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CASE STUDIES AND RESOLUTION OF BOUNDARY DISPUTES

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 (Fig. 1) are presented below.

Disputes across Regional Boundaries

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.

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, Kobenapec, 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.

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 whiles 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 whiles 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.
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 Municipalility 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. Dodoo 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 given opportunity to brief the meeting on the situation in his area of jurisdiction. He quoted from Dr. J.C. Reindorf’s book (page....) that “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 Labade

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, Nuhu, further quoted from the Local Government Report, 1972 as follows:

a) 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.

b) 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:
Settlement  
Jeikrodua Mangoase  
Jeikrodua (Original)  

Location  
Central Region  
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 Banyiwa 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.*

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 2). 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
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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.

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 “until the regional boundary is adjusted by constitutional process to transfer Ntoabomah to the Eastern Region” pg. 195RB. 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. The Committee decided to invite both Kwahu North and the Sene District Assemblies to the next meeting scheduled for Wednesday, 24th August, 2011 at ILGS, Madina.

_Based on the delineation of the regional boundary, Ntoabomah, Sitoroke, 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._

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.

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

The inhabitants of Papa se 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.

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

The inhabitants of Chasia, Kpakpalamuni, Kalajon, Dolisa, Kandige, Buleju, Eribieyiri and Doliguuo 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 DCD for Sawla Tuna Kalba District informed the meeting that some communities in his District have been wrongly placed in the Wa East District. He pointed out that, on the basis of the regional boundary, the Chasia settlement is located in the Sawla/Tuna/Kalba District in the Northern Region (Fig.3).

However, the DCE for Wa East 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 West District confirmed the claim by the inhabitants of Chasia and the other settlements in dispute that they were part of the district. The DCE for Wa West District submitted colonial documents from the 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. The Chairman explained that regional boundaries cannot be altered unless through a referendum and he reiterated that regional boundaries do not affect traditional allegiance and ownership of land.

A chief from Jeyiri contended that over the years, Chasia settlement 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 changed in favour of the Chasia community’s preference i.e. inclusion in the Wa East District.

The Chairman explained that the Committee was not set-up to delimit administrative boundaries but to resolve such boundary dispute 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 of Wa East District and the absence of a clearly demarcated regional boundary, 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 could initiate procedures for a definition and re-demarcation of the regional boundary.

The consensus was that 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, community of interest and the active presence of the Wa East District Assembly in the area.
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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 LI 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.

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.

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 Bugorogou. They claimed that Bugorogou is a suburb of Arigou and should therefore be enumerated by enumerators from the West Mamprusi District. However, the inhabitants of Bugorogou maintained that their settlement is not part of Arigou as claimed by the inhabitants of Arigou. They contended that Bugorogou 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 Bugorogou 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 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 Instruments, which created the West Mamprusi District. However, Bugorogou which is not located on the map available to the Committee is listed under the Talensi Nabdam District of the Upper East region. On the ground, Arigou and Bugorogou are two distinct communities, separated by a valley. The people of Bugorogou claimed that the map produced by Survey and Mapping Division (SMD) in
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1974 where the regional boundary deviated from the White Volta River (Fig. 4) was a fake and attributed it to an individual. Bugorogou was listed under the Talensi Nabdam District in the 2000 PHC.

The consensus was that the actual location of Bugorogou in relation to the regional boundary would be determined and the census data should be included in the appropriate district. After the regional consultative meeting at Bolgatanga, the Committee tasked two of its members to ascertain the location of Bugorogou in relation to the regional boundary. The team visited the site and obtained a topographical sheet of the area but Bugorogou was not located on it. In the absence of a clearly defined regional boundary in the area the census figures should be released on the basis of the existing LI which lists Bugorogou under Talensi Nabdam District. There is the need to clearly define and demarcate this section of the regional boundary.

District Boundary Disputes

Western Region

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.

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.*

**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.*

**Central Region**

**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.

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.*

**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.*

**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.

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.

Gomoa East and Effutu Municipal Assemblies

During the 2010 PHC enumeration exercise, the inhabitants of Ansafro 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 Ansafro in the Gomoa East District mostly hail from Winneba in the Effutu Municipal Assembly. He claimed that the GSS placed Ansafro 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 Ansafro are Efutus who migrated from Winneba and settled in the Gomoa Traditional Area. Ansafro is not contiguous to Efutu 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 Ansafro 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.*

Greater Accra Region

**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 Municipal Assemblies should respect the administrative boundary. The two Municipalities should cooperate to identify the exact location of their common boundary.*
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 Municipal Assembly while those to the left were placed in the Ga East Municipal Assembly.

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 Adenta-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.

Volta Region

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. 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.

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 in 2004 when it was created. He explained that the LI has wrongly placed Agoe and Jumbo in the Nkwanta North District instead of the Nkwanta South District. Consequently, the electorate in the disputed settlements refused to take part in the 2004 and 2008 presidential and parliamentary elections.

Alhaji Benson, an opinion leader from the Nkwanta North District Assembly, presented a map indicating the wrong placement of Agoe and Jumbo communities in the Nkwanta North District. He explained that the Kpassa River serves as the boundary between the Nkwanta North and Nkwanta South Districts. He emphasised that the boundary is not in dispute but the LI 1983 violates the district boundary i.e. the Kpassa River. He noted that the two communities are mainly inhabited by 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 the two settlements in the wrong district. The 2010 Population and Housing Census district figures for Nkwanta North and Nkwanta South Districts should be released on basis of the district boundary i.e. the Kpassa River rather than on the LI which established the Nkwanta North District Assembly.*
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 consensus 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.

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.

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.

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.

Eastern Region

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.

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 2010 Population and Housing Census of the affected communities should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework.*

**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 (Fig.5). 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
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 Figure 6.

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 a 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.*

**Ashanti Region**

**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.

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.
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.

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.
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.

Brong Ahafo Region

Sene and Pru Districts

The inhabitants of Kongo, Alhaji Akura, Mantukwa, Domeabra, Battorkope, Mangoase, Kidokope, Konkonsi, J.B. Kope, Chiripo, Kwaese (Avegorme), 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
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.

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.

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.*

**Northern Region**

**Central Gonja and Tolon-Kumbugu 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-Kumbugu 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-Kumbugu, 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-Kumbugu 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.*
Central Gonja and East Gonja District Assemblies

During the 2010 Population and Housing Census, the inhabitants of Yala, Dabope, Tinga Dabope, Cogo, 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.

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 LI1983. 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.

Upper East Region

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.*

**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 (Figure 7). 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 wrongly placed in the two Districts. 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 Nankanana District. He appealed to Government to create an administrative district for the Nankanas.
Kassena Nankana East and Nankana West Districts 2010
(According to L.I. of 2004)
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 because the Committee was constituted as a technical Committee.

*At the meeting, it was resolved that the census figures of the 2010 Population and Housing for the Kassena-Nankana East and Kassena-Nankana West Districts should be released on the basis of the existing legal framework i.e. the LI at the time of the Census. The demands for the creation of districts should be channeled through the Regional Coordinating Council to Government.*

**Upper West Region**

**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 Funi, 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, Kale Caezar, 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 Upper West Regional 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.

Conclusion

This Interim Report contains all the boundary disputes that were considered by the Committee and presents our findings and the consensus reached in each case. It is the hope of the Committee that the findings and resolutions of the cases would enable the GSS to release the district level census figures of the 2010 Population and Housing Census in an atmosphere of peace. It was explained that communities that are not satisfied with their placement may pursue their cases through legitimate and constitutional means.