid resettlement, resettlement activities should be conceived and executed as sustainable development programmes, providing sufficient investment resources to enable the persons displaced by the project to share in project benefits. . .

(c) Displaced persons should be assisted in their efforts to improve their livelihoods and standards of living or at least to restore them, in real terms, to pre-displacement levels or to levels prevailing prior to the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher” World Bank (2004, p. xxiii)
The adoption of these policy guidelines means that the BPA committed itself to being transparent, open and accountable to displaced persons in ensuring that the displacement process does not adversely affect their livelihoods or have least adverse effects.

Even though the World Bank Standards for resettlement was adopted, there was the need to support with various national legal and policy framework governing resettlement in Ghana. As such, the Environmental Resources Management Limited in 2005 to plan crucial policy documents and frameworks for the project. These policy frameworks were necessary to meet the EPA standards. Some of the key policy documents are Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), The Resettlement Planning Framework (RPF) and the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) and are discussed in the ensuing sections.


The ESIA document gave an overview of all envisaged environmental and social effects of the project and how they intended mitigating the negative impacts. It is a broad based document indicating the various impacts the project would have.

The ESIA document was produced through a wide stakeholder consultation at the district and national level. This document was exhaustive in spelling out how various issues (ranging from legal frameworks, hydraulic and hydrological works, environmental safety measures and resettlement of dam affected people). It was from the ESIA that the RPF and RAP were drawn. Studies were done by Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) and Environmental Resources Management Limited in which affected community baseline data were collected. Data was collected on community livelihood activities and expectations.
6.1.5 Resettlement Planning Framework (RPF) and Resettlement Action Plan

BPA officials proudly noted in an interview that there was an elaborate resettlement framework and resettlement action plan before resettlement. This, BPA noted, is unprecedented in the resettlement history in Ghana.

The RPF is the BPA resettlement policy document that outlines the processes and principles for resettlement to achieve the above objective, and includes frameworks for valuing and compensating assets, eligibility and resettlement measures for affected households, organizational responsibilities, as well as grievance, and monitoring and evaluation procedures.

A lot was put in education and the proper resettlement of dam affected people.

The RPF and the RAPs are detailed policy documents and are made public and these documents were planned with the views of all stakeholders (BPA Official, 2017)

The RPF (2007) is the resettlement framework with the main objective to:

…ensure that the Bui Dam Project improves people’s economic opportunities and living conditions and minimizes adverse impacts while also providing remedial measures for those adverse impacts that are unavoidable, particularly among the communities most directly affected by resettlement either through physical displacement or loss of economic resources. (ERM, RPF 2007: i)

Operational plans of this objective were espoused in the Resettlement Action Plan developed in 2009. Both the RPF and RAP categorised resettlement and compensation packages into three, namely:
- **Group 1: Resettled Households.** Resettled households will be entitled to the full complement of resettlement and rehabilitation measures, and will receive compensation on the basis of their assets inventory.

- **Group 2: Households losing land only.** Those households losing land but not requiring physical resettlement will be eligible to receive compensation for loss of assets (crops and trees). Those households losing a large portion of their land (i.e., more than 20%), will be entitled to certain rehabilitation measures.

- **Group 3: Host Communities.** Those households living at the host sites for resettlement will be affected by the resettlement and will be eligible for some rehabilitation measures (Environmental Resources Management, 2007, p. 83).

With these policy frameworks, BPA noted they had put in place sound structures that ensured good governance in the displacement process.

An official remarked

> All these policies were not just in place but adequately explained to stakeholders and I think we also did our part to ensure that they were properly resettled (BPA Official, 2017).

Displaced people were consulted in the selection of resettlement sites and design of houses. However, their inputs were not accepted by BPA because they wanted them to settle together so that the provision of social infrastructure such as potable water, electricity, health and schools could be easily provided. Table 18 is a summary of the main activities of the resettlement process.
Even though displaced persons understood the BPA’s point, they noted they could have been settled together on fertile lands in communities like Faoman or integrated into the Bongase community or a community where they could continue with their fishing and farming livelihood activities. They noted the present resettlement site does not provide as many sources of livelihood as their previous resettlement or if their resettled at preferred sites. BPA, however, paid heed for their plea to add a room each to number of rooms displaced people were to be compensated for. This was to recompense for their loss of store rooms, pens and common rooms.

### 6.1.6 Grievance Officer

There was a grievance officer located at BPA premises for all stakeholders to make complaints to about concerns for possible redress. Discussions with displaced people indicated that there was about 90% awareness of the existence of this officer to displaced people and about 30% patronage of it. Displaced people noted that they
formally complained about the poor cost of their compensations especially, but no change occurred.

6.1.7 Traditional Authorities

Through focus group discussions and in-depth interviews, it was noted that Chiefs were key partners in the displacement and resettlement process. They were the most widely consulted people because of their roles as community heads and land owners in some cases.

The Paramount Chief of Banda Traditional area as well as the respective chiefs of displaced communities were consulted variously through meetings with BPA officials. Even though they noted their views were seldom accepted, they were, however, frequently consulted.

Their main strength was that they could mobilize people and convey messages from their constituents to BPA Officials and vice-versa. Their major weakness was that they had little or no power to make BPA accept contrary views; but simply discuss what BPA brings on the table: as such, BPA’s view always prevailed. The most remarkable suggestion they made that was accepted, was that half of their resettlement funds should be used to connect electricity from the national grid to the resettlement area.

As community leaders, they had the responsibility to convey community views to BPA officials even if they would not be accepted. They noted, however, that there was little room to change the decisions of BPA. BPA stacked the planned strategies and timelines with very little room for flexibility.

It was noted that one big weakest was their illiteracy and ignorance about resettlement issues. But for the Ghana Dams Dialogue (GDD) that facilitated displaced persons to
visit to the Akosombo and Kpong dams to interact and learn some from their experiences; perhaps things would have been worse. They had poor civic education and techniques for negotiating and advocating.

It is however, noteworthy that other traditional leaders such as shrine priests, spiritual healers, and herbalists were not targeted. As a result, indigenous peoples’ world views and spiritual wellbeing may not have been well articulated and inculcated in the displacement process.

6.1.8 Community Men

Respondents noted a wide cross-section of men and women involved. The Assembly person and Unit Committees notwithstanding, household heads and women heads were targeted and meetings held with them. Men and women were actors as community associations such as fishermen and farmer associations were variously consulted.

Men were most involved in the process by virtue of most of them being household heads and community chiefs and elders. They noted they were variously involved and have always been contacted since the inception of the dam construction.

Like the chiefs and elders, men noted meetings were more of persuading them to accept whatever government says for the benefit of mother Ghana. Meetings were therefore more of appeals to accept whatever BPA tables than to solicit their views on issues at stake.

They noted more men than women benefitted from the compensation packages even though the compensation packages were too meagre to do anything meaningful for a livelihood and have impoverished them. They could not make very useful inputs into the process because they did not know much about resettlement. Even then, their suggestion of being relocated at Faoman by a section of them was not accepted because
BPA had convinced them that 'government had planned to settle them together at one place for the livelihood project'. This denotes that displaced persons were powerless in negotiating and therefore participated as mere consumers of information from BPA officials.

6.1.9 Community Women

Women noted they were grouped into groups for the purposes of consultation and were often consulted like the other groups in terms of information sharing. They were the least considered as they were often the last to be consulted and were often persuaded to consider decisions already taken by the other groups consulted earlier.

They had hope the Livelihood Enhancement Programme would enhance their living far beyond pre-resettlement livelihoods as they were promised training in fish processing, hairdressing, credit management and other livelihood development areas, which were not available at the old settlements and the previous dam resettlements of Akosombo and Kpong people did not have such. They had so much trust that BPA would improve their livelihoods as described. Again, they noted they did know of any alternatives to suggest in during meetings even.

6.1.10 Community Youth

To ensure that the youth adequately participated, the Youth Leadership Committee (YLC) was established by the insistence of BPA to enable the youth and all other interested persons deliberate on issues concerning them for the attention of BPA. They would normally meet to discuss issues for chiefs to deliberate with BPA officials and deliberate feedback from meetings with chiefs and elders.

Their strength was their capability to boycott, protest or cause mayhem and distort the displacement process and, as such, they were considered a formidable group. Their
main interest was the restoration of their livelihoods. Accordingly, they were assured by BPA officials that the Livelihood Enhancement Programme (LEP) would give them a variety of livelihood programmes if they relocated. The main weakness of the YLC is that it was unable to hold BPA officials to honour their promises and, as such, they have to look for alternatives ways of living; prominent among which is outmigration to other communities.

In terms of structural arrangements to reach out to all actors involved, the Bui Dam’s process was well-structured to ensure participation by all actors at all levels, receive feedback and be open to displaced people. Chiefs and elders of resettlement communities as well as community men women and youth groups were all involved unlike the Akosombo Dam’s resettlement process where VRA took sole responsibility of the resettlement process (Asiama, 2015a; Tsikata, 2012). However, authentic participation of displaced people in the process was not realised largely because of the power differences between BPA and displaced people as actors. This is discussed in the ensuing paragraphs.

6.2 Actor Mapping and Power Analysis

The relationship between actors in a given structure depends on the power relationship between them. The ability of an actor to demand or seek redress or influence a decision or contribute meaningfully depends on the power relations. Governance involves negotiations, consultations, advocacies and resistances that actors exercise to influence other actors.

Through focus group discussions, the power relations between the displaced people (chiefs, men and women) on one hand, and the BPA on the other, were analysed in an Actor Power Analysis Matrix shown in Table 19.
All groups of displaced people noted that, in terms of power relations, BPA overpowered them. Power over relations refer to a traditional dominance model where decision making is characterized by control, instrumentalism, and self-interest (Berger, 2005; Weaver, 2001).

This means BPA influenced the outcomes of the decisions as displaced people had little influence over them. Interactions between BPA and displaced people was not one in which displaced people could make insightfully inputs concerning their interests. Therefore, in most cases BPA’s interests prevailed. Being the legitimate state institution with responsibilities for resettling displaced people couple with its financial control and professional experts, BPA had power over all groups of displaced people. As such its interests such as ensuring that their timely relocations, sites of relocation and house styles are perpetuated with very little resistance from displaced persons.

Table 19 is a summary of the power relationship between BPA as an actor and the community actors.
These laws, policy and frameworks viewed with the structuration theory, form the signification, control and legitimacy of the BPA. It allocates both authoritative and resource power to the Bui Authority. Authoritative power includes the power to construct the dam over people’s interest, the authoritative power to resettle dam affected people on behalf of Government among others. The BPA had resource power as monies for resettlement were channelled through it. Through these powers, it tends to control or dominate other actors to conform to its rules or not. These laws, policies and

**Table 19: Actor Power Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTOR</th>
<th>MAIN INTEREST</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>BPA RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER ACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPA</td>
<td>• Resettlement on schedule</td>
<td>• BPA Law</td>
<td>• Power Over displaced persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pave way for smooth construction</td>
<td>• Resourced financially and professionally</td>
<td>• Top-down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant State Institutions (e.g. EPA, LC, RCC)</td>
<td>• Relevant state laws and standards are met by BPA</td>
<td>• State Laws</td>
<td>• Power with State Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expertize</td>
<td>• Bureaucratic and Legalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can sanction BPA</td>
<td>• Ensured compliance by BPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs Elders</td>
<td>• Land Possession</td>
<td>• Community Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retain status as Chiefs</td>
<td>• Landlords</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Responsible representatives of people</td>
<td>• Can mobilize community for resistance, riots etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>• Livelihoods</td>
<td>• Family/Household Heads</td>
<td>• Power Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Farmlands and Agricultural landlords</td>
<td>• Consultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>• Livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to riot or resist</td>
<td>• Power Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>• Livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Power Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Focus Group Discussions and In-depth Interviews, 2017*
framework as well as the permits obtained gave BPA the recognition and legitimacy. The extent to which BPA interacts with the other actors, particularly, displaced persons, is the core of this work.

A critical review of structures put in place in the displacement and resettlement process reveals power imbalances between state actors and displaced people. State institutions have legitimate power backed by laws that must be followed; while displaced persons depend on their experiences and coalitions, which may not be recognised by the state. While the law establishes these institutions to be obeyed by all, displaced persons have no such power. This confirms Fox's (2007) assertion that institutions may nominally recognize rights that actors, because of imbalances in power relations, are not able to exercise in practice. Conversely, actors may be empowered in the sense of having the experience and capacity to exercise rights, while lacking institutionally recognized opportunities to do so (Fox, 2007, p.335).

Interviews with some dam affected people have it they had they had no enough power to back their demands. In one of the men’s focus group discussions, the following assertion was made by a man of about 54 years.

*What power do we have if the state has empowered BPA to displaced us? Most cases in our discussions, they refer to the law and act accordingly and we must obey…we have no option (FGD with men, Township B, 2017).*

This means displaced people were not enlightened enough by law to deliberate assertively with BPA in particular, let alone to demand answers them.

It was again noted that
We did all we could to ensure that our views count in the planning and implementation process. We lobbied, we begged, we complained, petitioned but we were not successful and what else can we do? (Chief, Bui township B, 2017)

The above statement was made in relation to the choice of resettlement site and absence of the Livelihood Enhancement Programme, which is very prominent in the Resettlement Planning Framework and Resettlement Action Plan. Dam affected people lamented they ‘can only bark but cannot bite’ and, as such, cannot hold BPA answerable even though they know they are responsible. BPA’s Livelihood Enhancement Programme (LED) have not started yet even though displaced people have been relocated to their new settlements since 2013. This, according to community members, has put untold hardships, especially on the hitherto fishermen now settlement on land. However, resettled persons do not have the power to ensure that BPA fulfils its promise.

Second, the structure lays emphasis on the engagement with displaced people only after the lands have been acquired. In the case of compulsory acquisition in Ghana and that of the Bui Dam in particular, displaced persons are consulted in the enumerating of properties to be compensated for and to receive compensation determined by the Land Valuation Division of the Lands Commission (Asiama, 2015a, 2015b). There is not ample participation and accountability opportunities for displaced people to negotiate sums to be paid and timelines for payment, for instance. What was to be compensated for, at what costs and when compensation was to be paid are not-negotiable affected people. They are determined by law. Statutory state institutions such the Land Valuation Division of the Ghana Lands Commission value of agricultural lands and houses alone. Compensatory rates were determined by law and displaced persons had to challenge these rates in Court if they were not satisfied. It is noteworthy that the compensated packages do not include communal resources such as forest, hunting ranches on which many rural poor depend on were not counted and payments characterised by delays.
resulting in devalued sums. The structure of the resettlement process gives more credence to accountability of BPA to the regulatory bodies and other agencies than displaced people. This is because they were not under compulsion under any law to be responsible to displaced people as they are to the regulatory bodies like EPA. Similarly, the Lands Commission was not under any compulsion to explain its function to displaced people even though the Bui Dam project adopted the World Bank’s OP/BP 4.12 best practices to prevent the resettlement inadequacies associated with previous dam-induced resettlements. Asiama (2015) and the field survey indicated that dam affected people gave their opinions on resettlement sites, resettlement house designs and approved resettlement houses. This is a great improvement over the Akosombo resettlement as displaced persons were not involved at all in the planning and implementation of the resettlement project.

6.3 Examining the Conditions and Strategies for Good Governance

Are there practical spaces of participation and accountability in the myriad of all these policy and legal frameworks and regulations? The World Bank (2004), Cernea (2004) and WCD (2000) have all advocated for appropriate legal and policy frameworks and regulations that would promote effective participation and accountability.


On a scale of five (5), the study assessed the above CSFs of good governance in displacement and resettlement schemes with the use of a Relative Importance Index (RII). The Relative Importance Index is used to measure the importance attached to Critical Success Factors (CSFs) of a project. It is calculated as:

\[
RII = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \frac{a_i n_i}{5N}
\]

Where:

\(a\) = constant expressing the weight given to each factor by the respondents (ranging from 1 to 5).

\(n\) = frequency of each response

5 = a constant (i.e. 5 in this case because of the rating range of 1-5), and

\(N\) = total number of respondents (in this study 119 respondents). The RII value had a range from 0 to 1 (0 not inclusive), the higher the value of RII, the more significant the factor is to displaced persons in the resettlement process.

However, only 119 questions were found to be credible after data coding and editing. Data for this section was collected and computed based on 119 semi-structured
interviews found credible. Respondents ranked the critical factors on a scale of five and the results are shown in Table 20.

### Table 20: Assessing the Critical Factors for Good Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Rates</th>
<th>RII</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of Stakeholders</td>
<td>0 0 0 72 47</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>0 0 12 48 59</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law</td>
<td>0 12 61 34 12</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Consultations</td>
<td>0 21 18 60 20</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Pluralism</td>
<td>0 27 48 34 10</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in decision implementation strategies</td>
<td>0 0 69 41 9</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus Building</td>
<td>0 0 68 41 10</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear mandate of responsibilities of Stakeholders</td>
<td>0 21 67 31 0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring effective Communication between and among stakeholders</td>
<td>0 34 43 42 0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic levels</td>
<td>0 22 73 24 0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>0 29 71 19 0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Grievance System</td>
<td>0 38 69 12 0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Planning</td>
<td>34 1 57 12 15</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Trust and Respect among Stakeholders</td>
<td>9 42 40 28 0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient and Effective</td>
<td>0 49 58 12 0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness of Institutions to All e.g. Poorer Groups</td>
<td>17 38 49 5 10</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Negotiations</td>
<td>18 39 46 16 0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral and Cultural Value</td>
<td>27 32 54 6 0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample time for Consultations and Deliberations with others</td>
<td>41 32 43 3 0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank: [1= No extent, 2= Very low extent, 3= low extent, 4= high extent, 5= Very high extent]  
*Source: Semi-Structured Interviews, 2017*
Table 20 indicates that only 5 CSFs (with scores of 0.7 and above) were ranked as having significantly contributed to the success of the displacement and resettlement from the perspectives of the displaced people. It means, from the perspectives of respondents, as many as 14 Critical Success Factors of the process were not met. This means on the whole, the displacement process not characterised by good governance principles.

The legitimacy of stakeholders was not doubted by respondents as, in their view, the right people were chosen to work with. Dwevidi (2002) notes that, for the existence of good governments, actors must be legitimately chosen and recognised by all stakeholders. This ensured that almost all categories of people were represented hence the high Relative Importance Index of 0.87899. However, the capabilities of these representatives was an issue of concern. All focus group discussants lamented their lack of power in the negotiation process. It was noted that there was a lack of formal education and knowledge on resettlement rights and, as such, they could not have negotiated better. Realising somewhere along in the negotiation process that they needed external support, they proposed the hiring of a consultant or a legal counsel to lead them but poverty and discouragement from some BPA officials prevented the realization of it.

Secondly, the high RII of 8.9 on public participation and frequent consultation’s RII of 0.73277 in the table means respondents felt they participated in the process and were consulted frequently, but barely reached consensus on many cases. Mention was made of very frequent meetings of about three times a week with other stakeholders, especially the BPA but again there was a failure to reach consensus on some pertinent issues. Issues for which they could not reach consensus included costs of compensation,
choices of places of resettlement and timelines of implementation. Actors however reached consensus on the decisions to add a room each in the resettlement site to compensate for losses of animal houses, use part of a year’s remittance money to power electricity to the resettlement site among others. However, participation was merely cosmetic, as they were always persuaded to agree with displacement proposals and schedules without questions. Details of participation are discussed later in this chapter.

Other significant RII were Rule of Law, democratic pluralism and frequent consultation indices of 0.8437, 0.73277 and 0.70252, respectively. There were individual freedoms and rights of associations as displaced people, but as concluded, “they had no power to make significant inputs” in the process. It was noted that

“...BPA were tired not of meeting us at all. They resettlement officers were always ready to hear our concerns. We, as leaders also, had to make our concerns known to them but we could not push beyond that. BPA would refer to their documents but we had none to refer to. So, we were powerless. We had the chance to make inputs but we had not the power to do that” (Elder, Akanyakrom, 2017)

These five significant factors indicate that, structurally, the Bui Dam Displacement and Resettlement process has significantly laid down process for good governance, especially for voice and participation. Dam affected people had the opportunity to express their views. This is an immense improvement over the case of the Akosombo Dam process as it gave the dam affected people the opportunity to be heard and/or make inputs (Chambers, 1970; Tsikata, 2012).

Price (2015) holds that displacement would be successful if the displacement process allows transparent and fair negotiations with all actors, especially displacement persons. Transparency in the form of access to adequate information on the project such
as resettlement costs estimates was poor. Reports were made of suspicion of BPA officials reneging on agreed decisions of previous meetings. The fact that BPA discouraged displaced persons from getting a legal counsel or ‘consults’ on displacement questions the activities of BPA. In one of the in-depth interview a woman leader in Bui noted that

“...The BPA officials were very vigilant of us during the negotiations time. Any visitor who came us, they like to know who he was, what he came for and what he said. This made us a bit suspicious. If you doing the right thing why should be concern about outsiders?” (Woman Leader, Township B, May, 2017)

Negotiations were not fair to them because,

“BPA had an already prepared plan for which we mostly persuaded to buy into it; they were very little alterations that we could make into their plans” (Elder, Dokokyina –In-depth Interviews, 2017)

There was therefore no good faith, transparency as well as mutual respect between actors (Price, 2015). It was recalled that BPA officials from the outset knew exactly what they were doing and merely engaged them as part of their process. The strong discouragement for them to solicit the services of a lawyer to lead them and the lack of time for them to consult other people is a point to buttress their claim. These reasons accounted for the low RII of 0.50084 and rank of 17th on the table. (Details of accountability and transparency are discussed earlier)

- **Effective Communication**

Governance would only be successful if actors are well informed of the policies, rules and regulations as well as their responsibilities in the displacement structure. The content and quality of information advised actors on their behaviour in the structure.
Discussants were asked the direction and frequency of flow of information. It was noted that information flow was more from BPA to them than vice versa. Displaced persons depended far more on BPA for resettlement schedules and compensation packages.

 Mostly it is BPA that informs us of the meeting and what it is intended for. They come with what they have for us to discuss. We will then give our views and opinions on what they brought for discussion (Discussion with Chiefs, Field work, 2017).

Agenda setting was, therefore, more top-down than bottom up. Even though they acknowledged that they had the option to convene a meeting with BPA, they seldom did because they had no agenda of their own. On medium of information flow, it was noted that no single method was used. Information on the displacement and resettlement was available in both print and electronic media and got to them more by word-of-mouth from the BPA officials.

In focus group discussions held with chiefs and elders, women and youth groups, indicated that they had a lot of trust in the system especially at the beginning of the resettlement process. It can be concluded from the various focus group discussion that...the respect, the many meetings and promises that came from BPA officials were too convincing to doubt. They had ready answers to every fear that we had. We really trusted them at that time but today, I will say it was a propaganda. They knew that what they were promising us were not true but just wanted us to move (Source: FGD, Dokokyina, Men, 2017).

All groups indicated that their confidence was boosted when the GDD facilitated their visit to the Akosombo and Kpong resettlement sites to learn and share experience.
...even though the Akosombo trip was not organized by the BPA, their support of it gave us the impression that they were out for our good and, as such, we had a lot trust for them. (Chief, Bui, Township B)

However, displaced people were not given any training on negotiations, group dynamics, participation approaches and education on the laws, policies and regulatory frameworks on displacement and resettlement. This concurs with Arthur’s (2016) finding that Ghana’s displaced persons’ competence was not enhanced and, as such, could they make much in the process for their benefit.

6.4 The Role of Ghana Dams Dialogue in Enhancing Participation

The Ghana Dams Dialogue (GDD) established in 2006 by International Water Management Institute (IWMI). GDD is credited as the only platform that successfully engaged all stakeholders and that could be used as a planning tool for the development of dams not only in Ghana but in the West African Region. GDD provides multiple stakeholders with opportunities to hold discussions on deep-seated differences and contribute to the development of equitable solutions (Doh & Andoh, 2015).

GDD was instrumental in promoting dialogues between and among stakeholders from the community to the national level. Its main objective is to build capacities and provide tools for improved decision making on dam related issues, which would lead to equitable, transparent, participatory and sustainable development of dams in Ghana (http://ghanadamsdialogue.iwmi.org/project-overview/).

The GDD was successful in the sharing of information and increase awareness about resettlement and dam related issues affecting local communities and build capacity, amongst key stakeholders of the public, private and NGO sectors, at different levels from national to local, through roundtables and other learning mechanisms, and to bring
on board very relevant stakeholders who hitherto have not been actively involved in the dialogue process (Doh & Andoh, 2015; Gonsalvez, 2013). This feat, the Bui Dam’s officials noted, created an avenue for them to be fair and transparent in the displacement process as there were many stakeholders.

6.5 Assessing Displaced Peoples’ Participation in the Displacement and Resettlement Process

Affected people of the Bui Dam’s process noted they participated in the household interviews, land and property valuations, meetings and discussions. Their assessment of these numerous engagements with the BPA were ascertained in line with Bhatnagar and Williams's (1992) classification of participation as information sharing or at best consultation. This form of participation is manipulative as project beneficiaries are variously enticed to concord to predetermined plans without making inputs.

The benefits of participation to affected actors depends on the form and extent to which beneficiaries got in engaged in the process. Genuine participation involves partnerships and empowerment where affected persons own the process and make inputs for the mutual benefit of all stakeholders (Eberlei, 2011). This involves stakeholders’ deep involvement in all aspects of the planning and implementation process, having access to all information and contributing and reaching consensus with other stakeholders.

With the view that displacement and resettlement benefits are not equal with all social groups (Gopalakrishnan, 2012; Gururaja, 2000), the study ascertained the type of participation from the perspectives of men, women and women. This was done with the use of semi-structured interviews in which respondents described their participation process.
In order of dominance, all four groups noted that their participation in the Bui Dam displacement and resettlement process was more about receiving information from BPA officials than taking part in an authentic discussion of issues. This was followed by consultations and decision-making.

The differences in perceptions of chiefs and elders on one hand and women on the other hand, show chiefs and elders were most involved. Even though women reported that they were put in groups and were part of each group, they were said to have participated least, despite being most affected. Compensation was paid on lands and commercial agricultural trees like cashew, which few women had. Most dealings with community members were done with household heads, which consisted of less women.
This finding gives credence to Isaacman and Isaacman’s (2008) view that, in most cases of displacement, affected people have least participated in their own resettlement projects. There is, therefore, the need to improve the governance of displacement and resettlement processes by actively empowering displaced persons and actively and effectively involving them in all stages of the displacement and resettlement processes (Choi, 2015; Price, 2015).

Participation envisaged in the WCD (2000) and the World Bank’s BP/OP 4.12 involves genuine participation where dam affected persons would be recognised as active participations in all aspects of the resettlement process. The WCD for instance concludes that

*It means that we have to bring new voices, perspectives and criteria into decision-making and we need to develop a new approach that will build consensus around the decisions reached.* (WCD 2000, p197).

Displaced persons as primary stakeholders and their active participation is key for them to reap the benefits of the resettlement process as they were the beneficiaries. There was, therefore, the need to enhance the capacities of affected persons if need be to enable them, through training, to participate effectively and meaningfully. This is in accordance with Labonte and Laverack's (2001) view that the capacity to plan and implement community projects is measured through the level of technical expertise applied in community project implementation, experience in planning and implementing projects in the community, and community demonstrated competence, and community mobilization.

The enhancement of community competence with participatory enabling activities such as community involvement in skills training provides important solutions to address
unemployment leading to improved livelihoods and poverty reduction for many rural communities (Arthur, 2017). Details of the forms of participation from the perspective of resettled people are described below.

6.5.1 Participation as Information Sharing

All three groups agreed their participation in the displacement and resettlement process was merely to receive information from displacing officials. While community chiefs and elders estimated that about 48% of their involvement was receiving information from displacement officials; men, women and youth groups rated the involvement at 56%, 64% and 68%, respectively. Perhaps, the relatively low percentage score by chiefs and elders could be because of their deeper involvement compared to the rest of the groups. One remarked that BPA officials almost always wanted them to buy into their plan but we often resisted “so it is not like they just gather us and tell us what to do and we also keep quiet”. However, youth and women groups were of the view that they, themselves, never had an agenda and depended on what BPA would bring. In one of my focus group discussions, it was noted that

In most meetings, the officials would tell us that we have to do this and that by this day in order for the project to go on schedule and this is the preparations they (BPA) have made and we too are to do this by this and that day...Our inputs would be how to organize ourselves to do as instructed than discussing the options. We were therefore mere recipients of instructions (Field Survey, 2017)

However, one of the key strategic areas of the WCD’s (2000) strategic priorities for hydropower development, included ensuring that the adversely affected participate in talks to negotiate suitable entitlements and mitigation provisions and the implementation of long-term project monitoring and assistance for affected communities. The inability of displaced persons to air their views is a drawback in the
process. It is a rights issue: as dam affected people, they have the right to contribute to decisions affecting them (WCD, 2000). Respondents underscored that meetings were mostly more for information sharing because information came late and BPA insisted they would have to meet their deadline and, as such, had no time to discuss issues or simply that they have no money or the mandate to alter what is on their plan.

Information dissemination is ranked least among the forms of participation. This is because it was a one-way flow of information from the proponent of the development project to the public: in this context, from the BPA officials to displaced persons or resettled persons. This form of participation does not empower displaced persons in skills such as negotiations and development deliberations; and top-down forms of participation that do not harness the views of beneficiaries. With a majority of displaced persons being illiterate, the availability of information on line and in documents alone results in no information being available as most cannot access it.

### 6.5.2 Participation as Consultations

All groups of displaced people that the study held focus group discussions with, noted that they were amply consulted but in most cases, their views and opinions were not sought on most issues. They however noted that consensus reached on the decision to add an additional room to the number of rooms to be constructed at the resettlement sites and the payment of electricity to be connect from the national grid of which BPA would be part to the resettlement stipend.

“... they would tell us what they have and sometimes give us the chance to make our inputs. But no matter our loud we made our inputs, how hard we press and how often we make, their views prevailed. They would defend why their views should have prevailed. (Field Survey, 2017, Women FGD).”
And similarly;

_The BPA officials had answers to all our questions and why our views would not be accepted. So, for consultations; were consulted but in most cases our views were not accepted (Field Survey, 2017, Men FGD)_

Displacing officials created opportunities for actors to express themselves but the ultimate decision taking was their preserve and most often rejected displaced persons’ inputs and followed the laid down decisions.

Consultations are important in governance because, as noted by Conwall (2008), it can help address the feelings of alienation, and lack of entitlement or belonging that breeds civic disenchantment and (re)integrating the disenfranchised and socially excluded. Although dam affected people noted their views were mostly not taken, it nonetheless gave them the sense that they made inputs but were overpowered. This brings a lot of social and psychological relief as they noted “…we fought hard, but we could not get all we want”.

### 6.5.3 Participation as Action Initiation

Assessments of all groups showed low scores for their participation as in action initiation. They acknowledged that BPA initiated actions, planned and executed them with very little inputs from them.

_What did we know about resettlement processes and if we knew what resources did we have? It is because of poverty we settled at that place to earning a bit from the river and the farmlands there. We had no money to take our own initiative, and no one to turn to (Woman Leader, Field Survey, 2017)_

Poor financial capabilities of displaced persons, low knowledge of their rights during displacement and poor social networks accounted for their poor participation. Mention
was, however, made of the Ghana Dams Forum, Action Aid, and some FM radio stations that expressed interest in their plight. Displaced persons as actors, noted that they never had the opportunity to take or initiate any action on their own as part of the displacement process. This, they noted, was because of the rush in which the process was followed and the displacement structure. The youth noted, for example, that large tracks of forest wood were inundated during the construction process but the community could not negotiate to fetch the wood as it was not needed for the construction. This was because they, as displaced persons, had no direct interaction with their Synohydro, the construction company and therefore could not negotiate with them. They concluded that

“We therefore looked on while these resources which could have supported financially were inundated because we lacked the mandate to negotiate with them and did not know how to go about it” (Youth Leader, Township B, 2017).

Respondents lamented that they had little development initiatives to take in the process because they were ignorant in displacement and resettlement laws and regulations and therefore relied on comparing the present happenings with the Akosombo and Kpong resettlement process, which we knew were carried out with the help of Ghana Dams Forum. Participation is considered beneficial because it can enhance learning processes, improve the quality of decisions, contribute to empowerment, or promote democratic citizenship.

The poor participation of displaced people has led to the poor inculcation of cultural values and worldviews of the people in the planning and implementation of the resettlement schemes. Displaced people noted that houses in the resettlement site were
not constructed in line with their tradition and, as such, many are making alterations to the buildings they are staying in.

6.6 Assessments of Meetings as a Techniques of Participation

Popular forms of engagement with displaced persons were through meetings at with their various social groups. Meetings were very frequent between displaced persons as a group and BPA officials. It was therefore of interest to assess these meeting and their resultant outcomes. As part of the semi-structured interviews with 119 respondents, definitive propositions were put and they responded with a “Yes” or “No” answer. Their views are summarised in Table 21.

Table 21: Assessment of BPA Meetings with Resettlement Communities during Displacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Yes (Frequency)</th>
<th>No (Frequency)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings were fora for effective discussions</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting atmosphere was free from intimidation</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement officials were open in meetings</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings encouraged us to make inputs in the process</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions were frank and in good faith</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions were mostly a consensus in most cases</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects implemented were as agreed on in meetings</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced peoples’ views were implemented</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings were often rushed</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors had the opportunities to consult others if need be</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Survey, 2017*

A review of the meeting held indicated that meeting atmosphere and strategies did not lend themselves to authentic participation. Apart from the fact that meetings’ settings were free from intimidation and the fact the meetings were not rushed, displaced persons described the meetings as being mere gimmicks and not intended for them to participate authentically by their scores. Assessing governance and therefore participation merely by the number of meeting held with affected people could be
misleading as these meetings could just be a way of justifying monies spent by officials or records of work done.

Displaced persons alluded to the fact that their meetings were engrossed with hidden information, some of which would be made known in the meeting, and decisions would have to be made there and then. This ultimately impacts negatively on the contribution of displaced persons and the effects of the outcome on them (Wittenbaum, Hollingshead, & Botero, 2004). Relevant information and, more importantly, the timeliness of the information is an important decision-making factor.

- **Spaces for Voice and Participation**

  From the above discussions, structural and procedural conditions appeared followed in the displacement and resettlement process to ensure sound participation that could make displacement outcome better, acceptable and owned by displaced persons.

  Goetz and Jenkins (2002; 2005) gave three reasons to buttress the relevance of voice in governance. They noted that voice gives people the freedom to express their beliefs and preferences. On displacement and resettlement issues critical decisions like negotiating when and where to relocate, compensation issues like what to compensate for and not all vary according to the various actors’ perspective. For example, findings have indicated that displaced persons from Bator and Ankanyakrom preferred being resettled by a river to continue with their fishing profession but BPA thought otherwise and grouped them at a township. Adequate expression of voice, through discussions help actors to appreciate the perspectives of other actors better.

  Second, they noted that voice is an essential building block for accountability. Through exercise of voice, duty bearers explain issues to beneficiaries and listen to the voices of the beneficiaries. This brings about accountability in the process. Field data however
indicated that there was a Grievance and Redress Office at BPA but this was the least functioning office. Of the 89 (out of the 119) respondents who mentioned the Grievance and Redress Office, 76\% of them noted that it was ‘in name’ but did not really address any grievance.

Third, Goetz and Jenkins (2002; 2005) noted that the exercise of voice, and the conversations that result, play an important role in enabling communities to arrive collectively at the standards – the values and norms of justice and morality – against which the actions of power-holders will be judged. Additionally, voice matters because if people do not speak up, there is little or no chance that their preferences, opinions and views will be reflected in government priorities and policies. As evidenced from table 21, in a situation where meetings were rushed, actors’ perspectives were not implemented, no consensus was built, and where meetings were just information sharing, then the advantages of voice cannot be realized. The grievance office appeared to have been established as a standard displacement and resettlement practice, but in practice did not live according to its mandate.

The importance of citizen participation cannot be over-emphasized. Conwall (2008) notes that good citizenship participation makes citizens feel their views matter, by offering them information, by involving them in making sure the services they use work as best as possible; and by bringing them into contact with people from the state, the state can reduce feelings of exclusion and marginalization. Displaced persons’ views about timing of displacement, compensation of valuables, and choices of resettlement are all important pieces of information and, perhaps if heeded to, could have made the resettlement more beneficial for them and give them a sense of worth that they contributed to building their wellbeing. Authentic or meaningful participation could
have addressed displaced peoples’ feelings of alienation, and lack of entitlement or belonging that breeds civic disenchantment and (re)integrating the disenfranchised and socially excluded (Conwall, 2008).

From the above, participation, as employed in the Bui Dam resettlement, is what Cooke and Kothari (2001) described as ‘new tyranny’ in development. This is because participatory approaches in most development projects do not allow local people ample time and energy to participate and often does not adequately involve all sectors of the population. In the case under study, the need to meet deadlines made participation a gimmick. This finding agrees with Mosse’s (2001) view that participatory approaches are consistent with top-down systems and have not heralded the changes in prevailing institutional practices.

Participatory approaches are involved in most development projects like the Bui Dam project as a best practice or to satisfy international standards and protocols like the World Bank policy on forced resettlement and international protocols and standards like the Rights to Development and Indigenous People as well as the Free Prior Informed Consent.

Regrettably, Hickey and Mohan (2004)’s view that participation could be transformative in the lives of local people was not achieved in the Bui Dam case because local peoples’ participation was limited and did not contribute much to the displacement and resettlement process as well as to the enhancement of local people’s capacities and empowerment.

6.7 Transparency and Accountability

Generally, accountability refers to the process of holding actors responsible for their actions. More specifically, it is the process by which individuals, agencies and
organisations (public, private and civil society) are held responsible for executing their powers according to a certain standard (Tisné 2010). In the context of the study, accountability refers to the structures and processes put in place to ensure that actors in the displacement and resettlement process of the Bui Dam are held responsible for each other in their duties. Accountability in displacement refers to the process by which dam officials, related agencies and displaced persons ensure that each actor acts in accordance to their expected duties without any arbitrariness. It is more of a social accountability. Displaced citizens can demand and be answered by state officials in respect of the displacement and resettlement issues of the dam affected people.

Asiama (2015), in his study of compulsory land acquisition of the Bui Dam, noticed that, unlike the Akosombo Dam case where VRA took complete responsibility for the resettlement process and later handed over to local government agencies, BPA from the onset involved state line agencies such as the Lands Commission, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health and Ministry of Food and Agriculture as well as the Environmental Protection Agency. Second, the Bui Dam involved Non-Governmental Organizations and Civic Society groups like the Ghana Dams Forum and Action Aid; and the media were involved as horizontal state actors.

This arrangement, coupled with the numerous regulatory and policy frameworks, ensured accountability at the top level where responsible agencies or departments were to present reports and comply with Terms of Reference in the process. Thus structurally, as noted earlier, the process encouraged horizontal accountability. This arrangement made BPA more of a coordinating body depending on the technical advice of these agencies in the displacement and resettlement issues.
However, displacement and resettlement implementation transcends along multiple dimensions involving numerous actors in the international, State and local levels including displaced persons themselves (Fink, 2005) and therefore requiring varying levels of accountability. Although this arrangement at the institutional level appears to be a plausible mechanism, the relationship between these and the primary actors of displaced people is a matter of concern.

6.7.1 Stakeholder Assessment of Accountability in Displacement and Accountability Process

Accountability is not just a formal process and channels for reporting to a higher authority but are mechanisms by which local people assess duty bearers’ performance standards, responsiveness and even their morality (Antwi-Boasiako, 2010). Against this backdrop, displaced peoples’ perceptions on the accountability of BPA as actors in the displacement process was sought and are summarised in Table 22.

Table 22: Assessment of Transparency and Accountability by Social Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transparency &amp; Accountability</th>
<th>Men (N=52)</th>
<th>Women (N=31)</th>
<th>Youth (Men and Women) (N=36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to accurate relevant information</td>
<td>Number % (Yes)</td>
<td>Number % (Yes)</td>
<td>Number % (Yes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to project documents (e.g. Minutes, RPF, agreements)</td>
<td>9 17</td>
<td>6 19</td>
<td>6 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to project budget</td>
<td>0 100</td>
<td>0 100</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to project audit report</td>
<td>0 100</td>
<td>0 100</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to action plans</td>
<td>0 100</td>
<td>0 100</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open discussions of resettlement issues</td>
<td>12 23</td>
<td>6 19</td>
<td>6 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely Dissemination of Information</td>
<td>9 17</td>
<td>7 23</td>
<td>6 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to media</td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes well explained</td>
<td>18 34</td>
<td>7 23</td>
<td>6 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample time for deliberations</td>
<td>12 23</td>
<td>6 19</td>
<td>7 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Semi-Structured Interview, 2017
There is unanimity among the men, women and youth groups that accountability measured by the above tenets was poor during the displacement and resettlement process. Accountability thrives on the accurate dissemination of relevant information to related stakeholders for deliberative action. However, it was noted that access to relevant information, project budgets and audit report, projects reports, minutes of meetings as well as action plans was abysmal.

Validating this information revealed that most of these documents were available online and at the BPA offices for all to access. They were actually public documents. However, the poor illiteracy and educational levels of displaced persons prevented the accessibility and use of these materials to their advantage. Much as this assertion could be true, in the spirit of responsibility and openness, these documents could have been given to community leaders and have key points explained to them in languages that they could understand.

It underscores the point that ensuring accountability does not just require enabling structures but that well informed stakeholders can make use of the structures. Ignorant or not well informed stakeholders may not be able to know their rights and the channels available for them to demand accountability. Knowledge is power and if one does not know his rights and responsibilities, it would be difficult to know his or her entitlements, options available and redress seeking mechanisms. For example, there a Grievance Office unit at BPA but few people made good use of the opportunity to register their complaints and seek redress.

Mulgan (2003) saw accountability as ‘a relationship of social interaction and exchange involving complementary rights on the part of the account-holder and obligations on the part of the duty holder’. The exchange in this context includes the trade of relevant
information between BPA and displaced persons. BPA, the account-holder, was responsible for making relevant information on the displacement and resettlement process available in the media that can be understood by displaced persons. Displaced persons as a matter of responsibility was to seek relevant information rather than staying put to be informed by BPA officials. Both actors were to get feedbacks on information, decisions and the way forward and a consensus reached before action was taken.

The relevance of information means information needs to be broken down into comprehensible forms in the case of technical information and made available in forms available to all stakeholders including the media and the public (Willems & Van Dooren, 2011).

6.8 Livelihoods Change Analysis: The Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction Model

Displacement and resettlement schemes have often been associated with negative livelihood changes or impoverishment. Displacement involves land appropriation that affects the fundamental livelihood resources that displaced people depend on. Social vulnerability deals with the susceptibility of humans and the conditions necessary for their survival and adaptation (WBGU, 2005:33). UNISDR (2009), quoted in Derbile (2010a), notes that vulnerability denotes the characteristics and circumstances of a community, system or asset that make it susceptible to the damaging effects of a hazard. McEntire (2012) further notes that vulnerability consists of two sides: 1) an external side of risks, shocks and stress to which an individual or household is subject; and 2) an internal side, which is defenselessness, meaning a lack of means to cope without damaging loss. Loss can take many forms- becoming or being physically weaker, economically impoverished, and socially dependent, humiliated or psychologically harmed. The external side of vulnerability comprises the exposure to risks and shocks
in contrast to the internal side, which deals with the capacity to anticipate, cope with, resist and recover from the impact of a hazard (Bohle, 2007). Internal shocks, therefore, refers to the coping capacity of the affected people to recover from the external shocks.

Displacement, undoubtedly, is a source of vulnerability because it compulsorily displaces people from land; the main productive resource of people and, therefore, makes them susceptible to poverty if not well managed. It has a heavy debilitating effect on displaced persons if risks are not prudently managed through sound resettlement strategies in order to improve their livelihood.

In displacement and resettlement literature, a specific framework or model that analyses displaced persons’ vulnerability in terms of risks and how they can be reconstructed is the Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction Models developed by Michael P. Cernea as its framework of analysis. In his work, spanning from his 1990s studies of Worldbank sponsored dam projects, Cernea (1997; 2002; 2004) noted that the core problem of displacement or involuntary resettlement is the risk of being impoverished. These risks are: (a) Landlessness; (b) Joblessness; (c) Homelessness; (d) Marginalization; (e) Food insecurity; (f) Increased morbidity and mortality; (g) Loss of access to common property resources; and (h) Community disarticulation. Similarly, Terminski (2013) emphasizes that displacement erodes the natural capital, man-made capital, human capital and social capital bases of oustees and, therefore, adversely affects their economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security and political security in addition to cultural security of affected people as published in the 1994 Human Development Report.

The IRR model suggests that preventing or overcoming the pattern of impoverishment requires targeted risk reversal or mitigation. This can be accomplished through focused
strategies, backed up by commensurate financing. Turning the model on its head shows which strategic directions should be pursued: from landlessness to land-based resettlement; (b) from joblessness to reemployment; (c) from homelessness to house reconstruction; (d) from marginalization to social inclusion; (e) from increased morbidity to improved health care; (f) from food insecurity to adequate nutrition; (g) from loss of access to restoration of community assets and services; and (h) from social disarticulation to networks and community rebuilding.

To avert these risks, resettlement strategies must empower resettled people with fertile and equivalent land sizes, equivalent or better homes, re-training and alternative livelihood strategies and improves health services among others. Through prudent planning, adequate funding, genuine participation of affected people that the World Bank (2004) in displacement and resettlement projects a planned way sustainably improving the livelihoods of displaced people.

The model is more of a guide to preventing the impoverishment risks that displaced persons may face by strategizing to reconstruct these risks to secured situations through improved resettlement policies. In assessing the livelihood outcomes of resettlement of the Bui Dam, the study finds it appropriate to assess the extent to which these risks have been averted and therefore, their livelihood state.

The study, through interviews and discussions, made respondents assess the various changes in terms of how the risks of impoverishment were managed. Using a five-scale level Likert scale, their views were weighted and the relative importance index calculated. To ascertain whether there were significant differences between men, women and youth groups of displaced persons, the study ranked their assessments.
differently. Also assessed were the provision of social amenities like water, electricity and health care to augment life. Their assessments are shown in Table 23.
Table 23: Assessment of Community Livelihood Changes by Social Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>YOUTH</th>
<th>TOTAL Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landlessness</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joblessness</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Morbidity</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Mortality</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Insecurity</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Common Property</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Community Dislocation</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Amenities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable water</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Centres</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Roads</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication Services</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places of Worship Eg. Mosques and Churches</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Semi-Structured Interviews, 2017*
Displacement, which is the expropriation of land from dam affected people, touches on the very core of the livelihoods of the people as per Toulmin and Quan (2000). Cernea (2002) similarly notes that expropriation of land removes the main foundation upon which people’s productive systems, commercial activities, and livelihoods are constructed. This is the principal form of de-capitalization and pauperization of displaced people, as they lose both natural and man-made capital. This foundation needs to be reconstructed by affording displaced persons’ quality and commiserate land sizes or alternative incomes. This situation, would certainly lead to impoverishment of displaced people if not properly managed. To avert this, the government, through the BPA, compensated land users and owners the total land area of 455,912 acres compulsory acquired.

From the table, land based resettlement obtained RII = 0.46 and an insignificant RII in all categories of men, women and youth. The poor assessment was as a result of the following reasons:

**Small land sizes given at resettlement sites**

DPs reported they were not only given small parcels of land but infertile land. They noted that the present resettlement area at Bui is an abandoned land area because of its poor fertility. That could the reason why most displaced people’s choice resettlement was Faoman or Bongase but their pleas were not heeded to.
Land-based resettlement was poor because they were not properly compensated for as a result of delays in payment and poor valuation of their farmlands. Most affected were tree crops farmers like cashew farmers. One respondent lamented that;

.... What I was paid as compensation for my cashew farm was not even up to a quarter of my yearly harvest of cashew nuts on that same farm. It is so painful, my brother. And here, we do not have the land the farm even. (Woman, Akanyakrom,).

Some doubted measurements of their farm sizes for compensation saying that their farmland sizes were larger than what they were compensated for. They lamented that the compensation, even though small, took more than four years to arrive.

Tree crop farmers reported they would have preferred equal land to start cultivating their crops rather than the compensation they got. These findings agree with Cernea (1996; 2000) who found that most often compensation paid for lands acquired are inadequate and characterized by undue delays, which further affects the value of the money negatively.

Compensation was centred on houses and farmlands only. This made women the worse sufferers as most women did not own houses and did not have their own farms. Women depended on social networks and relations as well as non-farm land based on natural resources like fuelwood, clay, and wild fruits like shea, which were not compensated for. The relocation to the resettlement site means women had to weave new social relationships and forms of livelihood to cope with. This involves creating new networks for receiving and sending credit of their goods and services and accessing financial credits. Bebbington (1999: 2022) notes that:
“A person’s assets, such as land, are not merely means with which he or she makes a living: they also give meaning to that person’s world. Assets are not simply resources that people use in building livelihoods: they are assets that give them the capability to be and to act. Assets should not be understood only as things that allow survival, adaptation and poverty alleviation: they are also the basis of agents’ power to act and to reproduce, challenge or change the rules that govern the control, use and transformation of resources”.

Fishermen were short-changed in the compensation because they were compensated for the loss of water resources for which they depended on and their fishing resources such as boats, nets and hooks that they could no longer use because of their resettlement.

Fishermen perceive themselves the hardest hit by the resettlement because their fishing equipment cannot be used to fish in the now large and deeper dam with stronger water currents.

The over-reliance on land and reconstruction of houses as a way of restoring displaced peoples’ livelihood is inadequate as the capacities of these people to own and control productive resources are key. Empowerment of people in alternative livelihood strategies is paramount.

**Fishermen on Land**

Discussions with resettled people in Bator Akanyakrom especially, lamented that they, as fishermen, were settled on farms without any training. They opted to be settled by the water in order to continue with their fishing occupation but that was not accepted and the proposed dam, as part of the intended livelihood empowerment project, is yet to come about five years after resettlement. This, they noted, has brought them untold hardships and many of their youth are forced to migrate to other areas. Some are forced to fish in the high current dam, which sometimes results in fatal accidents.
On arrival here, some of our people dared fishing in the dam and they died due to the strong currents. Even though we are restricted from fishing we still have to survive. The alternative is to get an engine bought which we cannot afford (Source: Field Work, 2017)

These reasons, they noted have made life difficult for them. The effects were summarized thus…

“We live in block houses, but we are hungry because we do not have enough fertile land”

In a rural setting like the Bui Dam catchment area, land resource related employment remains the main livelihood activities. The enhancement of land resources such as dams for dry season irrigation and the rearing of small ruminants would have enhanced their livelihood. In land based resettlement, the need for agricultural technical assistance is crucial to enable resettled persons to adopt new technologies such as new techniques of cultivation, pest management and storage of farm produce.

The quality of governance of land and natural resources as well as the better performance of land policies and institutions are fundamental to the delivery of development goals in any society (Deininger &Binswanger, 1999; DFID, 2004; World Bank, 2003). Land is a primary means of subsistence and income generation in rural economies especially in the case of resettlement communities. Its access and security of tenure are key to the eradication of poverty and propelling development in the resettlement area (Quan, 2000; FAO, 2002).

Agriculture and rural livelihood among rural poor like the resettlement area largely depends on one’s access to and control of land and land resources. Addressing displaced people’s poverty, therefore, involves to a large extent making arable land accessible, and secure for them to use. This, coupled with the enhancement of their capacities in
alternative land-based livelihoods like aquaculture, rearing of small ruminants, would go a long way to eradicate poverty in resettled areas.

However, making land tenure a tool for achieving the above development requirements needs the appreciation of the complexity of the African land tenure systems, which requires equally complex tenure solutions that can be tailored to respond to the cultural, political and economic demands at multiple levels (Cotula, 2005; Wiley, 2003; 2006). As explicitly put by Cotula, Toulmin and Quan (2006, p. 2):

“securing land rights requires developing and implementing policy, legal and practical tools that are appropriate for different groups and circumstances, and that pay special attention to specific land tenure needs of poorer and more vulnerable groups; supporting democratic land institutions and land administration systems that are decentralized and problem centred, and that makes links with existing indigenous and customary mechanisms for managing land; improving access to effective systems of land dispute resolution, including courts, alternative dispute resolution and customary procedures”

It is therefore expedient that, in special cases like development-caused displacements and resettlements, special policy regulations are made to ensure land tenure security for resettled persons.

At Bui and Dokokyina settlement communities in particular, residents expressed interest in going into cashew and mango plantations that, according to them, fetch more for them and could revive the infertile land. They are, however, but unsure about the security of the lands to go into tree crop farming as BPA could demand of them anytime.

Although resettled persons noted that their previous settlements had no land titles or deeds, they had no fears that the Paramount chief of the area would sanctioned the use of it. As a result, they felt safe to go into cashew plantations farming in particular as it
fetched them more money annually. It is reported that land was generally accessible and one could farm as much as they could. In an in-depth interview a man recounted:

.... *I was one of the successful yam farmers at Old Bui, I used to farm as much acreage as I could and would load trucks full of yams for sale at harvest time. If the land was getting unfertile, I would look for new one and farm and that was how we were living. Here today, I cannot boast getting up to a truck full of yams because we have limited access to land and what we have is unfertile as well.* (Source: Field Work, 2017)

The smaller farm size and its infertility is a big bane on their livelihoods reconstruction. Lands around the settlement have been acquired by BPA, so residents have to go far to acquire lands under customary system from the Banda Traditional area kilometres away. The forceful acquisition of lands around the dam has made land scarce and therefore, less available for migrants, most of whom are the displaced people.

In a nutshell, indigenous people knowledge systems need more appreciated in displacements projects. There is the need for a better understanding of, accommodation to, people’s knowledge of their rights to land, their tenure arrangements and their views on the approach to payments such as compensation (Sillitoe, 2004). Perhaps, in doing this better alternative could be arrived at

6.8.2 From joblessness to reemployment

Loss of jobs as fishermen, farmers, farm labourers, fish mongers and food vendors was recorded. Displaced Persons narrated with nostalgia how they farmed to feed themselves, exchanged fish for food and vice-versa, and sold food in a booming market before they were resettled.

As explained earlier, there was no re-training of people like the fishermen into land-based livelihood activities such as cropping or rearing livestock. There was no
livelihood change or enhancement training and this, they noted, was an impediment on their lives. Similarly, women groups noted they were left without any empowerment in cash or kind. They noted they were mostly traders in food stuffs or fishmongers which they cannot practice at the current site because of low population size, poor farm harvests and the unemployment situation faced by their husbands.

A former kenkey vendor lamented

*Here, we are so few that I sell just few kenkey balls a day. The settlement is made up of only we the relocated people, and we are few and poor (Source: Woman, Bator, 2017)*

Displaced persons lamented the vehement refusal of BPA to employ them as unskilled labour in their offices for menial jobs like labourers and cleaners. Instead, they bring people from other places to do the work that they could do. They noted that, if each house could have a member working in the BPA offices, they would have improved their livelihood a lot.

In terms of unemployment, the women and youth were reported to be most affected. This has resulted in social vices such as indecent sexual relationships between some of their women with mainly BPA officials and Synohydro workers just to survive. The youth have gone into activities such as stealing metals to sell as scraps and illegal mining, popularly termed as ‘galamsey’ and outmigration to nearby Bongase and surrounding areas.

**6.8.3 From Homelessness to House Reconstruction**

All three groups of chiefs and elders, women and the youth noted that BPA needed to be applauded as far as housing is concerned. They were unanimous that no displaced persons were homeless with some few unoccupied houses at Dokokyina. This
accounted for the high RII of 0.866. The noted their relocated site was well drained and mapped out.

For the houses, we are happy with them. Except some few with toilets problems, we say we are pleased with the houses (Youth Leader, Bui, 2017).

They, however, noted that they were not given the documents of the houses and doubted if they could transfer or sell them. Housing is not so much of a problem in the Banda district, even today, but the housing at the resettlement Township B is made of better quality materials, well planned with drainage and access roads and close to social amenities like schools and the health centres.

The 2010 Population and Housing Census of the Ghana Statistical Services indicate that the Banda District, as a whole, has a total of 61.8 percent of the houses being built with mud brick or earth as the main construction material for outer walls; followed by structures that had cement blocks or concrete (27.2%) as the main construction material for outer walls; while houses whose outer walls are constructed with bamboo and burnt bricks form the least proportion (0.2%) (GSS, 2013). In terms of quality of housing and occupancy, the resettlement areas far outstands the rest of the District.

Out-migration of resettled people in search of better farmlands and jobs is making the population in the resettlement area further decrease. Similar findings were made by Schmidt and Diaw (1990) in their study of the Akosombo Dam resettlement sites.

Resettlement is not just only changing houses but also transferring and improving one’s ability to earn a better living. Improved livelihood strategies without housing would have been preferred to improve housing without livelihoods. As was put in the discussions with the youth, it was noted that
“…. You need to get to eat before going to bed and not the other way round. If we get good jobs, we will build our own houses, but good housing does get good jobs. Many of us are leaving to live in less quality houses elsewhere where we are sure of getting food to eat” (Man, Bator, 2017)

The displacement process can aptly be described as a relocation process, where emphasis is on evacuation of people whose habitats obstruct the construction of the dam to new locations. Resettled people’s livelihoods was not adequately catered for.

6.8.4 From Marginalization to Social Inclusion

Respondents noted that they felt isolated and lonely even though they had better social amenities like potable water, electricity and clinic. The resettlement site is about 3.5 km to the nearest market centre. The displacement has made some successful farmers and fishermen now poorer. They feel their lives now depend on the benevolence of BPA in providing the much needed livelihood activities envisaged. They feel disconnected from the larger society as they have relocated to a new resettlement.

Giddens (1991, p. 6) notes that modernity “produces difference, exclusion and marginalisation. Holding out the possibility of emancipation, modern institutions at the same time create mechanisms of suppression, rather than actualisation, of self.” This means the causes of exclusion or inclusion could be structural conditions. Therefore, it follows that attempts to address inequality and social exclusion must seek both to alter the structures, which constrain individual’s actions and from building the capacity to act of those actors with the least power and opportunities. Displacement and resettlement processes are processes of destroying existing social structures in previous settlements to construct new institutional structures in resettlement sites. During this process, displaced people lose their physical and social assets as well as their sense of actualization and self-help. A structure that allows the authentic participation of its
actors would articulate the concerns of all groups of people involved in the
displacement and resettlement process for redress. As a result, the resettlement process
could then become a process of social inclusion and not social exclusion.

In the case of the Bui Dam process, it was more of social exclusion because, there was lack of trust between BPA officials and displaced people and the poor as regards to the appreciation of their peoples’ culture and social networks. In short, the social relations and networks that aid their livelihoods and wellbeing were neglected. It is worth noting that livelihood studies have underscored the relevance of social and cultural capitals as equal determinants of livelihood strategies of individuals, family and communities (Ellis, 1998; Krantz, 2001). This concurs with Bourdieus (1991) earlier arguments that individuals struggle over resources and rewards, and that their struggles are structured around their possession of economic capital, social capital (various kinds of valued relations with significant others), cultural capital (primarily legitimate knowledge), and symbolic capital (prestige and social honour). These are both the objects and the means of their struggle.

Some of the cultural resources lost include the lust for the yam festival and the Easter get-together. Resettled people in Bui feel alienated from their ancestral land in Old Bui to a small, restricted, and unfertile land at the resettlement area. They who were once landlords, allocating lands to settlers have become settlers themselves. They have lost their power as landlords or large tract land owners to settlers.

The people of Bator Anyakakrom missed their annual Easter Celebration, which brought them together annually. Accordingly, in Old Bator residents far and near travelled in to commune with the rest at home and discuss important family and community issues. However, the harsh living conditions at the resettlement camp does
not permit such social gatherings and residents are rather relocating to other settlements in search of improved livelihoods.

Before we came here, Yam festivals used to be great for us. It was great as we celebrated our toils, thanked the gods for a good harvest, met as families etc. Since, we moved here, it has been a pale shadow its past if celebrated at all, because we do get the yams anyway. (Elder, Bui, 2017).

Resettled people felt short-changed. They had lost control over their families and lives. Chiefs and elders noted the rise in waywardness among the youth adding that

...What can we do? We have lost control over them. We cannot adequately feed them; how can we control them. In the glare of our eyes, some of our daughters are flirting with BPA officials just for “something small” but it is difficult to stop them (Elder, Anyakarom, 2017)

Resettled people felt they have become powerless and largely depend on BPA for their livelihoods. They noted that the population in the resettlement site was so low and distant from other communities, making them feel isolated.

Resettled people from Bator Anyakakrom lamented that their old Chief Palace where disputes were resolved and laws made in a serene cultural environment. Even though, they were promised a museum to be built at the resettlement site after the archaeological study of the area, this is yet to be a reality after over five years of resettlement. BPA was however, applauded for facilitating the pacification of shrines and other artefacts before leaving the old site. However, places of worship like churches and mosques constructed at the old sites have not been replaced at the new resettlement area. Churches were at various stages of construction by worshippers at the time of collecting data.
Groups agreed that healthcare services had improved tremendously as compared to their old settlements. Indeed, they now have physical access to healthcare services with the construction and operation of a health centre at the resettlement. Morbidity and mortality had thus improved significantly. They mentioned safe drinking water, improved toilet facilities, improved drainage and housing as some of the contributions to their improved health situation. Essential services like immunization, antenatal and post-natal services are now more accessible than their former resettlements.

There was also no reported incidence of any disease upsurge. Diaw and Schmidt’s (1990) study of resettlement communities Volta Lake after twenty-five years of resettlement indicated the prevalence of diseases such as sleeping sickness. Even though no particular disease prevalence was reported, disease surveillance is necessary as outbreaks of both communicable and non-communication diseases are often found in resettlement communities (Anand, Kumar, Saini, Meena, & Ingle, 2014; Kloos, 1990).

Elders and chiefs noted that there was the fear that, with the increase in promiscuity especially among the youth, there was the potential of sexually transmitted diseases in the resettlement area. In fact, BPA’s own ESIA warns of the potential of diseases such as bilharzia, *trypanosomiasis* or sleeping sickness and conditions like malnutrition may increase while Guinea worms and intestinal worms and onchocerciasis may decrease (Environmental Resources Management, 2007; Sutcliffe, 2009). Displaced people, however, raised concerns about the increasing desire for health care services beyond what was given at the CHPS compound.
6.8.6 From Food Insecurity to Adequate Nutrition

Food security refers to the access by all people at all times to have enough food for an active and healthy life. This definition encompasses the production, distribution and consumption of food by all who need it in order to be active and healthy (Quaye, 2008). In Ghana, the Ministry of Food and Agriculture’s operational definition of food security is “good quality nutritious food hygienically packaged, attractively presented, available in sufficient quantities all year round and located at the right place at affordable prices” (FASDEP, 2003; Quaye, 2008). More than half of the resettled people cannot produce enough to feed themselves all year round and therefore can be said to be experiencing food insecurity. This is because of the land access problems as already explained and the fact that crops were infected with pests and diseases. Mention was made of some worms that affected yams and tomatoes especially. Nutrition in terms of variety of quality food and protein intake was said to be poor. It was sadly noted

Now we do not eat fish every day because we do not fish anymore. The fish you see here are from the other communities, even sometime our women buy packaged fish for festivities (In-depth Interview, Man, Field Work, 2017)

Access to wild fruits and game, and resources like fuelwood have become difficult with the resettlement site. Resettled people had to travel long distances to access these resources, which is having a toll on their nutrition.

The Livelihood Empowerment Project espoused in the Resettlement Planning Framework and Resettlement Action Plans are yet to be implemented after over five years of resettlement. Attempts of residents to go into livestock farming is slow for lack of funds. At the time of data collection some were attempting poultry production with an average of about 100 birds.
Even though displacement affects the production side of food security, addressing food security in Africa should not involve improving the production or supply side alone but also promoting the non-farm income activities that include agro-processing, commerce, transport services, charcoal production, firewood gathering, repair services, wage work, and seasonal migration, among others (Haggblade, Hazell, & Reardon, 2002; Owusu, Abdulai, & Abdul-Rahman, 2011). Improving food security by removing obstacles in the supply side would include improving access to fertile lands, fighting pests and diseases, promoting the use of improved tools and boosting the technical knowhow of farmers in the resettlement site. However, focusing on the non-farm incomes of farmers such as agro-processing, which is mostly carried out by women, is generally pursued through traditional methods and on very small-scale basis and the diversification of livelihoods to non-farm activities such as small ruminant production, poultry production and general merchandize would go a long way to improve the food and job situation thereby reducing their vulnerability to food security.

Resettled people in the resettlement town are prone or vulnerable to food security but not necessarily food insecure. Vulnerability connotes risk of exposure to crises, stress and shocks; the risk of inadequate capacities to cope with stress, crises and shocks and the risk of severe consequences of, and the attendant risks of slow or limited poverty (resiliency) from, crises, risk and shocks (Yaro, 2004). Resettlement communities of the Bui Dam face all these three risks. First, as displaced people, with limited access to arable land and with limited alternative livelihood diversification capacities, especially for the fishermen, shocks like drought, pests and diseases of crops are threats. Their fragile livelihoods could worsen with any of these natural threats. Recovering from these threats would be difficult without any alternative livelihood opportunities like irrigation facilities to aid dry season gardening and farming and the rearing of animals.
Enhancing food security should involve building the capacities of displaced people not just in agricultural production processes but also in alternative income and livelihood strategies such as vocational and off farm livelihood strategies.

6.8.7 Restoration of Community Assets, Networks and Community Rebuilding

For poor people, particularly for the landless and assetless, loss of access to the common property assets that belonged to relocated communities (pastures, forested lands, water bodies, burial grounds, quarries, etc.) results in significant deterioration in income and livelihood levels. Typically, losses of common property assets are not compensated by governments (Cernea, 2002). This is consistent with Abbink’s (2012) study of contested governance and developmental discourse on the Omo River Dam in Ethiopia where the construction of the dam has had substantial irreparable damage to the environment, socio-economic systems, social and culture organization, and socio-cultural structures of dam affected people. Similarly, women who depend on these common pool resources for fuelwood and other forest products are not compensated for. Resettlement could enhance these assets by creating common pool resources such as woodlots and dugouts for community livestock.

Secondly, forced displacement tears apart the existing social fabric. It disperses and fragments communities, dismantles patterns of social organization and interpersonal ties; and kinship groups become scattered as well. Life-sustaining informal networks of reciprocal help, local voluntary associations, and self-organized mutual service are disrupted. This is a net loss of valuable “social capital,” that compounds the loss of natural, physical, and human capital. The social capital lost through social disarticulation is typically unperceived and therefore uncompensated for by the
programmes causing it, and this real loss has long-term consequences (Cernea, 2002; 2004; Courtland, 2006).

In the case of the Bui Dam resettlement, the resettlement rather enhanced social integration between the ethnic groups of Ewe, Nafane and Mo because, as they say, “we see ourselves as being in the same boat”. They noted that they worked together for their common good as resettlers and, as such, are more united now.

The Social capital lost included losing trading partners. Women fish mongers said they had trading partners they supplied fish to and they in turn supplied them with cloths and other basic needs. They had a reciprocal relationship and, as such, were not compelled to make immediate cash payments for their goods.

The study examined the provision of basic amenities like potable water, electricity and telecommunications, which were all rated high above 0.700 on the RII. All in the resettlement communities have access to household toilets, potable borehole water and electricity. This means resettled communities far outweigh the district in access to these social amenities. The Banda District, as a whole, according to the 2010 population census report has only 46% of its population having access to electricity from the Main Grid, 70% of the population have access to borehole pumps or well water and as much as 43.9% of the population of the district have no constructed places for toilets and use the bush or free range method.

However, the cost of using electricity is increasingly becoming a problem and many households risk being disconnected for default. In an interview with elders and chiefs it was said,
... We are in our present predicament because of electricity production for the whole country, but we had to sacrifice our meagre remittances to get electricity from the national grid here, in the resettlement town and still pay bills like others. Very soon, most of us here would be disconnected as we are not working to pay for the electricity (Chief, Bui, 2017).

De Haan and Zoomers (2005) conclusion that livelihood is not just about providing shelter, transacting money, securing food for consumption and exchange at the market place but also entails the ownership and circulation of information, management of skills and relationships as well as the affirmation of personal significance and group identity. Displaced people noted that their wellbeing is not just about being in better houses but their ability to provide essential services basic health services, education among others especially for their families. As noted:

*Of what importance is staying in a good house when you are isolated, cannot provide any financial or even social support for your people. In our old place, we could organize better funerals for our loved ones, celebrate festivals and send monies to our relatives in need better than here* (In-Depth Interview, Bui, 2017).

This view confirms earlier views of development as happiness that increased income, better objective health and higher levels of education do not automatically lead to greater happiness and one’s ability to relate to others, among others (Schimmel, 2009). All in all, the Bui Dam resettlement scheme measured by Cernea’s (2000) Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction Model was poorly done to avert the risks associated with displacement.

The risks of losing one’s spiritual resources was not even noted despite the fact that the previous resettlement sites of these resettled people was abundant with spiritual resources such as gods, shrines and places of worship (Zimmermann & Maennling,
Displacement leads to “spiritualessness” as people have to leave without their gods. It was noticed that churches and mosques were being reconstructed in the resettlement sites by resettled people to augment their spirituality despite their dire livelihood deprivation to fill the void of spirituality. The loss of spiritual resources in displacement was similarly reported in the case of the Akosombo Dam project in Ghana as well. Kalitsi (2004) and Tsikata (2006), for instance, noted the Akosombo Dam culminated into locality shrines disappearance, ancestral churchly terraces like holy thicket, and led to crucial physical and mental wellness repercussions for quite a handful of localities close-by. BPA ensured that some archaeological substances were salvaged and that dis-embalming and re-entombing of some forefathers interred in the localities to be submerged. However, some local forefathers ancestry locations, and locality historical or notable sights for the communities of Bator Akanyakrom, Bui, and Dokokyina being ruined irretrievably (Agency, 2012; BPA, 2011; Environmental Resources Management, 2007). Similarly, the belief in shrine gods like the Adrer, Kpooloo and Senyo Kupo for their protection against natural disasters, diseases and poor harvests have been lost.

For resettlement to be a development opportunity for affected people, the resettlement should empower affected people to meet the three values of development outline by Todaro and Smith (2012). The core values of development are

- **Sustenance:** The basic goods and services, such as food, clothing, and shelter, that are necessary to sustain an average human being at the bare minimum level of living.
Self-esteem: The feeling of worthiness that a society enjoys when its social, political, and economic systems and institutions promote human values such as respect, dignity, integrity, and self-determination.

Freedom: A situation in which a society has at its disposal a variety of alternatives from which to satisfy its needs and individuals enjoy real choices according to their preferences (Todaro & Smith, 2012, p. 22).

For the people in the Bui Resettlement Township B at Bui, these core values are an illusion. They are just living barely above sustaining level with most of them in despair with little or no opportunities for self-development. This is because of the provision of potable water, electricity, and land for subsistence agriculture and improved housing.

The same however, cannot be said of them having self-esteem as in human dignity and integrity and respect. Morale for self-development is low as displaced people feel their opportunities for development have been curtailed by the resettlement. Parents feel humiliated as they are unable to pay for their wards in second cycle institutions and basic medical expenditure. They feel deflated as they cannot celebrate their yam festival and Easter as before. This sense of low self-esteem is largely because lives in the resettlement is relatively much worse than their old settlement, and because expected livelihood improvements promised by displacing officials have been a delusion. They feel more like victims than beneficiaries of the dam.

Freedom of choices of life sustaining endeavours are more limited by the resettlement than at their previous residence. The fisher folk, for example, who settled in Bator Akanyakrom are forced to go into land-based livelihoods like farming or migrate to other water resourced communities to practice their occupation.
According to Todaro and Smith (2012), the above three values are basic in every development project. The resettlement project barely provided these. They further noted that the core object of every development is;

1. To increase the availability and widen the distribution of basic life-sustaining goods such as food, shelter, health, and protection

2. To raise levels of living, including, in addition to higher incomes, the provision of more jobs, better education, and greater attention to cultural and human values, all of which will serve not only to enhance material wellbeing but to generate greater individual and national self-esteem

3. To expand the range of economic and social choices available to individuals and nations by freeing them from servitude and dependence, not only in relation to other people and nation-states, but also to the forces of ignorance and human misery

These core values are upheld and promoted by the WCD (2000) report, the World Bank OB/OP .04 and the gamut of human rights laws and protocols stand against the deterioration of human lives as a result of development activities. Again these core values have not been achieved.

Assessing the resettlement site by Todaro and Smith (2012) core values of development, there have been increased and widened access to potable water, toilet and improved sanitation, electricity and housing in the resettlement in far higher levels before relocation. On this score, one can safely conclude that the Bui Dam resettlement is resettlement with development. However, on raising the levels of income through jobs, better education and esteem, the resettlement is left much to be desired.
6.9 Livelihood Vulnerability and Management Strategies in Resettlement Communities

Livelihood in the resettlement site as discussed above can be described as fragile. It exposes resettled officers to various livelihood risks and vulnerabilities. According to Watts and Bohle (1993, p. 45) “vulnerability as a concept does not rest on a well-developed theory; neither is it associated with widely accepted indicators or methods of measurement”. He, however, noted that vulnerability is a complementary interplay of the entitlement approach, empowerment approach and political economy approach. Thus, vulnerability is caused, respectively, by:

1. Lack of entitlements or command over food in the economic space of vulnerability;
2. Powerlessness in the political space of vulnerability; and
2. Appropriation and exploitation in the structural-historical space of vulnerability

He further noted that vulnerable groups in society are (1) the resource poor and those vulnerable to market disturbances, (2) the powerless and (3) the exploited. Vulnerable regions are: (1) the marginal regions; (2) the peripheral/dependent regions; and (3) the crisis prone regions (Watts & Bohle, 1993, p. 52-57). Resettlement regions are vulnerable prone especially if the risks factors are not adequately managed (Cernea, 1996; 2000). Their sense of vulnerability is summarized in the context of Watts and Bohle’s (1993) concept of vulnerability in Box 4.
An adaption of Watts and Bohle’s (1993) concept of vulnerability to study area include:

| Lack of Entitlements: Displaced people indicated they had reduced access to natural resources like land. This is because each household was apportioned 0.43 acres of land and the rest of the surrounding lands belonged to BPA. They were restricted from clearing new farmlands in the area.
Other natural resources include poor access to water resources for fishing and gardening and the resettlement area were less resourceful in terms of soil fertility and productivity. In terms of finances, they lacked formal income activities due to the uprooting of their livelihoods especially for the fishermen and the human capabilities to diversify into other areas of livelihood like animal husbandry.
Positively, they noted they had physical access to improved houses, social amenities like water, electricity and schools, good roads but lacked the financial capability to utilize and sustain them and that makes them vulnerable.
This puts them more prone to natural hazards such as droughts, rainfall failure and to the risks of price hikes and deviant behaviours like prostitution and theft by the youth.
Powerlessness, refers to displaced people’s or actors’ ability to influence or access resources or assets to improve their lives in a given structure. Power could be derived from coalitions, legal and normative arrangements as well as the human resource base of actors. Again, it was noted that displaced people lacked voice, and power to demand accountability from BPA, lack of power to participate actively and to influence outcomes to their advantage. Legal and normative arrangement were more on the side of state institutions than on displaced people and, as such, they perceived themselves vulnerable. Their poor level of formal education and vocation training capacities have made them less capable of getting formal employment at the BPA or any of the formal institutions around. This has resulted in outcomes that are affecting their livelihoods negatively. Exploitation: Displaced people felt the displacement procedure exploited their ignorance.
Source: Compile from various discussions and in-depth interviews with Displaced Persons, 2017.

This implies vulnerability is a relative term referring to one’s ability to access resources at his/her disposal and act in a way that would safeguard or improve the livelihood situation at any given time.

6.10 Livelihood Adaptation Strategies in Bui Resettlement

Despite the bleak picture painted by displaced persons, they noted that they were managing or coping or adapting with the situation. Managing risks of displacement involves managing personal risks, household risks management adjustment and assessing external support (Bohle & Fünfgeld, 2007). Personal risk management involves security personal assets such as farm tools and fishing boats and nets for diversification of livelihoods from traditional forms like fishing to poultry. At the
household level, livelihood management involves focusing more on the nuclear family, and reduction in the spending on social activities such as funerals and festivals. There were, however, no marked differences in the management of risks at these three levels.

On livelihood coping and adaptation, Bohle (2007, p. 23) notes that

> It is rather access to common property resources that shapes the livelihood options of the vulnerable. It is human capital in terms of good health, skills, and education, which determines the success of adaptation activities. Social capital comprising of social networks, family ties, self-help groups, friendship nets, neighbourhood communities, and saving clubs are frequently the most important “insurance” mechanisms of the most vulnerable

The quest for most vulnerable groups to cope with and adapt to new livelihood involves seeking more human and social capital. In the Bui Resettlement, human capital in terms of developing skills through educational and training is low, and therefore affects their adaptation activities. Informal skills in areas such as carpentry, welding and fabrication of basic farm implements like hoes, cutlasses, traps and basic repairs common property resources like the boreholes and their parts are lacking.

The Livelihood Empowerment Programme of the Resettlement Planning Framework and Resettlement Action Plans and even in the Environmental and Social Action Plan of the Bui Dam projects. Recognizing this void, the RPF sought to enhance the capacities of displaced people in employable skills and even provide common community property resources like fish ponds and dugouts. Women were to be trained in employable skills like dressmaking and soap production. All these have not seen the light of day. In the light of the failure of LED, management strategies employed by resettled people include:
6.10.1 Diversification of Livelihood

All respondents indicated that they do a combination of more activities for their livelihood than before. This include farming, rearing livestock, occasional migration to fish around the Bongase areas, scavenging for metal scraps at the construction sites and even ‘galamsey’ or illegal mining. It is, therefore, difficult to tell what work people are engaged in now as compared to what they previously engaged themselves in. The youth, especially do ‘any job’ to get some money. About 80% of respondents indicated that they have no main job and so they do anything to get some income in order to survive. Just about 2% of the women have diversified in petty trading consisting of operating drinking bars, food vendors and sale of provisions.

6.10.2 Agricultural Intensification

Crop cultivation is now more intensified because of the limited access to land by farmers and the infertility of the land as compared to their previous settlement. Intensification processes include better farm practices such as early weeding, and the application of farm inputs such as fertilizer and pesticides if they can afford them. They indulge in more mixed cropping now than before to offset the uncertainties of crop failure through disease. It was noted that a particular yam and tomatoes disease in the area made the cultivation of these crops difficult.

Apart from the intensification farming, some resettled persons indicate that they maintain farms at Old Dokokyina and around the Bongoase areas about 4km away to supplement what they have from BPA. This has brought some tension between them and landlords around there.
6.10.3 Migration

Migration is the most common coping strategy among the youth in the resettlement communities. About 80% of the youth said they migrated to other places to fish, farm or do some jobs to feed themselves and the rest of their relations at the resettlement site. Some of the jobs include apprenticeship or labourers at construction sites, being hired as security men by security firms in urban areas and serving in drinking bars and local restaurants popularly called chop bars. They lamented over the refusal of BPA to engage them for similar lower level jobs like cleaners, gardeners and security men for no apparent reason.

Elders noted migration is on the rise as there are no jobs.

“...most of our sons and daughters have migrated to other villages to either farm or fish and some to urban areas to look for jobs. It is necessary because there are no jobs here and we must eat” (Elder, Dokokyina, 2017)

They indicated that outmigration would increase if the situation did not change. Migration is a livelihood coping strategy often employed to avert the harsh living conditions of a people (Van der Geest, 2011). Similarly, Awumbila, Owusu, and Teye (2014) and Osmani (2012), found migration could lead to the accumulation of productive assets and skills if migrants have such intention. Migration in the resettlement townships include migration to water resourced areas to fish or do fishing related businesses such as trading in fish while some are engaged in illegal small scale mining at the fringes of Ghana-Ivory Coast border of the District. They pointed out that this was risky not only as a job but ran the risks of being robbed on their way by people suspected to be from Ivory Coast. Despite these risks, resettled people noted that it was one of the fastest ways one could get money to buy or rent fishing boats to fish in the river upstream. Other community members had migrated to old Dokokyina where they
engage in food crop farming during the rainy season and return to the resettlement site during the off season. In Dokokyina, it was underscored that the available land for cultivation was small in size and infertile, so the older ones remained to farm there while the young and strong migrate to other areas to engage in commercial farming.

Box 5 is the summary of the livelihood change story of a former cashew plantation farmer.

**Box 5: Livelihood Change Story**

Isifu, 50

In old Dokokyina, I farmed cashew and yam for the market and maize and cassava for my household. This made me secured because if yams failed, the cashew was there. As such, I was relatively secured against poor harvest.

During cashew season, I could harvest about two trucks cashew for sale and about four KIA trucks of yams for sale. Aside from this, I had small cassava and maize farms for my household.

During the construction of the dam, even though my farms was not nearer the dam, were told all those lands were acquired by BPA and we had to leave. The BPA officials would not listen to our plea for us to continue cultivating there till they needed the land. They brought officer to evaluate the cashew farms and two years later, I was paid a compensation which was far below the cost of maintaining the farm annually. That was the beginning of my poverty. The compensation could not afford an equivalent farm land let alone to add seedlings and chemicals for me to start a new cashew farm.

We were subsequently relocated here and given very small pieces of land to cultivate. How can a man with three wives feed on less than 2 acres of land? We are brought will starve if we all stay here. Some of my brothers have gone back to the Old village area to farm and feed the rest here. Gradually all of us would move to more fertile land places and return here only on occasions.

*Source: Indepth Interview, Man, 52, Dokokyina*

Women migration was said to be on the ascendency. Most women from Bator Anyakakrom had migrated to nearby fishing communities around to continue with their trade in fish. A woman noted:

---

2 Name not real in line with research ethics
We cannot sit here idle and be quarrelling with our husbands. We have to move and try our luck somewhere. I go to the fishing communities to smock fish for some people and in return get a portion of what I smoke. When it is much, I travel to sell them and also buy some things for myself and children. (Woman, 42, Bator-Akanyakrom)

Out migration is perceived to be the most viable livelihood survival techniques in the resettlement communities. Until the LEP or other forms of livelihoods are developed in the resettlement towns, out migration would continue as the only viable option out of poverty for these displaced people.

An elderly lady reiterated thus:

We settled in our old communities because life was there better. We farmed, offered sacrifices, celebrated festivals and were generally happy. If we have been moved here and we do not find life better, why will we not move? Some are old but our children should can move to better places. We cannot say because of the improved house and social amenities here and starve (Woman, Dokokyina, 2017)

Similarly, an elderly man of about 70,

We stay at a place where we are at peace with the land and ancestors or the spirits of the land. If the spirits of the land support you would be blessed and would be happy there even without staying in ‘block houses’. So, many are moving for various reasons including leaving to seek spiritual security at other places.

The above in-depth interviews bring to throws light on the spiritual connotations of resettlements and wellbeing. Land and land use are perceived have spiritual dimensions and form part of local peoples’ wellbeing and livelihood adaptation strategies (Derbile, 2010b). Aside from the livelihood trajectories, the outmigration of the people out of the resettlement communities could be as a result of the social tag on them as being ‘BPA people’ or the feeling that the spirits of the land do not support their wellbeing.
6.10.4 Illegal Jobs

Most of the youth in their quest to survive have resorted to illegal livelihood activities such as stealing of metal scrap at the construction site for sale and illegal fishing in the dam to the peril of their lives and illegal chainsaw operation. Most of the youth noted with no jobs available, they most go beyond the normal and go into odd jobs like the above to survive.

The talked about the risky nature of these illegal scrap and chainsaw operations. They often had like confrontations with BPA security personnel and police in their quest survival through the search for and sale of metal scraps. They ran the risk of having their boats or nets destroyed when caught fishing in the main dam as well as battling the strong water currents at the dam. Risky and unlawful as these jobs are described, they remained the only alternative for survival in the resettlement site. Some engage in ‘galamsey’ activities in nearby Kui near Babatokuma and other sites along the Ghana – Ivory Coast border.

These jobs engaged by the displaced people are not to enhance their human capabilities by learning new trades but for survival. They are more interest in hand-to-mouth activities for now before getting requisite capacity building activities. It is only after making some living through these activities they can pay for training. Discussion with youth groups as to why they do not migrate to learn trade but to risky places revealed the following:

To go for training, we need to pay which we do not have, fend for ourselves for about two years during the period of training. And after training, we will need some monies to start our businesses, and where can we get so. So, we prefer to go into activities that would fetch as monies despite the risks (Man, Field Survey, 2017).
These unlawful and risky businesses could remain as long as there are no alternative livelihoods: more so as skill training is unaffordable to displaced people.

The vying of the youth especially into these illegal jobs is no exception in underunemployment situations. Studies have confirmed that youth unemployment coupled with poverty and inequality are fertile grounds for crime that can lead to social chaos, conflicts and instability that might hamper the development of the country (Asafo, 2015; Bob-Milliar, 2012.).

It falls in line with the relative deprivation theory, which explains that, when expectations fall short of expectations of a group, it could lead to deviant behaviors and violence (Gurr, 2015). The expectations of displaced people enhanced capacity building and livelihood diversification leading to enhanced jobs have not been met to the least due to the failures of the implementation of the livelihood enhancement programme. Having lost much of their productive resources through displacement, ‘diversification’ to illegal and odd livelihood to activities to earn a living is an expression of their despair.

In a nutshell, the Bui Dam Resettlement, like the previous resettlements of the Akosombo and Kpong Dams failed in restoring the livelihoods of dam displaced people. It must however, be noted that the Bui Dam Project engaged more stakeholders and met standards and protocols like the Environmental Impact Assessment Clearance and has well planned Resettlement Planning Framework (RPF) and Resettlement Action Plan but failed in following its own adopted plans. On livelihoods, the RPF was very emphatic that

... a Livelihoods Enhancement Programme (LEP) will be established to assist with rehabilitation of villages. This comprises assistance programmes for
agriculture, fishing, trading, and grazing, hunting, and forest product collection. The programmes aim to improve livelihoods over and above pre-project levels, through the establishment of committees, business development programmes, micro-credit facilities, etc. The LEP and other resettlement measures will provide a safety net for those households directly impacted by the project, and will include measures specifically targeted on vulnerable people through registration of vulnerable households, assessment of vulnerability, and the design and implementation of specific assistance measures. (Zimmermann & Maennling, 2007)

The Livelihood Empowerment Programme (LEP) has not started. The hardship being experienced by displaced people is, therefore, more of an implementation failure as there were elaborate plans not just to mitigate against the livelihood deterioration of displaced people but to improve them. This concurs with resettlement projects that have failed over the years (Smyth, Steyn, Esteves, Franks, & Vaz, 2015).

6.11 Governance and Livelihood Outcomes: Displaced Persons Opinions

This displaced people’s opinions about the structures and processes and livelihood outcomes are summarised in Box 8 below. These were derived from concluding statements after in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. There exists a nexus between the displacement structures, process and livelihood outcomes of dam affected people.

The structure of the Bui Dam structure lays much emphasis on horizontal accountability. This involves ensuring that national regulatory and standards are met at the national level. As such, adherence to clearances from EPA and collaborating with state institutions like the Lands Commission, Ministries of Agriculture and Health among others. Vertical accountability was less embedded in the structure even though
Box 6 is a summary of displaced persons’ views on the displacement governance and how it has impacted on their livelihoods.

**Box 6: Displaced Persons Perception about Governance and livelihood outcomes**

- For meetings we had many of them especially at the beginning of the resettlement process, but we had little to say as we always made to believe that what BPA were offering was the best in Ghana comparing to the Akosombo and Kpong resettlement projects.
  
  What rights did we have if Government himself were displacing us? Whom were we to complain to again? We are either to accept or leave. We thought it would be better to accept the small from government than lose everything.
  
  Everything was already planned, what were we to add?

Comments: The above statements point to the powerlessness of displaced people and possible manipulative or palliative tendencies of BPA officials in the resettlement process. They felt they are worth nothing and could only accept what was offered by displacing officials.

- We would have been glad to resettle on our own if were given the livelihood enhancement projects as promised than staying in these nice houses with hunger. It was a choice for us to make

This resettlement has made us the men powerless over our wives and children. What authority do you have when you cannot provide a meal for your family? So, when your son goes steals metal scraps to sell for some food, you turn a blind eye and prays he comes back safely even though you do not like it.

This means, displaced people have little choices or preferences or that their choices were not considered at all in the displacement and resettlement process. Even though, displacement involves displacing houses, the emphasis on house restoration to the detriment of displaced people’s livelihoods restoration and development is of great concern. Cost of these houses could have gone into the livelihood issues instead of the housing project

- If things remain as it is, in a few years this resettlement would be empty. It cannot grow because we are isolated and surrounded by BPA lands. The nearest community is about 3.5 km away.

All the promises about the livelihood enhancement projects was just to entice us leave peacefully for them to use our land. Immediately, we were relocated BPA officials’ attitude changed. They could now talk to us harshly or even tell us to leave if we were satisfied. If not after about years of resettlement, the livelihood enhancement project has not yet started

Livelihoods deterioration is characteristic of the displaced persons as a result of the failure of the LEP. Life in the resettlement site was described as misery resulting in outmigration and the upsurge of social vices. Out-migration is the eminent strategy.

- Our plight is not a concern for BPA. Till date they employ cleaners and labourers, positions for which we qualified; but they prefer people from other regions even to those positions.

- We made numerous complaints to the District Assembly and our MP about our plight in the resettlement site here, but they did not yield any result. The new Assembly person is now in Bongase and we are not sure if he our concerns would heard at all in the District Assembly now even.

This points to the failure of state power bearers especially state officials to be responsible to vulnerable groups like displaced people. The District Assembly is the decentralized umbrella unit of all development activities in the District responsible for the development of area councils in the District but has accordingly been unable to impress upon BPA to embark on the LEP nor initiate similar projects in the resettlement communities to ease their plight. The Assembly Person and Member of Parliament for the area similarly have failed to be the voice of the voiceless displaced persons.
Displaced peoples’ voices were drowned and unfortunately there was little civil society organization participation. As a result, displaced persons were only involved as consumers of information and directives of BPA rather than to contribute constructively in the resettlement process. Bui Dam Project’s salient documents like Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, the Resettlement Planning Framework and Resettlement Action Plans were said to have been made with deep and wide public participation including all shades of displaced people; the operationalization of these programmes and desired outcomes did not result in the meeting of displaced people’s expectations.

The relevance of these documents can therefore be attributed to meeting the demands of national and international conditionalities of assessing dam development funds and clearances rather than meeting the governance needs of stakeholders. Stakeholder participation was amplified in the Resettlement Planning Framework (RPF, 2007, p111) that

‘It will be important for all project affected people to participate throughout the various stages of the resettlement activities and the land acquisition process. They will need to be consulted by the competent authorities and will have to be invited to participate in public meetings held at appropriate stages of the resettlement process. These meetings will be an occasion to discuss resettlement issues and will provide a forum for stakeholders to express opinions and offer their suggestions.’

There was limited participation of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), and this was of great concern. Apart from the learning and exchange visit trip by the Ghana Dams Forum, there was little mentioned about other non-governmental organizations in the
displacement and resettlement process. The deep involvement of civil society organizations and the media in issues like this ensure better transparency and accountability of actors. For example, till date the livelihood enhancement project which is well elaborate in the projects documents has been implemented and displaced peoples’ voices along are not enough to make BPA walk their promise. Livelihood outcomes in the resettlement is deplorable partly because of the poor inculcation or rejection of displaced people’s views of opting to be resettled in choices of settlements, the poor compensation and secondly because of BPAs own LEP, has been embarked on over the years.

6.12 Incidence of Impoverishment by Resettlement among Social Groups

It was difficult determining which social group was most affected negatively by the displacement and resettlement process. Through focus group discussions community chiefs and elders as a group, men, women and youth groups, each group indicated how they were impoverished. Even though they acknowledge the grave impoverishment upon resettlement due to poor access to productive resources like land and water resources for their livelihoods. Women were said to have been worst affected by the resettlement because of the joblessness at the resettlement centre.

6.13 Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the study outcomes from empirical and documentary data. It established that the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement process had adopted structures and policies to promote good governance among stakeholders especially for displaced persons. However, poor capacities and capabilities of displaced people prevented their optimal use of the structures to their advantage. This was worsened by the poor participation of strong civil society organizations to ensure that BPA worked to the benefit of all stakeholders. Displaced people could therefore not effectively
participate authentically in the process and were merely recipients of information in many instances. Their capacity inadequacies included poor formal education, poor knowledge on resettlement schemes and process, poor negotiating and advocating skills among other. It threw light on the fact that the availability of sound policy documents, as especially advocated by World Bank, does not necessarily lead to good governance leading to improved livelihoods of displaced people on resettlement. The Livelihood Enhancement Programme (Routledge), a flagship of BPA policy to improve the livelihoods of displaced people, have not been implemented and there appears to be no pressure from the District Assemblies, NGOs, Human Rights Activist and other CSOs on BPA to implement the much needed programme.

Needless to say, although resettled persons experience development in terms of improves physical and social infrastructure in the resettlement township, all respondents noted their livelihoods had deteriorated considerably resulting in marked food insecurity and joblessness in comparison to before resettlement. This has led to more agricultural intensification, massive outmigration and the engagement of unusual and illegal jobs like scavenging for metal scraps at construction sites and illegal mining.

Notwithstanding the inadequacies, the Bui Dam’s process is by far a much improvement in terms of planning, structures and policies than any planned resettlement in Ghana. The Akosombo dam resettlement project had no resettlement planning frameworks and plan of action (Kalitsi 2008).

The next chapter is the concluding chapter consisting of the overall summaries of findings and implications of study.
CHAPTER SEVEN
SUMMARIES, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.0 Introduction
This chapter summarizes the main findings of the study. It focuses on the structural implications of the BPA as to the delivery of good governance to displaced people, the process and the resultant livelihood outcomes of displaced people and the livelihood coping and management strategies. This involves a general overview of the study processes, limitations and findings. Major findings of the study modelled on the research questions follow.

The contributions to knowledge in terms of theory, policy and practical displacement and resettlement issues are then presented.

7.1 General Overview
The study was chosen against the backdrop that the poor resettlement consequences have been as a result of poor or inadequate consultation and inculcation of dam affected people’s views and rights in the displacement and resettlement process (Cernea & McDowell, 2000; Crisp, 2010; Dwivedi, 2002; Penz, Drydyk, & Bose, 2011). Similarly, international protocols like the World Bank Operational Policy (4.12), The Asian Development Bank and World Commission of Dams (2000) have necessitated the need for the meaningful participation of displaced persons in the resettlement processes.

Ghana’s Bui Dam RPF is the only displacement and resettlement plan based on the World Bank Operational Manual 4.12. It was, therefore, interesting to find out whether the issues of voice, accountability and participation have been core in the Bui Dams...
The World Bank’s OP (4.12) provides a detailed outline of the elements of a participation plan: “Involvement of resettlers and host communities, including:

(a) A description of the strategy for consultation with and participation of resettlers and hosts in the design and implementation of the resettlement activities;

(b) A summary of the views expressed and how these views were taken into account in preparing the resettlement plan;

(c) A review of the resettlement alternatives presented and choices made by displaced persons regarding options available to them, including choices relating to forms of compensation and resettlement assistance, to relocating as individuals, families or as parts of pre-existing communities or kinship groups, to sustaining existing patterns of group organization, and to retaining access to cultural property (e.g. places of worship, pilgrimage centres, cemeteries)

There was an institutional arrangement for a grievance office, which was established. The study noted that there has been great improvement in the Bui Dam case in terms of preparation and the involvement of stakeholders. More stakeholders including local chiefs and dam affected people, have been involved in the Bui Dam than in the case of previous dam-induced resettlements in Ghana. In line with international standards and requirements, there were at least consultations of dam affected people before and during displacement and resettlement. Participation of displaced people, was however, assessed to be minimal as BPA had a preconceived plan and time line to implement the process. However, comparing the Bui Dam’s resettlement process to those of Akosombo and Kpong Dams process, the Bui Dam’s case at least consulted affected people in the process were consulted and had laid down plans and policy documents
(Chambers, 1970; Diaw & Schmidt, 1990). Participation was largely information giving. Displaced persons could not hold BPA responsive to their demands and promises. This means decisions taken on displacement did not incorporate any of the displaced persons’ interests like location of resettlement site and style of houses to suite their worldviews.

In terms of accountability, displaced persons could not demand accountability from displacing officials because of the rigidity of BPA following their programmes and schedules; and because of their poor power base in terms of knowledge, social and economic capacities. There was weak involvement of CSO with the most formidable one being the Ghana Dams Forum. Their despair was summarised as follows:

...We could we have done, if our views were not considered. They would either tell us bluntly it was not possible according to their documents or they would agree in the meeting and not implement it (In-depth Interview, Woman, 2017)

There were, however, salient documents like the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, the Resettlement Planning Framework and Resettlement Action Plans and other related documents available and accessible publicly on line.

There were institutional arrangements to collaborate with State Institutions and Agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency, Ministries of Agriculture, Health and the Lands Commission. Again, this allowed broader state agency participation as opposed to the Akosombo Dam process where VRA was the sole planner and implementer of the resettlement process (Chambers, 1970; Diaw & Schmidt, 1990).

However, vertical accountability between BPA and displaced persons were largely top-down, directional and informative rather than being discursive. As a result, local
people’s view about displacement and resettlement where not solicited. Indigenous people’s knowledge on resettlement and wellbeing were lost.

7.2 Overview of Major Findings

7.2.1 Structures and Processes of Ensuring Good Governance

Appropriate and strong institutional or structural arrangements are necessary for the planning and implementation of sound resettlement plans and the delivery of good governance therein (Bartolome et al., 2000). The study found that the BPA had laid down structures indicating how it would have to relate to the Actors at the National, Regional and local levels. Each of these structures at the various levels is supposed to play a distinctive complementary role in ensuring sound displacement and resettlement.

At the national level, BPA related with actors on national and statutory issues like the acquisition of clearances, with Lands Commission in the appropriation of lands and the payment of compensations. These structural arrangements ensured that international and national level standards and best practices are adhered to. At this level, interactions were more of formal correspondences and interactions. These national regulatory bodies have constitutional powers sanction BPA for non-compliance.

At the regional level and district, it was structured to work with the Brong Ahafo Regional Coordinating Council and the District Coordination Council of the erstwhile Tain and now Banda District. At the Local levels, the Traditional authorities coordinated with Chiefs and elders of the affected Banda paramount Stools under which Dokokyina, Bui and Bator serve as sub-stools.

BPA had a Grievance Redress Officers and interacted variously with dam affected chiefs and elders, opinion leaders, men and women as well as the youth. This ensured that there was coordination between actors at the various levels thus enhancing
transparency and accountability. Bartolome et al. (2000) note that there must be institutional continuity from top-down to ensure information flow and feedback.

Data for this section was gathered through secondary data analysis of BPA policy documents such as the ESIA, RPF and the RAP, which clearly outline the institutional arrangements of the process. Earlier research by Fink (2005), Hensengerth (2010; 2013) and Asiama (2015) provided ample secondary data, which was reviewed to achieve this objective. Secondary data reviewed as juxtaposed with empirical data collected from resettled people in Resettlement Township B.

Even though there appeared to be a sound structure and clear procedures to ensure an open, transparent and responsive displacement and resettlement system, the poor capacity or knowledge base of displaced people as actors hindered the full realization of the structural objective. Participation of local people in the process, as passive as they were, meant that there were merely receiving instructions from BPA.

Empirical data revealed that poor educational levels of displaced people and the poor knowledge of their civic rights couple with the poor participation of civil right advocacy groups were responsible. Empirical data revealed displaced persons were ignorant of basic documents like the Resettlement Action Plans, Redress procedures and budgets.

Displaced persons were not assertive enough to demand accountability or seek redress if they felt short-changed. The capabilities of actors are as important as the enabling structure itself if not more. The vital role of relevant information to actors to be able to make informed decisions or actions, and to feedback into resettlement process were thus lost (Joshi, 2014; Kosack & Fung, 2014).
At the national level, there is horizontal accountability as BPA was answerable to institutions like the Environmental Protection Agency and the Lands Commission for environmental clearance and land acquisition and/or compensation issues, respectively. This was because these institutions had those statutory functions backed by the laws of the land.

However, downward accountability in terms of BPA being answerable to dam-affected people had no legal basis even though resettlement documents of the Bui dam spell out that displacement and resettlement should be participatory. Lower level actors were therefore incapacitated in that regard to holding BPA responsible and accountable.

Other capacity issues involve the financial capability of dam affected people in seeking expert advice like the services of a legal counsel. For example, grievances of unsatisfactory compensation can only be challenged in court (Asiama, 2015a), which most displaced persons cannot afford.

It is worth noting that favourable structural conditions alone do not guarantee good governance. An assessment of displaced persons’ experiences with the use of relative importance index revealed that institutions were less responsible, open and transparent in terms of access to information among others. This makes good governance a mirage in the process. As a result, displaced people as primary actors could not effectively participate authentically to make inputs that would affect their livelihoods.

Participatory approaches as outlined in the ESIA, RPF and RAP were mere gimmicks as BPA dictated the pace and content of the process with displaced persons being mere recipients of information. The possession of these documents is considered as best practices by the international protocols and recommendations. These documents alone are not sufficient to ensure sound resettlement schemes.
7.2.2 Strategies of Demanding and Delivery Governance

The second objective concerns how actors sought and demanded governance under the structures were investigated using mainly focus groups and in-depth interviews.

Strategies for delivering good governance were put in place by BPA ensuring all stakeholders of displacement were involved. Apart from dealing with the various community chiefs and elders, the community youth and women were grouped and consulted as well.

Methods of governance delivery included consultations with the various groups, holding of meetings with related groups and announcements. Community leaders relay deliberations to their constituents after meetings and holding consultations with them as a way of ensuring accountability to them.

In the same vein, seeking accountability from BPA officials included appeals, petitions and begging. Displaced people had no power to strongly demand responsiveness and, therefore, mostly appealed to them and in most cases, their appeals were not heeded to. Governance would only be successful if all stakeholders have some forms of power to coerce other stakeholders to be responsive to them. Backed by legislature, education and better-negotiating skills, lobbying skills, BPA always had their way.

The role of CSOs to mediate between the main actors were less felt. Mention was made of the role of the GDD in the initial stages promoting a learning visit to the communities resettled by Akosombo and Kpong Dams. This boosted their capacities on how resettlement should be. However, CSOs by empowering displaced people on the rights to development under the displacement and resettlement process with improved negotiating, advocacy and lobbying skills and knowledge were absent. The role of CSOs as watchdogs to ensure that human rights and rights to development were pursuit were minimal. There was, therefore, a gulf of power imbalances in favour of BPA under
the displacement process. Needless to say, displaced persons, therefore, thought their views and opinions were not given a listening ear.

7.2.3 Livelihood Outcomes
Displaced people indicated their livelihood had deteriorated by the displacement because of poor compensation, poor relocation and livelihood restoration measures. On compensation, they noted it was woefully inadequate and delayed unduly. They, therefore, could not use it to replace some of the assets lost. The cash for land compensation was thought not to be useful and not preferred. Most tree crop farmers and women especially were most affected because tree crop farmers would need to re-grow or acquire new lands and replant their tree, which will take at least three years to mature. Most women did not receive much of the meagre compensation because many of them did own land or landed property for which compensation was paid for. This result concurs with Scudder (2012) who found that displacement impacts differently on the various social groups.

The second perceived cause of their poor livelihood state was the choice of the relocation site. They claimed the site was infertile and too isolated for one to do any meaningful farming and trading. They noted that plots of land allocated to them were small and they had no opportunities of getting lands nearby as those lands were forcibly acquired by government for the project.

Resettlement of communities after displacement can be positive when it incorporates an effective compensation programme, including the payment of appropriate and realistic compensation packages and on schedule, provision of alternative appropriate housing units, and effective planning to uphold or provide livelihood opportunities for resettled people (Bennett & McDowell, 2012; Biswas, 2012; Price, 2015).
Resettled people of Ghana’s Bui Dam opined that there was too much premium put on housing rather than livelihood restoration of resettled people. Shelter, they noted, was good but livelihood was most desirable. The inability of BPA to empower resettled persons to go into self-employment ventures or even enhance their pre-resettlement livelihoods is having a toll on them. As a result, out-migration, especially among the youth and fishermen, was rife in the resettlement.

Ironically, the Bui Power Project envisaged cultivating about 3000 hectares of land for rice, which is yet to come to fruition. On livelihood restoration, the RPF (2007, p. 96) reads

*The Livelihoods Enhancement Programme (LEP) will provide a “safety net” for those households for who the disruption to economic and social networks, and to livelihoods, may heighten the risk of vulnerability and increased poverty, with all its negative consequences. It will also seek opportunities to improve livelihoods compared to pre-project levels, and will also cover impacts on the host site communities.*

LEP had elaborate plans in agriculture, fishing, trading and grazing as well as an implementation strategy. However, over six years of resettlement, it is yet to be a reality for the relief of resettled people. BPA is yet to explain why this desirable project is yet to be embarked on. This buttresses the point that sound policies and plans alone do not necessarily lead to good development outcomes. Dam financiers should go further to ensure that policies and plans are implemented.

This has brought untold hardships to resettled people in the resettlement town resulting in livelihood management strategies like ‘scavenging’ for scraps from the dam construction sites to sell, venturing into illegal surface mining and social vices.
This concurs with wide held views that displacement and resettlements often result in the breakdown of social and food security, credit and labour exchange networks, social capital and kinship ties (Baviskar, 1995; Bennett & McDowell, 2012; Cernea, 2000; Dwivedi, 2002).

7.3 Conclusions

In terms of governance, it is evident from the study there were structures put in place both the national and local level to enhance accountability and participation of both relevant state institutions and local people. Displaced people were consulted anyway at all stages of the displacement and resettlement process but were debilitated from making any meaning inputs because of capacities in displacement knowledge and skills in negotiating, advocating, petitioning and lobbying. As a result, they lacked the power to make BPA accountability to them BPA to them. They were poor participation of Civil Society Organizations to act as referees in the displacement and resettlement process to ensure fairness. Displaced persons thought their grievances and some of the agreed terms were not attended to and they were powerless.

There were negative livelihood changes across all sections of displaced people with the resettlement. Most significant asset loss was land among the farms and water source for fishing. While compensation for land and crops were inadequate, tree crop farmers felt most negatively affected and fishermen the worst affected as their river which was their ‘land” was not compensated for at all. They expected dam envisaged under the Livelihood Empowerment Programme (Routledge, 2003) component of the ESIA of the resettlement has not been implemented yet.

The study determined that the resettlement was conceived more on relocation to improved housing than livelihoods. This gave preference to the provision of improved
housing at the resettlement than improved livelihoods. Housing infrastructure was therefore greatly improved at the resettlement to the detriment of livelihood strategies. This has caused great impoverishment among displaced people even upon living in the very much improved houses than before. It was felt that the youth were especially hit by the impoverishment followed by women.

Many displaced people to recover or even survive the impoverishment have resorted to agriculture intensification on the smaller land sizes allocated to them and diversification of agriculture to include all kinds of crops needed for the household. This is opposed to the largely bush fallowing or land rotation method of farming hitherto practiced before resettlement. Outmigration to water resourced villages for fishing or to fertile and largely available land areas as well as the engagement in ‘galamsey’ and dealing with scraps are the other coping strategies in the resettlement.

7.4 Contributions of Study

The study contributes to the displacement and resettlement research by critically examining the governance and livelihood issues in development-induced displacement and resettlement using Ghana’s recent Bui Dam-induced displacement and resettlement as a case study.

The study makes contributions to theory and practice as follows.

7.4.1 Contributions to Theory

This study contributes to the research in displacement and resettlement by examining how the principles of good governance to displacement and resettlement studies. Asiama (2015) studied governance in only the compulsory land acquisition process of the Bui Dam. This research work went further to study the entire resettlement process and the resultant livelihood outcomes from the perspectives of resettled people.
The adaption of the actor-oriented approach to political ecology of the study gives a perspective that displacement and resettlement process need to appreciate the power or capabilities of actors as players within a politicized environment pertaining to their livelihoods which largely depend on their environments. The capabilities of actors (legal or social) to negotiate in a given structure is a major determinant in the livelihood outcome of the actor. Displacement and resettlement processes involve advocacy, advice, protest, petitions and boycotts which are political processes to influence the outcome of displacements to the benefit of the actors. The capability of displaced persons as active players in the politicized environment of advocating, advising and petitioning is often sublimed in the adoption of international protocols and normative arrangements at the national level.

Concentrating at the local level, the study underscores that just as at the international level, application of these protocols at the local level is of equal importance as at the international and national levels. Displacement and resettlement process should, therefore, examine the power basis and relations of actors as well as the avenues to exercise the powers (Displacement and resettlement structure). CSOs should be perceived as main actors in mediating the excesses of other actors in the process and ensuring that policies are fairly implemented.

Therefore, ensuring suitable hierarchical structure alone is not enough but that empowering stakeholders’ capabilities in terms of the knowledge base in rights, advocacy, and negotiation skills are equally important. The application of the actor-oriented political ecology contributes to methods of distilling data from the various actors about the same displacement and resettlement project.
The study contributed to the Cernea’s Impoverishments Risks and Reconstruction model in the following ways:

- The use of this model in the study contributed to reviewing which risks were well mitigated and why. It was underscored that the reduced livelihood of resettled people is because the risk of landlessness was poorly mitigated. Location of resettlement site and size and fertility of land at new resettlement site is poor. It was noted that the conception of land included farmlands to the neglect of water bodies that fishermen depended on as well as wild fruits, fuelwood and game and non-forest resources like clay that most women depended on. Even though monies paid for compensation were inadequate, fishermen and women felt short-changed as their resources were considered for compensation at all. The study therefore contributes that landlessness, as in the model, should encompass all land uses such as grazing lands, hunting ranches, and fishing grounds should be considered in order to appropriately mitigate the risks on displaced people.

- Cernea did not indicate in his model which risks would have a larger effect if not mitigated or mitigated (Cernea, 1997; 2000; 2004). Findings from this study indicate that mitigating the land risks of displaced people would contribute significantly to their livelihoods than any of the other risks. A good assessment of livelihood risks associated with landlessness and the appropriate mitigation measures would contribute significantly to reducing the joblessness, food insecurity and ill-health. The overemphasis on mitigating the homelessness of displaced persons than adequately mitigating the land related issues would lead to poor livelihoods as in the Bui Dam’s case.
The study also contributes to the application of Giddens (1984) Structuration Theory by confirming that structures, institutions and policies are necessary for the functioning of society; and that the knowledge base of the agency is likewise important. The theory as applied in the displacement governance of the Bui Dam, noted they were laid down policies, strategies and laws to ensuring good governance. However, they capacity of displaced people seek good governance

### 7.4.2 Contributions to Policy and Policy Implementation

In terms of policy, the study finds out that BPA has suitable policy documents for participation, voice, and accountability of stakeholders. However, the implementation of these policies was the challenge. Displaced people noted consultation was just a formality rather than eliciting their views. They described the meetings as avenues to receive information from displacing officers rather than to discuss issues and possibly come out with suitable alternatives.

Ghana has no development-induced displacement and resettlement policy or law yet and, therefore, relying on constitutional provisions relating to compulsory land acquisition by the state and international protocols like the World Bank’s recommendations as was applied in the Bui Dam process. A national development-induced resettlement policy that emphasizes on displaced peoples’ active role and civil society participation in its implementation is necessary.

Even as the resettlement planning framework sought to meaningfully involve displaced people at all stages of the process to make the outcome more beneficial to them, there were obvious implementation challenges, which could have been averted with the active participation of CSOs. Local and international CSOs should be empowered with both financial and intellectual resources in resettlement issues in order to serve as
watchdogs in the resettlement process. This would ensure that stakeholders were responsive to each other.

Finally, displacement should be conceived more as a livelihood disruption than shelter displacement. This would put a higher premium on livelihood reconstruction of displaced people than on housing. Resettlement should be more of livelihood restoration than replacement of houses. It is noteworthy that, the resettlement projects of Akosombo, Kpong and now Bui heavily tilted towards housing to the detriment of livelihood restoration and have resulted in impoverishment of resettled people (Adu-Aryee, 1993; Diaw & Schmidt, 1990; Owusu, Obour, & Nkansah, 2017).

Livelihood restoration such as training and re-education or the beginning of livelihood enhancing infrastructure like dams should pre-empt displacement to enable displaced people to adjust to their new environment quickly. Displaced persons could be put into co-operatives and be given training in skills and resource management even before they were physically resettled.

Displacement and resettlement schemes and policies should be based on broad stakeholder consultative research and not just to adapt consultations as a mere strategy. For instance, in the Bui Dam displacement and resettlement case, there were wide consultations and recommendations obtained but these were not implemented. The Ghana Dams Forum (2008) recommendations in Raschid-Sally, Akoto-Danso, Kalitsi, Ofori, and Koranteng (2008) and other research-based recommendations should be adhered to. BPA’s own ESIA was not adequately adhered to especially with regard to the failure to implement the livelihood empowerment project. It is unclear why the LEP has not been embarked upon yet, but under the BPA Act 740, all issues pertaining to the resettlement is to be borne by the State. It is, therefore, most probable that funds for
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it have been released by the state to BPA to implement this very important component of the resettlement. It is recommended that, as a policy, funds for the displacement and resettlement should be readily available even before the commencement of the dam construction project.

The situation where resettled people would have to wait years before remedial measures are taken should be avoided. The Akosombo Dam resettled people suffered for about a generation before the establishment of the VRA Trust Fund in July, 1996 to help augment their deplorable situation. The Bui Dam resettled people should not go through such an experience.

7.4.3 Towards Endogenous Development Approach to Resettlement

The study has a number of implications for endogenous development. In Endogenous Development (ED), indigenous or local knowledge systems and spirituality are prime issues to consider. The archaeology baseline on the Bui Dam Project submitted by the Archaeology Department of the University of Ghana noted that;

*Cultural heritage of significance has been recorded in the project area. These include the shrines, old and contemporary cemeteries and burials inside homes or in open spaces in the settlement. The cultural landscape shows that the people in the project area have a strong attachment to historical traditions, idols (mainly collections of stones/boulders) and interaction with ancestors. The relationship between the people and of their natural and cultural environment is one of hope, fear and/or reverence. This is a factor that should be appreciated and properly understood in the evaluation of the reactions and responses of communities as they moved into new locations. The land on which communities are living now is accorded a spirituality that is regularly propitiated and worshipped.* (Ako Okoro, 2006, p.4)

The structure and processes of the displacement and resettlement process did not fully harness the culture and spirituality of the displaced people. Spiritual leaders and the
spirituality of displaced people were not emphasised. ED puts premium in the holistic wellbeing of people and, as such, takes cognisant of the interconnectedness between the people’s spiritual, social and physical wellbeing. The following steps are suggested by the thesis research as a contribution towards the application of Endogenous Development approaches into displacement and resettlement processes

a. First is the understanding of displaced people’s worldviews about their land resettlement. This would help bring out their values and resources that contribute to their wellbeing in that locality. This information is important to knowing resources to compensate for and how to compensate for it. Methods such as community institutional and resource mapping could be used to map out the various resources of value and how they are being managed. The people of Bui and Dokokyina, for example, feel socially short-changed in that their social status as chiefs and land lords have been lowered.

b. Discuss with community members the strategies by which, in their view, how displacement could occur with minimal effects on their value systems. This could lead to complementarity of strategies between local community people and officials. How can social networks, spirituality and economic wellbeing be retained or improved with the impending displacement? If communities’ strategies are not applicable for lack of time, resources, personnel etc. then discuss and agree on the nearest alternatives according to their worldviews.

c. Allow the exhaustion of local knowledge before complementing with external knowledge systems. This would make community members appreciate their inadequacies and do not see the external knowledge as an imposition but a complement. Displacing authorities should build on displaced people’s world view in planning and implementing resettlement schemes.
The study acknowledge that implementation of the above measures could have challenges such as the inability to meet project schedules. It is in this regard that views of Cernea (1996; 2000) and Scudder (2005) as well as the World Bank (2004) that resettlement should be conceived as a project on its own and not a side effect of displacement. Same importance should be attached to the resettlement like the dam construction itself. Therefore, with sound community animation and early resettlement planning the above recommendations are feasible. The over-reliance on the economic costs and benefits of the development projects have resulted in the generational miseries of thousands of people around the globe (Cernea, 1996; 2000; Isaacman & Isaacman, 2013). A sacrifice of tact and time to truly understand the worldviews and its contribution to the wellbeing of dam affected people could avert these generational miseries.

The overreliance of foreign experts and world views to plan and implement displacement schemes is a contributory factor of the failures of displacement and resettlement schemes (Scott, 2000; Dwevidi, 1999; 2002). This study recommends that, since resettlement is for the displaced persons, their worldviews, local knowledge systems and strategies of displacement should be the key in the planning and implementation of displacement and resettlement schemes to make resettlement schemes more beneficial to them.

7.5 Limitations of the Study and Directions of Future Research

This study is a research based on displaced people as primary stakeholders in the displacement and resettlement process. It would be useful if further research using multi-stakeholder approach for a comprehensive appreciation of the governance and livelihood issues of Bui Dam displacement and resettlement process. Further research
could compare strategies employed during the displacement and resettlement of Resettlement Township A in Jama in the Bole District of the Northern Region to what transpired in Resettlement Township B in the Banda district. This would give a more holistic picture of the Bui Dam’s displacement and resettlement project.

The poor interests and participation of CSOs in the resettlement process need further research. Displacement makes displaced people more vulnerable to various risks of impoverishment in the resettlement process is an attempt to alleviate these risks and, therefore, should be of interest to CSOs. The involvement and impact, as found by this research, leaves much to be desired. Further research into how CSOs and even some Government Agencies like the Department of Social Welfare and the Department of Community Development, could play more active roles in monitoring displacement and resettlement processes is recommended. Similarly, both state-owned and non-state own media houses should be empowered to do independent and accurate research and reportage on issues arising during displacement processes to the wider public.

Morvaridi (2005) notes that concerted efforts of CSOs help improved the resettlement outcomes of displaced persons of the Illysu Dam in Turkey through advocacies.

Furthermore, research into the effects of cash compensations as a measure to ameliorate the displaced people’s impoverishment would be useful. This is because displaced people’s concern about the paltry sums of its contribution paid could be because of the poor capacity to use cash for productive purposes. Valuation of assets should be in tune with present day economic circumstances. Compensation was paid for land and landed properties alone. However, considerable loss of water rights and fishing resources were lost by fishermen, which were not compensated for. For improved livelihoods, compensations packages should capture as many assets as possible.
Further research into the relationships between displaced people’s worldviews and spirituality about their settlements and welfare is recommended. Issues such as indigenous strategies for resettlement could be explored and incorporated in future resettlements. Enhanced participation of local people would lead to a more culturally acceptable resettlement.

7.6 Final Conclusion

All in all, notwithstanding the many negative assessments of BPA performances in the displacement and resettlement process, the BPA process is a far improvement in resettlement governance in the country compared with governance processes of the Akosombo and Kpong Dams. Displaced people at least were consulted at all stages and were given the chance to make inputs into the process even if their inputs were often not accepted.

In terms of livelihoods outcomes, however, there is a lot to be desired as resettlement was just relocation into improves houses and settlement with social amenities alone. The need to ameliorate the lives of resettled people through income generating activities is very much needed to curb their impoverishment. Given the repercussions of the Akosombo and Kpong Dam’s impoverishments leading to the establishment of the VRA Trust Fund, it would have been thought that livelihood enhanced should have taken prime position in the Bui Dam’s case.
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APPENDIX A: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS DAM-AFFECTED PERSONS

Dear Respondent,
I am Frederick Der Bebelleh, a PhD Candidate with the University for Development Studies, Tamale.
I am conducting a study on the topic:

“GOVERNANCE AND LIVELIHOOD EFFECTS OF GHANA’S BUI DAM DISPLACEMENT AND RESETTLEMENT PROCESS:
Empirical Perspectives from Displaced People”

I solicit your opinions on the above topic with the view of exploring and strengthening ways of improving good governance in displacement and resettlement schemes in Ghana.
It is also a survey towards the award of a Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Development Studies.
Kindly be assured of your confidentiality in the responses you give.
Thank You for freely agreeing take part in this study.
Tel: 0243144256
Email: fbebelleh@uds.edu.gh

---

SECTION A: General Information

- Name of interviewer..................
- Questionnaire No..................
- Date of Interview..................
- Place of Interview..................
- Community Before Resettlement.....
- Resettlement Camp..................
- Name of interviewee (Optional).....

---

B: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

1. Sex........
   01= Male  [ ]
   02= Female [ ]

2. Age........
   01= Below 30 Years (Youth) [ ]
   02= 30-60 Years (Adult) [ ]
   03=60 Years (Aged) [ ]

3. Marital Status...
   01= Married [ ]
   02=Divorced/Separated [ ]
   03=Single [ ]
4. Residential status: 
   01=Native [ ]
   02=Migrant/settler [ ]

5. Status in the Community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Resettlement</th>
<th>After Resettlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 Chief</td>
<td>01 Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Household Head</td>
<td>02 Household Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Clan/Ethnic Head</td>
<td>03 Clan/Ethnic Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Women Head</td>
<td>04 Women Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Ordinary Resident</td>
<td>05 Ordinary Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Other (Specify)</td>
<td>06 Other (Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Main Occupation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Resettlement</th>
<th>After Resettlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 Farming</td>
<td>01 Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Hunting</td>
<td>02 Hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Fishing</td>
<td>03 Fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Charcoal Production/Fuelwood Dealer</td>
<td>04 Charcoal Production / Fuelwood Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Formal Employment</td>
<td>05 Ordinary Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Other (Specify)</td>
<td>06 Other (Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for change in main occupation (if any) …………………………………

Level of Formal Education:

| 01= Never Attended School | [ ] |
| 02= Basic Level (JHS)    | [ ] |
| 03= Vocational/Technical  | [ ] |
| 04= SHS/Vocational Level  | [ ] |
| 05= Post-Secondary       | [ ] |
| 06= Tertiary Level       | [ ] |
SECTION C: General Assessment of the Displacement and Resettlement Process
PARTICIPATION

5. Did you participate in displacement and resettlement process?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

6. If yes, in what capacity and how?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

7. If No, Why?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. Do you think the process was accountable?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

9. Why? ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. To what extent did the following groups participate in the process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>VMuch</th>
<th>Averagely</th>
<th>Poorly</th>
<th>How</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs and traditional Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Assembly Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female household Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How often did you meet to discuss issues concerning your displacement in resettlement process at the following levels?
   o Community levels [ ] Quarterly [ ] Monthly [ ] Weekly [ ] Others (Specify)
   o With CSOs - [ ] Quarterly [ ] Monthly [ ] Weekly [ ] Others (Specify)
   o With BPA - [ ] Quarterly [ ] Monthly [ ] Weekly [ ] Others (Specify)
   o All three above - [ ] Quarterly [ ] Monthly [ ] Weekly [ ] Others (Specify)

12. Rate the following statements about your meetings?
   [ ] Meetings were more of information dissemination than discussions
   [ ] Meetings atmosphere was free from intimidation
   [ ] Displacement officials were open to us
   [ ] Dam-affected persons were encouraged to make inputs in the process
   [ ] We discussed frankly and in good faith

13. Rate the participation of the following groups of people in the displacement and resettlement process?
   Men [ ] Very Much [ ] Much [ ] Least
14. Explain your rating

…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………

15. Which of the following stages do you think displaced persons participated most
a. Compulsory land acquisition and displacement process
b. Resettlement planning process
c. Compensation payment process

ACCOUNTABILITY
16. Rate the accountability of the process by the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to information (timeliness, media etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to project documents (Minutes, agreements etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to project budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to project audit report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to action plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Least Accountable 2. Somewhat Accountable 3= Averagely Accountable 4= Very Accountable 5= Most Accountable

17. To what extent were the following groups accountable to their constituents by reporting and discussing deliberations as well as conveying views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs and traditional Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Assembly Executives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female household Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Least Accountable 2. Somewhat Accountable 3= Averagely Accountable 4= Very Accountable 5= Most Accountable

TRANSPARENCY
18. Do you think the displacement and resettlement process was transparent?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

19. Why do you think so?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
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20. Were the processes of displacement and resettlement adequately explained to you?  
Yes [ ] No [ ]

21. Were given adequate time to prepare?  
Yes [ ] No [ ]

22. Was information flow appropriate?  
Yes [ ] No [ ]

23. Were you given enough information at each time during the process?  
Yes [ ] No [ ]

24. Why do think so?  
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Documents concerning displacement were readily available [ ] Yes [ ] No  

25. What was the most used medium of communication?  
[ ] Radio [ ] Newspapers [ ] Notices [ ] Through Representatives [ ] Public Announcements

26. Was there a complaints office where one could go for clarification?  
Yes [ ] No [ ]

27. Was it easy to get clarification from officials? [ ] Yes [ ] No

ROLE OF CSOs/NGOS

28. Do you think the displacement and resettlement process collaborated well CSOs, Displaced Persons and the District Assembly?  
Yes [ ] No [ ]

29. Explain your answer?  
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

30. What were the CSOs/NGO(s) engaged?  

31. Do think these CSOs/NGOs made any impact in ensuring good governance in the process? [ ] Yes [ ] No

32. Explain your answer with specific examples if any?  
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

33. What do you think were the weaknesses and strengths of these CSOs?  
Strengths  
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Weaknesses
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

34. Was the District Assembly adequately involved in the process?  
Yes [ ] No [ ]

35. What significant role did the play in ensuring good governance in your view?  
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Do you think this was adequate? Yes [ ] No [ ]

36. Explain your answer above?  
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
ROLE OF ACTORS - Displaced Persons, Host Communities and Chiefs

37. Do think dam affected communities were adequately involved in the process? Yes [ ] No [ ]
   Why
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

38. How did displaced persons hold their community leaders or representatives accountable?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

39. Do think the choosing of community representatives were fair and transparent? [ ] Yes
   [ ] No
40. Explain…………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

41. Do you feel displaced persons and their representatives made significant inputs in the
   process? Yes [ ] No [ ]
42. What was the most significant input in your view and why do you think so?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

43. Do think community members or represents had the capacity to influence the process?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
44. Why do you think so?....................................................................
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

45. If ‘No’ in question 46, what capacity or skills do you think they lacked?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

Effects of the Displacement and resettlement Process
46. What changes have the resettlement process brought in your life? (Probe changes in
   Physical, natural, social and financial changes)
Positive Changes
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

Negative………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
47. Which members of your community benefitted most from the following and why? (Probe into the form of benefits and groups like women, men, Traditional authorities etc)
   a. The Land displacement and compensation process
   b. Resettlement Camp
   c. Any other

48. Which group benefitted least and why in the following process?
   a. The Land displacement and compensation process
   b. Resettlement Camp
   c. Any other

APPENDIX B: FOCUS GROUP AND IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW GUIDE

Existence of a supportive democratic and human rights context through
- Respect for human rights such as freedom of speech, association, religion
- No discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, religion
- Promotion of tolerance and social harmony
- Respect for rights of displaced persons

Appropriate degree of consultation in decision-making
Was the Bui Power Authority
- accountable to local people through consultative meetings, information dissemination etc.
- have the requisite powers and capacity to perform their functions
- have some constraints to act in the broader of interests displaced persons.

Collaborative management in decision-making for D & R involving representatives of all affected parties, particularly local and indigenous people

Citizen participation occurring at all levels of decision-making related to D & R
(Land Acquisition and Compensation Negotiations, Relocation Options, Timings, Resettlement Site Planning, management planning, operations) with special emphasis at the local level and the equal participation of men and women

Existence of civil society groups and an independent media
- Were CSOs part of the D & R process? What roles did they play? Did they mediate to act as a check and balance on the exercise of the powers of the Bui Power Authority and Displaced persons?
- What was the role of the media?

- levels of trust
- What were the levels of trust among the various actors, governmental and non-governmental, national, state and local, involved in the D & R process?
- Level of access Information by actors
- The complexity and bureaucracy of getting access to information on D & R
- Media of information dissemination

Clarity – “Who was accountable to Whom?”
- Was there clarity in the roles and responsibility of actors?

Role of leaders –
- Clarity in the appointment of leaders
- Appropriateness of responsibilities assigned to leaders
Were there spaces for demand Accountability – Effective public institutions of accountability, including access to information, capacity to analyze and report, ability to get action, comprehensiveness of mandates, to lodge complaints and demand explanation without fear of victimization?

- **Civil Society and the Media** – How effective were civil society groups and the media in mobilizing demand for accountability especially on behalf of displaced persons.

- **Existence of a supportive redress context** characterized by respect for the rule of law including
  - Clarity of roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders
  - Equality before the law irrespective of one’s gender, ethnic group and status
  - Stakeholders having the right to seek legal remedies against the government and against their fellow citizens

- **Fair, impartial and effective enforcement of any D &R rules** including
  - The transparency of the rules themselves (their existence is known and accessible)
  - The absence of corruption among public officials
  - The right of appeal for those charged with transgressions

- **Fairness in the process in dealings with all stakeholders** including
  - Respect for the rights, uses and traditional knowledge of local and indigenous Peoples.
  - An assessment of other options or views of D & R
  - Dissemination of information to all groups

- **Fairness in sharing or benefiting from the outcomes of D & R** including
  - Compensation and livelihood options
  - Resettlement packages between resettlement Camps and groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Rates</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Consultations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Pluralism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in decision implementation strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear mandate of responsibilities of Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring effective Communication between and among stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Grievance System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Trust and Respect among Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient and Effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness of Institutions to All Eg. Poorer Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral and Cultural Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample time for Consultations and Deliberations with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank: [1= No extent, 2= Very low extent, 3= low extent, 4= high extent, 5= Very high extent]

Source: Field Survey, 2017
APPENDIX C: ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS GOVERNANCE PROCESS BY THE VARIOUS GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• Men Groups’ Assessment</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of Land Acquisition Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of Relocation Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Women’s Group Assessment

| Effects of Land Acquisition Process |     |       |       |
| Reasons for Assessment |     |       |       |
| Effects of Relocation Process |     |       |       |
| Reasons for Assessment |     |       |       |
| Overall Assessment |     |       |       |
| Reason for Assessment |     |       |       |

• Youth Group

<p>| Effects of Land Acquisition Process |     |       |
| Reasons for Assessment |     |       |
| Effects of Governance of Relocation Process |     |       |
| Reasons for Assessment |     |       |
| Overall Effects |     |       |
| Reasons for Assessment |     |       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landlessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joblessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Morbidity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Mortality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Common Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Community Dislocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Amenities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places of Worship Eg. Mosques and Churches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1= Very negative, 2= Negative 3= Somewhat 4= Positive change 5= Very positive