

REPUBLIC OF GHANA



MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT BOUNDARY DISPUTES
RELATING TO THE
2010 POPULATION AND HOUSING CENSUS**

8TH MAY, 2012

CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES.....	v
ABBREVIATIONS.....	vi
MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.0 Appointment of Committee and the Terms of Reference.....	1
1.1 Interpretation of Our Terms of Reference.....	3
1.2 Procedure.....	3
CHAPTER TWO: PRINCIPLES UPON WHICH THE DELIMITATION OF BOUNDARIES ARE BASED.....	6
2.0 Introduction	6
2.1 Regional Boundaries	6
2.2 District Boundaries.....	8
2.3 Constituency and Electoral Boundaries	9
2.4 Census Enumeration Areas	9
2.5 Traditional Areas and Boundaries.....	10
CHAPTER THREE: THE CAUSES OF BOUNDARY DISPUTES	12
3.0 Introduction	12
3.1 Divergence between Traditional and Administrative Boundaries.....	12
3.2 Lack of Updated and Authentic Maps.....	13
3.3 Lack of Collaboration among Implementing Agencies	13
3.4 State of Regional and Administrative Boundaries	14
3.5 Lack of Awareness of the Legislative Instruments (LIs)	14
3.6 Composition of Districts in the Legislative Instruments	16
3.7 Growth and Disappearance of Settlements.....	16
3.8 Actions of Some Assembly Officials	16
3.9 Intervention of Politicians and Opinion Leaders.....	17
3.10 Increasing Awareness of the Value of District Level Population Figures.....	17
3.11 Ignorance of the Location of Administrative Boundaries	17
CHAPTER FOUR: CASE STUDIES AND RESOLUTION OF BOUNDARY DISPUTES.....	19
4.0 Introduction	19
4.1 Disputes Across Regional Boundaries	19
4.1.1 Dormaa Municipal Assembly (BAR) and Bia District Assembly (WR)	19
4.1.2 Kintampo North Municipal Assembly (BAR) and Central Gonja District Assembly (NR)	19
4.1.3 Asuogyaman District Assembly (ER) and North Tongu District Assembly (VR)	21
4.1.4 Ga South Municipal (GAR) and Awutu Senya (CR) District Assemblies	22
4.1.5 Sene District Assembly (BAR) and Kwahu North District Assembly (ER)	24
4.1.6 Asunafo South District Assembly (BAR) and Atwima Mponua District Assembly (AR)	26
4.1.7 Ga West Municipal Assembly (GAR) and Akwapem South Municipal Assembly (ER)	27
4.1.8 Sawla-Tuna-Kalba District Assembly (NR) and Wa East District Assembly (UWR)	27
4.1.9 Dangbe East District Assembly (GAR) and North Tongu District Assembly (VR)	30

4.1.10	Dangbe East District Assembly (GAR) and South Tongu District Assembly (VR)	31
4.1.11	West Mamprusi District Assembly (NR) and Talensi Nabdam District Assembly (UER)	31
4.2	District Boundary Disputes	32
4.2.1	Western Region	32
	Bia and Juabeso District Assemblies	32
	Prestea-Huni Valley and Wassa Amenfi East District Assemblies	34
4.2.2	Central Region	35
	Gomoa East and Awutu Senya District Assemblies	35
	Cape Coast Metropolitan and Abura/Asebu/Kwamankese District Assemblies	35
	Upper Denkyira East Municipal and Upper Denkyira West District Assemblies	36
	Agona West Municipal and Asikuma-Odoben-Brakwa District Assemblies	36
	Agona West Municipal and Agona East District Assemblies	37
	Gomoa East and Effutu Municipal Assemblies	37
4.2.3	Greater Accra Region	38
	Ga West and Ga East Municipal Assemblies	38
	Ga East and Adentan Municipal Assemblies	38
4.2.4	Volta Region	40
	Nkwanta North and Nkwanta South District Assemblies	40
	Ho Municipal and Adaklu-Anyigbe District Assemblies	44
	Ho Municipal, Adaklu-Anyigbe and North Tongu District Assemblies	44
	Krachi East and Biakoye District Assemblies	45
	Hohoe Municipal and South Dayi District Assemblies	45
4.2.5	Eastern Region	46
	New Juaben Municipal and Akwapem North District Assemblies	46
	Yilo Krobo and Akwapim North District Assemblies	47
	Kwahu East and Kwahu South District Assemblies	48
4.2.6	Ashanti Region	49
	Sekyere Central and Sekyere Afram Plains District Assemblies	49
	Kumasi Metropolitan and Afigya Kwabre District Assemblies	51
	Kwabre East and Sekyere South District Assemblies	52
	Asante Akim North Municipal and Sekyere Afram Plains District Assemblies	52
4.2.7	Brong-Ahafo Region	53
	Sene and Pru Districts	53
	Asunafo North Municipal and Asutifi District Assemblies	53
	Techiman and Nkoranza South Municipal Assemblies	54
4.2.8	Northern Region	54
	Central Gonja and Tolon-Kumbungu District Assemblies	54
	Central Gonja and East Gonja District Assemblies	55
	Yendi Municipality and Saboba, Gushiegu and Karaga District Assemblies	55
4.2.9	Upper East Region	56
	Bolgatanga Municipal and Talensi Nabdam District Assemblies	56
	Kassena-Nankana West and Kassena-Nankana East District Assemblies	56
4.2.10	Upper West Region	58
	Wa West and Wa East District Assemblies	58
CHAPTER FIVE: GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS		60
5.0	Introduction	60
5.1	The Creation of Awareness on the Distinction Between Administrative and Traditional Boundaries	60
5.2	Update of Administrative Maps and Demarcation of Boundaries	61
5.3	Effective Collaboration among Implementing Agencies	61
5.4	Scrutiny and Dissemination of Legislative Instruments (LIs)	61

5.5 Adherence to established Areas of Jurisdiction..... 62
5.6 Naming of Districts and Settlements 62
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION 63
REFERENCES..... 65

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1:	Administrative Boundaries in Dispute during the 2010 PHC.....	2
Figure 2:	Fragmented Kwahu South District.....	15
Figure 3:	Disputed Section of the Boundary between the Brong-Ahafo and Eastern Regions.....	25
Figure 4:	Disputed Section of the Boundary between the Upper West and Northern Regions.....	29
Figure 5:	Disputed Section of the Boundary between the Upper East and Northern Regions.....	33
Figure 6:	Fragmented Nkwanta North District.....	41
Figure 7:	Proposed Nkwanta North and Nkwanta South Districts.....	43
Figure 8:	Proposed Districts in Kwahu as Delimited by GSS Field Staff in consultation with the Two District Chief Executives, March 2008.....	50
Figure 9:	Fragmented Kassena-Nankana East and Kassena-Nankana West Districts....	57

ABBREVIATIONS

GSS	Ghana Statistical Service
PHC	Population and Housing Census
EA	Enumeration Area of Ghana Statistical Service
LI	Legislative Instrument
EC	Electoral Commission
SMD	Survey and Mapping Division of the Lands Commission
DDF	District Development Facility
MMDAs	Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies
MCE	Metropolitan/Municipal Chief Executive
MMDCEs	Metropolitan, Municipal and District Chief Executives
DCE	District Chief Executive
ILGS	Institute of Local Government Studies
GPS	Global Positioning System
PNDC	Provisional National Defence Council
MLGRD	Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
PRAAD	Public Records and Archives Administration Department
BAR	Brong-Ahafo Region
WR	Western Region
CR	Central Region
GAR	Greater Accra Region
AR	Ashanti Region
ER	Eastern Region
NR	Northern Region
UWR	Upper West Region
UER	Upper East Region
VR	Volta Region

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

Prof. Raymond Bagulo Bening

Chairman

John Cofie-Agama

Facilitator

David Yenukwa Kombat

Facilitator

Kofi Agyeman-Duah

Akoto-Danso Samuel

Jones Ofori-Boadu

Alhaji Amadu Sulley

Sylvanus Kofi Adzornu

Daniel Amanyó

Joseph Adu Baiden

Robertson Adjei

George Muller

Jones Obeng

Samuel Seth Passah

Secretary

**To: Hon. Minister of Local Government and Rural Development
Accra**

**LETTER OF PRESENTATION OF FINAL REPORT ON DISTRICT BOUNDARY
DISPUTES**

We were appointed as a committee to resolve the district boundary disputes that have delayed the release of the district level census figures of the 2010 Population and Housing Census of Ghana. We submitted an interim report on 16 April, 2012. The Interim Report presented our findings and the consensus reached on each dispute in order to enable the Ghana Statistical Service to release the district level census figures in an atmosphere of peace.

The Committee now presents our comprehensive report. We will like to take this opportunity to thank the Hon. Minister for Local Government and Rural Development for entrusting us with the task, and the Hon. Regional Ministers, officials of the District, Municipal and Metropolitan Assemblies, the chiefs and other traditional rulers for the courtesies extended to the Committee.

**Prof. Raymond Bagulo Bening
(Committee Chairman)**

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Appointment of Committee and the Terms of Reference

We were appointed by the Minister for Local Government and Rural Development, Hon. Samuel Ofose-Ampofo, on 3rd August 2011, with the following terms of reference:

To research into the issues of District boundary disputes associated with the 2010 Population and Housing Census and make recommendations to Government to enable the Ghana Statistical Service (GSS) to release the District level census figures.

The Committee was inaugurated on the same day and it began work immediately because of the urgency of the situation.

The Ghana Statistical Service (GSS) undertook a Population and Housing Census in September 2010. The provisional census figures at the national and regional levels were released in early February 2011. However, the district level population figures could not be released as a result of boundary disputes involving certain localities in some districts.

The Enumerators faced many challenges during the Census. Some communities refused to be enumerated. In other communities, enumerators were harassed, arrested and locked up by aggrieved community leaders. The main reason for the refusal to be enumerated was that the Enumerators were from Districts other than the Districts they belonged. In the past some communities boycotted parliamentary, presidential and District Assembly level elections because of wrongful placement of their communities.

It took the intervention of opinion leaders, senior census officials, District Chief Executives and, in some instances, Regional Ministers to persuade households in some communities to respond to the Enumerators. The agreement reached with the communities before they accepted to be enumerated was that, after the census enumeration, data for those communities would be placed in the appropriate districts.

In March 2011, the Ghana Statistical Service requested the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development and the Electoral Commission to discuss how the boundary issues could be resolved. It was decided that a committee comprising officials of the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, the Electoral Commission, Ghana Statistical Service and the Survey and Mapping Division of the Lands Commission should be formed to resolve the boundary disputes. The boundaries in dispute during the 2010 PHC are shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1:

1.1 Interpretation of Our Terms of Reference

Our Terms of Reference entailed a detailed consideration of the causes of each boundary dispute and how it should be resolved based on consensus to facilitate the release of the census figures in an atmosphere of peace.

The outcome of our reflections and interactions with the concerned communities was the identification of several categories of boundaries involved in the disputes. These are:

- i. Regional boundaries;
- ii. District boundaries;
- iii. Constituency and Electoral Area boundaries;
- iv. Census Enumeration Area (EA) boundaries and localities;
- v. Traditional Area boundaries; and
- vi. Land ownership boundaries.

The causes of the boundary disputes include:

- i. Non- coincidence of the traditional and administrative boundaries;
- ii. Lack of knowledge of the exact location of boundaries;
- iii. Ignorance of the content of the LIs;
- iv. Anomalies in the Legislative Instruments (LIs);
- v. Actions of some District Assemblies such as crossing boundaries to collect revenue and grant building permits;
- vi. Lack of updated maps;
- vii. Lack of collaboration among the implementing agencies:
 - a) Electoral Commission;
 - b) Ghana Statistical Service;
 - c) Survey and Mapping Division of Lands Commission;
 - d) Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development;
 - e) District Assemblies;
- vi. Lack of consultation with Regional Coordinating Councils and marginalization of Traditional Authorities; and
- vii. Intervention of some Politicians and influential Opinion Leaders in the listing of localities in the LIs of District Assemblies.

1.2 Procedure

In pursuance of our charge, the Committee held its own meetings and interacted with stakeholders in public fora. The Committee met many times and held ten regional consultative meetings were and two meetings in Accra which involved some Regions. The Committee itself met many times to consider a few memoranda and petitions and prepare this report.

The Committee held public sessions which were well attended by some Chiefs, a few Members of Parliament, District Chief Executives and officials representing the interested parties. After the usual customary exchange of greetings, there was self-introduction, followed by a welcome address by the Regional Ministers or their representatives. The Chairman made an opening statement in which he outlined the procedure to be followed and gave an account of the evolution of regional, administrative and constituency boundaries and how they impacted on traditional political formations, traditional allegiance and ownership of land. The basic principles for the conduct of a national census were also outlined. The implementing agencies made detailed presentations on how they carry out their functions which were related to the conduct of the 2010 Population and Housing Census and the district level census data.

After each presentation, views were invited from the public and explanations provided. Questions from the public were answered by the members of the Committee and some of the participants. Thereafter, the cases of boundary disputes were presented by the parties involved and they were questioned on the immediate and remote causes of the dispute and how the issues could be amicably resolved. The Committee considered 42 boundary disputes through out the whole country. Minutes and records of attendance of all of the participants at each forum were taken. The public participated very actively in the discussions and virtually all the cases were resolved by consensus and some of the decisions were publicly proclaimed.

To ascertain the sites of the localities being disputed in relation to the regional and district boundaries, the 1:50,000 scale topographic sheets of Ghana, which show details of regional boundaries and other geographical features and the road map of Ghana produced by the Survey and Mapping Division of the Lands Commission in 1974 were used to carry out the exercise.

The absence of up-to-date maps meant that the administrative areas and boundaries which existed in 2010 had not been shown on any maps that were readily available. Although digital town sheets are available, these do not cover the entire country. Even in the areas where these sheets are available, the features are insufficient and they could not be used for purposes of delimitation of enumeration areas.

At each forum to dialogue with the parties involved in boundary disputes, it was made clear that the Committee's mandate was to deal solely with the boundary issues relating to the 2010 PHC. It was emphasized that the Committee was not a boundary delineation or demarcation Committee. It was stressed further that the Committee was to dialogue with all parties involved in the disputes so as to reach a consensus to enable the Ghana Statistical Service (GSS) to release the district level census data.

The significance of the district level census figures for national and local level planning, budgeting, disbursement of funds by District Assemblies Common Fund Secretariat and Development Partners, and the creation of administrative districts and constituencies was explained to underscore the urgency to release the census data. The Electoral Commission depends

on the GSS for data to determine the regional and district allocation of constituencies and for the creation of new districts. The Census figures are crucial for the registration of voters and logistics planning.

CHAPTER TWO

PRINCIPLES UPON WHICH THE DELIMITATION OF BOUNDARIES ARE BASED

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the basic principles upon which the delimitation of the various boundaries that impacted on the conduct of the 2010 Census and the release of the District Level data are based. It is those principles which are particularly relevant to the boundary functions and disputes regarding the census data that are presented here.

2.1 Regional Boundaries

The Gold Coast was divided into three major divisions in 1907: the Gold Coast Colony, simply known as the Colony, Ashanti and Northern Territories of the Gold Coast. In the organization of the Gold Coast into Regions and Districts, it was recognized that until accurate information as to the rightful ownership of lands claimed by different chiefs near the limits of their territories was available and until the position of the villages could be represented on the map a more complete definition of the boundaries could not be provided.

In 1904, Governor John Rodger noted that (Bening, 1999: 23):

The existing boundaries were settled on the basis of imperfect maps and incomplete knowledge of the tribal lands and in this way instances have occurred when parts of the same tribe have been included under different administrations.

The commissions that defined the boundaries between the littoral Colony and Ashanti and between the Ashanti and the Northern territories made accurate surveys of the country and collected detailed information as to the limits of lands belonging to the various ethnic communities and the spheres of influence of the border chiefs. They were charged with (Bening, 1999: 23): the definition of a boundary which, while adhering as far as practicable to natural features should, at the same time, be laid down with due regard to tribal boundaries''.

Captain G.W.C. Soden said, with regard to the Ashanti-Sefwi section of the Gold Coast Colony - Ashanti boundary, that: (Bening, 1999: 24):

Impartially and just consideration of everyone's claim have been the points aimed at in laying down the boundary. It is too much to expect that all will be satisfied and I suppose that it is inevitable that a certain number of malcontents will run with complaints to their various commissioners, to the effect that they did not get the land they claimed. To such I can only say that whatever 'give and take' there may be in the

natural boundaries laid down, no one has lost an acre of valuable land which they were justly entitled to, and I think that the advantages of a natural boundary are so enormous that they ought to be strongly upheld.

In 1914, German Togo was partitioned between Britain and France and the British Sphere of Togoland was attached to the Gold Coast. The northern section of this territory was administratively linked to the Northern Territories whilst the southern section was administered as part of the Eastern Province of the Gold Coast Colony. In 1952, the southern section of British Togoland and the Ewe-speaking areas of the Gold Coast Colony were constituted into the Trans-Volta Togoland Region.

Ghana attained independence with 5 regions: Eastern Region, Western Region, Ashanti Region, Northern Region and Trans-Volta Togoland Region. In 1959, Brong Ahafo Region was created from the Ashanti Region in the face of great opposition. In 1960, the Central Region was carved out of the Western Region and the Upper Region was created out of the Northern Region. In 1983, the Upper Region was divided into Upper East and West Regions while the economic region of Greater Accra in the Eastern Region was raised to a political region (Bening, 1999: 112-146)

Although the creation of regions under the Nkrumah regime was debated in parliament and adopted, after the overthrow of Nkrumah the 1969 Constitution stipulated that regional boundaries could not be changed without consulting the people of the regions to be affected. The strict conditions provided for changing regional boundaries have been carried through all the constitutions of Ghana since 1969.

The 1992 Constitution provides for the creation, alteration or merger of regions through a constitutional Instrument. If the President, upon the presentation of a petition or on the advice of the Council of State, (Ghana, 1992: Article 5 (2)):

is satisfied that there is a substantial demand for
the creation of a new region;
the alteration of the boundaries of a region; or
the merger of any two or more regions,

he shall, on the advice of the Council of State appoint a commission to inquire into the demand and to make recommendations on all the factors involved in the determination of the issue.

Where the Commission of Enquiry finds that: (Ghana, 1992: Article 5 (4)):

there is the need and a substantial demand for the creation, alteration or merger ... it shall recommend to the President that a referendum be held, specifying the issues to be determined by the referendum and the places where the referendum should be held.

The President is required to refer the recommendations to the Electoral Commission, for a referendum. The issue referred for determination by referendum (Ghana, 1992: Article 5 (6)):

shall not be taken to be determined by the referendum unless at least fifty per cent of the persons entitled to vote cast their votes at the referendum, and of the votes cast at least eighty per cent were cast in favour of that issue.

Where a referendum involves the merger of two or more regions, the issue shall not be taken to be determined unless at least sixty per cent of the persons entitled to vote at the referendum in each such region voted in favour of the merger of the two or more regions.

The President has the mandate to issue a constitutional instrument giving effect, or enabling effect to be given, to the results where the legal requirements have been satisfied. Thus, the regional boundaries have been entrenched in all the constitutions of Ghana since 1969. This explains the fact that all the political regions created since 1969 were decreed by military regimes. The regional boundaries therefore take precedence over district and constituency boundaries.

2.2 District Boundaries

When the Colony, Ashanti and Northern Territories were first divided into Provinces and Districts, the administrative boundaries inland were indeterminate but as the country was opened up and became better known, the administrative units were defined based on the chiefdoms as the colonial power relied on the traditional rulers to govern the country. When the Gold Coast Colony was divided into districts in 1907, the policy of the Committee which constituted the administrative units was (Gold Coast, 1908: 101):

to re-adjust them as far as possible in conformity with the boundaries, so far as they exist, of the Divisions of the Native Headchiefs. The absence of the territorial principle in native jurisdictions, and the consequent circumstances that a village owing allegiance to one Headchief may be surrounded by villages owing allegiance to another, rendered in some instances the realization of this ideal impracticable; in such cases obvious natural features and boundaries defined by the Courts of the Colony have been put to use.

It is important to point out that the territorial principle is applicable in traditional jurisdiction and the difficulty of “islands”, enclaves and exclaves is not peculiar to Ghana.

The Commission that investigated the 1948 riots noted that: (Bening, 2010: 134): “Only in Native Administration, residing largely in a hierarchy of vested interest jealously guarded by Chiefs and Elders, was the African provided with an approach to political expression.” It was therefore, recommended that the basis of participation in local affairs should be broadened by the establishment of democratic local authorities “so as to give representation therein to a specified proportion of adult males within the area not now eligible for membership” (Bening, 2010: 134).

The 1949 Committee on Constitutional Reform proposed the establishment of elected local authorities based on District, Urban, Local and Area Councils in order to harness local loyalties at every practicable level and to afford opportunities for the majority of people to participate actively in the process of local and central government. The Committee submitted that, in defining local authority areas, due consideration should be paid to (Bening, 2010: 134):

1. Community of interest of the people of the area. This implies that existing states and divisional organizations should, wherever practicable, be the basis for the formation of a Local Authority;
2. Population; and
3. Resources- the amount of revenue from local sources that each area can command.

Regard should also be paid to significant geographical factors.

Since then, in the delimitation of administrative boundaries, successive governments have refined these criteria but a cardinal principle has always been that no district should lie in two regions.

2.3 Constituency and Electoral Boundaries

The creation of constituencies and the delimitation of electoral boundaries on a nationwide basis started in 1950 and up to 1982. The exercise was undertaken by Delimitation Commission. This function is now the preserve of the Electoral Commission. The criteria for the delineation of constituencies are specified in Article 5 (2) of the 1992 Constitution. For our purposes, it is important to note the principles that have guided the delimitation of constituency boundaries since 1950 are (Bening, 1993: 1-44; Ghana Electoral Commission, n.d.):

- No constituency should fall within more than one region;
- No constituency should cut across a district boundary;
- No electoral area should cut across a constituency boundary;
- No unit area should cut across an electoral area boundary.

2.4 Census Enumeration Areas

For the conduct of the 2010 Census, the administrative districts were divided into Enumeration Areas (Ghana, (n.d): 10-15). In creating the Enumeration Areas, the Legislative Instruments which established the Districts were used to ensure that no localities were left out and all duplications avoided. During the field delimitation of the Enumeration Areas, the Ghana Statistical Service observed some inconsistencies in certain Legislative Instruments which were reported to the Electoral Commission and the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development. Some localities were listed in two adjoining districts and some localities in the Legislative Instruments were in a different region. Some of the anomalies were rectified by the

Ghana Statistical Service in consultation with the District Assemblies before the census. Reports received from the field officers indicated that most District Assemblies assisted greatly in the exercise. Enumeration Area boundaries were coterminous with district and regional boundaries.

2.5 Traditional Areas and Boundaries

Before colonization, Ghana consisted of kingdoms, chiefdoms and communities without a centralized system of government. The chiefdoms are now designated as Traditional Areas. The so-called societies without rulers or acephalous communities were under the jurisdiction of various Tindanas, the traditional custodians of the land. The Tindanas usually hail from the families of the first settlers who established their authority over certain territories. The colonial administration organized the so-called segmentary societies into chiefdoms and divisions which were constituted into administrative districts and the Tindanas lost their secular powers to the chiefs appointed by the government.

The boundaries of the traditional areas and territories under the Tindanas were usually based on physical features such as rivers, mountains, hills, lakes and trees. Some sections of the boundaries were delimited by burying bottles and erection of mounds. Since the colonial era, it has been accepted in principle that the division of Traditional Areas and Divisions between two administrations is unsound. However, traditional African boundaries are seldom the well defined lines that administrators might wish them to be.

Nonetheless, in November 1928, the Eastern Provincial Council of the Colony resolved that (Bening, 2010: 264):

the existing administrative districts which do not take into account the territorial jurisdiction of the Paramount Chiefs concerned is full of danger and that much of the disintegration and other difficulties in some states are due to such improper clarification of the administrative districts.

As Nana Ofori Atta I persisted in his demand that all the divisions of Akim Abuakwa Traditional Area should be constituted into one administrative district, the Ag. Commissioner of the Eastern Province suggested that (Bening, 2010: 265):

it would be extraordinarily interesting to ascertain from the Chiefs a description of their state boundaries and their recommendations to the course they desire Government to take...there is not a single state in this province which has not some dispute with the adjoining state concerning its boundaries or jurisdiction over certain areas....

It was proposed that the President of the Eastern Provincial Council should be told that their request would be considered when government was satisfied that there were no more inter-state boundary disputes. The Provincial Council was asked to provide a list of the specific cases where it was desired that administrative boundaries should coincide with inter-state boundaries.

By October 1930, the President of the Eastern Provincial Council, Sir Ofori Atta I, was still talking in general terms about the truncation of states and urging the government to remedy the defect in the political administration of the Colony.

The Traditional Authorities prefer that administrative boundaries should coincide with the traditional limits of ownership of land and traditional allegiance. The Chiefs and Tindanas are not happy that their subjects are divided between administrative units and that natural resources in their traditional areas are used to develop other areas especially where their territories have been given to another district owing to administrative convenience. Some of them perceive that their people may no longer pay allegiance to them. In 1972, the Siriboe Commission on the delimitation of administrative boundaries declared that (Ghana, 1972: 15):

our primary aim was not to determine who owns the land involved or what Paramount Chief should enjoy the allegiance of the inhabitants. We were guided mainly by the need to create administrative areas which would be viable, compact and convenient for local government purposes.

The superimposition of modern administrative boundaries on the network of traditional boundaries regarding allegiance to chiefs and land ownership is a major source of conflict between chiefdoms which rebound on District Assemblies. The non-demarcation of both traditional and administrative boundaries and ignorance of the location and functions of regional and district boundaries have compounded the problem. Chapter three outlines the causes of the boundary disputes considered by the Committee.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CAUSES OF BOUNDARY DISPUTES

3.0 Introduction

This chapter outlines the main causes of administrative boundary disputes regarding the 2010 Population and Housing Census which have delayed the release of the district level census figures. Many of the disputes related to the creation of new districts, lack of knowledge of the precise location of administrative and traditional boundaries, the absence of up-to-date maps, and conflict between the functions of traditional and modern administrative boundaries.

3.1 Divergence between Traditional and Administrative Boundaries

One of the causes of the boundary disputes is non-coincidence of traditional and administrative boundaries. Many chiefs are not happy when their traditional areas are divided between two or more administrative districts. They prefer that traditional boundaries should be coterminous with administrative boundaries so that there is no interference with the exercise of traditional jurisdiction and allegiance. However, where there is a conflict between traditional allegiance and administrative boundaries, administrative convenience takes precedence over traditional allegiance.

The conflict between traditional allegiance and administrative boundaries arises partly from the fact that the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development and Parliament which develop the Legislative Instruments establishing districts do not adequately involve the traditional rulers and other opinion leaders in the communities. Another cause of the disputes is that some paramount and divisional chiefs whose land is included in a district in which they do not reside do not get the necessary recognition by the District Assemblies. In such situations, the Chiefs bemoaned the fact that the District Assemblies do not consult them in the naming of projects. Non payment of royalties derived from their lands is another source of grievance among traditional rulers.

For example, part of the New Juaben Municipal Assembly falls under the Akwapem Traditional Area. The Chiefs expect the Assembly to consult them in the naming of projects that fall within their traditional area. At the Committee's meeting with traditional leaders and District Assembly officials of disputing districts from the Eastern Region, the Akwapem Chiefs cited the Koforidua Polytechnic and the Koforidua Sports Stadium to buttress their case. They indicated that the two projects are in Adweso in the Akwapem Traditional Area and not in Koforidua and should therefore have been named as Adweso Polytechnic and Adweso Sports Stadium respectively. The Chiefs also bemoaned that the Akwapem North District Assembly does not receive part of the royalties derived from the projects.

3.2 Lack of Updated and Authentic Maps

The lack of up-to-date and authentic maps and physical demarcation of traditional and administrative boundaries on the ground are some of the major causes of disputes between districts. The use of unapproved maps and sketches by unauthorized agencies in delineating district boundaries is also another source of misunderstanding between districts. For example, officials of the Nkwanta North District Assembly used tourist maps to make claims for some settlements in the Nkwanta South District. The use of unauthentic maps in the operations of the District Assemblies will avoid some of the conflicts.

The absence of updated maps and plans of scientific accuracy to enable correct identification and ascertainment of boundaries based on topographical features such as rivers, hills, valleys etc and roads and settlements were key challenges faced by the Ghana Statistical Service in the 2010 Population and Housing Census. For instance, the Survey and Mapping Division's latest map on the scale of 1:50,000 which covers the entire country was produced in 1974.

3.3 Lack of Collaboration among Implementing Agencies

The weak collaboration amongst the implementing agencies viz. Ghana Statistical Service (GSS), Electoral Commission (EC), Survey and Mapping Division (SMD) of Lands Commission and the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development largely contributed to the challenges that confronted the GSS in the conduct of the 2010 PHC. The GSS updates their Enumeration Area maps which are derived from the administrative map of Ghana produced by the Survey and Mapping Division of Lands Commission. The Enumeration Area (EA) maps are based on the districts existing at the time of the census. The administrative map of districts at the preparatory stage of the 2010 PHC was not available. As new districts had been created in 2004 and 2008, the census cartographers had to rely on information provided by the District Assemblies and the LIs.

The LIs were developed without the involvement of the GSS and other implementing agencies. The Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development is responsible for the development of LIs for the creation of districts. This was done without adequate consultation with implementing agencies such as GSS, Survey and Mapping Division of the Lands Commission and Electoral Commission. The consequences of this were that:

- i. some localities were duplicated in adjoining districts.
- ii. some of the districts were not compact
- iii. some of the LIs cut across the regional boundaries.
- iv. the amendment and repeal of LIs posed a great challenge in determining the boundaries of particularly the new districts.

The lack of compactness and geographical contiguity of some districts is best exemplified in Kwahu South District (Fig. 2). Other classic cases are Kassena-Nankana East and Kassena-Nankana West Districts. The problem was attributed to the development of LIs by the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development without adequate consultation with the traditional rulers, communities, the Electoral Commission and manipulation by local politicians and opinion leaders.

In the face of these challenges, an attempt was made by GSS field staff to reconcile the settlements listed in the LIs with what was actually on the ground based on the maps available and the submissions by the District Assemblies. However, during the enumeration exercise, the officials of some of the District Assemblies disagreed with what had previously been mutually accepted.

The Survey and Mapping Division of the Lands Commission is the statutory government agency mandated to produce accurate, scientifically proven and authentic maps for the country. The SMD is involved in the production of topographic maps, ortho-photo maps, thematic maps, GIS applications and all other mapping derivatives. The SMD has current large scale maps of all regional capitals and some selected cities and towns based on important economic activities. But these cover just a small percentage of the land mass of the country. The medium scale map at 1:50,000 which was produced in 1974 and the road map of Ghana which was produced in 1994 have not been revised due to lack of resources. Ideally such maps should be revised every five years.

3.4 State of Regional and Administrative Boundaries

Most of the regional and district boundaries have not been clearly defined and demarcated, unlike during the colonial era. This has created some uncertainty about the location of some border settlements resulting in disputes between adjoining districts.

3.5 Lack of Awareness of the Legislative Instruments (LIs)

There is a general lack of awareness of the LIs among the populace. Some senior officials of District Assemblies do not even know of the existence of the individual LIs for their Districts and the consolidated LI 1983. Consequently, they did not know the limits of their boundaries. Some Regional Coordinating Councils were also not aware of the consolidated LI. The LI 1983 was promulgated without adequate consultation with all the stakeholders. Some of the district boundary disputes were based on the individual LIs which are in some cases different from the consolidated LI.

Figure 2:

3.6 Composition of Districts in the Legislative Instruments

The poor listing and description of settlements in the LIs and the omission of smaller communities was also a cause of boundary disputes. Some settlements are repeated in the LIs of adjoining districts. In the urban centres, it is very necessary to provide adequate description of administrative boundaries using street names, house numbers, major drains and astronomical lines.

In the rural areas, the Legislative Instruments just mention major settlements that constitute the District without vivid descriptions of the administrative boundaries. Since the LIs incorporate all the smaller localities, the Enumeration Area (EA) demarcation officers from GSS sometimes did not know where to place the settlements that were not listed in the LI. Another issue had to do with new settlements that had sprung up particularly in the borderlands. Since there are no boundary descriptions in the Legislative Instruments, it is often difficult to place such new settlements where they properly belong.

3.7 Growth and Disappearance of Settlements

Another major cause of the disputes was the growth, expansion and disappearance of settlements which often led to uncertainties about the location of the settlements in relation to administrative boundaries. Boundaries in sparsely populated areas which were far from administrative capitals were usually ignored in the operations of District Assemblies. As soon as new settlements were established in the empty lands and the existing settlements expanded, the Assemblies began to focus their attention on these areas. This often led to disputes as to which Assembly had jurisdiction over such settlements as, in most cases; the exact location of the boundary was not known. This was the case between Adentan and Ga East Municipal Assemblies and Awutu Senya District and Ga South Municipal Assemblies.

Another example is the Jeikrodua area in the Ga South Municipal Assembly of the Greater Accra Region.

Mangoase was a small settlement in the Awutu-Senya District of the Central Region. Mangoase and Jeikrodua have expanded and become virtually one settlement thus obscuring the regional boundary which coincides with the Kasoa-Bogyawse Road. The Awutu-Senya District Assembly is now claiming Jeikrodua in the Greater Accra Region.

3.8 Actions of Some Assembly Officials

Officials of some District Assemblies cross into other districts to collect revenue, issue land permits and grant building permits. In order to consolidate their gains, they begin to shift their boundaries to cover these areas. Examples of such cases are Adentan and Ga East, Ga South and Awutu-Senya, and Ga West and the Akwapem South Municipal Assemblies.

Some District Assemblies have also initiated development projects/programmes in adjoining districts. This occurred mainly in areas where the people along the borders belong to the same ethnic group. The result was that the officials of such District Assemblies insist that the people in such areas should be enumerated as part of their districts. During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, officials from some District Assemblies contested their boundaries with census officials. Examples are Central Gonja and Kintampo North and Nkwanta North and Nkwanta South.

3.9 Intervention of Politicians and Opinion Leaders

Some politicians and opinion leaders used their influence in the development of the LIs for the creation of Districts without consulting the chiefs and community leaders. The result was that some communities found themselves where they did not want to belong. Some politicians, traditional rulers and community members reiterated this fact in almost all the regional fora organized by the Committee. The inability of Members of Parliament to scrutinize the LIs prior to their passage was another source of concern.

The chiefs and various community leaders complained about the fact that they were not consulted in the naming of their districts. The earlier local government areas were named after the capitals of the districts. A case in point is Wa East which is not wholly East of Wa and Wa West which were the outcome of the intervention of some politicians. This creates unnecessary bitterness among the people.

3.10 Increasing Awareness of the Value of District Level Population Figures

Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies have become keenly aware of the benefits that are derived from high population figures. The creation of districts and constituencies and the elevation of Districts to Municipal and Metropolitan status largely depend on population figures.

The allocation of the District Assemblies' Common Fund and the District Development Facility (DDF) are also based largely on population. The Assemblies have therefore taken unusual interest in the collection of census data so that the figures would reflect the actual population size of their areas. The officials of some District Assemblies have therefore over enthusiastically extended their functions across district and regional boundaries.

3.11 Ignorance of the Location of Administrative Boundaries

Major physical features, like rivers, hills, mountain ranges and valleys, are usually used as administrative boundaries. However, in some instances, the boundaries do not follow natural features throughout their entire course. In the case of the Upper East and Northern Regions, the boundary veers off the White Volta northwards around Arigou and rejoins the river west of the

town. Ignorance of this fact made some officials of the Talensi-Nabdam District Assembly and some traditional rulers in Bugorugu to alledge that the wall-map of Ghana on the scale of 1:250,000 produced by the SMD in 1974 was drawn by an individual. It was claimed that the map was fake. Another example is the case between the South Tongu District in the Volta Region and Dangbe East in the Greater Accra Region.

CHAPTER FOUR

CASE STUDIES AND RESOLUTION OF BOUNDARY DISPUTES

4.0 Introduction

The disputes that were investigated by the Committee may be divided into two broad groups: those relating to regional boundaries and those relating to district boundaries. However, it should be pointed out that the disputes across regional boundaries were not brought up by the Regional Coordinating Councils but by the District Assemblies adjoining the regional boundaries. The main problem was conflict between traditional allegiance and land ownership boundaries and regional and administrative boundaries. The Committee explained to the parties concerned that administrative districts do not necessarily coincide with traditional areas. It was further explained that administrative boundaries do not affect the exercise of traditional jurisdiction and allegiance and ownership of land. The specific boundary disputes considered by the Committee are presented below.

4.1 Disputes Across Regional Boundaries

4.1.1 Dormaa Municipal Assembly (BAR) and Bia District Assembly (WR)

During the 2010 PHC enumeration in September/October 2010, the inhabitants of Adiembra No.3 and Zizera refused to be enumerated by enumerators from the Bia District. They claimed that they belonged to the Dormaa Municipality and not the Bia District. Census officials from both districts met to discuss the issue and it was decided that census officials from the Dormaa District should enumerate the communities based on the request of the inhabitants. It was agreed that the issue should be investigated and the census data for the communities be included in the appropriate district.

At the consultative meeting on the 10th October, 2011 at Sunyani, Vincent Oppong Asamoah, the MCE of the Dormaa Municipal Assembly and Tweneboa -Kodua, DCE of Bia District corroborated the experience of the GSS personnel during the census. The two District Assemblies agreed that the localities belonged to the Bia District. So the completed census forms of Adiembra No.3 and Zizera were labelled for Bia District and forwarded to the GSS. The GSS confirmed what had been said and the receipt of the census forms for the two communities.

The consensus at the forum was that the census data for Adiembra No.3 and Zizera should be included in the Bia District.

4.1.2 Kintampo North Municipal Assembly (BAR) and Central Gonja District Assembly (NR)

The inhabitants of Adido Deke, Jerusalem, Kafuwuripe, Bethlehem, Kayiripe Kawupe, Mataheko, Bamako, Benimu Aluwepe, BBC, BBC Mempeasem, Rome, Gbakope, Anifape, Mallam, Chariso, Dokupe, Nigeria Camp, Kplanchasepe, Kobenape, Sawape, Lembirso,

Agamakope, Abrasewurpe and Soroto claimed they belonged to the Central Gonja District instead of the Kintampo North Municipality. They therefore refused to be enumerated by census officials from the Kintampo North Municipality.

The Regional Statistician for Brong Ahafo Region, Seidu Omar met with the District Assembly officials of Central Gonja District and it was also agreed that census officials from the Central Gonja District should be allowed to enumerate the inhabitants. It was also agreed that the issue would be investigated and the census data for the listed communities included in the appropriate district.

At the regional consultative meeting with stakeholders in Tamale, the District Chief Executive for Central Gonja, Salisu Be-Awuribe claimed that the localities are listed in the LI for his District. He indicated further that during the 2010 PHC, census officials from the Kintampo North Municipality transgressed their boundary and attempted to enumerate the inhabitants of the affected settlements which in his view fell under his jurisdiction. He pointed out that the settlements in question were on the south bank of the Black Volta River. Salisu Be-Awuribe argued that the inhabitants of the settlements concerned migrated from his district and settled on the southern bank of the Black Volta River. He explained that it is the Central Gonja District Assembly which has been providing social services such as potable water, schools, clinics, etc. in those settlements. He therefore requested that the census data for the communities should be placed under the Central Gonja District.

The Municipal Chief Executive for the Kintampo North, Alhassan Seidu Harrison explained that the settlements constitute grey areas due to the fact that the LIs establishing both districts did not capture them. He argued that since the Black Volta River is the regional boundary, all the settlements fell under his jurisdiction. He emphasized that, in his view there was no problem as such between the two districts regarding the ownership of the settlements. He stated that the people on both sides of the Black Volta River are Gonjas just as the two District Chief Executives are.

It was explained that the settlements are located south of the Black Volta River which is the boundary between the Brong Ahafo and Northern Regions. The localities are therefore situated in the Kintampo North Municipality of the Brong Ahafo Region. Since the regional boundaries are entrenched in the Constitution, they take precedence over district boundaries. Indeed, district boundaries should not cross regional boundaries. The regional boundary therefore takes precedence over the LI in which the settlements are listed.

The DCE of Central Gonja, Salisu Be-Awuribe, appealed to the Committee to furnish his office with the final report on the dispute. He pointed out that, in so doing, he would have the opportunity to explain in detail the principles guiding the delimitation of administrative boundaries in the country to the communities under his jurisdiction. He indicated that this would forestall any hostilities in future. He reiterated the need to involve MMDCEs in the demarcation of

administrative boundaries and delineation of EAs by the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development and Ghana Statistical Service to avoid re-occurrence of similar disputes.

It was accepted that, since the regional boundary cannot be changed without a referendum, the district level 2010 PHC census figures for the named communities should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework ie the regional boundary.

4.1.3 Asuogyaman District Assembly (ER) and North Tongu District Assembly (VR)

There was no problem regarding the enumeration of the inhabitants of the communities in question, i.e.Ogoli and Old Akrade, during the 2010 PHC. However, when the Committee on District Boundary Disputes was set up, the inhabitants of the two settlements came to indicate where their census figures should be included. The two settlements have grown and merged and now constitute virtually one settlement but retain their individual identities.

Ogoli and Old Akrade are both in the Asuogyaman District. The inhabitants of Ogoli indicated that on the basis of the regional boundary, Ogoli falls in the Volta Region while Old Akrade is located in the Asuogyaman District of the Eastern Region.

The District Chief Executive of Asuogyaman, Johnson Ehiakpor gave the historical background of the district boundary dispute between his District and the North Tongu District. He reported that the communities involved are Ogoli and Old Akrade. He said the existing LI which created the Asuogyaman District Assembly captured Ogoli community which was predominantly Ewe-speaking under his area of jurisdiction whilst the Old Akrade was placed under North Tongu District. He explained that on the basis of the regional boundary, Ogoli falls in the Volta Region while Old Akrade is located in the Eastern Region.

The Committee asked for the map of the area to be displayed for scrutiny by all stakeholders. It was found that both Ogoli and Old Akrade are in the Eastern Region. The Committee requested that the two parties should be invited to the next meeting scheduled for Ho so that a consensus could be reached. The DCE of North Tongu was not present at the consultative meeting at Ho on September 13, 2011. All the parties who could not attend the regional forum were invited to a meeting in Accra.

Although the DCE of North Tongu attended the meeting in Accra on October 19, 2011, he did not raise the dispute relating to Ogoli. At the previous meetings, the DCE for North Tongu and the DCE of Asuogyaman were requested to discuss the issue and inform the Committee of their decision.

It was accepted that since Ogoli was in the Eastern Region, the district level census figures for the community be included in the Asuogyaman District.

4.1.4 Ga South Municipal (GAR) and Awutu Senya (CR) District Assemblies

The disputed localities are Kpormitey, Amanfrom and Jei Krodua. A study of the Legislative Instrument establishing the two districts indicate that both Kpormitey and Amanfrom are located in the Awutu Senya District. Jei Krodua began as a small village which developed with time into a large community. Later, the people re-named the newly developed area as Jei Krodua Mangoase. This led Jei Krodua to appear as two separate localities. However, the major road from Kasoa to Bogyawse which runs through Jei Krodua serves as the regional boundary between Central and Greater Accra Regions. During the 2010 PHC, enumerators from the Ga South Municipality crossed the regional boundary and enumerated some households in Kpormitey and Amanfrom in the Awutu Senya District in the Central Region. This was done on the basis of mutual understanding between census officials of both districts and the communities.

At the consultative meeting held in Accra on 17th August, 2011, the Municipal Chief Executive for Ga South, Sherif N.O. Doodoo stated that he assumed office in 2009 and began working with the LI 1827 which established the Weija Municipal Assembly. He pointed out that, per the records in his office, the Weija Municipal Assembly was renamed Ga South Municipal Assembly during the inauguration of the Assembly by the then Greater Accra Regional Minister. This was due to that fact that the indigenous people agitated for the change of the name and the Minister obliged. The MCE however indicated that, the Assembly is legally known as Weija Municipal Assembly.

The MCE informed the meeting that, when he assumed duty, it was observed that there were ambiguities in the administrative boundaries despite the fact that regional boundaries were clearly defined. He elucidated that the LI 1983 which created electoral areas brought about a lot of challenges and distortions which culminated in district boundary disputes between Ga South and Awutu Senya. He disclosed that PNDC Law 26 established the Greater Accra Region as a political entity. LI 1498 established the Ga District Assembly which was split into Ga West and Ga East District Assemblies. Subsequently, Ga South District Assembly was carved out of Ga West District Assembly. He explained that LI 1498 which established the Ga District gave detailed description of settlements and pillars that constituted the District Assembly. He indicated that one of the settlements, Jeikrodua was split by the regional boundary. It was this which caused the dispute over the enumeration of households during the 2010 Population and Housing Census. He indicated that the Jeikrodua settlement overlapped the District Assembly boundary which is coterminous with the Regional boundary.

The District Chief Executive of Awutu Senya, Nuhu Adams, was invited to brief the meeting on the situation in his area of jurisdiction. He pointed out that (Reindorf, 1966:24)

Ga is the name particularly applied to the people and country bounded on the east by the lagoon Tshemu near Tema, west by the river Sakumo fio, south by the sea and north by the Akwapem Mountains. It is, however, generally applied to the people and land from the Cooks loaf or Langma to

the Volta. The seven Towns forming Akra people are:

- i. Ga, English or James Town (British Akra)
- ii. Kinka or Ussher Town (Dutch Akra)
- iii. Osu or Christianborg (Danish Akra)
- iv. La or Labadi
- v. Teshi
- vi. Ningowa or Little Ningo and
- vii. Tema whilst the Ga Adangme coast towns are Kpong or Poni, Gbugbla or Prampram, Nungo or Ningo and Ada. The inland Adangme towns are Shai, Krobo, Osudoku and Asutuare.

The DCE of Awutu-Senya also referred to the report of the Local Government Boundary Commission 1972 (Ghana, 1972: paragraph 17):

We wish to make it clear that the boundary changes we have proposed are not to be deemed to confer title to land or to affect traditional allegiances or alignments. They are purely for purposes of effective Local Government.

He further pointed out that (Ghana, 1972: paragraph 76):

Jurisdiction over the villages of Jeikrodua and Odupong-Ofako is also disputed between the Ga Local Council and the Awutu Local Council. As these villages are in the Central Region, we consider that jurisdiction over them should remain vested in the Awutu Local Council.

The District Chief Executive, explained that the springing up and growth of settlements as a result of the Coastal Road Construction tended to blur the regional and district boundaries. This culminated in settlements which were not included in the LI 1376 which established the Awutu-Efutu-Senya District Assembly. He disclosed that PNDC Law 26 decreed that Mile 7 which was used as a land mark for the boundary demarcation should be changed to a regional boundary. Nuhu was of the opinion that the newly built-up areas did not feature in the recent maps produced by SMD of Lands Commission and other agencies charged with the mandate to produce maps.

The issue at stake was fundamentally related to the growth of settlements on either side of the regional boundary. Officials of GSS explained that they were mindful of the existing regional boundaries as well as the LIs in the delimitation of the enumeration areas. It was explained that the settlements in dispute are situated as follows:

<u>Settlement</u>	<u>Location</u>
Jeikrodua Mangoase	Central Region
Jeikrodua (Original)	Greater Accra Region

The Chairman noted that the 1992 Constitution of Ghana was very clear on the relationship between regional boundaries, administrative boundaries and constituencies. He reiterated that land ownership or traditional jurisdictions were not affected by regional and administrative boundaries. The regional boundary should serve as the basis for the resolution of the problems presented by both parties i.e. Ga South and Awutu Senya District Assemblies. He emphasized that the Committee's work would be guided by the location of settlements/localities in relation to district and regional boundaries.

The Central Regional Minister, Ama Banyiwaa Doe, pointed out that the concerns raised by some of the Traditional Authorities in the areas of controversy were mostly the violation of traditional boundaries during district boundary delimitation.

It was agreed that since the regional boundary cannot be altered except by a referendum, the district level census data should be released in accordance with the existing legal framework.

4.1.5 Sene District Assembly (BAR) and Kwahu North District Assembly (ER)

The Enumeration Areas for the Sene District were delineated based on the LIs and the regional boundary. However, during the 2010 PHC, the inhabitants of Ntoaboma, Sitorkope, Kpekuidzi No.2, Digya Island and other surrounding settlements refused to be enumerated by census officials from Sene District (Figure 3). They claimed to belong to the Kwahu North District as a result of an earlier administrative arrangement between Atebubu and the Kwahu District Councils for the latter to act as an agent of the former in administering Ntoaboma. The District Statistical Officer and the District Coordinating Director of Kwahu North and the District Chief Executive for Sene met and agreed that the inhabitants should be enumerated by census officials from the Kwahu North District. It was also agreed that the data should be put in the appropriate district after the resolution of the dispute.

At one of the Committee's meeting at the Institute of Local Government Studies (ILGS), Madina, the DCE for Sene District, Dominic Napare indicated that the dispute between his District and the Afram Plains (Kwahu North?) District was about Ntoabomah which was ceded to the Kwahu North District, a decision that transgressed the regional boundary. He disclosed further that the Digya Forest Reserve was also ceded to Kwahu North despite the fact that it is located in the Sene District of the Brong Ahafo Region. Dominic Napare informed the meeting that, in his view, the locality ought to be under Sene District. He claimed that Ntoabomah was more accessible from his District than from the Kwahu North District and expressed concern that the LI that established the Kwahu North District still placed Ntoabomah and surrounding localities under that District instead of Sene District.

Figure 3:

It was pointed out that Ntoabomah was temporarily ceded to the Kwahu North District for the purposes of administrative convenience about 1972. The arrangement was to continue until accessibility in the area had improved or (Bening, 2010: 195) “until the regional boundary is adjusted by constitutional process to transfer Ntoabomah to the Eastern Region”. The DCE for Sene District was requested to furnish the Committee with a list of communities in dispute during the 2010 PHC to enable the Committee comprehend the situation better.

Based on the delineation of the regional boundary, Ntoabomah, Sitorkope, Kpekuidzi and surrounding settlements are in the Sene District of the Brong Ahafo Region. It was therefore agreed that the 2010 PHC census data for these localities be released according to the existing legal framework in spite of the earlier arrangement. However, the Kwahu North District should continue to have oversight administrative responsibility over the localities and its surrounding areas due to poor accessibility to Kwame Danso, the district capital of the Sene District. The Local Government Act of 1993 allows joint venture by District Assemblies.

4.1.6 Asunafo South District Assembly (BAR) and Atwima Mponua District Assembly (AR)

The inhabitants of Siana claimed they belong to the Asunafo South District of the Brong Ahafo Region and not the Atwima Mponua District of the Ashanti Region. This led to their refusal to be enumerated by census officials from Atwima Mponua District. An agreement was therefore reached between the officials of the two District Assemblies to allow census enumerators from Asunafo South District to enumerate the inhabitants Siana whilst the matter was investigated for an appropriate resolution.

At the meeting of the Committee in Sunyani on 10th October, 2011, a traditional ruler from Asunafo South District queried the use of the Tano River as the boundary between the Asunafo and Atwima Mponua Districts. He indicated that two rivers viz. Tano and Srim have always served as their administrative boundary. He disclosed that the boundary dispute between the two districts was sent to a court of competent jurisdiction for the determination of the case. The traditional ruler claimed that the court ruled in favour of the Asunafo South District. He therefore contended that Siana and surrounding villages along the west of the Tano River belong to Asunafo South District. He expatiated that, when Kwame Nkrumah, former President of Ghana delimited the Brong Ahafo Region, the settlements in contention were placed under the Brong Ahafo Region and for that matter the Asunafo South District. The Chief proposed that the census data for the disputed communities should be included in the Asunafo South District.

It was explained that since 1969, all the Constitutions of Ghana have clearly stated that regional boundaries cannot be changed except through a referendum in strict adherence with specified conditions as contained in, Article 5, sub-section 6 of the 1992 Constitution. The disputed settlements are listed in the consolidated LI 1983 under the Asunafo South District in the Brong Ahafo Region. The participants were aware of the LI 1983 but some were yet to receive copies of it.

The meeting resolved that the 2010 PHC district level data of Asunafo South and Atwima Mponua Districts should be released on the basis of the regional boundary and the consolidated LI.

4.1.7 Ga West Municipal Assembly (GAR) and Akwapem South Municipal Assembly (ER)

The inhabitants of Papase and Hebron claimed that traditionally they belong to the Akwapem Traditional Area. During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, enumerators from Ga West were deployed in Papase and Hebron and the inhabitants of the two communities expressed their dissatisfaction about the arrangement. They allowed the enumeration to proceed but demanded that the census data for the communities in contention should be included in the Akwapim South Municipality.

Ms Patience Osei-Nyarko, Ga West Municipal Assembly Town and Country Planning Officer, reported that Papase and Hebron which legally belong to Ga West Municipal Assembly are being claimed by Akwapem South Municipal Assembly. She indicated that, on several occasions, officials of the Akwapem South Municipal Assembly crossed the boundary to collect revenue at the expense of the Ga West Municipal Assembly. Ms Osei-Nyarko also disclosed that permits for the construction of new buildings were issued by the Akwapim South Municipal Assembly. She added that the processing of land documents for the area is done at Koforidua in the Eastern Region instead of Accra. The dispute hinges on the loss of revenue by the Ga West Municipal Assembly.

In strict adherence to the 1992 Constitution, the regional boundaries cannot be altered except through a referendum. As the two communities are located in the Greater Accra Region and the existing LI also listed them in the Ga West Municipal Assembly, the consensus was that the district level census figures for Papase and Hebron should be included in the Ga West Municipality in accordance with the existing legal framework.

4.1.8 Sawla-Tuna-Kalba District Assembly (NR) and Wa East District Assembly (UWR)

The inhabitants of Chasia, Kpakpalamuni, Kalajon, Dolisa, Kandige, Buleju, Eribieyiri and Doliguo refused to be enumerated by census officials assigned by Sawla-Tuna-Kalba District. The reason was that they belonged to Wa West District instead of Sawla-Tuna-Kalba District. The Upper West Regional Statistician met with the census field supervisor for the area and it was agreed that the Enumeration Areas (EAs) involved should be enumerated by census officials from Wa West District with the understanding that the matter will be investigated and data for the communities placed in the appropriate district.

At the Committee's meeting with stakeholders in Wa, the DCE for Sawla-Tuna-Kalba District stated that some communities in his District have been wrongly placed in the Wa East District. However, the DCE for Wa East disagreed with his counterpart and cautioned that the

placement of the affected communities in the Sawla-Tuna-Kalba District might result in conflict if the necessary review of the regional boundary was not carried out. He therefore appealed to the Committee to tackle the issue professionally to ensure that the communities are placed under Wa East District Assembly on the basis of the current arrangement.

The LI which established Wa East District confirmed the claim by the inhabitants of Chasia and the other settlements that they were part of the District. The DCE for Wa East District submitted colonial documents from the Public Records and Archives Administration Department (PRAAD), formerly the Ghana National Archives, which showed that the disputed settlements have been part of Wa District and since 1948 they have always been included in the Wa District for census purposes. However, the map of Ghana produced by the Survey Department of Ghana in 1974 shows that Chasia is located in the Northern Region on the basis of the regional boundary (Fig. 4).

A chief from Jeyiri contended that in the past, Chasia was enumerated as part of Wa Urban Council. He disclosed that the inhabitants were assured by the Regional Statistician of the GSS that the census figures would be part of the Upper West Region. He therefore cautioned that there could be hostilities if the regional boundary is not altered in favour of the Chasia community's preference i.e. inclusion in the Wa East District. The Chairman explained that regional boundaries cannot be altered unless through a referendum. Additionally, he reiterated that regional and district boundaries do not affect traditional allegiance and ownership of land. Besides, the Committee was not set-up to delimit administrative boundaries but to resolve the boundary disputes relating to the 2010 PHC.

The current map of Ghana shows that Chasia is located in the Northern region. However, in view of the documentary evidence submitted by the DCE for Wa East District, the absence of a clearly demarcated regional boundary and the effective presence of Wa East District Assembly in the provision of development projects and facilities in the area, the *status-quo* should be maintained. As the LI also listed the disputed settlements in the Wa East District, the Chairman advised that, after the release of the district level census figures, the Sawla-Tuna-Kalba District Assembly may initiate procedures for the demarcation of the boundary.

Figure 4:

The consensus was that since census data for the disputed settlements have always been included in Wa District since the colonial era. It was therefore agreed that the census figures of the settlements for the 2010 PHC should be included in the Wa East District based on proximity and community of interest and active present of the Wa East District Assembly in the area. The LI establishing the Wa East District incorporates the settlements in the district. The Sawla-Tuna-Kalba District Assembly may pursue the matter by constitutional means.

4.1.9 Dangbe East District Assembly (GAR) and North Tongu District Assembly (VR)

The inhabitants of Ada Luta and Mafi Luta, Kpedzi or Tehe complained of duplication of these localities in North Tongu District and Dangbe East District. This situation has been an issue of dispute between the two districts for some time now and especially when it comes to national exercises such as registration of voters and population census. The inhabitants therefore refused to be enumerated by census officials deployed from the Dangbe East District. The intervention of North Tongu District Assembly officials enabled the inhabitants to be enumerated. They were assured that the matter will be investigated and the census figures put in the appropriate district.

The LIs establishing the two districts includes Ada Luta under Dangbe East District while Mafi Luta is listed under North Tongu District. In the case of Kpedzi or Tehe, it is the same locality in Ewe and Dangbe languages respectively. The LI listed Kpedzi in the North Tongu District. On the basis of the regional boundary the disputed localities are legally in the North Tongu District.

The DCE of North Tongu informed the meeting that the affected settlements in his view belong to the North Tongu District. He therefore wanted to know where the regional boundary places the settlements. He indicated that the people of Ada Luta belonged to the North Tongu District regardless of the name Ada Luta which people misconstrue as belonging to Dangbe East District. He explained that the settlement is predominantly inhabited by Dangbes. The DCE added that the settlements being contested were Ada Luta, Mafi Luta and Kpedzi or Tehe. He was of the opinion that the names of the communities could be the source of the dispute. The name of the community in Ada dialect is Kpehe whilst the Ewes refer to it as Kpedzi. On the basis of the LI Kpedzi belongs to the North Tongu District.

On the map showing the regional boundary, Ada Luta and Mafi Luta, Kpedzi or Tehe are in the North Tongu District in the Volta Region. It was explained that the regional boundary takes precedence over the LIs as a district cannot lie in two regions.

The meeting agreed that the LIs of both Districts violated the regional boundary. The consensus was that the district level census data should be released based on the existing regional boundary.

4.1.10 Dangbe East District Assembly (GAR) and South Tongu District Assembly (VR)

The inhabitants of Dordoekope, Tuanikope and Adjokatse refused to be enumerated by a census official assigned by Dangbe East District. They claimed to belong to South Tongu District. The inhabitants seized the EA maps and drove the census officials out of the communities. The Dangbe East District Census Officer reported the matter to the Ghana Statistical Service Head Office and a cartographer was dispatched to the area. A meeting was quickly arranged between the officials of both District Assemblies at Dordoekope and the matter was resolved to allow enumerators from South Tongu District to undertake the exercise.

At the meeting of the Committee on 19th October 2011 at Institute of Local Government Studies (ILGS), Madina, the DCE for South Tongu reported that Dordoekope ought to have been under the jurisdiction of his District. He indicated that per the regional boundary, the affected settlement belonged to the North Tongu District. He contended that, historically, the Dordoekope was part of South Tongu. He explained that the anomaly occurred during the Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC) era when resources were distributed to people in the community by the Dangbe East District Assembly. In view of the resource flows from Dangbe East District Assembly, the people opted to belong to that District rather than to the South Tongu District because of the benefits derived from Dangbe East.

The Chairman made it clear that the regional boundary cannot be changed owing to the relevant provisions in the 1992 Constitution.

The LI that established South Tongu District Assembly listed the settlements in South Tongu. However, on the basis of the regional boundary, these localities are located in the Dangbe East District Assembly of the Greater Accra Region.

Since the regional boundaries are entrenched in the Constitution, the consensus was that, the census figures for the disputed settlements should be included in the Dangbe East District in the Greater Accra Region.

4.1.11 West Mamprusi District Assembly (NR) and Talensi Nabdam District Assembly (UER)

During the 2010 PHC, the inhabitants of Arigou prevented enumerators from Talensi Nabdam District from enumerating the inhabitants Bugorugou. They claimed that Bugorugou is a suburb of Arigou and should therefore be enumerated by enumerators from the West Mamprusi District. However, the inhabitants of Bugorugou maintained that their settlement is not part of Arigou as claimed by the inhabitants of Arigou. They contended that Bugorugou is a locality on its own with a village head and is part of the Talensi Nabdam District. Census officials from Talensi Nabdam District enumerated the inhabitants of Bugorugou whilst those who worked in Arigou were from West Mamprusi District.

At the meeting of the Committee with stakeholders at Bolgatanga on 7th October, 2011, the 1974 map of Ghana on the scale of 1:250,000 indicated that Arigou is located in the West Mamprusi District of the Northern Region. This was confirmed by the Legislative Instrument, which created the West Mamprusi District. However, Bugorugou is not located on the 1974 map and on the topographic sheet of the area. On the ground, Arigou and Bugorugou are two distinct communities, separated by a broad valley. The people of Bugorugou claimed that the map produced by Survey and Mapping Department (SMD) in 1974 where the regional boundary deviated from the White Volta River was a fake and attributed it to an individual. Bugorugou was listed under the Talensi-Nabdram District in the 2000 PHC.

The consensus was that since the regional boundary has not been clearly demarcated and Bugorugou has been included in Talensi-Nabdram District by the LI establishing the District the status-quo should be maintained i.e. placing the 2010 Census figures for Bugorugou in the Talensi-Nabdram District.

After the regional consultative meeting at Bolgatanga, the Committee dispatched a team of experienced Cartographers to determine the location of Arigou and Bugorugou in relation to the regional boundary using the Global Positioning System (GPS). It was established that Bugorugou is in the Upper East Region, while Arigou is in the Northern Region based on the 1974 map (Fig. 5). There is an urgent need to clearly define and demarcate this section of the regional boundary.

4.2 District Boundary Disputes

4.2.1 Western Region

4.2.1.1 Bia and Juabeso District Assemblies

During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, the inhabitants of Alhaji (New Wiawso), Quartey Nkwanta and its surrounding settlements indicated that they belonged to the Juabeso District and not the Bia District as indicated by the enumeration area maps. They therefore declined to be enumerated by the census officials from the Bia District. On the other hand, the inhabitants of Annorkrom, Asanteman, Attakrom, Abrahamkrom and Dansokrom complained that they had been wrongly listed in Juabeso District instead of Bia District. This posed a great challenge to the enumerators from both district during the enumeration.

Figure 5:

The Western Regional Statistician met with officials of the two District Assemblies and a consensus was reached to swap the enumeration areas of the affected localities. The assurance was that the population of the affected localities would be placed in the appropriate districts after this has been ascertained from the LIs. This arrangement was accepted by the parties and the inhabitants were duly enumerated.

The District Coordinating Director for Juabeso at the meeting held in Sekondi on 21st October, 2011 confirmed the statements made by the inhabitants of Alhaji (New Wiawso), Quartey Nkwanta and its surrounding settlements. The Juabeso District Assembly had realized the error and decided to cede the communities to the Bia District. The DCE of Bia, Tweneboah-Kodua, corroborated the statement made by the District Coordinating Director for Juabeso.

The DCE for Bia District indicated that the District was carved out of the Juabeso-Bia District. He lamented the continuing use of the name Juabeso-Bia instead of Bia for the new District. This has affected the flow of resources meant for the Bia District as farm inputs, healthcare and educational materials are sometimes diverted to the Juabeso District.

It was unanimously agreed at the meeting that since there is no dispute about the settlements, they should be placed in the Bia districts.

4.2.1.2 Prestea-Huni Valley and Wassa Amenfi East District Assemblies

The inhabitants of Krofofrom and Abotare in the Prestea Huni Valley District prevented census enumerators from carrying out their activities during the 2010 Population and Housing Census (PHC). Their reason was that the census officials assigned to work in their communities were from Prestea Huni Valley District whilst they belong to Wassa Amenfi East District. They maintained that they would only allow census officials from Wassa Amenfi East District to enumerate them. The Statistical officers from the two districts met with the Western Regional Statistician and it was agreed to deploy enumerators from Wassa Amenfi East District to do the work.

Both DCEs stated that they did not have any serious boundary problem. The Enumeration Area (EA) 001 for Prestea-Huni Valley crossed the district boundary such that part of the EA was in the Wassa Amenfi East District. They confirmed that both Breman Krofofrom and Abotare are in the Wassa Amenfi East District. The DCEs were of the opinion that the issue was basically traditional allegiance and ownership of land.

It was resolved that the 2010 Population and Housing Census data for Prestea-Huni Valley and Wassa Amenfi East District Assemblies should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework and at the time of the Census. Since the Administrative boundaries do not affect traditional allegiance and land ownership, they are purely for convenience administration and delivery of services by the Government.

4.2.2 Central Region

4.2.2.1 Gomoa East and Awutu Senya District Assemblies

Nyanyano Kakraba has been a community in dispute for a long time between the Effutus and the Gomoas and during the 2010 Census the issue came up again. The Central Regional Statistician, with the assistance of the officials from the two District Assemblies officials convinced the inhabitants to allow enumeration to be carried out whilst the matter is investigated to establish the appropriate district to which the locality belong.

During the consultative meeting at Cape Coast on 22nd September, 2011, a traditional ruler from Gomoa East reported that the dispute over Nyanyano Kakraba always recurred during elections. He bemoaned the number of times Awutu-Senya revenue collectors trespassed the administrative boundary to mobilise revenue at the expense of the Gomoa East District. Another traditional ruler from Awutu-Senya claimed that the issue was basically a land dispute which had been referred to the Lands Commission to determine the true custodians of the land at Nyanyano Kakraba. He asserted that Nyanyano Kakraba belonged to the Effutu traditional area and a court had ruled in favour of the Effutus and documents exist to attest to his claim.

A third traditional ruler indicated that based on the LIs, the community is located in the Gomoa East District. The Chief lamented the transfer of votes from the Gomoa East District Assembly to Awutu Senya District Assembly during all national elections. He was of the view that traditional boundaries should be used in the delineation of administrative boundaries to avoid the unnecessary encroachment of land by people from other traditional areas.

The consensus was that based on the current LI 1983, the Nyanyano Kakraba is located in the Gomoa East District.

4.2.2.2 Cape Coast Metropolitan and Abura/Asebu/Kwamankese District Assemblies

The traditional rulers of Asebu Traditional Area complained of the placement of Greenhill area in the Cape Coast Metropolis. They insisted that since that portion of land traditionally belongs to Asebu Traditional Area, it should have been part of the Abura-Asebu- Kwamankese (AAK) District. The Central Regional Statistician assured them during the census that the issue would be reported to the appropriate authorities for the necessary action.

The MCE of the Cape Coast Metropolitan Assembly, Anthony Egyir Aikins, indicated that some suburbs in the Cape Coast Metropolis including Green Hill and Aggrey Memorial traditionally belong to the Asebu traditional area. The LI 1983 captured the communities under the Cape Coast Metropolis; however, the Abura-Asebu-Kwamankese District Assembly is claiming those communities.

A representative from the Abura-Asebu-Kwamankese District Assembly presented a map prepared in 1955 in support of their claim and contended that the settlements would not be ceded to the Cape Coast Metropolis. A traditional ruler was of the view that the confusion was created

by the LIs which did not conform to the traditional boundary. He indicated that prior to the LIs, the chiefs were exercising their authority over the settlements without any difficulty or dispute. He added that the administrative boundary has divided them.

The Member of Parliament (MP) of Gomoa East Constituency, P.O.E Ekow, noted that the problem associated with the LIs was not created by Parliamentarians. He was of the view that, in some cases, the time allocated for them to peruse such documents was inadequate to enable them examine the documents thoroughly to avoid some of the deficiencies in the LIs.

The traditional rulers from both Districts stated that they know their common boundary and there is no controversy about it as they exercise their traditional authority and jurisdiction in the area without any difficulty. The problem was between the Assemblies. The Central Regional Minister, Ama Benyiwa-Doe, requested all the parties to furnish the Committee with proper write-ups relating to their specific issues to enable them to come out with a comprehensive report.

It was accepted that Greenhill is listed under Moree Alata electoral area which is in the Cape Coast Metropolis on the basis of the LI. The traditional ruler has accepted the administrative boundary and District Assemblies should recognize this.

4.2.2.3 Upper Denkyira East Municipal and Upper Denkyira West District Assemblies

The inhabitants of Teacher Boateng, Ayaba Akura, Kwame Boateng, Ayensukrom and Ameyaw claimed that they are in the Upper Denkyira West District and refused to be enumerated by census officials from the Upper Denkyira East Municipality. The District Statisticians responsible for the two districts resolved the issue amicably by transferring the enumeration area maps to enumerators from the Upper Denkyira West District who carried out the enumeration of the communities on the understanding that the matter would be investigated and the data would be included in the appropriate district.

Officials of Upper Denkyira East Municipal and Upper Denkyira West District Assemblies informed the meeting that there was no dispute between the two Districts.

It was accepted that the localities fall under the Subin Electoral Area in the Upper Denkyira West District. It was therefore resolved that the 2010 Population district Census figures for the affected communities should be included in the Upper Denkyira West District.

4.2.2.4 Agona West Municipal and Asikuma-Odoben-Brakwa District Assemblies

During the 2010 PHC, the inhabitants of Aboaso refused to be enumerated by census officials from the Agona West Municipality. They claimed to belong to Asikuma-Odoben-Brakwa District. The enumerators were taken hostage by the Chief of Aboaso. The issue was reported to the District Census officer for Agona West who organized a meeting with the Chief and Elders of the community. It was realized that the EA maps for Aboaso were inadvertently sent

to both Districts. The enumerators were released and the census forms were handed over to the census officials of the Asikuma-Odoben-Brakwa District to carry out the exercise. The District Chief Executive for Asikuma-Odoben-Brakwa, Georgina Nkrumah Aboah, indicated that she was not aware of what had happened as there was no boundary dispute between the two districts.

It was resolved that the district level census data for Aboaso should be included in the Asikuma-Odoben-Brakwa District.

4.2.2.5 Agona West Municipal and Agona East District Assemblies

A traditional ruler intimated that the dispute relates to land ownership. He explained that after the partitioning of the Agona District into Agona East and Agona West Districts, the issue of land ownership arose. The chief noted that Aborso was part of the Swedru Traditional Area in the Agona West Municipality. He claimed that the split of the Agona District caused the wrongful placement of Aborso in the Agona East District.

The DCE of Agona East District, Martin Luther Obeng, stated that the LI which established the District listed Aborso under his area of jurisdiction and that the district boundary to a large extent coincided with the traditional boundary.

It was agreed that the census data for Aborso should be included in the Agona East District in conformity with the existing legal framework.

4.2.2.6 Gomoa East and Effutu Municipal Assemblies

During the 2010 PHC enumeration exercise, the inhabitants of Ansafo protested against their enumeration by census officials from the Gomoa East District. They insisted that traditionally they are Effutus, and should therefore be enumerated under the Effutu Municipality. The District Statistical Officer for Gomoa East explained to them to allow the enumerators to undertake the exercise with the assurance that the issue would be reported to the appropriate authorities for the necessary action.

At the Committee's meeting in Cape Coast on 22nd September, 2011, a chief from the Effutu Traditional Area noted that the people of Ansafo in the Gomoa East District mostly hail from Winneba in the Effutu Municipal Assembly. He claimed that the GSS placed Ansafo under Gomoa East Municipality despite the fact that, traditionally the people are predominantly Effutus. The Chief emphasized that, since they belong to the Effutu Traditional area, they requested the GSS to enumerate them as part of the Effutu Municipality instead of the Gomoa East District.

The majority of the inhabitants of Ansafo are Efutus who migrated from Winneba and settled in the Gomoa Traditional Area. Ansafo is not contiguous to Efutut Traditional Area.

It was explained that administrative boundaries do not affect traditional allegiance and ownership of land. It was also explained that the Efutus of Ansafo should recognize that they

have migrated from their traditional Area and settle in another traditional Area which in another district.

The consensus was that the 2010 Population and Housing Census data for Ansafro should be included in the Gomoa East District.

4.2.3 Greater Accra Region

4.2.3.1 Ga West and Ga East Municipal Assemblies

At the time of the 2010 PHC, there was no dispute between Ga East and and Ga West Municipalities regarding the settlements along their common boundary.

At the Committee's meeting with stakeholders, the MCE of Ga East Municipal Assembly, Quao Sackey indicated clearly that his office was not contesting the location of Kwabenya and Agyemankatah with Ga West Municipal Assembly. He opined that the problem might have emanated from the grid systems and the provision of amenities by both Municipalities. He emphasized that the provision of social infrastructure and expansion of settlements had resulted in the difficulty in determination of the exact district boundary between the two districts. He added that, in some cases, revenue collectors from both Municipalities cross the district boundary to collect revenue. A typical example is Kwabenya where officials from the Ga West Municipality often cross the administrative boundary to collect revenue.

The MCEs for both Ga South and Ga East Municipalities indicated that some of the problems encountered were as a result of the poor delineation of boundaries of the newly created MMDAs in 2004 and 2007/08. They were of view that the Chiefs and other opinion leaders in the communities were not adequately consulted during boundary delimitations.

The Committee entreated all parties to consult the SMD of Lands Commission on all issues relating to administrative boundaries since it is the statutory body responsible for the production of administrative maps.

The consensus was that on the basis of the existing LIs the officials of the two Mucipal Assemblies should respect the administrative boundary. The two Municipalities should cooperate to identify the exact location of their common boundary.

4.2.3.2 Ga East and Adentan Municipal Assemblies

The boundary dispute between Ga East and Adentan Municipal Assemblies involved Ashiyie, Amanfrom, Amrahia and Marledzor which are located along the Adenta-Dodowa road. This road divides the four communities between the two districts. During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, the Ghana Statistical Service delineated enumeration areas of these communities based on the existing boundary. Those parts of the communities that fell to the right of the Adenta-

Dodowa road were included in the Adentan Municipality while those to the left were placed in the Ga East Municipality.

During the 2010 Census enumeration exercise, officials of the Adentan Municipal Assembly expressed their dissatisfaction about the placement of parts of the communities in the Ga East Municipality by the Ghana Statistical Service. It was against this background that this boundary was listed among the disputed district boundaries.

At the consultative meeting with officials of the Ga East and Adentan Municipal Assemblies, the Municipal Chief Executive of Adentan Municipal Assembly, Madam Nubyl K. Vanlare, stated that her office received complaints to the effect that some of the communities in the Adentan Municipality were being enumerated by Census Officials from Ga East Municipal Assembly during the 2010 Population and Housing Census. She stated that per the LI 1493 which established the Adentan Municipal Assembly, the communities clearly fall within the Adentan Municipality. Some revenue collectors from the Ga East Municipal Assembly have been crossing the district boundary to collect revenue from parts of the aforementioned communities located west of the Adenta -Dodowa road.

Madam Nubyl K. Vanlare explained that in the past, the Tema Municipal and Ga District Assemblies were created with the Adenta-Dodowa road as the boundary. With the creation of the Ga East Municipal Assembly, the Adenta-Dodowa road remained the district boundary between Ga East Municipal and the then Tema Municipal Assemblies. Due to distance revenue collectors did not travel from Tema to the communities to collect revenue. Ga East revenue collectors took advantage of the situation and crossed the district boundary to mobilize revenue. However, with the creation of the Adentan Municipal Assembly in 2008, the management of the Assembly protested against the continuation of the practice.

The Municipal Chief Executive was of the view that the Ga East Municipality wanted to maintain the *status quo* regardless of the establishment of the Adentan Municipal Assembly. The Adentan Municipal Assembly therefore petitioned the Ghana Statistical Service to rectify the anomaly and ensure that all the communities were brought under the Adentan Municipal Assembly. She further pointed out that for the purposes of revenue generation, the rectification of the discrepancy by the Statistical Service was very crucial.

The Municipal Chief Executive for Ga East Municipal Assembly, Quao Sackey, explained that since the inception of the decentralization concept, the Adenta-Dodowa road has always been the boundary between Ga and Tema Districts. He stressed that population growth and expansion of settlements did not lead to a shift of the boundary. He added that the Adentan-Municipal Assembly was carved out of the Tema Metropolitan Assembly and this did not affect the boundary of the Ga East Municipal Assembly.

Robertson Adjei, a member of the Committee, explained that the Adenta- Dodowa road has been the administrative boundary and it has divided the communities for a long time. He noted that developments have brought some of the settlements close to the road.

The Chairman reiterated that administrative boundaries do not interfere with traditional allegiance and land ownership. He stressed that settlements that have grown and spilled over administrative boundaries do not change the boundaries. He explained that once a settlement crosses an administrative boundary, that part of the settlement ceases to be part of the former administrative area.

The Municipal Chief Executive of Adentan, Nubyl K. Vanlare contended that the Adenta-Aburi road was the administrative boundary between Adentan and Ga East, to the best of her knowledge. She indicated that the affected settlements, based on community of interest wanted to belong to the Adentan Municipality. She revealed that the communities usually made requests for developmental projects to the Adentan Municipal Assembly. She therefore expressed her dissatisfaction on the use of the Adenta-Dodowa road as the administrative boundary between Ga East and Adentan. The MCE appealed to the Committee to examine the issue critically and consider the principle of community of interest to include all parts of these settlements in the Adentan Municipal Assembly. She noted that over the years, the Adentan Municipality had initiated and implemented a number of development projects in the affected communities.

The consensus was that the 2010 Population and Housing Census data for Ga East and Adentan Municipal Assemblies should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework. The decision was that the Dodowa road should serve as the district boundary upon which the census figures are released.

4.2.4 Volta Region

4.2.4.1 Nkwanta North and Nkwanta South District Assemblies

The Nkwanta North and Nkwanta South Districts were carved out of the Nkwanta District in 2008 with the Kpassa River, a major landmark, as the administrative boundary. The 2010 Population and Housing Census enumeration area maps were prepared on the basis of this information. However, during the census enumeration, inhabitants of Jumbo and New Agoe which are listed in the Nkwanta South District refused to be enumerated by enumerators from that District. The reason was that Obiteyie Numbers 1 and 2, Agoe Junction and other settlements which are located further south of the district boundary are rather listed in the Nkwanta North District (Fig.6). Additionally, the inhabitants of Jumbo and New Agoe are mainly Konkombas and would wish to belong to Nkwanta North which is inhabited predominantly by Konkombas. During the census enumeration, the District Statistician for Nkwanta South District arranged with enumerators from Nkwanta North to enumerate Jumbo and New Agoe settlements with the understanding that the figures will be put in the appropriate district after the matter had been investigated and resolved.

Figure 6:

At the consultative meeting with officials of the Nkwanta North and Nkwanta South District Assemblies, the MP for Nkwanta South, Gershon K. B. Gbediame, noted that the Nkwanta North District was carved out of Nkwanta District and that he was not involved in the boundary delimitation of the Nkwanta North District when it was created in 2004. He claimed that the LI has wrongly placed Jumbo and New Agoe in the Nkwanta South District instead of the Nkwanta North District. Consequently, the electorate in these settlements refused to take part in the 2008 presidential and parliamentary elections as part of the Nkwanta South District which also constitutes the Nkwanta South Constituency.

At the meeting, Alhaji Benson, an opinion leader from the Nkwanta North District, presented a map indicating the wrongful placement of New Agoe and Jumbo communities in the Nkwanta South District. It was however established that the Kpassa River is the boundary between the Nkwanta North and Nkwanta South Districts. It was noted that the LI 1983 for Nkwanta North violates the district boundary by including Obiteyie Numbers 1 and 2 and Agoe Junction in the Nkwanta North District. It was noted that the inhabitants of New Agoe and Jumbo are mainly Konkombas who wish to be part of the Nkwanta North District which is also predominantly inhabited by Konkombas. The MP for Nkwanta South, Gershon K. B. Gbediame, reaffirmed the views of Alhaji Benson. He called for calm between the communities since in his view; the tensions and the undercurrents could explode and result into serious hostilities.

It was claimed that the agitation in the communities was as a result of the neglect of the Nkwanta South District Assembly to provide infrastructural facilities in the affected communities. The MP emphasized that the affected communities should be made part of the Nkwanta North District so as to prevent the electorate from boycotting the 2012 presidential and parliamentary elections.

The consensus was that there is no boundary dispute as such between the two districts, but the LI placed Obiteyie Numbers 1 and 2 and Agoe Junction in the wrong district. The 2010 Population and Housing Census district level census figures for Nkwanta North and Nkwanta South Districts should be released on the basis of the district boundary which is the Kpassa River rather than the LI 1846 that established the Nkwanta North District. The two District Assemblies should urgently pursue the resolution of the district boundary with the MLGRD through the Volta Regional Coordinating Council.

After the consultative meeting in Accra, the Committee dispatched two Cartographers to the two Districts to ascertain the actual locations of the settlements in dispute. It was established that New Agoe and Jumbo were located south of the Kpassa River, and north of Obiteyie No.1 and No.2, Agoe Junction and other settlements which are in the Nkwanta North District (Fig.7). During their visit, the Cartographers held separate meetings with officials of the two District Assemblies and it was agreed that the Konkomba settlements immediately south of the river should be included in the Nkwanta North District because of community of interest. This decision was communicated to the EC which was represented on the Committee, in view of the impending Biometric Registration in order to avoid the out-break of violence in the future.

Figure 7:

4.2.4.2 Ho Municipal and Adaklu-Anyigbe District Assemblies

During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, enumerators from the Ho Municipal Assembly crossed the district boundary to enumerate the inhabitants of Darve and Gbleve even though these communities are in the Adaklu-Anyigbe District. This action was influenced by the fact that Darve and Gbleve belong to the Ho Dome Traditional Area which is in the Ho Municipality.

The census officials from Adaklu-Anyigbe District having noticed that these communities have been enumerated by their counterparts from the Ho Municipality reported the matter to the Regional Statistician for redress. Cartographers from the Head Office of the Ghana Statistical Service were invited to the area to determine where the two localities actually belong. It was established that Darve and Gbleve are part of the Adaklu-Anyigbe District. The completed census questionnaires were subsequently transferred to the Adaklu-Anyigbe District.

At the consultative meeting with stakeholders in Ho, the Chief Executive for Ho Municipality confirmed that Darve and Gbleve lands belong to the Ho Dome Traditional Area. Based on proximity and community of interest, the MCE sought a review of the LI to ensure that the communities are included in the Ho Municipality.

The concensus was that Darve and Gbleve communities belong to Adaklu-Anyigbe District according to the LI. Since administrative boundaries do not interfere with the exercise of traditional authority and allegiance, the census data for the communities should be released on the basis of the LI.

4.2.4.3 Ho Municipal, Adaklu-Anyigbe and North Tongu District Assemblies

During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, the inhabitants of Bakpa, Tsave and Mantekope refused to be enumerated by enumerators from Adaklu-Anyigbe District Assembly. They claimed that the communities belong to North Tongu District. The Ghana Statistical Service decided to deploy enumerators from North Tongu District to enumerate the communities so that the matter would be investigated and the figures put in the appropriate district. The existing LI indicated that these communities belong to the Adaklu-Anyigbe District. The inhabitants of these communities are Mafis who have crossed from the North Tongu District to settle in the Kalakpa Natural Reserve which is in the Adaklu-Anyigbe District.

At the consultative meeting, the DCE for the North Tongu District Assembly intimated that his office was not involved in any dispute with the Ho Municipal Assembly during the 2010 PHC. The MCE for the Ho Municipal Assembly held a contrary view. He indicated that some localities inhabited by Tongus administratively belong to the Ho Municipality. He disclosed that the Abutia Traditional Council owns the land in dispute which is inhabited by people from the North Tongu District Assembly. He explained that the boundary between Adaklu-Anyigbe, Ho and North Tongu was the Gold Coast-Togo boundary, now a relict boundary. The MCE for Ho Municipality

indicated that some of the settlements in the borderlands have spread across the administrative boundaries. He maintained that the affected settlements fall under the Ho Municipal Assembly.

A traditional ruler expressed concern about the exclusion of chiefs and other relevant stakeholders during the delineation of administrative boundaries. It was suggested that the engagement of technocrats to sensitise the citizenry on boundary delimitation nationwide would allay fears on land ownership and traditional allegiance. The DCE for the North Tongu District Assembly explained that a programme had been fashioned out to relocate the inhabitants of Bakpa, Tsave and Mantekope to the North Tongu District and that the North Tongu District Assembly had adhered to the provisions in the legal framework relating to administrative boundaries.

The meeting resolved that the 2010 Population and Housing Census district level figures of Ho Municipal, Adaklu-Anyigbe and North Tongu District Assemblies should be released on the basis of the existing LIs.

4.2.4.4 Krachi East and Biakoye District Assemblies

The inhabitants of Tapa Alavanyo and its surrounding communities refused to be enumerated during the 2010 Population and Housing Census by enumerators from Krachi East District as they claimed to belong to the Biakoye District. The District Statisticians from both Districts met with the District Assembly officials and it was agreed that census officials from Biakoye District should enumerate the inhabitants of Tapa Alavanyo and the other island communities. They were assured that the case would be examined and the census data for the communities would be included in the appropriate district.

During the regional consultative meeting with stakeholders in Ho, Bernard Sakyiama, the Acting District Co-ordinating Director for Biakoye District Assembly, claimed that the settlements concerned were basically pockets of Islands which fall under the Biakoye District. According to LI 1755, Tapa Alavanyo is situated in the Krachi East District and not in the Biakoye District.

It was agreed at the meeting that the district level census figures for Tapa Alavanyo and its surrounding communities should be included in the Krachi East District on the basis of the existing LIs.

4.2.4.5 Hohoe Municipal and South Dayi District Assemblies

The Ghana Statistical Service census officials did not encounter any administrative boundary disputes between the Hohoe Municipal Assembly and South Dayi District Assembly during the 2010 Population and Housing Census. However, the two districts were invited by the Volta Regional Coordinating Council to attend the consultative meeting due to a long standing district boundary dispute between the two districts.

At the meeting, the Municipal Budget Officer for the Hohoe Municipality informed the meeting the case at hand was a long standing issue. He explained that New Kpeve was part of the Kpando District whilst Old Kpeve was included in the Hohoe Municipality. He further explained that the boundary between the two districts was the Gold Coast-Togo boundary. With the creation of the South Dayi District which was carved out of the Kpando District in 2007, their boundary with the Hohoe Municipality has remained the same. He noted that there was therefore no problem between the Hohoe Municipality and the South Dayi District.

The DCE for South Dayi District confirmed the statement made by the representative of the Hohoe Municipal Assembly that it was during the colonial era that the two communities i.e. Old Kpeve and New Kpeve were divided into two. He further disclosed that with regard to traditional allegiance, New Kpeve which is the district capital of South Dayi District owes allegiance to Old Kpeve.

It was agreed at the meeting that since there is no boundary dispute between the two districts the 2010 Population and Housing Census district level figures for Hohoe Municipal and South Dayi Districts should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework, based on the relict boundary.

4.2.5 Eastern Region

4.2.5.1 New Juaben Municipal and Akwapem North District Assemblies

The Ghana Statistical Service reported that they did not experience any boundary disputes between New Juaben Municipal Assembly and the Akwapem North District Assembly during the 2010 Population and Housing Census. However, during the Regional Consultative meeting with stakeholders from the Eastern Region, traditional rulers from the Akwapem Traditional Area complained about the naming of facilities sited on Adweso land by the New Juaben Municipal Assembly.

A traditional ruler from the Akwapem Traditional Council explained that the Akwapem Traditional Council had two major issues with the New Juaben Municipal Assembly. First, the payment of royalties by the inhabitants of Adweso to the New Juaben Traditional Council, and secondly the lack of recognition of Akwapem traditional rulers by the New Juaben Municipal Assembly culminating in the naming of major development projects without recourse to the Akwapem Traditional Council. For instance, the Koforidua Sports Stadium falls under the Akwapem Traditional Authority. He bemoaned that the New Juaben Municipal Assembly has christened it as Koforidua Sports Stadium instead of Adweso Sports Stadium.

Daniel Ampadu, the Town and Country Planning Officer of the Akwapem North District reported that the Ghana Statistical Service based the demarcation of the 2010 Population and Housing Census enumeration areas on LI 1430 but the MCE for New Juaben Municipal Assembly

at the time contested the boundary. He informed the meeting that the MCE was of the opinion that there were some discrepancies with the boundary and it did not reflect the real situation on the ground. In view of that a Committee was set up by both parties to deal with the dispute. Daniel Ampadu lamented that, during the process of resolving the impasse, the New Juaben Municipal Assembly unfortunately declined to cooperate with the Committee to resolve the dispute.

The Municipal Chief Executive for the New Juaben Municipal Assembly, Alex Asamoah, indicated that, to the best of his knowledge, his office and Akwapem North District had no major administrative boundary dispute. He associated himself with the earlier statements made by the Chairman that administrative boundaries did not affect traditional allegiance and land ownership. The MCE emphasised that the contentious settlements traditionally belonged to Akwapem Traditional Council but for administrative convenience, they were included in the New Juaben Municipality. In view of this, the MCE appealed to the chiefs to comprehend the principles underlying boundary demarcation and collaborate effectively with the District Assemblies to develop and foster cohesion among their inhabitants.

The Deputy Eastern Regional Minister, E.O. Teilabi, expressed his joy for the dialogue and consensus reached. He therefore suggested that the Committee and other stakeholders should sensitise the traditional rulers to fathom that administrative boundaries are distinct from traditional boundaries. He stressed that Chiefs should be made aware that, in some instances, administrative boundaries transgress traditional boundaries.

The MP for New Juaben South Constituency, Beatrice Boateng, was of the opinion that most traditional rulers were not conversant with the distinction between traditional boundaries and administrative boundaries. She therefore recommended that a nationwide programme should be rolled out to sensitise all stakeholders on the principles underlying boundary delimitations. She was of the opinion that this would prevent disputes arising from the divergence of administrative and traditional boundaries.

It was resolved that the 2010 Population and Housing Census figures for the New Juaben Municipality and Akwapem North District should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework. It was also recommended that the New Juaben Municipal should give due recognition to traditional rulers of Akwapim Traditional Area.

4.2.5.2 Yilo Krobo and Akwapim North District Assemblies

The inhabitants of Asamang Ketewa and some surrounding settlements refused to be enumerated by census officials from the Yilo Krobo District. The inhabitants of these communities are Akwapims and therefore wanted to be enumerated by census officials from the Akwapim North District. The Yilo Krobo District Assembly officials including the District Statistical Officer persuaded the people of the affected communities to allow enumerators from the Akwapim North District to carry out the enumeration whilst the matter was thoroughly investigated.

At the consultative meeting with stakeholders in Koforidua, the District Chief Executive for Yilo Krobo, Andrews Sodah, stated that the challenges encountered during the 2010 Population and Housing Census bordered on traditional allegiance rather than administrative boundaries. He indicated that a number of settlements within the Yilo Krobo District are predominantly inhabited by Akwapems such as Asamanketewa and surrounding settlements near Boti Falls. These settlements are being administered by the Yilo Krobo District even though the lands traditionally belong to the Akwapem Traditional Council.

A traditional ruler from the Akwapem Traditional Council explained that some Krobos had settled on Akwapem lands over the years and were now claiming ownership of the lands. He referred to the Jackson Report which clearly defined the boundary between Yilo Krobos and Akwapems. The chief was of the view that the incessant encroachment on the Akwapem lands by Krobos had brought about disputes. He insisted that further consultations should be made to determine the true custodians of the lands at the centre of controversy. The traditional ruler pointed out that until all parties involved were adequately consulted, the issues confronting the District Assemblies regarding land ownership and administrative boundaries might not be resolved.

The Chairman noted that the Committee has not been mandated to deal with traditional boundaries and land ownership. He indicated that there are statutory bodies that could handle such issues. In that regard, he stressed that people should be enumerated where they spent census night despite their traditional allegiance and loyalty.

It was noted that administrative boundaries do not affect traditional allegiance and ownership of land. The meeting therefore resolved that the the 2010 Population and Housing Census of the affected communities should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework.

4.2.5.3 Kwahu East and Kwahu South District Assemblies

During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, 44 localities belonging to the Kwahu South District were wrongly placed in the Kwahu East District and 25 localities in the Kwahu East District were similarly placed in the Kwahu South District. This was brought to the notice of the Ghana Statistical Service and they deployed a Director and a Senior Cartographer to investigate the issue. They met with officials of the two Districts and the matter was amicably resolved so that enumeration could be completed. The basis of the agreement was a tentative re-demarcation of the Kwahu traditional area into three compact districts. It was agreed that the matter should be investigated further for any corrections to be effected.

At the consultative meeting with the stakeholders in Koforidua, the District Chief Executive for Kwahu East, Samuel Asamoah, reported that his office petitioned the Ghana Statistical Service detailing anomalies in the demarcation of Enumeration Areas (EAs) for the 2010 Population and Housing Census when the corresponding maps were released in 2009.

After the creation of additional districts in 2007, the number of districts increased from 138 to 170. A technical team from GSS was tasked to consult the newly created district assemblies to obtain first-hand information on the composition of the newly created districts and their respective boundaries. The team visited Kwahu East and Kwahu South districts and discovered the anomalies in the listing of some of the localities in the LIs. Consultative meetings were held to discuss the anomalies and the DCEs and the other officials of the District Assemblies proposed a realignment of the administrative boundaries in order to create compact districts as shown in (Fig. 8).

The GSS conducted the census on the basis of the proposed districts as the three Assemblies had agreed that the proposed map reflected the realities on the ground and should therefore be used for any future demarcation of their boundaries. However, it was decided that the proposed map did not have the legal basis and that the existing LIs should form the basis for the release of the district level census data.

The resolution was that the 2010 Population and Housing Census figures of the Kwahu South and Kwahu East District Assemblies should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework. After the release of the district level census figures, the Traditional rulers in conjunction with the District Assemblies should seek a more convenient organization of the Kwahu Traditional Area into three compact districts.

4.2.6 Ashanti Region

4.2.6.1 Sekyere Central and Sekyere Afram Plains District Assemblies

The boundary dispute between the Sekyere Central and Sekyere Afram Plains Districts did not impede the enumeration of the communities in contention. However, because of the issues raised by the District Assemblies regarding the placement of the affected communities, the matter was referred to the Committee by the Ghana Statistical Service.

At the regional consultative meeting in Kumasi, the traditional rulers from the Sekyere Central District complained of the inclusion of Kwagyedu, Bameanu, Ahuntea and Dawia in the Sekyere Afram Plains District. They claimed that traditionally these localities are part of Sekyere Central District and there was no reason why the Ghana Statistical Service enumerated them as part of the Sekyere Afram Plains District. The Chiefs therefore requested that the population figures for the affected localities should be included in the Sekyere Central District. It was further indicated that the Sekyere Afram Plains District transgressed the boundary to start a school building project but this was stopped by officials of the Sekyere Central District. However, the matter has been amicably resolved and the Sekyere Afram Plains District Assembly is continuing with the project.

Figure 8:

Officials of the Sekyere Afram Plains District informed the meeting that the Legislative Instruments establishing the two districts placed Kwagyedu, Bameanu, Ahuntea and Dawia in the Sekyere Afram Plains District. They therefore requested that the 2010 Census data for the two districts should be released on the basis of their LIs.

The District Chief Executive for Sekyere Central, Akuoko Frimpong, stated that revenue collectors from the Sekyere Afram Plains District Assembly cross the district boundary to collect revenue from his district. He lamented the way and manner the enumerators from Sekyere Afram Plains and Ejura Sekyedumasi District Assemblies violated the district boundaries during the 2010 Population and Housing Census to enumerate communities in the Sekyere Central District. The District Coordinating Director for Sekyere Afram Plains District Assembly opined that the LIs are legal documents upon which the District Assemblies should make their claims to settlements.

The Chairman explained that in as much as the LIs are legal documents, there were some of them which did not reflect the situation on the ground. The LIs do not define administrative boundaries explicitly. They only list settlements in the various districts without any description of the boundaries. In the absence of well-defined boundaries for the Districts it is difficult to assign some portions of towns along the borders that have expanded and merged with other towns in adjoining districts.

Some of the traditional rulers and officials from the District Assemblies were not aware of the Composite LI 1983. They expressed concern about the inability of the implementing agencies to consult them in the development of the legal framework for the creation of districts.

The consensus was that 2010 PHC figures for Sekyere Central and Sekyere Afram Plains should be released on the basis of the existing LIs.

4.2.6.2 Kumasi Metropolitan and Afigya Kwabre District Assemblies

The boundary dispute between the Afigya Kwabre District and the Suame and Tafo Submetros of the Kumasi Metropolitan Assembly was brought to the Committee by the Ashanti Regional Coordinating Council. At the regional consultative meeting in Kumasi with stakeholders, traditional rulers from the Afigya Kwabre District stated that the River Owabi is the boundary between their district and the Kumasi Metropolis. They further indicated that Abouhia, New Kyekyere and Kyeraso are all located north of River Owabi and since Kumasi Metropolis ends on the southern bank of the river, the localities are part of the Afigya Kwabre District. They demanded that the census figures for the affected localities should be added to the Afigya Kwabre District.

The Town and Country Planning Officer for Afigya Kwabre District informed the meeting that the Afigya Kwabre District was carved out of Sekyere District in 2004. Over the years, the Afigya Kwabre District has been collecting revenue from Abouhia and surrounding communities but recently the Kumasi Metropolitan Assembly started transgressing the boundary to collect

revenue from the disputed settlements. Officials from the Kumasi Metropolitan Assembly are refusing to accept the Owabi River as the boundary between the two districts. The Presiding Member for the Kumasi Metropolitan Assembly stated that the disputed settlements belong to the Tafo Traditional Council and they were only at the meeting to ensure that the ownership of land remains under the control of the Tafohene.

The consensus was that there is no boundary dispute between Afigya Kwabre District and Suame and Tafo Submetros of the Kumasi Metropolitan Assembly but some enthusiastic officials of the KMA have been collecting revenue outside the jurisdiction of the Assembly. A traditional ruler promised to liaise with his colleagues to deal with any outstanding land disputes and resolve them amicably.

4.2.6.3 Kwabre East and Sekyere South District Assemblies

At the Committee's meeting in Kumasi some traditional rulers from Kona in the Kwabre East District appealed to the Committee to be included in the Sekyere South District since they owe traditional allegiance to the Sekyere Traditional Council and not Kwabre. The Chiefs of Kona were concerned about the exploitation of the natural resources by and the payment of mining royalties and land rent to, Kwabre East District Assembly at the expense of Sekyere South District Assembly where the Paramount Chief resides. The chiefs from Kona proposed that on the basis of community of interest they should be included in the Sekyere South District.

It was agreed at the meeting that the 2010 PHC figures of the Kwabre East District Assembly and Sekyere South District Assembly should be released on basis of the existing legal framework.

4.2.6.4 Asante Akim North Municipal and Sekyere Afram Plains District Assemblies

The Ghana Statistical Service did not experience any problem with regard to the enumeration of the communities in the Sekyere Afram Plains and Asante Akim North Municipal Assemblies during the 2010 Population and Housing Census. However, during the consultative meeting with stakeholders in Kumasi, a traditional leader from the Sekyere Afram Plains District complained about the wrongful placement of Abotantim, Suanso, and Mossi Panin in the Asante Akim North District. Although, the relevant LIs indicate that these localities belong to Sekyere Afram Plains District.

The Municipal Chief Executive for Asante Akim North, Osei Bonsu, confirmed that his office did not encounter any problem with the Ejisu-Juaben Municipal Assembly during the 2010 Population and Housing Census. He intimated that the Asante Akim North Municipal Assembly was rather contesting with Sekyere Afram Plains District on issues of traditional allegiance and land ownership of Abotantim, Suanso and Mossi Panin. There has been a long-standing dispute over these areas between the traditional rulers. The MCE for Asante Akim North indicated that a

court of competent jurisdiction determined the case in their favour in 1909 and that most of the disputed settlements have been wrongly placed under Sekyere Afram Plains District.

The consensus was that the case was not an administrative boundary dispute. The committee's mandate did not extend to settling of disputes on traditional allegiance and land ownership. The 2010 PHC figures for Sekyere Afram Plains District Assembly and Asante Akim North Municipal Assembly should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework.

4.2.7 Brong Ahafo Region

4.2.7.1 Sene and Pru Districts

The inhabitants of Kongo, Alhaji Akura, Mantukwa, Domeabra, Battorkope, Mangoase, Kidokope, Konkonsi, J.B. Kope, Chiripo, Kwaease (Avegorome), and Ghanakpe refused to be enumerated by census officials from Sene District during the 2010 Population and Housing Census. They claimed to belong to Pru District instead of Sene District. At a meeting of the Brong Ahafo Regional Statistician and the two District Statistical Officers it was agreed that census enumerators from Pru District should be deployed to carry out the enumeration of the inhabitants of the localities.

At the consultative meeting with stakeholders in Sunyani, the District Chief Executive for Sene District, Dominic Napare, indicated that the localities concerned do not belong to his District. Any dispute in the area bordered on traditional allegiance and land ownership rather than where the localities belong administratively. However, the District Chief Executive for Pru District Assembly, Masawud Mohammed claimed that all the affected communities belong to the Pru District. He was also of the view that District boundaries should be coterminous with traditional area boundaries and that the Pru District should be re-demarcated accordingly.

The Paramount Chief of Yeji, Pemanpem Y. Kagbresey, registered his displeasure on the exclusion of chiefs in the process of enacting LIs.

The meeting agreed that the 2010 PHC figures for Sene District and Pru District Assemblies should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework.

4.2.7.2 Asunafo North Municipal and Asutifi District Assemblies

During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, the inhabitants of Asukese prevented census officials from the Asutifi District from enumerating them. They claimed to belong to the Asunafo North Municipality. They objected to the enumeration area maps which included Asukese in the Asutifi District. The Brong Ahafo Regional Statistician intervened and enumerators from Asunafo North Municipality enumerated the community on the understanding that the matter

would be investigated and the census data for the community would be placed in the appropriate district.

The Municipal Chief Executive for Asunafo North Municipal Assembly, Mohammed Doku, confirmed that Asukese falls under Asunafo North Municipal Assembly in the Mim Airport Electoral Area. The Ghana Statistical Service inadvertently placed it in the Asutifi District.

The decision was that the census data for Asukese and surrounding villages should be included in the Asunafo North Municipality.

4.2.7.3 Techiman and Nkoranza South Municipal Assemblies

During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, the inhabitants of Bobokrom and its adjoining villages refused to be enumerated by census officials deployed from the Techiman Municipal Assembly as a protest against their inclusion in the Techiman Municipality. They explained that traditionally they are part of the Nkoranza Traditional Area and as such should be part of the Nkoranza South Municipality. The Brong Ahafo Regional Statistician therefore mobilized enumerators from the Nkoranza South Municipality to enumerate the communities so that the issue could be investigated and the appropriate action taken.

At the consultative meeting with stakeholders in Sunyani, a traditional ruler from Nkoranza confirmed that a petition was sent to the Ghana Statistical Service to investigate the matter and enumerate the community as part of the Nkoranza South Municipality. The LI establishing the Nkoranza South Municipality has wrongly placed Bobokrom and its surrounding communities under the Techiman Municipal Assembly as the Fia river is the boundary between the former Nkoranza District and the Techiman Municipality.

The Municipal Chief Executive for the Techiman Municipality intimated that he was not adequately informed about the dispute involving the Bobokrom settlements. He admitted that the Fia River serves as both the administrative and traditional boundary between the two Districts. He assured the Committee that he would consult his management on the issue and get back to the Committee on the exact location of the settlements.

It was resolved that the Ghana Statistical Service should ascertain the exact location of the settlements and include them in the appropriate District as the district boundary has been accepted by both parties.

4.2.8 Northern Region

4.2.8.1 Central Gonja and Tolon-Kumbungu District Assemblies

The inhabitants of Torope, Borimangpe (Borimangyili), Dakolipe (Dakoliyili), Nekpegu, Chepe and Nyinyagpe (Nyinyagyili) claimed to belong to the Central Gonja District and refused to

be enumerated by census officials from the Tolon-Kumbungu District. Census officials were deployed from the Central Gonja District to enumerate them. The inhabitants were assured that the matter would be investigated and data for the communities would be placed in the appropriate district.

At the regional consultative meeting with stakeholders in Tamale, the District Chief Executive for Tolon-Kumbungu, Alhaji Iddi-Mansah Mahama, indicated that there was no boundary dispute between the two districts. The District Chief Executive for Central Gonja however, pointed out that there was a boundary dispute. He intimated that during the 2010 Population Housing Census, some localities in the Central Gonja District were wrongly placed in the Tolon-Kumbungu District. The LI 1750 which created the Central Gonja District Assembly listed all the disputed settlements under that district.

Officials of the Ghana Statistical Service and the Northern Regional Coordinating Council decided that the communities should be enumerated by census officials from the Central Gonja District and that the matter would be investigated and the figures for the communities would be placed in the appropriate District. The DCE for Tolon-Kumbungu did not contest the claim by the DCE for Central Gonja.

The meeting therefore agreed that the 2010 PHC figures for the listed communities should be included in the Central Gonja District on the basis of the existing legal framework.

4.2.8.2 Central Gonja and East Gonja District Assemblies

During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, the inhabitants of Yala, Daboep, Tinga Daboep, Congo, Cheposipe, Seidupe, Freetown, Agege, Santa, Mawekpo, Nyamendae, Kplangase, Gbavukope and Avegome refused to be enumerated by census officials deployed from the East Gonja District. They claimed to belong to the Central Gonja District and not the East Gonja District. The Northern Regional Statistician intervened and ensured that the inhabitants were enumerated by enumerators from Central Gonja District. A scrutiny of the LI by cartographers from the Ghana Statistical Service established that the localities fall under Central Gonja District. They therefore assured officials of Central Gonja District that the census data for the affected communities would be included in their district.

There is no boundary dispute between the two districts, but rather the inadvertent deployment of enumerators from East Gonja District to the affected communities caused the problem. It was agreed that the 2010 PHC figures for Central Gonja and East Gonja District Assemblies should be released on basis of the existing legal framework.

4.2.8.3 Yendi Municipality and Saboba, Gushiegu and Karaga District Assemblies

The Saboba District Assembly complained that Mpaabi, Njondo, Dalarbzando and Kuloudo were wrongly enumerated by census officials from the Yendi Municipality and appealed to the Ghana Statistical Service to include the settlements in the Saboba District. The GSS had

established that the LI placed the settlements in the Saboba District except Kuloudo which is listed as part of Gushiegu District.

At the consultative meeting with stakeholders in Tamale, traditional leaders and officials from Yendi and Saboba Districts accepted the findings of the GSS. In a related development, 10 communities were wrongly placed under the Karaga District instead of Gushiegu by the LI. According to the parties involved, a Committee was set-up to deal with the issue and the decision was to include the affected communities in the Gushiegu District.

The resolution was that there was no boundary dispute as such between the aforementioned districts and the census figures were to be released on the basis of the existing LIs.

4.2.9 Upper East Region

4.2.9.1 Bolgatanga Municipal and Talensi Nabdam District Assemblies

The inhabitants of Tongo Beo refused to be enumerated by census officials from the Bolgatanga Municipal Assembly during the 2010 Population and Housing Census because they claimed to belong to the Talensi Nabdam District. The Upper East Regional Statistician deployed enumerators from the Talensi Nabdam District to enumerate the inhabitants of the community. It was agreed that the matter would be investigated and the data for the community would be included in the appropriate district.

At the regional consultative meeting with stakeholders in Bolgatanga, a representative of the Bolgatanga Municipal Assembly reported that some of the settlements in the Talensi Nabdam District such as Tongo Beo, for reasons of proximity, wanted to be part of the Zuarungu Traditional Council which is in the Bolgatanga Municipality. It was established at the forum that Tongo Beo is listed in the Talensi Nabdam District on the basis of the existing Legislative Instrument.

The consensus at the meeting was that the 2010 Population and Housing Census figures for the Tongo Beo community should be included in the Talensi Nabdam District.

4.2.9.2 Kassena-Nankana West and Kassena-Nankana East District Assemblies

In 2004, the Kassena-Nankana District was split into Kassena-Nankana East and Kassena-Nankana West Districts. The LIs establishing the two districts listed only the major localities and both districts were fragmented (Fig. 9). This posed a major challenge to cartographers with regard to smaller localities that were not listed in the LIs. Consequently, when the census enumeration area maps were prepared, it came to light that a number of localities had been placed wrongly in the two Districts.

Fig. 9

Notable among them are Mirigu, Sirigu, Kandiga, Mion and Yua which were inadvertently placed in the Kassena-Nankana East District and Nabango in the Kassena-Nankana West District.

The inhabitants of the affected communities refused to be enumerated by census officials during the 2010 Population and Housing Census because officials were coming from districts other than their own. The Upper East Regional Statistician and officials of the two District Assemblies including opinion leaders from the affected communities met at Navrongo and the communities agreed to be enumerated on the assurance that the matter would be investigated and the census figures placed in the appropriate districts.

During the consultative meeting with stakeholders at Bolgatanga, the Regent of Mirigu complained bitterly about the marginalization of the Nankanas in the Kassena-Nankana East District. He stressed that since 1988 several petitions have been forwarded to Government to separate the Nankanas from the Kassenas through the creation of a Nankana District. He appealed to Government to create an administrative district for the Nankanas.

Another traditional ruler appealed to the Committee to handle the issues from a technical perspective devoid of political interference and influences to enable all parties to accept the findings and recommendations of the Committee. The Committee assured the meeting that it would not be manipulated in anyway by anybody.

It was resolved that the census figures of the 2010 Population and Housing Census for the Kassena-Nankana East and Kassena-Nankana West Districts should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework i.e. the LIs in force at the time of the Census. The demands for the creation of districts should be channeled through the Regional Coordinating Council to Government. To avoid the fragmentation of districts the Chiefs and the communities should be consulted and up-to-date maps use for the delimitation of boundaries.

4.2.10 Upper West Region

4.2.10.1 Wa West and Wa East District Assemblies

During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, the inhabitants of Tanina claimed that they do not belong to Wa West District and prevented the census officials from that District from enumerating them. The Upper West Regional Statistician intervened and resolved the matter amicably for the inhabitants to be enumerated. It was noted that the locality was initially part of Wa East District. The people petitioned for a change to Wa West District because of the distance to Funsu, the district capital. They preferred to belong to Wa West District with Wechiau as its capital because of easy accessibility. The change from the Wa East District to the Wa West District was effected in the LI establishing the latter District. The census maps were prepared based on the LI.

At the regional consultative meeting in Wa, the District Chief Executive for Wa West District, Seidu Tungbani, disclosed that his office was not aware of any dispute with Wa East District Assembly in connection with the 2010 Population and Housing Census. However, the District Chief Executive for Wa East indicated that the dispute emerged during the 2010 Population and Housing Census. He recalled that Tanina legally belongs to the Wa East District but the census officials from the Wa West District attempted to enumerate the inhabitants of Tanina. He indicated that during the last District Assembly elections, Tanina was placed under the Wa West District. Following that the inhabitants of Tanina petitioned the Upper West Regional Coordinating Council to be sent back to the Wa East District.

The Deputy Regional Minister for Upper West Region, Cezar Kale, explained that it was the inhabitants of Tanina who demanded to be included in the Wa West District and this was acceded to and they are now asking to be included in the Wa East District again. It was noted the Wa East District Assembly had initiated and was executing some development project at Tanina community and this was enticing them. The Deputy Minister indicated that the Tanina community cannot be toying with the authorities in this matter.

The resolution was that the census figures for Tanina should be included in the Wa West District where it is listed in the existing LI.

CHAPTER FIVE

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

On the basis of a careful consideration of the oral submissions and petitions on the boundary disputes and consensus at the various regional fora, the Committee submits the following recommendations with a view to preventing a reoccurrence of a similar situation with regard to national exercises such as censuses and elections.

5.1 The Creation of Awareness on the Distinction Between Administrative and Traditional Boundaries

Traditional boundaries are the territorial limits of the indigenous political formations i.e chiefdoms, traditional areas and land ownership boundaries. Administrative boundaries include the territorial limits of the political regions and boundaries of metropolitan, municipal and district assemblies and their sub-divisions. Some traditional rulers and many members of the general public are not conversant with the distinction between traditional and administrative boundaries. It is recommended that a nationwide programme should be rolled out to sensitise traditional rulers, politicians, Regional Houses of chiefs, public officials, district assemblies and the general public on the principles underlying boundary delimitation so as to prevent disputes arising from non-coincidence of administrative and traditional boundaries. Although attempts have been made to make traditional and administrative boundaries coterminous, there are some exceptions. A part of a traditional area can be included in another district purely for the purposes of administrative convenience. Administrative boundaries are created purely for administrative convenience and the delivery of socio-economic services by Government. However, this should not interfere with the exercise of traditional jurisdiction and allegiance and ownership of land.

The development of LIs establishing district assemblies by the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development and Parliament should be undertaken with adequate involvement of traditional rulers as, in most cases, chiefs prefer administrative districts to be congruent with their traditional areas. However, in cases where such arrangements are not feasible and results in conflict between traditional jurisdiction and allegiance and ownership of land the administrative boundaries takes precedence.

Local politicians, opinion leaders and traditional rulers should not be allowed to influence the development of the LIs establishing Districts. Chiefs and community leaders should participate in the exercise in the transparent and accountable manner. This would eliminate the wrongful placement of localities and ensure geographical compactness of Districts.

5.2 Update of Administrative Maps and Demarcation of Boundaries

There is the need for the Survey and Mapping Division of the Lands Commission to provide up-to-date and authentic maps for the whole country. All government agencies and the District Assemblies should be encouraged to use the official maps of the country instead of reliance on unapproved maps and sketches by unauthorized agencies in delineating district boundaries. This will prevent misunderstanding between District Assemblies. Current maps and plans would facilitate the description and definition of boundaries and easy identification and ascertainment of boundaries. Physical demarcation of boundaries on the ground would minimize boundary disputes.

There is an urgent need for the Survey and Mapping Division of the Lands Commission to revise the outdated maps in collaboration with stakeholders. The Survey and Mapping Division of the Lands Commission should be adequately resourced to update its map products regularly to facilitate accurate delimitation of administrative and traditional boundaries. It is also recommended that some sections of regional boundaries which are in dispute should be redemarcated.

5.3 Effective Collaboration among Implementing Agencies

The MLGRD should foster strong collaboration among the implementing agencies viz. Ghana Statistical Service, Electoral Commission, Survey and Mapping Division of the Lands Commission in the creation of districts and the delimitation of administrative boundaries to forestall recurrence of the district boundary problems associated with the 2010 PHC. The development of LIs for the districts should also be done with the involvement of all implementing agencies. The updates of Enumeration Area maps by the Ghana Statistical Service should be a collaborative affair to avoid the duplication of settlements in adjoining districts and ensure compactness of districts. The cartographers of the Ghana Statistical Service should desist from altering existing legal frameworks of the MMDAs in the course of their duties in the field.

5.4 Scrutiny and Dissemination of Legislative Instruments (LIs)

The MLGRD should always ensure adequate consultations with Chiefs and other stakeholders in the development of the LIs countrywide. Members of Parliament and the the Select Committee on Local Government should delgently scrutinize LIs when they are laid in Parliament. This would forestall the listing of the same settlements in different LIs and the omission of smaller communities. The MLGRD should also ensure adequate dissemination of the LIs and the District Assemblies should make sure they obtain copies of the current LIs. The GSS should provide adequate orientation for field staff to reconcile properly the settlements listed in the LIs with what actually pertains on the ground.

5.5 Adherence to established Areas of Jurisdiction

District Assemblies should be advised by the MLGRD to collect revenue, issue land and building permits and collect data only in their established areas of jurisdiction. District Assemblies should give due recognition to chiefs whose lands fall under their jurisdictions even where the chiefs reside outside the district. The traditional rulers and land owners should be consulted by District Assemblies in the naming of project on their lands. Land royalties should be paid to land owner whether they are in or outside the district.

5.6 Naming of Districts and Settlements

The names of some of the Districts are a source of conflict as some chiefs and communities claimed that they were not consulted and have been marginalized. Some settlements in the borderlands bear two names in certain communities and this causes disputes as to where the settlements belong. There is the need to work on the naming of settlements in the districts to change the anglicized names to the accepted traditional names. There is the need to revive the idea of having a uniform and accepted system of determining geographical place names.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

The Committee was charged with the responsibility of resolving the administrative boundary disputes which arose during the 2010 Population and Housing Census in order to facilitate the release of the district level census figures. The Minister for Local Government and Rural Development, Hon. Samuel Ofose-Ampofo, stressed at the inauguration of the Committee that it was set up as a technical body and should operate as such. We would like to emphasize that this committee was entirely independent, and free to report in any way that it thought fit within its Terms of Reference. It is important to state this fact as Ghanaians have generally become cynical of committees.

The committee held several meetings in Accra with some of the disputing parties, mainly chiefs, officials of District, Municipal and Metropolitan Assemblies and other opinion leaders. The committee also visited all the regional capitals to consult and dialogue with all the communities involved in the boundary disputes.

A participatory approach was adopted by the Committee at all the fora. The principles upon which the regional, district, constituency, electoral area and census enumeration area boundaries are delimited were explained to the participants. The implementing agencies also outlined the procedures they adopted in the discharge of their functions with regard to the 2010 Population and Housing Census. The brief historical account of boundary delimitations also drew attention to the functions of the various territorial limits as they related to our task.

The procedure adopted at our meetings with the stakeholders facilitated informed public participation in the discussions at each forum. The partitioning of Chiefdoms and other Traditional Areas between Districts was generally detested by the traditional rulers. In connection with Composite LI 1983, the chiefs present reiterated that they should have been effectively involve during the reviews so as to ensure that the individual LIs reflect the realities on the ground. There is a need for more recognition of traditional rulers by the Assemblies and the implementing agencies.

Some of the disputes arose because of the confusion between the functions of administrative, traditional and land ownership boundaries, while others were caused by officials of some Assemblies crossing the administrative boundaries to collect revenue outside their jurisdiction. A few cases that were brought before the Committee were not disputes that arose during the 2010 Census enumeration in the communities. Those cases that were within our jurisdiction were discussed and resolved. The committee did not deliberate on the dispute over the movement of six Electoral Areas in Akuse from the Lower Manya Krobo District to the Dangme West District as the case was before the Supreme Court.

Some of the complaints were outside our terms of reference such as demand for the alteration of regional and district boundaries, naming of districts, for example Wa East and Wa West and geographical place names. These matters are capable of solution only by reference to processes of law.

The lack of collaboration among the institutions responsible for the delimitation of administrative, electoral and census enumeration areas as well as inadequate consultation with the Survey and Mapping Division of the Lands Commission were major causes of the disputes. The inability of the Survey and Mapping Division to regularly update maps of the country also contributed to the boundary disputes. The proliferation of all kinds of un-authenticated maps which are used by some Assemblies gave rise to conflicts.

The recommendations of the committee were based mainly on consensus. It is the hope of the Committee that there would be no agitations relating to the wrongful placement of localities after the release of the district level census figures. However, attention must be drawn to the urgent need to clearly define and demarcate sections of the regional and district boundaries which were in dispute. **The Northern-Upper East and the Northern-Upper West regional boundaries around Arigou and Bogorogou and Chassia and their environs respectively, are flashpoints that can easily degenerate into major conflicts in the future and should therefore not be ignored. Another case is the boundary between the Nkwanta North and Nkwanta South Districts in the Volta Region which requires urgent clarification to the inhabitants in the borderlands.**

After the release of the district level census figures, if there are still challenges, the parties that feel that their communities have been wrongly placed and are not comfortable with the existing LIs could petition Government for redress.

The Ghana Statistical Service may consider re-aligning the Enumeration Areas for national censuses with the Electoral Areas of the constituencies as determined by the Electoral Commission. Ghana is divided into political regions and the regional boundaries are entrenched in the Constitution. The regions are divided into administrative districts and municipalities which are sub-divided into urban, zonal and town councils, while the Metropolitan Assemblies are further partitioned into Sub-metropolitan areas. It is the District, Municipal and Metropolitan Assemblies which are organized into constituencies and electoral areas by the Electoral Commission. The adoption of electoral areas as enumeration areas will aid planning for all governmental agencies.

Finally, the Committee wishes to express its thanks to the Minister for Local Government and Rural Development for entrusting us with the task and to the Regional Ministers, the staff of the Regional Co-ordinating Councils, the Chiefs and other traditional rulers and the DCEs for their hospitality and cooperation during the meetings in Accra and in the other regional capitals.

REFERENCES

Bening, R. Bagulo (1993). "Evolution of Electoral Constituencies in Ghana 1950-1952", *Research Review Supplement*, University of Ghana, No. 6.

Bening, Raymond Bagulo (1999). *Ghana: Regional Boundaries and National Integration*, Accra: Ghana Universities Press.

Bening, Raymond Bagulo (2010). *Ghana: Administrative Areas and Boundaries 1874-2009*, Accra: Ghana Universities Press

Ghana (1972). *Report of the Local Government Boundary Commission 1972*, Accra-Tema

Ghana, (n.d.). *Electoral Laws*, Electoral Commission of Ghana. The publication was issued in 2008.

Ghana, (n.d.). *2010 Population and Housing Census: Enumerator's Manual*, Ghana Statistical Service. The publication was issued in September 2010.

Gold Coast (1908). "Report on the Native Affairs Department 1907", In *Gold Coast Gazette* No. 101 of 31st October 1908.

Reindorf, Rev. Carl Christian, (1966). *The History of the Gold Coast and Asante*, Accra: Ghana Universities Press. Second Edition.