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TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Ref. No. AG.01/109

Office of the Auditor-General
Ministries Block ‘O’
P. O. Box MB 96
Accra

Tel. (021) 662493
Fax (021) 662493

October 2004

Dear Sir,

PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORT OF THE AUDITOR-GENERAL ON
MANAGEMENT OF GHANA’S CASTLES AND FORTS

I have the honour to submit to you for presentation to Parliament my eighth Performance Audit Report pursuant to Article 187 (5) of 1992 Constitution and Section 13(e) of the Audit Service Act 584. The Service Act, which came into force in November 2000, gives me the authority to audit programmes and activities of Public office to ensure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources.

2. The Audit Service traditionally audits financial statements prepared by public organizations. Performance audit has been introduced at Ghana Audit Service since 2002.

3. The audit was carried out by three man team comprising Messrs Lawrence Ndaago Ayagiba, Henry Missah and Mrs. Victoria Akodor professionally trained in conducting performance audit to internationally recognised standard. The team included an architect and the audit was directed by Mrs. Zipporah Martey.

4. Performance Audits are carried out by teams of professional staff which if required may include specialists such as architects, engineers and legal experts. Depending on the extent of coverage and complexity, it normally takes between six months and one year to complete performance audit, thus making it more expensive than the traditional financial audit.
5. Effective performance audit can lead to better use of resources by Public bodies and provide support to democratic governance by bringing about accountability, transparency, improved operations and better decision making.

6. This eighth report is on management of Ghana's Castles and Forts which served as transit points for Slaves taken outside the continent and being relics of the Slave trade, they are considered as tourist attractions today.

7. The purpose of the audit is to ascertain how efficient Ghana Museums and Monuments Board (GMMB) has been carrying out its mandate of preserving the historical monuments, how effective their marketing strategies are in promoting the castles and forts as tourist destinations to achieve the intended economic benefits and the use of these treasures as research laboratories for students and researchers.

8. Before the submission of the report to Parliament, the draft report was discussed with all stakeholders, copies of the draft was made available to them for their written responses.

9. Upon receipt of their responses, the draft was reviewed to include the responses and reaction of the auditee where necessary to ensure that the report is fair, balanced, complete and accurate.

10. The report makes necessary recommendations to address problems mitigating against achievement of economy, efficiency and effectiveness in maintenance, restoration and marketing of the Castles and Forts.

11. The audit intends carrying out a follow-up at an appropriate time to assess the status of implementation of recommendations made in this report and what has been achieved.
12. I would like to thank my staff for their assistance in the preparation of this report and the staff of GMMB, NCC, Ministry of Tourism, Ghana Tourist Board, KEEA, World Heritage Foundation, UNESCO, UNDP, USAID and others for assistance given to my staff during the audit.

13. I trust that this performance audit report will meet the approval of Parliament.

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD DUÀ AGYEMAN
AUDITOR-GENERAL

THE RT. HON. SPEAKER
OFFICE OF PARLIAMENT
PARLIAMENT HOUSE
ACCRA
REPORT OF THE AUDITOR-GENERAL ON MANAGEMENT OF GHANA’S CASTLES AND FORTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Ghana’s role in the slave trade can be seen in the number of castles and forts (See definition in appendix 4) that are dotted along her southern coastline. Built between 1482 and 1863, the castles and forts served as members of Ghana’s role in commerce and as transit points for slaves taken outside the continent.

2. There were 42 of such forts and castles left over as relics of the slave trade by 1950. Only 17 are left standing today, with the rest in ruins. Realizing their historical significance, UNESCO has designated the 17 World Heritage Sites.

3. The Ghana Museums and Monuments Board (GMMB) was established under the National Liberation Council Decree (NLCD) 387 of 1969. GMMB is to acquire, protect, conserve and manage Ghana’s movable and immovable material cultural heritage for posterity, for the purpose of research and education of the public. GMMB is to take advantage of the unique character of this heritage to derive maximum economic benefit to the Institution, the Community and Nation in collaboration with the government, marketing and promoting agencies.

4. The audit was conducted to ascertain how efficient and effective GMMB has been in carrying out this mandate.

5. The audit was based on interviews, review of documents, inspection and observation at the two castles and eight forts and covered the period 1999 to 2003.
6. The audit found that GMMB has satisfactorily acquired the monuments, sourced external funding and training of staff. However, restoring and taking the unique position of the monuments to derive economic benefits had not been fully accomplished. These difficulties are in the areas of maintenance and marketing of the monuments and also in management of the human resource capacity and capability.

7. The main findings are:
   - Good initiatives and efforts
   - The Castles and Forts are not well maintained;
   - The Castles and Forts are not well marketed;
   - The management of human resource is ineffective.

**Good initiatives and efforts.**

8. The management of GMMB since its establishment has identified and recorded 42 castles and forts, but more could be done with the assistance of the UNESCO office in Ghana. GMMB has also sourced external funding for training of staff and for restoration works on the castles and forts.

9. To sustain and improve upon the good initiative and efforts, we recommend GMMB:

   - To continue the good efforts on the documentation of the castles and forts, and seek assistance from the UNESCO office in Ghana to identify and retrieve Franklin Lodge which is not documented and any other monument that might not be known to them.

   - To pursue the expected external assistance from the Italian Government for the restoration of fort Amsterdam and UNESCO funding under “The Elmina 2015 strategy” and

   - To continue to seek staff career development through in-house and out-house training programs.
Castles and Forts are not well maintained

10. GMMB has a statutory duty to maintain the castles and forts. However, due to insufficient funding, inappropriate restoration practices, coupled with limited inspections to Cape Coast and Elmina Castles, GMMB has not been able to fully accomplish its mandate.

11. In order to improve upon maintenance of the Castles and Forts we recommend that GMMB:

- Takes an active part in selecting, through competitive tendering, consultants and contractors with proven track records in restoration works for future works;
- Insists on following laid down principles in restoration works and involves trained staff during restoration exercise and monitoring processes;
- Not limit inspections to Cape Coast and Elmina Castles but extend inspection to the other forts by making alternative transport arrangement to inspect and report defects as early as they appear to forestall further damage.
- Sets aside a much higher percentage of Internally Generated Fund (IGF) for routine maintenance and as a matter of urgency seeks assistance to salvage the castles and forts which are on the verge of collapse.

The castles and forts are not well marketed

12. Promoting Ghana as a Tourist destination and to attract Tourists require that the castles and forts are well marketed to the outside world to enable the nation achieve the intended economic benefits. The audit found that GMMB has not been able to achieve this objective as the institution has not taken advantage of the technological development to market these monuments.

13. To improve as a consequence upon the image and marketing of the Castles and Forts we recommend that GMMB should:
Have a website and give it publicity;

Collaborate with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) to instruct all the missions abroad to include a brochure about the monuments with every visa application form.

Set parameters with Tourist Board on the extent to which marketing of the monuments should be done by the Board.

Consider re-training and equipping some of the idle staff as security guards to protect the environs of the monuments and/or collaborate with the District Assemblies to provide security.

Consider re-enacting some of the scene of the slave trade by creating dummies in the slave dungeons and also recreate the governor’s residence which is empty to excite the Tourist; and

Follow up management’s idea to stage artistic performances in the night to improve revenue generation from gate fees.

**The management of human resource is ineffective**

14. Maintaining the required number of skilled staff and artisans are essential to enable GMMB perform its responsibilities. The audit showed that, while GMMB is unable to retain skilled staff trained abroad in restoration works, it is at the same time retaining high levels of artisans that are redundant and continue to draw salaries.

15. To improve human resource management we recommend that:

- Management should take steps to retain their specialist and skilled staff for whom resources have already been used to give training abroad by expediting action on the proposed restructuring exercise.

- Management should re-examine the needs of the artisans and either redeploy or reassign them.
CHAPTER ONE
REPORT OF THE AUDITOR-GENERAL ON MANAGEMENT OF GHANA'S CASTLES AND FORTS
INTRODUCTION

Ghana’s Castles and Forts are historical monuments serving as evidence of the early European contact with the African continent. Built between 1482 and 1863, these monuments are reminders of Ghana’s role in commerce and in the slave trade which resulted in the transfer of Africans outside the continent. This historical past, distasteful though it may be, has created interest in Ghana by Africans in the Diaspora in tracing their ancestral roots. To the rest of the world, they are monuments to mankind’s shameful past.

2. By faith of their history, the castles and forts are of tourist interest and Ghana derives some economic benefits by promoting them as tourist attractions. Secondly, the castles and forts constitute huge museum elements useful to students of history and researchers. Furthermore, the castles and forts have been designated world heritage sites by UNESCO.
3. There were a total of 42 castles and forts (see list in appendix 1) along the coast of Ghana by 1950, today only 17 are counted as being in existence. Therefore, concerns for their proper preservation are obvious.

4. It is in the light of indications of dilapidations of the structures at the castles and forts, and in accordance with Section 13(e), Audit Service Act 584 of 2000 that we conducted a performance audit into the management of Ghana's castles and forts.

Purpose and scope

5. The purpose of the audit was to find out how efficiently Ghana Museums and Monuments Board (GMMB) was carrying out its mandate of preserving the historical monuments. Also how effective their marketing strategies are in promoting the castles and forts as tourist destinations to achieve the intended economic benefits and the use of these treasures as research laboratories for students and researchers.

Methods and implementation

6. The methods adopted for the audit were (refer to appendix 2);
   - Review of documents; the team reviewed documents such as legislative instruments, financial statements, correspondences, a draft corporate plan and a brief on GMMB.
   - Interviews; the team also conducted interviews with the key personnel of GMMB and other key players
   - Inspection and observations. The team visited two castles and eight forts to ascertain their conditions.
CHAPTER TWO
DESCRIPTIVE CHAPTER

Historical background

7. The history of The Gold Coast (now Ghana) is usually preceded by the level of commerce in gold and diamonds, and chapters of the slave trade. Which ever way one views it, Ghana occupies an important position in world history in general and West Africa in particular. Equally noticeable is the rich and indelible history the country is endowed with.

8. Some of the country's past history can be read in history books and others are tangible and stand in the form of monuments. These monuments are the Forts and Castles along the coast, the Asante Traditional buildings, Palace walls and ancient Mosques inland.

9. Castles and Forts constitute the country's historical legacy. They represent historical treasures and monuments to the memory of the early European contacts with Africans. These Castles and Forts built between 1482 and 1863, initially served as residences for the early European traders and missionaries and later as transit points for slaves taken outside the continent.

10. By 1750, three castles, thirty nine forts and twenty four lodges dotted the coast of the country. By 1950, there were three castles and nineteen forts. Currently only three castles and fourteen forts are standing today. Twenty-five are in ruins but are recognized as heritage sites.

11. In retrospect, Ghana was an active market in the slave trade and as relics of the slave trade, these castles and forts have become legacies of the historic past of mankind hence their significance to national and world history.

12. Recognizing their unique place in world history, the World Heritage Convention of UNESCO has designated Ghana's castles and forts as World
Heritage Monuments thereby making their preservation of paramount importance to the Nation and other stake holders like students of history and academia.

13. To add to the traditional exports, various Ghanaian Governments in recent past have turned their attention to tourism as a foreign exchange earner. With a high concentration of forts and castles in the sub-region, Ghana is in a unique and advantageous position as a major tourist destination.

14. For the purpose of harnessing resources and control of the country’s historical monuments, GMMB was established under the National Liberation Council Decree (NLCD) 387 of 1969. This decree was further strengthened by the Executive Instrument (E.I.) 29 of 1973. These Instruments made the institution of GMMB the legal custodian and manager of Ghana’s material cultural heritage. The Institution comprises two divisions:

- The Museums and
- The Monuments

15. The Monuments Division is responsible for:

- The Forts and Castles;
- The Asante Traditional Buildings;
- The ancient Mosques, Palaces and Town Walls in the Northern Regions of Ghana;
- Some selected Architectural and cultural sites.

16. GMMB for administrative purposes is answerable to the National Commission on Culture.

Goals and objectives

17. The goals and objectives of the custodian of Ghana’s material heritage are set out in the mission statement of GMMB.
Mission statement:

"The mission of the Ghana Museums and Monuments Boards is to acquire, protect, conserve and manage Ghana's movable and immovable material cultural heritage for posterity, for the purpose of research and education of the public. To this end the Board shall endeavor to promote and foster national identity and unity, take advantage of the unique character of this heritage to derive maximum economic benefit to the Institution, the Community and Nation in collaboration with the government, marketing and promoting agencies. The Board will seek to promote the welfare and development of its employees."

Funding:

18. Funding of GMMB is from;

- Government of Ghana subvention through the National Commission on Culture
- Internally Generated Funds (IGF).

There are also donors support and assistance from the under listed agencies and institutions (See Appendix 6 for contributions:

i. Dutch Government
ii. Italian Government
iii. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
iv. United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
v. United Nation Development Program (UNDP)
vi. Midwest University Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA)
vii. Smithsonian Institute (S.I)
viii. Conservation International (C.I.)
ix. Central Regional Development Commission (CEDECOM)and
Current developments

19. Fort Good Hope at Senya Berekua has been rented to Kebab Enterprises who operate a Guesthouse, Restaurant and a gift shop. Fort Orange has been rented to Ghana Port and Harbours Authority while Fort Patience is used as guest house. Plans are being made to involve the people of Butre in the upkeep of Fort Batenstein located in the town.

20. The Ministry of Tourism in 2003 provided funds for the rehabilitation of the wash rooms at the Cape Coast and Elmina castles. Also the World Heritage Center of UNESCO is currently helping the Board set up a Documentation Center at the Ussher Fort.

Key players

Refer to Appendix 3.
CHAPTER THREE
FINDINGS

21. From the mission statement of GMMB the set objectives are; to acquire, protect, conserve and manage Ghana’s movable and immovable material cultural heritage for posterity, for the purpose of research and education of the public and to take advantage of the unique character of this heritage to derive maximum economic benefit to the Institution, the community and nation.

22. Over the years since its establishment in 1969, GMMB has made efforts to meet its objectives under various constraints. There are some achievements which we detail below under good initiatives and efforts. However, not all their efforts have yielded the expected results as the castles and forts are:

➢ Not well maintained
➢ Not well marketed; and
➢ The Management of Human Resource is ineffective

Good initiatives and efforts

Documentation of the Monuments

23. In compliance with its statutory objective, GMMB since its establishment has been able to acquire and document 42 castles and forts.

24. In addition GMMB in collaboration with Professor Kwesi James Anquandah has produced a handbook entitled “Castles and Forts of Ghana” as part of their documentation efforts which traces the history of these monuments with graphical presentations.

25. Information from UNESCO office in Ghana revealed that Fort Victoria built by the Portuguese and now known as Franklin Lodge located near Usher
Fort in Accra has not been documented. The inability to possess this building means the nation has been denied an asset.

**Sourcing for external funding and assistance**

26. GMMB acknowledges the need to access external funding to augment their budgetary resources to assist the Board accomplish the mandate to protect and conserve the monuments. As these monuments have been designated World Heritage sites, interests in them have become international. This recognition has motivated GMMB to seek external assistance from various external donors.

27. Donors have provided 85% of the funding used for restoration of the castles and forts in the last ten years. Presently there are proposals from UNESCO to spend about 2 million Euros for ‘The Elmina 2015 Strategy’ for Tourism development in Elmina of which the castle and fort in the town are beneficiaries. Through GMMB collaborative efforts, the Italian government has initiated moves to restore Fort Amsterdam.

28. The assistance received in the past from these donors enabled GMMB to undertake the previous restoration works. It is expected that the new inflows would help GMMB to improve upon the present condition of the castles and forts.

**Staff career development**

29. To equip its staff with requisite knowledge to meet the present and future challenges, GMMB has over the years sought both external and internal assistance in training some of its staff in their fields of speciality. The aim of improving the human resource requirement to enable them carry out their functions effectively was thus achieved although not all could be retained as explained in Section 3.4.1.
The monuments are not well maintained

30. The castles and forts were built between 1482 and 1863. The construction materials were burnt bricks and stone for the walls, extensive use of pine hard wood for the floors above ground level and the application of arches as supports for suspended floors. By these materials and methods, the monuments were engineered to withstand the harsh and saline coastal weather. The builders’ appropriately avoided the use of steel because of corrosion. The choice of bricks and stone was to withstand the weather and for aesthetic reasons.

![Fort Frederikshavn (Princesstown) showing original materials used](image)

31. The castles and forts have in recent years not been properly maintained as the audit revealed:

- Poor conditions of the forts and castles;
- Inappropriate restoration methods applied in previous restoration works;
- Maintenance of the castles and forts is not enough; and
- Inspections limited to Cape Coast and Elmina castles and fort.
Poor conditions of the forts and castles

32. Over the years GMMB has tried to preserve and conserve the castles and forts with assistance from the Government of Ghana and some donor communities. However, the preservation and conservation efforts have not yielded the required results. There are indications that the structures are deteriorating. An inspection by the team at Forts Amsterdam, Williams, Usher and Elmina Castle showed a picture of dilapidation.
33. An example of such deterioration is visible at Fort Amsterdam which is partly in ruins. The external walls are in pieces, the roofs have collapsed, have neither doors nor windows, and the only picture one gets of an ancient fort is the massive sizes of the remaining walls.

![Fort Amsterdam (Abandze)](image)

34. At Elmina the roof top and upper floors of the southern wing of the Castle are collapsing and had been cordoned off from visitors for the past three years. As a temporary measure the floor has been propped up with timber. Similarly parts of the structures at Fort Williams at Cape Coast and Usher Fort in Accra are collapsing.

35. By 1950 there were three castles and 19 forts. Today three castles and 14 forts are standing as such the nation has lost five forts in about 50 years. There is the possibility that some more might be lost if steps are not taken to prevent further deterioration.

36. The GMMB, in collaboration with the Komenda, Edina, Eguafo, Abriem District Assembly and the Dutch Government, has initiated an action plan to
restore the two castles and Fort Jago in the central region. Collaboration with the Italian Government is underway to restore Fort Amsterdam.

**Improper restoration methods applied in previous restoration works**

37. Restoration, unlike refurbishment, is principled on returning or renovating a building to its formal condition. Historical significance has made restoration works as specialized works. Emphasis is therefore laid on getting the building closest to the original, rather than attempting to make it look beautiful or modern. Usually in restoration, attempts are be made to patch defective elements instead of replacing them. Where replacement is inevitable efforts are made to get an element nearest in both appearance and quality to the original one.

38. The audit revealed several examples where principles of restoration had not been adhered to.

39. In 1994, USAID and UNDP sponsored the restoration work of Cape Coast and Elmina Castles. The Cape Coast works were contracted to Paa Badu Construction Ltd. while works for the Elmina Castle was contracted to Akaido Construction. Both consultants and contractors were selected by the sponsors without any input from the specialist of GMMB.

40. At the Cape Coast Castle, the contractor removed the original ceiling without replacing them. Parts of rotten timber members that needed to be patched were completely replaced and nails used instead of joinery. The nails are rusting thus creating more holes in the floors and leaving the members loose. Similarly, the roof was replaced and started leaking soon after hand over. (See letter of correspondence with consultant in Appendix 5). Under the contract, a Defects Liability Period of ten years exists, yet at the time of the audit, the defects had not been attended to although the consultant was notified before the end of the defect liability period.
41. Furthermore, some walls were chiseled to introduce electrical conduit and are either partially covered or without switches and sockets.

42. An earlier restoration work on the castles and forts by The Public Works Department (PWD) in 1972 completely plastered the brick and stone walls. The walls were then painted with white emulsion paint. Again paint was applied in 1994. At the Cape Coast Castles we found weak plaster work. Paint work is often green caused by fungus and of the coastal weather.

53. At the Elmina castle similar structural alterations were made. In addition, the roof top and upper floors of the southern wing were reinforced using steel beams during the P.W.D. restoration. During the audit, the steel beams of that section of the castles having rusted, had failed and the structure is collapsing.
54. Fort Williams at Anomabu and Usher Forts in Accra, until 2000, were used as prisons. Massive reinforced concrete works were carried out to create toilet chambers and wash rooms for the prisoners. These additional structures are collapsing and are affecting the structural tolerance of the forts.

55. The inspections of Fort Goode Hope in Senya Breku and Fort Patience in Apam, both of which are used as Guest houses have evidence of complete replacement of doors and windows. The picture is the same at Fort Orange in Sekondi where workers of Ghana Ports and Harbours Authority staff reside.

56. The consequences are that the castles and forts will cease to resemble the original and the use of materials intolerant to the weather will hasten the dilapidation of the monuments.

**Maintenance of the castles and forts is not enough**

57. GMMB should preserve the monuments by carrying out routine maintenance work. This involves detection and restoring any defect that occurs on the monuments. It also includes protecting the metal elements like the guns and canisters from rust by applying the appropriate paint. GMMB is also required to continue to patch the falling plaster and paint the monuments. The audit found that the inspector of monuments submitted reports to the Regional Director Central/Western for repair works that needed to be carried out. However, most of the works remain undone and the staff cannot cope. This is evident in cracked walls, broken doors and windows, unpainted metal elements and collapsing structures in all the forts and castles visited.
58. We observed that budgetary allocation for maintenance work is not enough. From 2000 to 2003 an average of 98.7% of the budget was allocated for personal emoluments, administrative expenses and investments while an average of only 1.3% was for service activity which includes an unspecified amount for maintenance. (see table 1 below).

Table 1. Table of budgetary allocation to GMMB for 2000-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Personnel Emolument, administrative and investment (million $)</th>
<th>Service Activities (million $)</th>
<th>Total (million $)</th>
<th>Percentage of Personnel emolument, administrative and investment to total</th>
<th>Percentage of service to total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,564*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCC budget for 2000-2003

59. Analysis of expenditure in terms of material requirements show that, this allocation for maintenance is inadequate. For instance, to protect the guns and canisters from rusting, GMMB will require on average a drum of bitumen to paint them monthly. The cost of one drum (198kg) cutback medium cure
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(MC1) bitumen on the market is 1,013,958.00 cedis. Alternatively half drum of Carboline 15 marine paint once every three and half months. The cost of a drum of such marine paint is 14million. In addition, GMMB should repair cracks and defects from this same allocation.

60. In November 2002, the Board directed that all revenue generated at the castles and forts should be deposited in their own account (until November 2002 all IGF was paid into the Consolidated Fund). Accounts were, therefore, opened, the disbursement of which is decided by the Board.

61. Data on revenue generation showed 628,399,536 was realized between November 2002 and December of 2003 from the Cape Coast and Elmina Castles.

62. At the time of the audit, 587,819,702million had been disbursed from the IGF account. The money was spent on procurement of Social Security and National Insurance Trust (SNNIT) flats for staff, outstanding allowances to staff and administrative expenses but nothing was spent on maintenance. As a result, the GMMB failed to take advantage of the IGF to address some of the concerns regarding repair works. Thus, putting the maintenance of the castles and forts at a disadvantage compared with other expenditures.

63. The effect of not attending to defects when they appear is promoting further deterioration.
Inspections limited to Cape Coast and Elmina castle and fort

64. The routine inspection of the castles and forts enables early identification of defects for rectification before they get worse. The Inspector of Monuments stationed at Cape Coast and responsible for Central and Western Regions is required to inspect the Cape Coast and Elmina Castles on daily basis and each of the other forts at least once a week. This enables him to identify problems or defects and report to the Director for remedial action to be taken.

65. In all the forts except Fort Orange and Fort Goode Hope there are caretakers employed by GMMB to receive visitors and keep the place tidy. Because the caretakers do not have technical background, they do not carry out checks and report on defects. It is the duty of the Inspector of Monuments to conduct inspections.

66. During the audit, we found that the Inspector had not visited any of the forts in the Western Region in the last three years. Similarly, he had not visited any of the Forts outside Cape Coast and Elmina in the Central Region within the last eighteen months. Consequently, there is no current information on the status of the forts outside Cape Coast and Elmina.

67. The audit discovered that the Central/Western had one Toyota special utility vehicle (pick up) which was bequeathed to the office by the Heritage Foundation Project in 1994. The vehicle is old, poorly maintained and unable to undertake long distance journeys to where some of the forts are located. Other alternative arrangements could, however, have been made to inspect the monuments but the vehicle was used for local running. Since inspections are limited to Cape Coast and Elmina Castles, reports on defects on the other forts are not available for remedial action to be taken. This has contributed to further deterioration of the structures.
**Forts are The Castles and not well marketed**

68. One of the objectives of GMBM is to take advantage of the unique character of the castles and forts to derive maximum economic benefits. Achieving this objective requires GMBM to package and market the Forts and Castles as Tourist destinations, attract more tourists to the country and derive the necessary benefits.

69. Generating revenue from the castles and forts is one way to acquire resources to maintain them for the benefit of present and future generations.

70. However, the audit revealed that:
   - **Opportunities to market the Castles and Forts have not been fully taken**;
   - **Conditions around the castles and forts are unfriendly; and**
   - **There is room for improving revenue generation.**

**Opportunities to market the castles and forts have not been fully taken**

71. Technological advancement has opened up new opportunities for marketing of products. The World Wide Web, television with international coverage and e-commerce are only but a few. The use of the Embassies and High Commissions are also means by which information about the castles and forts could be spread outside the country.

72. As the audit showed, these opportunities have not been taken by GMBM to market the castles and forts. The audit found that GMBM has no Website through which tourists could browse to gather information about the castles and forts. Ghana Tourist Board (GTB) has a Website www.africaonline.com.gh/Tourism. GTB are responsible for promoting Ghana’s Tourism industry of which the castle and forts are part. Some information, therefore, about the castle and forts have been made available on their website together with others.
73. It became apparent during our interviews with the Director for Central and Western regions that GMMB is looking to GTB to market the castles and forts that is why GMMB is not giving the marketing aspect the necessary attention.

74. The audit also found from UNESCO office in Accra, that information about the Goree Island in the Republic of Senegal is more known than Cape Coast or Elmina castles although Goree Island is a third the size of any of the two. The reason is that Goree Island is well marketed through the internet and other media. It is not surprising that two United States Presidents who visited Africa in the last five years visited\(^1\) Goree Island.

75. Out of thirty Non-Ghanaian Tourists interviewed during the audit, twenty-seven of them either heard about the castle and forts from friends in their respective countries or from a book titled "Lonely Planet". Two of the respondents also read from newspapers in Denmark. None of the respondents obtained any information from the Ghana missions abroad.

76. Due to GMMB inability to market the forts and castles very well, a large number of potential Tourists have not been informed.

**Conditions around the castles and forts are unfriendly**

77. The immediate environs of the castles and forts adjoin the town settlements and the beaches along the Atlantic Ocean. None of the castles or forts have been fenced off from any of the settlements and there is no existing law preventing people from approaching to the vicinity of the monuments.

78. During the audit we found that the unemployed town folk loiter around the castle and forts making attempts to extract monies from tourists. They do

\(^1\) Cable News Network (CNN) news report of the US Presidential visits to Africa
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this under the pretext of selling artifacts or asking to guard their vehicles while they are on tour. At the Cape Coast Castle eighteen out of the twenty tourists interviewed said they had been harassed one way or the other. At Elmina the situation was the same.

79. The audit also revealed that the immediate surroundings of the monuments had foul smell because the areas were littered with human excreta.

80. The District Assembly in Elmina constructed public toilets with water closets (ten bowls each for men and women) close to the Castle but some of the locals do not use the facility and rather preferring to use the beaches.

81. The audit found that attempts by management of GMMB to discourage this act have not yielded the required results. The local authorities and District Assemblies feel alienated from the upkeep of the castles and forts in their localities. This is because their demands for royalties and part of the revenue respectively have not been met by GMMB resulting in non cooperation between GMMB, the Local Authorities and the District Assemblies.

82. These unfriendly scenes and harassment of tourists do not encourage people to visit these attractions.

Revenue generation

83. One of the objectives is to take advantage of the unique character of the castles and forts and derive maximum economic benefits. This requires GMMB to generate revenue from its operations. Revenue from the castles and forts are collected as entrance fees from visitors. Ghanaian visitors, apart from school pupils, pay $2,000.00 whilst Non-Ghanaians pay $5 or the cedi equivalent.

84. The audit shows that 80% of the revenue collected is from Non-Ghanaian visitors.
Table 2: Attendance of visitors who pay to enter the two castles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non Ghanaians</th>
<th>Ghanaians</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>15,398</td>
<td>71,263</td>
<td>86,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>16,123</td>
<td>32,068</td>
<td>48,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15,080</td>
<td>60,599</td>
<td>75,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>15,873</td>
<td>16,664</td>
<td>32,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>10,443</td>
<td>12,136</td>
<td>22,579</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Attendance records at Cape Coast and Elmina Castles

85. From Table 2 above, the significant decline in attendance in 2001 for non Ghananain visitors was attributed to the event of September 11 in the USA. However, there was an increase in attendance in 2002 but for the unavailability of attendance records for the first quarter of 2003, we could not determine whether the upward trend was sustained. For the Ghanaian visitors the high attendance of 1999 and 2001 were due to special festivals like PANAFEST.

86. From the table of revenue generation, income levels remained high despite the decline in the over all attendance, because, the foreign component which remained relatively stable accounted for high income trends due to the depreciation of the cedis.

Table 3: Table of revenue generation from Cape Coast and Elmina Castles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elmina (amount in millions ¢)</th>
<th>Cape Coast (amount in million ¢)</th>
<th>Total in million ¢</th>
<th>% Increase on previous years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GMMB Western/Central Regions
87. The audit found for example, revenue figures for Cape Coast and Elmina Castles but not for any of the other forts because; there are no records of attendance from any of the other forts. As stated in paragraphs 83 some of the Tourists who had visited Cape Coast and Elmina Castles did not know the existence of the other forts.

88. Management of the castles and forts in the Central and Western Regions from where most of the revenue is generated do not set revenue targets and so are not under any obligation to meet them. At the close of work at 4:30 pm there is no activity at the castle and the area quickly becomes quiet and deserted. Management, however, acknowledges the need to get some activities at nights as another way of improving revenue which the audit found encouraging since marketing and packaging the castles and forts properly are essential in improving revenue performance.

89. The castles and forts as they stand are interesting because of the historical background but lack the excitement because they are empty. In addition, we are concerned that the number of visitors to these attractions, are declining at an alarming rate.
The Management of Human Resource is ineffective

90. The required staff levels for both skilled and unskilled are essential for planning and accomplishment of organizational objectives.

91. The audit revealed, however, a:
   - Decline in skilled staff; and
   - High level artisans;

Decline in skill staff

92. The recruitment and retention of staff with the required skills, knowledge and potential, are necessary for an entity to perform current and future task.

93. The audit found that there has been a significant decline in the number of recruited graduates specializing in different fields over the years. For example, out of 22 graduates recruited in 1988, 14 had left.

94. There is one Architect conservator at post. However, three others who were given further training overseas to specialize in conservation practices have left. This has reduced the number of conservators envisaged by the Board to meet its operational requirements.

95. Low levels of remunerations at GMMB in particular, and the disparity generally in salary levels of people of the same grade in the public service of Ghana turns out to be the main cause for individuals leaving. In addition, low remuneration makes it difficult to recruit new personnel.

96. Concerns about job satisfaction were also expressed as a contributory factor for staff leaving GMMB. The Board has recognized the need to prevent this and proposed a 40% increase to compliment its skilled labour in a corporate plan for 1998-2002, which was, however, not implemented for lack of funds.
97. The Board also intends to undertake a restructuring exercise on all aspects of its activities including salary levels, recruitment and strategies to retain skilled labour, by the end of May, 2004.

**High level of artisans**

98. Human resource planning system requires the efficient use of labour to achieve the expected results. In situations where the number of labour is far in excess of requirement, optimum use of people and cost effectiveness is not achieved.

99. In 1994 the USAID, in conjunction with the Central Regional Development Commission, advised the Board to recruit more staff to enable them undertake major conservation work at Cape Coast and Elmina Castles which they were funding. After the project the additional staffs were incorporated into the main stream workforce of the Board.

100. The number of permanent artisans (22 masons and 14 carpenters) stationed at Cape Coast and Elmina Castles are too high as the Board has not undertaken any major rehabilitation work for the past ten years and a very low budget to carry out frequent maintenance work

101. The result is the high number of idle hands and a higher proportion of the Boards subvention being used to pay salaries and wages (from 1999-2000 an average of 91% of annual subvention) at the cost of other activities like the maintenance of the castles and forts.

102. The need to reduce this category of staff has been recognized by the Board and it is expected that its proposal to reduce the labour force of the non skilled staff by 40% would be realized.
CHAPTER FOUR
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION


104. The audit findings detailed in Chapter 3 show that GMMB is making efforts to achieve its objectives but there is room for improvement.

105. The audit found that 42 Forts and Castles have been acquired and documented. However, information from the UNESCO office in Accra show that Franklin Lodge in Accra is not in the list (see list in appendix1). There might be others not known to GMMB. GMMB has collaborated with some donor communities in the past to restore the castles and some forts. Presently there are proposals under the ‘Elmina 2015 Strategy’ by UNESCO to assist in the restoration of some selected sites in Elmina of which the castle and fort are beneficiaries.

106. However in spite of these efforts and achievements, the forts and castles are not properly conserved and managed.

107. Conservation of the Castles and Forts have not been professionally done as inappropriate conservation methods were employed in 1974 and again in 1994 during restoration works resulting in accelerated dilapidation. Secondly maintenance works on the monuments are done in bits and are therefore not enough due to low budgetary allocations. Inspections of the monuments by the Inspector of Monuments are limited to Cape Coast and Elmina and this has made it difficult for GMMB to detect and carry out routine maintenance early at the other sites.
108. The effects of these are visible at Elmina Castle where the southern section has been cordoned off to visitors because it is collapsing, leakages in the Cape Coast Castle and total ruins at Fort Amsterdam.

109. The audit also revealed that management of the castles and forts are not marketing the monuments well enough to attract tourists. GMMB has not seized opportunities available in technological advancement to market the Monuments to the outside world. About 70% of tourists heard about the castles from friends and not even the Ghana missions abroad. There has also been a significant decline in the number of people visiting the attractions.

110. The audit also found that conditions in and around the Castles and forts are not friendly and so does not represent a good package when marketing the Monuments. For example loiterers harass tourists at the sites and there is foul smell from human excreta some of which are littered around the immediate surroundings of the monuments.

111. The audit did not ascertain the economic benefits accruing to the nation in general from the marketing effort of GMMB to bring tourists. However, the benefits to the institution from analysis of revenue figures were examined. During the period under review, the audit revealed that revenue generation was increasing in a declining rate (see table 3). GMMB management does not set revenue targets and therefore are not guided by any limits.

112. In the area of managing their human resources, the audit found a decline in skilled staff and high levels of artisans.
CHAPTER FIVE
RECOMMENDATIONS

Sustaining and improving upon the good initiatives

113. To sustain and improve upon the good initiative and achievement, we recommend GMMB;

➢ To continue the good efforts on the documentation of the castles and forts, and seek assistance from the UNESCO office in Ghana to identify and retrieve Franklin Lodge and any other monument that might not be known to them.

➢ To pursue the expected external assistance from the Italian Government for the restoration of fort Amsterdam and UNESCO funding under “The Elmina 2015 strategy” and

➢ To continue to seek staff career development through in-house and out-house training programs.

Improved maintenance

114. In order to improve maintenance of the Castles and Forts we recommend that GMMB should:

➢ Take active part in selecting consultants and contractors with proven track records in restoration works for any future works;

➢ Insist on following laid down principles in restoration works and involve their trained staff in the restoration exercise and monitoring process;

➢ Since the defects occurred before the elapse of the Defects Liability Period, GMMB should enforce the clause.

➢ Not limit inspections to Cape Coast and Elmina Castles but extend to the other forts by making alternative transport arrangement to inspect and report defects as soon as they appear to forestall further damage.
Set aside a reasonable percentage of IGF for routine maintenance and as a matter of urgency seek assistance to salvage the castles and forts, which are on the verge of collapse.

Fort Williams (Anomabu)

**Improve the marketing of the Castles and Forts**

115. To improve the image and marketing of the Castles and Forts we recommend that GMMB should:

- Have a website and give it publicity;
- Collaborate with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) to instruct all the missions abroad to include a brochure about the monuments to every visa applicant.
- Set parameters with Tourist Board on the extent to which marketing of the monuments should be done by each Board.
- Consider re-training and equipping some of the idle staff as security guards to protect the environs of the monuments and/or collaborate with the District Assemblies to provide security.
- Consider re-enacting some of the scene of the slave trade by creating dummies in the slave dungeons and also recreate the governor's residence which is empty to excite the Tourist; and
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Follow up management's idea to stage artistic performances in the night to improve revenue generation from gate fees.

Improve Human Resource management
116. To enable GMMB carry out its functions effectively, there is the need for proper manpower planning and evaluation. Management should be able to detect early warnings of short falls and surpluses in staffing levels and take necessary measures to contain them. To improve the human resource management we recommend that:

- Management should take steps to retain their specialist and skilled staff for whom resources have already been used to give training abroad by expediting action on the proposed restructuring exercise.
- Management should re-examine the staff needs of the artisan and either redeploy or reassign them.
## Catalogue of Forts, Lodges and Castles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of Edifice</th>
<th>Date built</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fort Prinzenstein</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Keta</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fort Königstein</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fort Fredensborg</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Ningo</td>
<td>Visible ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fort Venon</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Prampram</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fort Augustaborg</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Teshie</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Christiansborg castle</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>Seat of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fort Creve Coner (Usher Fort)</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>Visible ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>James Fort</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>Prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fort Goode Hope</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Senya Breku</td>
<td>Guest house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fort Leydsaaamheid (Patience)</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Apam</td>
<td>Guest House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>English Fort</td>
<td>About 1800</td>
<td>Winneba</td>
<td>Visible ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>English Fort</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Tantumkwemi</td>
<td>Untraceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>French Fort</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Amoku</td>
<td>Untraceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>English Lodge</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Egya</td>
<td>Untraceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>English Lodge</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Anashan</td>
<td>Untraceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Redoubt</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Anashan</td>
<td>Untraceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fort Amsterdam</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Kormantse Abandze</td>
<td>Visible ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fort Williams</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Anomabu</td>
<td>Visible ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fort Nassau</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Moree</td>
<td>Untraceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dutch Lodge</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>Queen Anne’s Point</td>
<td>Untraceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>English Fort</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Queen Anne’s Point</td>
<td>Untraceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fort Fredericksburg</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Amanful</td>
<td>Untraceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fort M’Carthy</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Cape Coast</td>
<td>Untraceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Corner’s Hill</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Cape Coast</td>
<td>Untraceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fort William (Smith’s Tower)</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Cape Coast</td>
<td>Light house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fort Victoria (Phipp’s Tower)</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Cape Coast</td>
<td>Light house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cape Coast Castle</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Cape Coast</td>
<td>Good shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Elmina Castle</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>Elmina</td>
<td>Good shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fort Conraadsburg (Fort St, Jago)</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Elmina</td>
<td>Good shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fort de Veer</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Elmina</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Fort Natglas</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Elmina</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Fort Java</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Elmina</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fort Schomarus</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Elmina</td>
<td>In rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fort Batonstein</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Elmina</td>
<td>In rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>English Fort</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Komenda</td>
<td>Visible ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fort Vredenburg</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Komenda</td>
<td>In rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>French Post</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Komenda</td>
<td>In rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sam Sebastian</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>Shama</td>
<td>Visible ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>English Fort</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Essikadu</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fort Orange</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Sekondi</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>French Lodge (Fort Wisten)</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>Takoradi</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Fort Batonsten</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Butri</td>
<td>In rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fort Metal Cross</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Dixcove</td>
<td>In rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Fort Dorethea</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Akwida</td>
<td>In rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Brandenburgers Fort</td>
<td>About 1700</td>
<td>Takrama</td>
<td>In ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Fort Fredericksburg</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>Prices Town</td>
<td>Visible ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Fort San Antonio</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Axim</td>
<td>Visible ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Fort Elize Carthago</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Ankobra Mouth</td>
<td>Visible ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Fort Duma</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Egwira</td>
<td>Visible ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Appollonia Fort</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Benyin</td>
<td>Partly in good shape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ancient forts and castles of the Gold Coast
By Dr. S. Ephraim 1970

---

Methods and implementation

Review of documents

1. The team called for and reviewed the:
   ▶ National Museum Decree, 1969 and
   ▶ Executive Instrument; National Museum Regulation, 1973 which established, defined the limits of mandate and empowered GMMB to manage the castles and forts.

2. Reviews were also made of:
   ▶ A draft corporate plan of GMMB;
   ▶ A brief on the GMMB; and
   ▶ Some correspondence between GMMB, National Commission on Culture (NCC) and a Consultant assigned the restoration of the monuments

3. These documents gave us an insight into the standards and targets set by GMMB in their corporate plan, the goal and objectives of GMMB in their mission statement and the problems they encounter with consultants assigned to the restoration of the monuments.

4. Financial statements for GMMB for 1999 to 2003 were also reviewed to enable the team determine the level of revenue generation.

Interviews

5. Interviews were held with the key players. Among them are the Chairman of NCC, Board chairman of GMMB, The Director, Head of the Architectural and Drawing Office and Senior Accountant all of GMMB head office.
6. Also interviewed were the Regional Director for Central and Western Region of GMMB, Acting Head of the Monuments Education Unit, Inspector of Monuments, the Senior Accountant, Tour Guides and caretakers at the castles and forts in the Central and Western regions.

7. In addition interviews were conducted with The Chief Director and Senior Accountant at the Ministry of Tourism. Similar interactions were made with the Central Regional Director of Ghana Tourist Board and visitors to the castles and forts.

8. The choices of interviewees were influenced by their roles in the decision making or implementation level except for the tourist who were chosen at random.

9. Among the donors, representatives for the European Union, UNDP, UNESCO AND USAID were interviewed. These Donors have contributed about 85% of the total amount used for restoration of the castles and forts in the last ten years. In addition UNESCO has outsourced about 1,985million Euros meant for developmental projects in Elmina, part of which will be used for the castles.

**Inspection and Observation**

10. The team visited two castles at Cape Coast and Elmina and eight forts. The choice of Cape Coast and Elmina castles was because they are the two castles apart from the Christiansbourg castle at Osu which is the seat of Government. Secondly the two castles generate about 90% of IGIF from castles and forts.

11. Fort Jago at Elmina, Fort Orange in Sekondi, Fort St. Sebastian at Shama, Fort Williams at Anomabu, and Fort Good Hope at Senya Bereku, Fort Patience at Apam, Fort Amsterdam at Abandze and Ussher Fort in Accra.
12. Fort Good Hope and Fort Orange were selected because they have been given out for private use, whilst Fort Williams and Ussher Forts because until May 2000, they served as prisons. Four other forts were chosen from the Central and Western Regions because of the large concentration of forts in the two regions.
Key players and their responsibility

National Commission on Culture (NCC)
National Commission on Culture is responsible for cultural issues. They control the budget and allocate funds from Government of Ghana to GMMB. As the Commission is responsible for GMMB, they present the interest of GMMB to government.

Ghana Museums and Monuments Board
The Board is responsible for taking major policy decisions. It ensures that policy decisions are adhered to by management. The Board vets and gives approval for the disbursement of IGF.

The Director is responsible for the day to day administration of the GMMB. He ensures that policy decisions are implemented at the staff level. The Director coordinates the activities of all the departments and is the liaison between the staff and the Board members.

The Conservator provides technical advice and support services for the maintenance of the castles and forts. They inspect the castles and forts reports to the Regional Director any defect needing attention. They are also responsible for providing estimates to cover repair works on any reported defect and supervise the artisans on any restoration work.

The Monuments Education Officers are responsible for educating and guiding visitors to the forts and castles. They carry out research and also provide assistance to researchers.

Regional Directors Central and Western region exercise management control, including mobilization of revenue. He also gives approval for expenditure at the regional level.
The Ministry of Tourism formulates policies aimed at marketing and promoting tourist industry including the castles and forts.

The Ghana Tourist Board is the agency of the Ministry of Tourism in the Regions responsible for marketing the tourist potentials of Ghana.
Appendix 4

Definition of Castle, Fort and Lodge

Three classes of fortified stations are noted in the historical architectural record during the main period of fort construction between 1482 and 1787, and which were designated as Lodge, Fort and Castle.

The difference lies in scale, either in terms of size, content or functional capacity.

The Lodge described as a sort of miniature fort and an indefensible trading post, was small in size, built often of earthen material or wood but sometimes of local stone. It was usually designed to be a temporary structure for small scale trade or military purpose pending the construction of a more permanent structure.

The Fort took the form of a permanent, durable structure built in brick or stone. It contained several structures for use by commandant, officers, garrison and servants and it had up to 50 guns installed in it.

Castles covered a wider area than a fort, was larger in size and had a more complex network of buildings. In addition, it had the capacity for a much larger population. Apart from its European staff and garrison, there could be up to 1000 slaves there at any time. Also, the castle was equipped with up to 100 guns and extensive logistics.
The Managing Director,
Paabudu Construction Limited,
ACCRA.

Dear Sir,

RE: HISTORIC PRESERVATION (FORTS/CASTLES) PHASE II CAPE-COAST CASTLE: LEAKAGE

We refer to leakages at the roof in the Cape-Cost Castle and draw your attention to a letter from the Regional Director of the Ghana Museums and Monuments Board (copy attached) on the issue, which is self-explanatory.

This issue had been reported on before after which we went on inspection with you and M/s. Adriu the Specialist Supplier of the waterproof membrane.

Could you as a matter of urgency take a look at the roof since you were the main-contractor on the project and submit a proposal for remediying the situation.

Kindly treat with dispatch.

Yours sincerely,

E. BANNING
For: MODULA GRUP

CC: Regional Director, Museums Board
Dear Sir,

HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROJECT PHASE II
HANDRAIL AND NEWEL POSTS FOR THE GOVERNOR’S
RESIDENCE — CAPE COAST CASTLE

In February 2001, we wrote to you requesting the return
of the Handrail and Newel Posts for work in the Governor’s
residence. However, you did not react to our letter neither
did you return the items despite several follow ups by the
Inspector of Monuments (copy attached for ease of reference).

The above items were inspected and found among your other
properties in your store at the Cape Coast Castle by the
Senior Conservator of Monuments when you started carting them.

In order to maintain the good working relations between the
Ghana Museums and Monuments Board and your esteemed firm we
should be grateful if you could please return the Handrail and
Newel Posts to this office at least by close of work on Friday
October 25, 2002.

Counting on your usual co-operation.

Thanks.

Yours faithfully

/\Hand\ /

REGIONAL DIRECTOR
(REMAYMOND AGBO)

THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
PAABADU CONSTRUCTION LTD
POST OFFICE BOX A.127
CAPE COAST
THE PRINCIPAL ARCHITECT
MODULA GROUP
POST OFFICE BOX 01276
CAPE COAST

LEAKAGE - CAPE COAST CASTLE

Our letter No. AM.0007/Vol.8/93 dated
August 5, 2002 refers (copy attached)

We wish to report once again that immediate measures
should be taken to address the issue of leakage at the Cape Coast
Castle.

We wish to state further that due to infiltration of
rainwater, some parts of the timber decking underneath the
roof covering are fast deteriorating.

We anticipate an urgent reaction to our request this time please.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

REGIONAL DIRECTOR
(RAYMOND AGBO)

cc: The Acting Director
Ghana Museums and Monuments Board
Post Office Box 3343
Accra
MR. MAID-DOMETEY,
MODULA GROUP,
P.O. BOX 0276,
OSU - ACCRA.

Dear Sir,

HISTORIC PRESERVATION PHASE II - CAPE COAST CASTLE ROOFING

This letter is to inform you about roof leakages in the Cape Coast Castle. During the rainy season all roofs on the South-Western wing leaked constantly.

We therefore wish that necessary arrangements be made to rectify the situation. We count on your usual co-operation.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

SENIOR ADMINISTRATOR
(CHARLES KENSAH)

cc: The Director,
ADHOC LTD.,
P.O. Box 1307,
ACCRA.

" The Acting Director,
Ghana Museums and Monuments,
P.O. Box 3343,
ACCRA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount in cedis</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NORSK/STOFART (Norway)</td>
<td>24,177,974</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>14,495,000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Individuals (Cape Coast)</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ICCROM</td>
<td>978,670</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>52,527,000</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>42,265,000</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The under listed also made various donations over the last ten years.

i. Dutch Government

ii. Italian Government

iii. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

iv. United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

v. United Nation Development Program (UNDP)

vi. Midwest University Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA)

vii. Smithsonian Institute (S.I)

viii. Conservation International (C.I.)

ix. Central Regional Development Commission (CEDECOM) and

x. United States International Council of Monuments and Sites (USICMS)