|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Forest Investment Program** | | | | |
| **Ghana Forest Investment Plan** | | | | |
| **Monitoring and Evaluation Report** | | | | |
| Investment Plan Endorsement Date | Nov-12 | | | |
| Lead MDB | IBRD | | | |
| Other MDBs | AfDB | | | |
| Reporting Date : June – 30 | | | | |
|  | Title | Implementing MDB | FIP Funding Approval Date | MDB Funding Approval Date |
| Projects/Programs | Enhancing Natural Forest and Agro-Forest Landscapes | IBRD | 19-Dec-14 | 27-Feb-15 |
| Engaging Local Communities in REDD+/Enhancing Carbon Stocks | AfDB | 25-Sep-13 | 21-Jan-14 |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| THEME 1.1 : GHG EMISSION REDUCTIONS OR AVOIDANCE / ENHANCEMENT OF CARBON STOCKS | | | | | | | | | |
| Ghana | | | | | | | | | |
| Lead MDB: IBRD | | | | | | Level: Project | | | |
| Other MDBs : AfDB | | | | | | | | | |
| Endorsed FIP Funding (Million USD): 50.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| Co-Financing (Million USD): 5.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| Reporting Period | From : 01/01/2017 | | | | | | | To: 31/12/2017 | |
| Project Title: Engaging Local Communities in REDD+/Enhancing Carbon Stocks | | | | | | | | | |
| Table 1.1 | Unit | Reference Emission Level/Baseline | | Target 1 | Target 2 | Report Year 2015 | Report Year 2016 | Report Year 2017 | Total Actual to date |
|  |  | If Applicable | |  |  | Actual Annual | Actual Annual | Actual Annual |
| GhG Emission Reductions/Avoidance/Enhancement of Carbon Stocks | Million Tons of Co2 Equivalent | TBD | | TBD | 3.9 | N/A | N/A |  |  |
| GHG emissions from reduced/avoided deforestation and forest degradation | Million Tons of Co2 Equivalent | TBD | | TBD | 1.9 | N/A | N/A |  |  |
| GHG sequestered through natural regeneration, re- and afforestation, and other related activities | Million Tons of Co2 Equivalent | TBD | | TBD | 2.0 | N/A | N/A |  |  |
| Type of Forest(s) | High Forest : Closed Forest and Open Forest in the High Forest Zone and the Transitional Zone | | | | | |  |  |  |
| Area Covered | Ha | 90000 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IP Lifetime | Years | 5 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Please specify methodology (ies) used for GHG accounting (e.g. by project/program), including the start year and period for the Reference Emissions Level | | | Refer to Ghana's Monitoring and Reporting Plan.  **Additional Assumptions**   1. Annual deforestation rates : 2 % (estimate at the national level according to Ghana FIP Investment Plan, 2012) 2. Expected reduction in Rate of Deforestation with FIP in Project areas 40% reduction 3. Deforestation in the business as usual scenario : 43 200 Ha 4. T CO2/ha in forest: 360 (average above ground biomass, weighted average for ”reserves” and “off reserve forest remnants” in the high forest zone, Ghana FIP Investment Plan) 5. T CO2/ha in main alternative land use : 201,85 (cocoa plantation, source : Ghana FIP Investment Plan, 2012, based on Hansen, C.P. et al., 2009; Katoomba Group et al., 2011) | | | | | | |
| Please provide a brief description of the interventions (context and objective) | | | 1. Establishment of 16,000 Ha of Climate Smart Cocoa (incorporation of trees in cocoa farms) 2. Establishment of 10,000 Ha of Climate Smart Agriculture (incorporation of trees in other agricultural landscapes) 3. Establishment of 5000 Ha of Small Scale Plantations 4. Establishment of 1200 Ha of Woodlot 5. Implementation of wildfire management guidelines on Off Reserve areas. 6. Community sensitization and awareness creation. 7. Formation and equipping fire volunteers and fire squads 8. Presence of Officers at the Project Sites 9. Establishment of 60Ha of Model Plantations 10. Establishment of 150ha of Seed Orchard | | | | | | |
| Success Story? Although the tons of carbon sequestrated through the project is yet to be quantified, it is worth mentioning that some of the project interventions contributing to the emission reductions and enhancement of sequestration potential have been achieved. For instance the target for model plantation has been achieved, the targeted number of fire volunteers formed trained and resourced have been achieved, the target for seed orchard has been achieved and target for trees on agricultural lands and cocoa farms achieved. All these interventions collectively are generating some level of carbon sequestration and emission reductions. The Resource Management Support Center of Forestry Commission is to be resourced to undertake the carbon assessment for the program using the MRV system developed under the National REDD+ program. | | | | | | | | | |
| Challenges? Two of the interventions i.e. establishment of 5000ha of small to medium scale plantation and 1200 ha for woodlot which was anticipated to enhance carbon sequestration under the program are lagging behind due to unavailability of lands off- reserves. This problem is caused by the stiff competition for land for other agricultural crops like cashew farming and rubber. Also, there has been a general decline in interest in terms of communal ownership of plantations. The project has therefore introduced incentives for participating farmers and most importantly, creating access to opening up degraded lands in forest reserves to accommodate part of the targets under the Modified Taungya System (MTS). | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| THEME 1.1 : GHG EMISSION REDUCTIONS OR AVOIDANCE / ENHANCEMENT OF CARBON STOCKS | | | | | | | | |
| Ghana | | | | | | | | |
| Lead MDB: IBRD | | | | | Level: Project | | | |
| Other MDBs : AfDB | | | | | | | | |
| Endorsed FIP Funding (Million USD): 50.00 | | | | | | | | |
| Co-Financing (Million USD): 5.00 | | | | | | | | |
| Reporting Period | From : 01/01/2017 | | | | | | To: 31/12/2017 | |
| Project Title: Enhancing Natural Forests and Agroforest Landscapes | | | | | | | | |
| Table 1.1 | Unit | Reference Emission Level/Baseline | Target 1 | Target 2 | Report Year 2015 | Report Year 2016 | Report Year 2017 | Total Actual to date |
|  |  | If Applicable |  |  | Actual Annual | Actual Annual | Actual Annual |
| GhG Emission Reductions/Avoidance/Enhancement of Carbon Stocks | Million Tons of Co2 Equivalent |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |  |  |
| GHG emissions from reduced/avoided deforestation and forest degradation | Million Tons of Co2 Equivalent | 74.5 | 77.9 | TBD | N/A | N/A |  |  |
| GHG sequestered through natural regeneration, re- and afforestation, and other related activities | Million Tons of Co2 Equivalent/Ha | 369 | 469 | TBD | N/A | N/A |  |  |
| Type of Forest(s) | High Forest : Closed Forest and Open Forest in the High Forest Zone | | | | |  |  |  |
| Area Covered | Ha | 736,350 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IP Lifetime | Years | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Please specify methodology (ies) used for GHG accounting (e.g. by project/program), including the start year and period for the Reference Emissions Level | | | Refer to Ghana's Monitoring and Reporting Plan.  **Additional Assumptions**   1. TCo2e Per Ha in Closed Forest. 369 2. Rate of Deforestation in Closed Forest. 1.3% 3. Rate of Deforestation in Open Forest 1.8% 4. Expected Rate of Deforestation with FIP Interventions In Closed Forest 1.0% 5. Expected Rate of Deforestation with FIP intervention in Open Forest 1.5% | | | | | |
| Please provide a brief description of the interventions (context and objective) | | | 1. Enrichment of 10,000HA of Degraded Forest Reserves 2. Establishment of 50,000 Ha of CREMA ( to enhance resource management by land owners and local community members) 3. Establishment of 300ha of Model Plantation 4. Establishment of 1000 Ha of Plantation 5. Boundary Planting of forest reserves 6. Pillaring of Admitted Farms 7. Replacement of Defaced Forest Reserve Boundary Pillars 8. Securing Internal and External Boundaries of Forest Reserves 9. Presence of Officers at the Project Sites | | | | | |
| Success Story? Under the year of reporting, the project engaged five community based organizations to support the Forestry Commission and Ghana Cocoa Board to facilitate the adoption of conservation practices by forest fringe communities through the Community Resource Management Approach (CREMA). Through the community training programs, awareness and sensitization campaigns undertaken by these organizations, the communities have understood the importance of the forest and the need to protect and conserve the biodiversity. The improvement in their understanding and the sense of ownership conferred unto these CREMAs have reduce the tendencies to degrade and deforest thereby contributing to the emission reduction targets of the program. | | | | | | | | |
| Challenges? Interest from Communities/individuals has significantly increased in participating in the project due to the positive impacts of the interventions but resources are limited to bring everyone onboard especially the distribution of free tree seedlings for incorporation in cocoa and other agricultural landscapes to enhance carbon stocks and make the farms resilient. Going forward, the program is leverage the performance based payments expected from the Ghana Cocoa Forest Program (Carbon Fund) to encourage private sector, civil society organizations and government agencies to support and replicate these initiatives. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| THEME1.2: LIVELIHOODS CO-BENEFITS | | | | | | | |
| Ghana | | | | | | | |
| Lead MDB: IBRD | | | | Level: IP | | | |
| Other MDBs : AfDB | | | | | | | |
| Endorsed FIP Funding (Million USD): 50.00 | | | | | | | |
| Co-Financing (Million USD) | | | | | | | |
| Reporting Period | From : 01/01/2017 | | | | | To: 31/12/2017 | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| Table 1.2A (Please aggregate projects/programs level data into this table) | | Baseline | *Target indicated at the time of MDB Approval* | Report Year 2015 | Report Year 2016 | Report Year 2017 | Total Actual to date |
| Actual Annual | Actual Annual | Actual Annual |
|  | | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1. People in forest and adjacent communities with monetary/non-monetary benefits from forest and Climate Smart Agriculture (Number) | Total | 0 | 207,500 | 11,803 | 76,347 | 45,846 | 133,996 |
| Men | 0 | 102,500 | 6,845 | 37,845 | 22,841 | 67,531 |
| Women | 0 | 105,000 | 4,958 | 38,502 | 23,005 | 66,465 |
| Indicator 2. Direct project beneficiaries (Number) | Total | 0 | 21,501 | 1706 | 6,320 | 6,777 | 14,803 |
| Men | 0 | 10846 | 1194 | 2,544 | 4,316 | 8,054 |
| Women | 0 | 10,655 | 512 | 3,776 | 2,461 | 6,749 |
| Success Story? Trainings and supporting farmers in improved climate smart cocoa production practices and other agroforestry management practices is helping to improve yields and boost incomes, while also helping farms to become more resilient and farmers more adaptable. The adoption of cocoa smart and improved agronomic practices is improving soil fertility and contributing to food security. Daily wages paid to farmers (work gangs) have improved household income that has translated in high number of school enrollment and improved health conditions of farm families | | | | | | | |
| Challenges? There are more farmers willing to participate in the program than the program can accommodate in the time period of the project | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| THEME1.2: LIVELIHOODS CO-BENEFITS | | | | | | | |
| Ghana | | | | | | | |
| Lead MDB: IBRD | | | | Level: Project | | | |
| Other MDBs : AfDB | | | | | | | |
| Endorsed FIP Funding (Million USD): 50.00 | | | | | | | |
| Co-Financing (Million USD) | | | | | | | |
| Reporting Period | From : 01/01/2017 | | | | | To: 31/12/2017 | |
| Project Title: Enhancing Natural Forests and Agro-forest Landscapes | | | | | | | |
| Table 1.2b (Please aggregate projects/programs level data into this table) | | Baseline | *Target indicated at the time of MDB Approval* | Report Year 2015 | Report Year 2016 | Report Year 2017 | Total Actual to date |
| Actual Annual | Actual Annual | Actual Annual |
|  | | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1. People in forest and adjacent communities with monetary/non-monetary benefits from forest and Climate Smart Agriculture (Number) | Total | 0 | 87,500 | 11,112 | 34,340 | 18,226 | 63,678 |
| Men | 0 | 42500 | 6,444 | 21,220 | 7,545 | 35,209 |
| Women | 0 | 45,000 | 4,667 | 13,140 | 10,681 | 28,488 |
| Indicator 2. Direct project beneficiaries (Number) | Total | 0 | 9,501 | 867 | 2,050 | 2, 737 | 5,654 |
| Men | 0 | 4846 | 607 | 1,250 | 1,536 | 3,393 |
| Women | 0 | 4655 | 260 | 800 | 1,201 | 2,261 |
| Success Story? The project was able to reach out to more women than men as compared to the previous year. Through the awareness and sensitization campaigns by the five Community based organizations and the Implementing Agencies, the traditional and cultural beliefs in the communities which restricted most women from engaging in the project activities are gradually being managed. | | | | | | | |
| Challenges? | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| THEME1.2: LIVELIHOODS CO-BENEFITS | | | | | | |
| Ghana | | | | | | |
| Lead MDB: IBRD | | | Level: Project | | | |
| Other MDBs : AfDB | | | | | | |
| Endorsed FIP Funding (Million USD): 50.00 | | | | | | |
| Co-Financing (Million USD) : 5.0 | | | | | | |
| Reporting Period | From : 01/01/2017 | | | | To: 31/12/2017 | |
| Project Title: Engaging Local Communities in REDD+ | | | | | | |
| Table 1.2b (Please aggregate projects/programs level data into this table) | Baseline | *Target indicated at the time of MDB Approval* | Report Year 2015 | Report Year 2016 | Report Year 2017 | Total Actual to date |
| Actual Annual | Actual Annual | Actual Annual |
| Indicator 3.Number of Communal Managed enterprises | 0 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4. Number of ha of woodlots for fuel planted to support livelihood of fringe communities (Ha) | 0 | 1200 | 0 | 200 | 89.9 | 289.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Success Story? | | | | | | |
| Challenges? Competition for land has been a major challenge affecting the achievement of this target. This challenge is being addressed by improving the incentives to be given to participating beneficiaries. | | | | | | |

**FIP FORM 1.2**

**THEME 1.2: LIVELIHOODS CO-BENEFITS**

**Level: Investment plan**

Please answer the following questions with a narrative description of the results achieved by the FIP investment plan in your country in the reporting year. Explain the progress made in the reporting year, compared to the previous one. Please provide one narrative for each relevant aspect, such as income, employment, entrepreneurship, access to finance, education, health, or others.

1. Number of beneficiaries:

The main/direct project beneficiaries are the rural communities who manage agricultural and forest landscapes for their livelihoods. Many of the forest fringe community members rely on the forest for their energy and food demands but with the decline in forest resources, it means their livelihood options are also dwindling and as such the GFIP offers them opportunities to adopt. Other project beneficiaries include Ministries, Departments and Agencies in charge of Natural Resources and Environmental Management, Private and civil organizations who benefits through improved policies and institutional strengthening.

These project beneficiaries derive either direct benefit from project interventions, indirectly/directly benefit from policy reforms and institutional strengthening or get monetary/non-monetary benefit from an intervention which as a result improves the lives and households as a whole.

Per the Program design, 21, 501 individuals are expected to benefit directly from planned intervention by the end of the program. This target does not cover the dependents or the households of the beneficiaries. During the year under reporting, 6,777 beneficiaries were recorded as compared to 6,320 beneficiaries in 2016. In terms of gender aggregation, more men were engaged as compared to women participation during the year under review.

At the Investment Plan level, it is expected that a total of 207,500 people will derive both direct and indirect benefits from the program. These beneficiaries include individuals engaged by the project and paid to provide services and their dependents. During the year under review, 45,846 beneficiaries were recorded as compared to 76,347 beneficiaries in 2016. Although the achievement in 2017 couldn’t match that of 2016, the overall progress made so far is satisfactory as the end target is achievable.

1. Which actions were taken to provide livelihood co-benefits (monetary or non-monetary benefits) that beneficiaries received?

Livelihood co-benefits are channeled to the beneficiaries through the implementation of field based project interventions. The project is structured such that field based activities are implemented by the Forestry Commission, Ghana Cocoa Board and the Forestry Research Institute of Ghana. Most of the field based activities aim to restore degraded forest reserves and also increase tree stocks on agricultural landscapes.

To ensure that communities in the project regions receive livelihood co-benefits, local communities and forest dependent individuals including farmers, work gangs, private nursery operators are engaged by the project to provide specified services on a given project activity .

During the year of reporting, the following ensured that livelihood co-benefits were provided by the project;

* Private nursery operators in the project regions were contracted to supply seedlings for various planting activities which gave them monetary benefits.
* Community work gangs with majority being females were engaged to transport seedlings from delivery points to planting sites which earned them monetary benefits
* Farmers/tree planters groups were contracted to undertake various planting activities including enrichment, model plantations, boundary planting etc. Most of these farmers gained monetary benefits.
* Free tree seedlings, plantain suckers and other logistics including cutlasses, drying mats, protecting clothing were supplied to various beneficiary farmers to support project interventions including the establishment of community woodlot plantations, small to medium scale off reserve plantation and climate smart cocoa production.
* Farmer business schools and other community level trainings were organized for farmers. These trainings have imparted knowledge to these beneficiaries on the techniques of raising high quality tree seedlings, incorporating trees into cocoa farms which improves yield and also makes them resilient against diseases.

1. Who was involved? Were any partnerships established?

District Managers/Officers from the Forestry Commission and the Ghana Cocoa Board spearheaded the actions to ensure that various livelihood co-benefits were received by the Communities. The engagement of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) during the course of the implementing year also supported the project especially in the mobilization of community members and discharge of various training programs.

The partnership was established between the Forestry Commission, Ghana Cocoa Board and the CBOs, where a collaborative approach was adopted to ensure successful implementation of the livelihood component of the GFIP.

It’s also worth mentioning that, women participation during the year of reporting improved as compared to the previous years as a result of a strategy which was adopted by the project to use the CBOs to mobilize community members.

1. Why did it make a difference?

The introduction of the Community Based Organizations enhanced the awareness creation strategy of the project which resulted in the engagement of more women.

By incentivizing farmers to engage in climate smart cocoa production and agriculture through tailored training and support, signs of improved yield are becoming more obvious on the various beneficiary farms. With the improved extension and capacity developments provided by the project, farms are becoming more resilient to climate related and post-harvest losses they previously suffer on their farms.

Furthermore, the supply of free tree seedlings and farm inputs to farmers to establish community woodlots, small to medium plantations and for incorporation into cocoa farms has reduced the initial establishment cost burden of farmers which was a disincentive/barrier to best and environmentally friendly practices.

1. Will benefits last after the project is completed? Explain.

Sustainability is always factored in the implementation of the livelihood co benefits. Farmers who have gained knowledge and are practicing Climate Smart Cocoa are expected to have an increase in production yield over a long period. Nursery operators producing quality seedlings as a result of technical guidance from the Forestry would be able to sustain their business beyond the project and plans are being developed to link them to incoming government afforestation programs as well as private plantation developers to sustain the business beyond project end date.

The Forestry Commission and Ghana Cocoa Board through the district offices will continue to provide technical support for the project beneficiaries through extension services after the project is completed to sustain the investment made by the project.

Under the ELCIR+ project, logistical support are being procured to establish community based enterprises which in turn will provide permanent jobs for the communities.

1. How do they impact vulnerable groups?

Women and children are the two main vulnerable groups in the project areas. The increased participation of women during the year of reporting means an increased level of income for the women. The increased level of income means that women and their dependents (mainly children) can have access to health care and education. The impact in the long run can be seen from improved health, reduced incidence of school dropout and increased enrollment of children to schools due to parent’s ability to afford the cost of education for their wards.**FIP FORM 2.1**

**THEME 2.1: BIODIVERSITY AND OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

**Level: Investment plan**

Please answer the following questions with a narrative description of the results achieved by the FIP investment plan in your country in the reporting year. Explain the progress made in the reporting year, compared to the previous one.

1. Which activities have been conducted in the reporting period to reduce the loss of habitats and other environmental services?

* **Awareness creation and capacity building on wildfire Management**

Wildfires have been one of the key drivers of deforestation within the forests and agro-forest landscapes of Ghana. In view of this, the GFIP has been creating awareness each year on wildfires within the project catchment area. Communication channels such as community level durbars and community radio broadcast programmes are being employed to sensitize farmers and community members on the role of ecosystems in supporting human existence, the need for their protection and responsible practices especially during the dry season to ensure sustainable supply of the services they provide. Community fire squads have been formed, trained and resourced in a number of forest-fringe communities to assist in protecting the already fragile forest ecosystems, agroforestry lands and farm fallows from the ravaging impacts of wildfire. Forestry Commission field staff have also been provided with equipment including camping items, firefighting clothing and fire beaters for effective protection and monitoring of forest and wildlife resources. Again a framework for community wildfire plans developed.

* **Enrichment Planting**

Restoring a plant community that can support plants and wildlife that are normally associated with a particular ecosystem helps restore lost habitat, protect and improve the quality of the soil, stabilize the local climate and also play an important role in regulating the air and water quality. During the reporting year, a total area of 4, 198.89ha of degraded forest reserves were planted with local species as compared to 4,343.75ha planted in the previous year. A manual of operations (MOP) for the enrichment planting was developed through FIP support to guide the field officers. Species planted included *Khaya ivorensis (*Dubin*), Melicia exelsa (*Odum*), Triplochiton scleroxylon (*Wawa*), Terminalia superba* (Ofram*), Terminalia ivorensis (*Emire*). Pericopsis elata (*Kokrodua*), Guibourtia ehie (*Anokye hyedua*), Entandrophragma candolei (*Penkwa akoa*), Tieghemella heckeii (*Baku*).*

* **Restoration of degraded Watersheds within ecological corridors**

The FIP in Ghana targets the restoration of 500ha of degraded watershed through planting of local species to protect and improve the quality of water and other natural resources within the ecological corridors by reducing the amount of pollution through both natural and human activities. The project has been successfully in this regard by restoring a total area of 369.89 ha. During the year under review, a total area of 282.9ha of degraded watershed was planted as compared to 86.93ha in the previous year. The significant achievement in the reporting year means the FIP has contributed in protecting more rivers, improved the quality of water, and has also restored lost habitats. . The local species included *Terminalia ivorensis (*Emire*). Terminalia superba* (Ofram*),* *Khaya ivorensis* *(Red* Mahogany)

* **Restoration of degraded Sacred Grooves**

During the year of reporting, a total area of 182ha within 8 degraded sacred groves was restored through plantation establishment. The restored area means a restored habitat, improved soil quality and improved air quality. The previous year was used for rapid assessment of the grooves and maps were developed for the 20 identified degraded scared grooves. The progress made during the year under review was the planting of a total area of 182 ha.

* **Community Resource Management Areas (CREMA)**

Five CREMAs are expected to be established and operationalized to manage and protect the forest and other natural resources. In the previous year, the sizes of the CREMA were identified, delineated and mapped. During the year under review, significant progress was made towards the establishment and operationalization of the CREMAs as a result of a collaborative effort between the Forestry Commission, Ghana Cocoa Board and the five Community Based Organizations which were contracted to support the process. Progress made include i. Community sensitization and biodiversity education ii. Selection of Priority and Non Priority Clusters iii. Formation of community Resource Management Committees. The concept devolves power of management of the natural resource to the community therefore the buy in and ownership prospects spears the community on to better protect and management the remaining biodiversity.

* **Consultations and Registration of Admitted Farm Owners**

To prevent further encroachment into the forest reserves, the project consulted and registered 308 admitted farm owners during the year under review from expanding their boundaries as compared to 223 farmers in the previous year. When the forest is not encroached and destroyed for cocoa production, the associated roles the forest plays in the context of Biodiversity and Environmental Services remains.

* **Payment For Environmental Services**

A framework and strategies for executing payment for environmental services based on local systems and international best practices have been developed by the project and validated by all key stakeholders during the year under review. An implementation guideline has been developed and it is expected that the strategies developed will be piloted by the project in the ensuing year.

2. What have been key contributions (successes) of FIP interventions regarding biodiversity and environmental services in your country context during this reporting year?

The awareness creation on the part of forest fringe communities; formation, training and resourcing of community fire squads to assist in the protection of the already fragile forest ecosystem and the new restoration investments from FIP contributed significantly in the conservation of the ecosystem and in turn will improve the functioning of the ecosystem in supporting humankind.

Again the support and commitment the FIP provided to develop the framework and strategies for payment of Environmental Services will in turn reduce biodiversity lost since farmers and landowners will receive incentives in exchange of managing their land to provide some sort of ecological services.

1. What have been your key challenges and what are opportunities for improvement?

Wildfires still remains a treat to the ecosystem and the investment made by FIP and also changing attitudes of farmers and landowners to really appreciate the importance of the ecosystem is a challenge. However the commitment of the project through awareness and capacity building on wildfires and general importance of ecosystem conservation, and resourcing of the communities and the Forestry Commission to tackle the incidence of wildfires will help curb the situation

The continual increase in population of the forest fringe communities has been a key challenge. The population increase means there is pressure on the limited land available for farming and food production. The pressure on the land as a result of continual farming makes it difficult for land to regain its potential for biodiversity conservation. The issue of food security however is being addressed through the Modified Taungya System (MTS) where the communities are allowed to farm in degraded forest reserves.

1. Other criteria:

**FORM 2.2**

**THEME 2.2: GOVERNANCE**

**Level: Investment plan**

Please answer the following questions with a narrative description of the results achieved by the FIP investment plan in your country in the reporting year. Explain the progress made in the reporting year, compared to the previous one.

1. How has FIP contributed to ensuring that stakeholder processes allow the participation of marginalized or vulnerable groups, such as women and indigenous or traditional groups, in forest-related decision-making processes?
2. How has FIP contributed to the quality, timeliness, comprehensiveness, and accessibility of forest-related information available to stakeholders, including public notice and dialogue on pending actions?
3. What have been key contributions (successes) of FIP regarding forest governance in your country context during this reporting year?
4. What have been your key challenges and what are opportunities for improvement?
5. Other criteria:

**FIP FORM 2.3**

**THEME 2.3: TENURE, RIGHTS, AND ACCESS**

**Level: Investment plan**

Please answer the following questions with a narrative description of the results achieved by FIP investment plan in your country in the reporting year. Explain the progress made in the reporting year, compared to the previous one.

1. Which actions have been taken to improve the legal frameworks to protect forest-related property rights and access for all forest stakeholders, including women and indigenous peoples?

One of the sensitive areas which needed policy and legal reviews to improve forest related rights and access was the existing Tree Tenure and Benefit Sharing arrangements. Over the years, farmers although nurture naturally occurring trees on farms do not receive any benefits after harvesting. This has created a disincentive for farmers and therefore resulted in the destruction of naturally occurring trees on farms.

Under the year of reporting, the following progress were made towards the policy reforms to protect forest related properties and access;

* Stakeholder platforms within the Natural Resource sector were assessed and the appropriate platforms were selected and trained to effectively engage in the FIP Policy reforms processes.
* Through expert group consultations and focused group discussions with the stakeholder platforms including farmers, women groups and local people, a preferred tree tenure and benefit sharing framework was developed.
* Zonal consultation workshops were organized to validate the preferred tree tenure and benefit sharing option.
* Through a collaborative effort with all stakeholders including Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), a tree registration form was developed to provide a database of farmers who have planted or nurtured trees on their farms to make it easy for the benefit sharing arrangement to be implemented.

1. What have been key contributions (successes) of FIP regarding forest tenure, rights, and access in your country context during this reporting year?

The Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources through the GFIP is committed to ensuring changes in current policy implementation practices which have disadvantaged farmers in the past. Through consultations, sensitization and awareness campaigns on the new tree tenure and benefit sharing arrangements, most of the farmers have welcomed the good news being propagated and gradually changing attitudes by maintaining trees on their farms which they used to destroy in the past because of unfavorable policy practices.

Tree registration exercise being piloted through the project is giving the farmers the opportunity to register the trees (both planted and naturally occurring) on their farms and this is gradually building their confidence in the new policy direction. This initiative provides comfort to farmers and strengthens their belief that they will benefit in the future when the tree is harvested for timber of leveraged for its carbon sequestration potential.

The gradual change in attitude of farmers through the commitment of the project to reform policies will go a long way to contribute to the restoration effort by the Country.

1. What have been your key challenges and what opportunities for improvement do you see?

One of the key challenge is the capacity of Forestry Commission staff at the district level to facilitate the registration of farmers/farms/trees on farms. The registration process requires an officer at the district level to visit the farm to be registered and record important features including taking the coordinates of the farm, size of the trees, year planted, year nurturing started etc. However, inadequate human resource capacity has made it difficult to have staff purposely dedicated to see to the smooth implementation of the registration. Through improved collaboration, the Forestry Commission and Ghana Cocoa Board are committed to assign and train dedicated staff to see out the implementation.

Secondly, the feedback received from the field during the registration indicated that in most cases, it is very difficult to differentiate between planted and naturally occurring trees for registration. This is very important because planted trees are owned 100% by farmers unlike naturally occurring trees. The project is exploring various avenues to resolve this issue including learning from countries which have attempted this initiative before.

1. Other criteria:

**FIP FORM 2.4**

**THEME 2.4: CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT**

**Level: Investment plan**

Please answer the following questions with a narrative description of the results achieved by the FIP investment plan in your country in the reporting year. Explain the progress made in the reporting year, compared to the previous one.

1. Which actions enhanced institutional capabilities to develop and implement forest and forest-relevant policies at the national, regional, and local Level?

With FIP project support, guidelines for integrating REDD+ into District Assembly Plans was developed and validated by all REDD+ institutions including representatives from all the 13 Forest District Assemblies in the project regions. A facilitator will be engaged to support training on the use of the guidelines which will enhance the capacities of the District Assemblies to develop and implement forest and forest related policies.

With regards to the Tree Tenure and Benefit Sharing Policy reform processes, key institutions which directly or indirectly implement REDD+ activities benefited from the consultative processes which directly or indirectly built their capacities to engage in the policy reform processes and also enhanced their capabilities to engage in future policy development and implementation.

The project also trained key staff of the Forestry Commission, Ghana Cocoa Board, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources, Forestry Research Institute, Five Community Based Organizations regarding participatory sustainable forest management and also gained practical and concise understanding of the requirements and responsibilities of monitoring and evaluation of forest related projects. These trainings although not directly linked to forest policies have improved the performance of these officers in the delivery of their responsibilities in the overall implementation of the project including the policy component. In terms of progress comparison between the year under review and the previous year, 60% of targeted staff have been trained as compared to 25% in the previous year.

1. Through which actions did FIP improve capacities of stakeholders in forest and land use planning and management?

The community and district platforms established during the previous year have been inaugurated and a facilitator also engaged to support training of the platforms. The stakeholders or the platforms inaugurated during the year of reporting include fire squads, cocoa and tree planters group and Committee Forest Committees (CFCs).

1. What have been key contributions (successes) of FIP regarding capacity development in your country context during this reporting year?

With FIP project support, the Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources hosted a validation workshop on the guidelines for the integration of REDD+ into District Assembly Plans. The guideline which was also developed with FIP project support, establishes modalities, procedures, guidance and standards for building capacity and understanding REDD+ mechanism for planning and management of natural resources.

1. What have been your key challenges and what are opportunities for improvement? The biggest challenge is the capacity of the project to extend the trainings to all the project beneficiaries. But the challenge is being addressed through the training-of-trainers approach. Through the trainer-of trainers approach, extension agents of the Forestry Commission, Ghana Cocoa Board and Ministry of Agriculture are able to extend the trainings to the project beneficiaries even beyond project end date.
2. Other criteria:

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 3.1: Theory of change and assumptions** |

****

|  |
| --- |
| **Please explain how the implementation of the FIP investment plan is contributing to transformational changes in addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in your country. Please report progress on the theory of change and assumptions at mid-term and end of the investment plan. If projects start at different points in time, the FIP country focal point may decide which point in time best represents the mid-term of the investment plan**   1. Please briefly describe how FIP contributed to transformational changes in addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in your country as presented in the endorsed FIP investment plan. What is the value added of FIP?   Major among the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation as identified in the IP are Agricultural Expansion (50%) Timber Harvesting (35%) Mining (5%).  The two projects currently running under the IP have series of activities planned towards reducing deforestation and forest degradation caused by agriculture expansion while ensuring productivity on the same piece of holding. During the period under review, the following where implemented as the transformational actions to catalyze the desired changes in behavior. It is important to note that behavioral and attitudinal changes take time.   1. **Policy Intervention** Pursue changes in policy “practice” and incentives to improve enabling environment for SLFM and Develop/ improve institutional models, procedures, guidelines to enhance quality of FC service delivery   **Problem Identified during the development of the IP -** Current policy implementation practices create disincentives for rural communities for the nurturing of existing trees in the landscape. Approaches to allocation of timber harvesting rights, documentation for newly planted trees, and compensation for damage done to agricultural investments during forest harvesting disadvantage farmers and communities. Under these conditions, farmers remove natural trees (illegally with some financial benefit) to reduce risk. Communication barriers (and mistrust) between communities and the FC compounds the situation.  **Transformational Intervention undertaken during the period under review –**   1. **Tree Tenure and Benefit Sharing Policy**: A Tree Tenure and Benefit Sharing Framework was developed through extensive consultations with resources owners and key stakeholders. The framework will ensure that farmers/landowners are incentivized to protect and nurture trees. Again through a collaborative effort of all stakeholders including Civil Society Organizations and the United Nations Development Programme, a form for registering farmers who have planted or nurtured trees on their farms was developed. Although the framework developed is yet to be finalized and rolled out, the Ministry through the project is committed to complete the necessary processes to ensure reform in that policy direction so that most resource owners (farmers) gain the confidence and gradually change attitudes towards the management of naturally occurring trees as well as biodiversity in general. 2. **Domestic Wood Procurement Policy**: Guidelines on the policy which ensures that only legally sourced timber is used for all government projects has been developed, printed and disseminated to various stakeholders in the timber industry. The aim of the policy is to deny market access to illegal chainsaw operators. District Assemblies procurement Entities and other Government Agencies have been trained on the use of the guidelines. The Policy however is yet to be adopted by Government. 3. **Wildlife Resource Management Bill:** The current legislation that governs wildlife and protected areas do not address cardinal issues like community participation and devolution of power for resources management to the community or the private sector players. The Bill which was laid before Parliament could not be approved before the 4th Parliament was dissolved after a change of Government in January 2017 in spite of the effort by the Ministry. The Bill is therefore to be repackaged and resubmitted to the current Parliament for consideration and approval. To facilitate and expedite the submission process, consultative workshops were held with the Attorney General, Parliamentary Select Committee for Forestry and Parliamentary Subsidiary Committee. In addition, awareness creation exercise on the revised bill were held for community members in the Brong-Ahafo and Western Regions during the year of reporting. 4. **Operational Intervention** Support integrated landscape level planning in support of community based resource use decisions in Districts   **Problem Statement** Weak spatial and land use planning do not support improved, informed and sustainable decision making. Top down decisions at times have not respected the existing land uses and production activities at community level. From the bottom up, individual agents often make land use decisions (e.g., clearing trees, burning for land preparation) that are incompatible with long term sustainable management aims. Enforcement of rules becomes easier when all parties recognize and acknowledge the rationale and mutual agreement behind the rules. Improved management of forests and trees in reserves and in agricultural landscapes depends on mutual agreement on a set of practices, use and non-use zones, etc. Within CREMAs, and as part of the establishment process, participatory land use management is required to ensure that all community members understand and agree on the designated uses, zones, etc.    **Transformational Intervention during the period under review:**  The community and District level platforms established in 2016 to support integrated land use planning have been provided with trainings and logistical support to enhance their capacities to function effectively. Through the FIP, guidelines for incorporation of REDD+ in District Development Plans have been developed. The guidelines were validated by all stakeholders including all the District Assemblies in the Project Regions. The guidelines which establish the modalities, procedures, and standards for capacity building and understanding REDD+ mechanism for planning and which also provides measures and actions to address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation is being used as the source material for education and training of Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assembles and other relevant stakeholders. Further, the FIP engaged 5 Community Based Organizations to support the Implementing Agencies (Forestry Commission and Ghana Cocoa Board) to promote the adoption of Conservation Practices through the Community Resource Management Area (CREMA) concept. The involvement of the CBOs has rekindle the interest of resources owners in managing their resources in a sustainable manner. Resource owners were mobilized into groups and received tailored trainings related to sustainable forest and resource management.     1. Please assess how well the theory of change and underlying assumptions described in the endorsed investment plan are playing out in practice, what can be learned, and whether corrective measures need to be taken.   The theory of change in Ghana’s context assumes that the reforms in certain policies especially the Tree Tenure and Benefit Sharing and improved collaboration and communication between the resource owners/platforms and the officers of the Implementing Agencies will reduce the rate of deforestation in the Country and also lead to improved forest management. Even though the policy reforms processes are not concluded yet, the commitment shown by the Ministry and the awareness and educational campaigns embarked through the project has given a sense of confidence and belief to the resource owner and they are very happy and are gradually changing their behaviors especially destroying naturally occurring trees on their farms. Again the relationship between the platforms, officers on the ground from FC, COCOBOD and Agricultural Department, and the farmers has improved which is good for the protection and management of the forest resources |

****

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 3. 2: Contribution to national REDD+ and other national development strategies and uptake of FIP approaches** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Please describe how the FIP enhanced and/ or advanced the national REDD+ process (including REDD+ readiness and performance-based mechanisms) and relevant development strategies?**  SUPPORT FOR THE NATIONAL REDD+  The GFIP and the REDD+ process has mutually benefited from each other. There is a long standing relationship between the National REDD+ Secretariat which is responsible for leading the Ghana REDD+ process and the Management Unit of the Ghana Forest Investment Program. The synergies can be seen in the adoption of the MRV developed by the REDD+ Secretariat for the measurement of Carbon and the use of the Safeguard policies prepared by the REDD+ Secretariat.  During the year under review, the GFIP supported Ghana REDD+ process in the following;  **Performance Based Mechanisms**: The Ghana Forest Investment Programme through its policy reforms and field based activities which includes enrichment planting, forest boundary planting, climate smart cocoa and agriculture has served as a very good learning point for participation in the Ghana Cocoa Forest Program (GCFP) which is a result based payment mechanism under the Carbon Fund. The GFIP has tested the proposed interventions under the GCFP hence farmers are familiar with these approaches with strong capacities going into the actual implementation of the GCFP.  **Safeguards Trainings**: The REDD+ secretariat during the year under review benefited from the GFIP by participating in safeguards training supported with funds from the GFIP. This training is helping the vision of the sector to mainstream safeguards in all our future endeavors. The FIP also supported the processes for the development of the Safeguards Information System (SIS) through participation of meetings and workshops organized by the National REDD+ secretariat  **SUPPORT FOR OTHER GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENTAL STRATEGIES**  During the period under review, a guideline for the integration of REDD+ into district Assembly plans and Payment for Environmental Services were completed with funds from the FIP through consultancies. The guideline even though developed with support from the FIP will guide District Assemblies implementation strategies by establishing the modalities, procedures, guidance and standards for building capacity and understanding of REDD+ mechanism for planning to address drivers of deforestation, forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks (REDD+). Again the strategies for payment of Environmental Services will go a long way for the Forestry Commission to replicate in similar ecosystems.  The GFIP also supported the processes leading to the reform in Policies especially the Tree Tenure and Benefit sharing arrangement where preferred sharing arrangement is being sought out to incentivize farmers to protect and nurture trees on farms. The program also resourced Cocoa Research Institute and Forestry Research Institute of Ghana to undertake further research in quality seedlings and best guidelines practices for the incorporation of trees on cocoa farms  **UPTAKE OF FIP APPROACHES**  The FIP activities and interventions have been embraced by the communities. Through the various sensitization campaigns and the improved relationship between the communities and the district officers of Forestry Commission and Ghana Cocoa Board, the communities have realized the need to support Government efforts to restore the degraded forests and improve the health of the environment and at the same time helping reduce poverty in the project areas.  In the year under review, private plantation developers and farmers through the farmer field schools to model plantation sites have taken up the good silvicultural practices demonstrated with support from the FIP. The climate smart cocoa and Agriculture initiatives have been welcomed by most farmers and they are planting 18 trees per hectare on their farms as the minimum stocking level.  The new CREMA concept which now includes agriculture, climate smart cocoa production and any other product that can be considered as a resource by the community is well received by the communities. Again the campaign to prevent expansion of farms and encroachment of forest reserves and other project intervention is well received by farmers and have been consulted and registered to prevent further expansion of their farms. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 3.3:**  **Support received from other partners including the private sector.** |

****

|  |
| --- |
| **Please describe how bi- and multilateral development partners supported the interaction of FIP and other REDD+ activities.**  The World Bank and the African Development Bank are the two Multilateral Partners supporting the interaction of the Ghana FIP and other REDD+ activities. The direct financial support the project receives from the MDBs provides platform for FIP and other REDD+ projects to interact and explore linkages during missions and meetings.  The REDD+ secretariat at the Forestry Commission also provide the opportunity to the Ghana Forest Investment Program to interact during missions and meetings organized by the REDD+ secretariat.  **Please describe how the (formal and informal) private sector actors have taken up good practices demonstrated through FIP? Please describe challenges encountered in involving the private sector in FIP.**  Small to medium scale plantation developers and many farmers are adopting to good practices piloted through the FIP. To provide hands on training for interested plantation developers and community members, the project has established model plantations which serves as a demonstrational site and farmer field schools for the project beneficiaries to enhance their silvicultural practices. During the year of reporting, farmer field schools were organized for farmers, tree planters and small to medium plantation developers to these model plantation sites. Through these visits, these private actors are able to improve on their orthodox ways of establishing plantations and they have demonstrated in practice the knowledge they acquired through the FIP. Again the climate smart cocoa concept cannot be overlooked. FIP is the project which has been able to put in practice the Climate Smart Cocoa concept. Through radio programs, awareness creation campaigns, most farmers have successfully incorporated trees into their cocoa farms (18 trees per hectare) and more farmers are reaching out to the project for support (tree seedlings and other logistics) to also support the good news propagated through the FIP and the Ghana Cocoa Board.  The challenge in involving the private sector especially the small to medium plantation developers has to do with the acquisition of land off reserves and incentives to prepare land for plantation establishment which has made it difficult for the project to meet the target of small to medium plantations and woodlot.  **Please describe how civil society organizations and other stakeholders have been involved in FIP implementation?**  During the year under review, the project engaged five Non-Governmental Originations which are community based to support the project to promote the adoption of conservation practices through the CREMA concept. The already established relationship between these NGOs and the communities benefited the project immensely to mobilize the community members to support the CREMA concept. Again, to develop a tree tenure and benefit framework (preferred option) meant that consultative processes were to be undertaken to engage all key stakeholders and therefore, civil society organizations, farmers, Women Groups, Traditional Authority and Government Agencies were well consulted and involved in the processes to develop the framework. Contributions from these CSOs and other stakeholders were key in developing the framework. Again these group are well represented on the GFIP Project Steering Committee which met during the year under review to vet and approve work plans and budgets and other important decisions. |

****

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 3. 4:** **Link of Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM) for indigenous Peoples and Local Communities to investments from government’s point of view.** |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide comments on the complementarity of DGM and its contribution to the FIP investment plan. What have been the collaboration and synergies between the FIP focal point office and DGM?  The DGM project is supposed to have a zero or little influence from the Government sector. The DGM is being executed through a private entity called Solidaridad. The FIP Project Management Unit which houses the office of Ghana’s FIP focal point ensures that Solidaridad and a member of the DGM steering committee are always represented during FIP missions and other meetings which requires their participation to discuss synergies and implementation updates. The DGM again is represented on the FIP Steering Committee and the FIP is also an observer on the DGM Steering Committee. These platforms provides the forum to discuss collaborative measures and synergies.  The DGM is being implemented in the same communities as the FIP. During the year of review, one of the collaborative approach was through the awareness and sensitization campaigns and community entries. The FIP during its awareness campaigns included DGM in its discussions and the same was done during DGM awareness campaigns. This approach meant that although the projects have different objectives, the communities realized that both projects have a common purpose which is to reduce poverty reduction and therefore are keen to engage in both projects. This also saved time for both projects to reach out their messages to the communities. |

|  |
| --- |
| **NARRATIVE 3. 5:** **If applicable: highlights/showcases (example of particular outstanding achievement(s) that you want to mention)** |

****

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please provide examples of particularly outstanding achievements or key successes.   **ADOPTION OF CONSERVATIVE PRACTICES THROUGH THE COMMUNITY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AREAS (CREMA)**  As a result of the importance the Government of Ghana attaches to the role of local communities in natural resources conservation and management, a Community Resources Management Area (CREMA) model was adopted by the project for implementation. The CREMA model seeks to balance conservation and development by mobilizing communities that live with or next to natural resources to integrate natural resource conservation into their traditional land uses to improve local livelihoods and encourage the constituent communities to actively participate in natural resources governance and management.  The processes leading to the establishment of a CREMA over the past years takes a relatively long time. The processes usually takes an entire project duration and sometimes goes beyond the project cycle due to the complexity of dealing with the local communities.  The CREMA establishment and operationalization was entrusted to the Wildlife Division of the Forestry Commission to lead the processes. After almost two years of project implementation, the project couldn’t report any significant progress on the CREMA. The fact that the Wildlife Division did not have the adequate capacity to contain the scope of the CREMA activities meant that additional support was needed to fast-track the implementation of the CREMA concept. During the reporting period, the project engaged five Community Based Organizations to support the Wildlife Division to establish and operationalized the CREMAs.  It is worth mention that with the CBOs on board, the CREMA processes have come very far in a relatively short period. The communities have been mobilized into clusters, there have been sensitization activities, initiation of the CREMA governance system including drafting of constitutions and election of Executives. The CREMA when fully established and operationalized will help protect the investments by FIP in the communities and also give the communities an alternative Livelihood which will reduce the dependency on the Forest. Thus the progress made so far during the year of reporting is worth sharing.  **TREE TENURE AND BENEFIT SHARING POLICY**  As a result of disincentives that was created under the current policy for rural communities for the nurturing of existing trees in the landscape and the disadvantages to farmers and communities in the approaches to allocation of timber harvesting rights, documentation for newly planted trees, and compensation for damage done to agricultural investments, farmers lack the confidence to maintain trees on farms and tends to remove natural trees (illegally with some financial benefit) to reduce risk.  In the previous year, the project initiated extensive consultations with key stakeholders to select the preferred option out of the several options which were proposed in the report from the study which was conducted under the NREG-TA project. During the year under year, a tree tenure and benefit sharing framework was developed through the consultative engagements with key stakeholders. The framework which represents the preferred benefit sharing option is already building the confidence of farmers to nurture and maintain naturally occurring trees on their farms. Again a form was developed through a collaborative process with Civil Society Groups and the United Nations Development Program to register farms/farmers and tree on farms. This has assured farmers that whiles the preferred option is ensuring that they benefit from their nurturing effort, the registering process will only build their confidence and help change their attitude from the previous practice of destroying trees on their farms  Please provide examples of outstanding achievements in gender mainstreaming:   * What have been the most important achievements and impacts in terms of gender mainstreaming in FIP investments? * Are there any lessons learned or good practices regarding integration of gender into these investments? |

|  |
| --- |
| **SUMMARY OF THE FIP ANNUAL STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP**   1. Which stakeholder groups were invited to the annual workshop (organizations and number of people for each)? Please attach the list of participants, including the name of the organizations they represent.  * **Academia** * **Civil Society Organizations** * **Community Beneficiary Group** * **Dedicated Grant Mechanism** * **Government Agencies** * **Private Sector** * **Traditional Authority** * **Women Group**  1. How did you ensure stakeholder participation in the workshop? Which methodologies were used to integrate all stakeholders’ views during the workshop? (For example, did you break down the stakeholders into groups to discuss a topic depending on their expertise? How did you reach a consensus for the reported data?)   For the stakeholders to fully participate in the workshop, the methodology which was adopted was a participatory and open dialogue approach. During the workshop, the stakeholders were grouped based on their expertise to discuss the thematic areas of the template. The discussion was done in both English and Twi (Local dialect) to ensure participation of the local communities and farmers. After the group work, each group presented to the other stakeholders to validate their data and reach consensus. Between the presentations, the participants asked questions and made contributions which were duly incorporated where it was necessary.   1. What were the key issues raised during the workshop? |