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Executive Summary
The Ghana School Feeding Programme (GSFP) commenced in 2005 with the intermediate objective of reducing hunger and malnutrition; increasing school enrollment, retention and attendance and to boost local food production. The GSFP is an initiative under the comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Pillar 3 seeks to enhance food security and reduce hunger in line with the UN-Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The collaboration between ECASARD/SNV as a local capacity builder necessitated this survey to identify ways of linking the farmers through FBOs to the GSFP as a means of achieving the third objective of the programme i.e. to boost local food production. The objective of the study to establish the level of FBOs /farmers’ engagement in boosting local food production through the GSFP in the Greater Accra Region; this is in accordance with the third objectives of the programme. The study was examined under the following headings; Effectiveness of FBOs in the study area, Farmers’ willingness to market their farm produce to the GSFP, Commonly cultivated crops in the study area and the quantities that farmers are willing to supply to the GSFP and benefit of the GSFP to the farmers.

The data/information for the study was gathered from January to April 2009 by the ECASARD team. The findings shows that; about 66% of the FBOs are registered, and 81% of them meets at least once every month. This shows that they are effective and efficient. The main purpose of cultivation by the farmers was income oriented. About 97% of the farmers are willing to market on the average, 6 (100kg) bags of maize, and 3 (91kg) bags of cassava 7 (52kg) boxes of tomatoes 6 (16 kg) bags of pepper and 7 baskets of okro to the GSFP. Maize, cassava, pepper, tomatoes, beans and other leafy vegetables such as lettuce, cabbage are cultivated in the study area. 21% of the farmers have benefited from the GSFP nevertheless, the only source of benefit was the fact that their children are fed.

The following recommendations are eminent:
• The various stakeholders in the implementation process that is, the District Implementation Committee (DIC), Schools Implementation Committee (SIC) and the matrons should be sensitized about the need to purchase foodstuffs from the community.
• It is also recommended that if farmers/FBOs are represented at SIC level this will ensure and enhance linkages between them and the major stakeholders in the District
Further studies that would capture all the actors in the implementation of the GSFP is required. Their views should be collated and used to review the implementation of the programme so far to ensure participation and benefits for all stakeholders.
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Chapter One

1.0 Background
The GSFP an initiative under the comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Pillar 3 seeks to enhance food security and reduce hunger in line with the UN-Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

In an attempt to reduce poverty, the Government of Ghana (GoG) with support from the Dutch Government commenced the implementation of the Ghana School Feeding Programme (GSFP) in 2005. The objectives of the GSFP are three fold.
1. Increase school enrolment, attendance and retention
2. Reduce hunger and malnutrition
3. Boost domestic food production

The GSFP commenced with 10 pilot schools, selected from each region of the country. By August 2006, the number of schools had been increased to 200 covering about 69,000 pupils in 138 districts\(^1\). The basic concept of the GSFP is to provide pupils with one hot nutritious meal, prepared from home-grown food crops on every school going day.

The Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development has the oversight responsibility for the GSFP. The GSFP has the following as collaborating partners MoFA, MOE, GES, MoH, Strategic Partners (Royal Netherlands Embassy, World Food Programme, Netherlands Development Organization (SNV), Food and Agriculture Organization, etc.)

The Ghana School Feeding Programme (GSFP) is envisaged to become one of the core pillars of poverty reduction in poor rural communities of the country. This will ensure food security at the farmer household level to meet the United Nations (UN) MDG goal of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger.

The strategy to feed school children with locally prepared food that is nutritionally adequate will focus 80% of the programme spending on local foodstuff and therefore cutting down on post harvest losses and provide markets for farm output, impacting the economy at the rural

\(^1\) GSFP Annual Operating Plan 2007
household and community levels. With improved incomes, poor rural households can afford the additional food intake needed to ensure the full complement of nutritional needs that will address the rampant short-term hunger, poor resources farmers/small scale farmers and the problems of ages under – five and maternal malnutrition.

A Farmer Based Organization (FBO) is defined as an organised group of farmers, engaged in production, processing and/or marketing of agricultural products which includes; food crops, livestock and poultry, fisheries, tree crops, agro-forestry, horticultural crops, beekeeping, snail and grass cutter rearing, mushroom production, etc (AgSSIP, 2005). Such groups may be a co-operative registered with the Department of Co-operatives, or a group organized by MOFA or Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) which is registered at the District Administration. For the purpose of the study, FBOs may or may not be registered.

FBOs have always existed in Ghana in one form or another. They range from informal village-level groups to organized groups. The informal village-level groups form the greater proportion. They are promoted by various institutions, including governmental, financial, religious bodies and NGOs. The purpose for which they are formed are diverse and includes disbursement of credit and input packages, enhanced access to agricultural technologies, general up-liftment in the community through engaging in income generating activities, pooling of financial resources, joint marketing and being channels for distribution of governmental development services. For the purpose of this study, establishing the level of FBOs/farmers’ engaging in boosting local food production through the GSFP is a priority, by engagement we mean, ways through which they can market their produce to support the GSFP.

This survey was necessitated out of two reports by Send Ghana and SNV, Ghana in 2008 which indicated that, food for the GSFP was not purchased from farmers within the communities in which the school is situated and much more research was needed in terms of production and income level of the local farmer.

This study will seek to address the following questions:

- To what extent are the FBOs in the study area effective in their farming activities?
• What are the crops and animals that are commonly cultivated by farmers in the study area and are they willing to supply to the GSFP?
• To what extent have the farmers in the study area benefited from the GSFP?
• What recommendations can be made regarding what farmers in the study area can effectively contribute to and benefit from the GSFP

1.1 Main objective
To establish the level of FBOs/farmers’ engagement in boosting local food production through the GSFP

1.1.1 Specific objectives
1. To determine the effectiveness of FBOs in the study area.
2. To identify various crops and animals that the FBOs/farmers produce in the area and are willingness to supply to the GSFP.
3. To determine the extent to which the Farmers in the study area have benefited from the GSFP.
4. To make recommendations based on findings on what the farmers in the study area benefited or can benefit from the GSFP.

1.2. Limitations of the study
This study focused on only farmers without the involvement of other stakeholders such as caterers, even though; they are very important actors in the implementation of the programme. This makes the research one sided (soliciting the views of the small scale farmers, who are at one end of the table.), and so active involvement of the FBOs/farmers would not be easy.

Again due to lack of funds we were unable to reach out to all the farmers in the study area but rather a sample was taken, therefore generalizations made from the sample cannot be the actual representative of the reality on the ground.

The level of literacy of the respondents is low; this resulted in some gaps in the data obtained.
Chapter 2

2.0 Methodology and Study Area

2.1 Introduction
This chapter describes the study area and explains the methods used in the survey. It gives a description of the specific research tools employed and how they were used to collect information for the survey. It also discusses the sampling technique, the survey timeline, as well as type and distribution of the data used for the survey.

2.2 Study Area

The Greater Accra Region is the smallest of the 10 administrative regions in terms of area, occupying a total land surface of 3,245 square kilometres or 1.4 per cent of the total land area of Ghana. In terms of population, however, it is the second most populated region, after the Ashanti Region, with a population of 2,905,726 in 2000, accounting for 15.4 per cent of Ghana’s total population.

The political administration of the region is through the local government system. Under this administration system, the region is divided into ten districts namely, Accra Metropolitan Area, Tema Municipal Area, Ga East District, Ga West District, Dangme East District, Dangme West District, Ledzekuku-Korwor Municipal, Adenta Municipal, Ga South, and Ashiaman. Ledzekuku-Korwor Municipal, Adenta Municipal, Ga South, and Ashiaman are newly created Districts. Each District, Municipal or Metropolitan Area, is administered by a Chief Executive, representing central government but deriving authority from an Assembly headed by a presiding member elected from among the members themselves.
2.2.2 Physical features

It has a coastline of approximately 225 kilometres, stretching from Kokrobite in the west to Ada in the east. The soils have low organic contents with shallow top soils which limit the capacity for crop production. The vegetation is mainly coastal savannah shrubs interspersed with thickets. Some trees are however found mostly in the Dangme West and Ga districts.

The region is relatively dry since it falls within the dry coastal equatorial climatic zone with temperatures ranging between 20° and 30° Celsius and annual rainfall ranging from 635 mm along the coast to 1,140 mm in the northern parts. There are two rainfall peaks notably in June and October. The first rainfall season between April and July is associated with the major cropping season in the region.

With the recent floods during the major season in parts of the region, however, a significant proportion of vegetable farmers are increasingly depending on the minor season (September-October). The region is not well endowed with mineral resources and possesses only granite, clay and salt.

The main rivers that flow through the region are the Volta and Densu. In addition, there are small seasonal streams flowing mostly from the Akwapim Ridge into the sea through numerous lagoons. Because the region is bordered on the south by the Gulf of Guinea, there are ecologically very important but highly polluted lagoons and wetlands in AMA, Tema and Dangme East.

The dredging work on the Korle lagoon in AMA to tap its full potential is ongoing. It should also be mentioned that the Volta River’s estuarine delta is at Ada in the Dangme East District.

2.2.3 Ethnicity

The largest ethnic group in the region is the Akan, comprising 39.8 percent, followed by Ga-Dangme (29.7%) and Ewe (18%). In terms of individual ethnic sub groups, detailed results indicate that the Gas form the single largest sub-group, accounting for 18.9 per cent of the
population. Among the Akan group, the Fantes constitute 10.6 percent, Asantes, 8.3 per cent and Akuapem 4.9 percent (http://www.ghanadistricts.com)

2.2.4 Occupation

The occupational structure shows that 42.0 per cent were engaged in sales and service occupations, with 24.7 per cent as production, transport and equipment operators. As expected, the region has a larger concentration of professional and technical workers (10.8%) compared to the national figure of 6.5 percent. On the other hand, agriculture, animal husbandry and forestry, fishermen and hunters, do not feature as prominently (9.1%) as compared to that for the country (49.1%) (http://www.ghanadistricts.com)

2.2.5 Type of Activity

The major occupation in the Greater Accra region is sales work (30.4%), followed by production, transport operators and related workers (24.7%). The pattern of occupation in Dangme West and Dangme East however is very different from that of AMA, Tema and Ga.

This is due to the geographical location and the administrative nature of the districts. For instance, Tema and AMA are the main gateways to the country for most goods and services. AMA is the seat of government and Ga takes most of the excess population and land pressures from AMA. Activities in these three districts are therefore likely to be similar.

Sales workers are predominant in AMA (34.0%) and Tema (26.8%). For these two districts, the proportion of females is twice that of males. On the other hand, workers in agriculture, animal husbandry, fishermen and hunters constitute the major occupation in Dangme West (50.2%) and Dangme East (52.3%).

In each of these two Dangme districts, a high proportion of males engage in agriculture and related work, the proportion of males being more than half in each district. Sales workers are the second most important occupation in Dangme West (16.4%) and Dangme East (15.4%), with the proportion of females being more than three times that of males.
2.2.6 Agriculture

Mainly due to the small physical size of the Region and the poor nature of the soils and absence of major water bodies, agricultural production does not play a significant role in the economy of the Region but nevertheless the potential exists for agriculture to play an increasingly important role in the Region’s economy. The Region’s major agricultural activities revolve around fishing, crops production, poultry and livestock.

Crops production in the Region centres around the cultivation of staples like maize and cassava, vegetables, bananas and pineapples and is mostly done under rain-fed conditions. There is however an immense potential for irrigation agronomy in the Accra Plains, and the Region has two small-scale irrigation projects at Weija and Dawhenya with a total Capacity of 250 hectares.

Figure 2.1: Map of Greater Accra showing various Districts without four newly created ones
2.3 Methodology

2.3.1 Sampling Technique
Initially, the study was intended to cover FBO in the region. But it later became imperative to administer some questionnaires to small scale farmers in the District as well this was necessary to make the sample a representative of the population, otherwise the study would have been a bias towards members of FBOs. In all, 200 farmers, selected from 32 FBOs from selected communities in 5 Districts (Adenta, Tema, Dangme East, Ga East and Ga West) of the Greater Accra Region were covered by the study.

The selection was also influenced by the active presence of ECASARD network members in these districts. Again these districts have a lot of farming communities; made up of FBOs which can participate in the implementation of the programme. Below is the distribution of the FBOs in the study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of FBOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ga East</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ga West</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenta</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tema</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangme West</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2 Data Collection
Basically, the study employed the use of primary data collected from Small Scale Farmers in the Greater Accra Region through interviews by the use of well structured questionnaire. Both qualitative and quantitative research approaches were used to obtain information for the analysis.

2.3.3 Methods
Both qualitative and quantitative data was gathered through interviews with farmers. A well structured questionnaire was used to collect the data. Both closed and open-ended questions were included (see appendix 1). In addition, focus group discussions such as Community fora organized by ECASARD to sensitize farmers and solicit their views on the GSFP. Findings of the community sensitization report is attached in appendix 3.
Data was then analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

2.3.4  Survey Timeline
The study covered a period of 4 months - from January to April 2009.

2.4.  Data Quality Assurance
Information for the survey was collected by facilitators who were selected members of FBOs in the selected Districts. Prior to the survey, training was organized for these members where the objectives of the survey and research instruments were thoroughly discussed and appraised.

2.5.  Challenges related to the survey
Difficulty in conducting face to face interviews with some members of Farmer Based Organizations because they were too busy to spend some time answering the questionnaires; as a result, in some cases, questionnaires were left and follow ups made later.

Most FBOs in some Districts of the Greater Accra Region have been inactive because they have had most of their farmlands zoned and sold for estate and other development projects and therefore it was very difficult to locate and administer the questionnaire.
Chapter Three

3.0 Findings

3.1. Introduction
This chapter discusses the findings of the study, the socioeconomic characteristics of the farmers, the effectiveness of the FBOs in the study area, the commonly cultivated crops, the farmers’ awareness of the GSFP and their willingness to supply foodstuffs to the GSFP, and finally benefits they have obtained from the GSFP.

3.2. Socio-economic Characteristics of the farmers in the study area
From table 3.1, the average age of the respondents was 47 years, however, majority of the farmers (29%) were between 31 to 50 years, but the combined majority of the respondents i.e. 34% falls between the ages of 30-40 years. This means that most of the youth in the area are still into active farming.

At least 70% of the farmers had formal education up to the junior School level. This will enhance their ability to adopt technologies as well as their understanding of the terms of marketing their foodstuffs.

It can also be noticed, from the table below that; about ninety percent(90%) of the respondents are married, signifying their level of responsibility. Sixty-five percent (65%) of the farmers were males and thirty-five percent (35%) were females. This might be due to the fact that, in a typical Ga community, males are the heads of household and are the prominent decision makers who represented their families on the survey.
Table 3.1: Socio-economic Characteristics of the Farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow/Widower</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS/MSLC</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ECASARD Field survey, April, 2009*

3.3. Effectiveness of FBOs in the study area

On the effectiveness of FBOs, the following indicators were used; registration, presence of executive members, frequency of meetings and payment of dues.

From table 3.2, it is obvious that, out of 200 respondents sampled, 132 of them representing 66% were members of FBOs, which shows that, there is a high level of willingness of the farmers to cooperate among themselves. Moreover, among the 32 FBOs sampled, 21 of them were registered. This is a good indication of their level of commitment. An additional indication is seen in the fact that a greater number of the FBOs meet at least once every month which helps to foster effective communication and cohesiveness within the groups.

As shown in table 3.2, it is worth noting that most of the FBOs sampled seemed effective and efficient.
### Table 3.2: Indicators of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership of an FBO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Meetings</td>
<td>once monthly</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than monthly</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of Dues</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ECASARD Field survey, April, 2009*

### 3.4. Commonly Cultivated Crops

For proper implementation of the idea of involving the farmers or FBOs to supply foodstuffs to the GSFP, it is important to identify the various crops that are commonly grown in the area, this will inform the caterers of where and when to get the foodstuffs for the programme. It will also inform them about some common foodstuffs which may have been neglected over the years but are delicacies which may be considered in the planning or reviewing of menus for the programme.

From the fig 3.1 below, it is apparent that, majority of the farmers do cultivate all year round; i.e. they cultivate in both the major and the minor season. However, there are crops that are usually cultivated during the major season and others that are for the lean season. It is important that, these are treated separately since it will inform the buyers of what may be available to buy/purchase at any point in time.
3.4.1. Major Season Crops
The major rainy season is characterized by large amounts of rainfall which invariably are adequate for crop production; to this effect several crops can be cultivated. From the figure 3.2 below, the commonly cultivated crops in the area which are produced in large quantities are: maize, cassava, pepper, tomatoes and okro. Other crops such as beans, garden eggs, yam, fruits and other leafy vegetables are as well produced in the area but are not in large quantities.

Figure 3.2: Major Season Crops
Source: ECASARD Field survey, April, 2009

Other Crops (Beans, Garden eggs, Yam, Cocoyam, Plantain Mango, Watermelon, Pineapple Cabbage, Lettuce)
3.4.2. Minor Season Crops
This is a period where the rainfall amount is fairly inadequate for the cultivation of most crops except a few crops that can be cultivated without irrigations for example tomatoes, pepper, okro and leafy vegetables. In view of this, maize, pepper, tomatoes and okro are the ones that are mainly cultivated during this season; cassava did not feature because planting is done during this period. This is shown in figure 3.3 below show

![Figure 3.3: Dry Season Crops](image)

*Source: ECASARD Field survey, April, 2009*

*Other Crops (Beans, Garden eggs, Yam, Cocoyam, Plantain Mango, Watermelon, Pineapple Cabbage, Lettuce)*

3.4.2.1 Purpose of cultivation
Table 3.5 explains the purpose for which the farmers produce these crops, and it is evident that, home consumption and sale are the predominant reasons for the production of these crops; of which 92% indicated that the purpose of their cultivation is to market the produce. This shows that in their quest for increased income, the farmers gave priority to the sale of their produce as a main purpose of their production.
Table 3.5: The Main Purpose of Cultivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>Yes 12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 188</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Consumption</td>
<td>Yes 133</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 67</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>Yes 40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 160</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>Yes 184</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ECASARD Field survey, April, 2009

It is therefore obvious that, crops such as maize, cassava, pepper, okro, beans and tomatoes can be obtained from the small scale farmers in the communities involved in the GSFP

3.4.3. Willingness to supply
This section looks at the extent to which the farmers are willing to supply their foodstuffs to the GSFP. An overwhelming majority (97%) of the farmers are willing to supply their foodstuffs to the GSFP if an opportunity is created through well defined linkages between DIC, SIC and caterers.

Table 3.6 Willingness to Supply to the GSFP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quantities of produce that were produced by the farmers are displayed in table 3.6 below. From the table, out of the 200 farmers sampled from the region, an average of 10 (100kg) bags of maize, 18 (91kg) bags of cassava, 9 (52kg) boxes, 6 (16 kg) bags of pepper, and 25 baskets of okro were the quantities obtained per farmer per season.
Table 3.7: Quantities of Crops per season per farmer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>10 bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>18 bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>9 boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>6 bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okro</td>
<td>25 baskets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ECASARD Field survey, April, 2009
*These are marketable quantities produced by the farmers.

Table 3.8 shows the quantities of produce farmers are willing to supply to GSFP per season. They were willing to supply an average of 6 (100kg) bags of maize, 3 (91kg) bags of cassava, and 7 (52kg) boxes of tomatoes 5 (16 kg) bags of pepper, and 6 baskets of okro per farmer per season to the GSFP. It indicates that, generally they are willing to supply about 60% of their produce to the GSFP should the market be created. If the farmers within the area are aware of the availability of market for their produce, they will increase their production in order to get more income and by so doing, boost local food production in the area.

Table 3.8: Quantities of Crops willing to supply to GSFP per season per farmer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>6 bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>3 bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>7 boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>6 bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okro</td>
<td>7 baskets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ECASARD Field survey, April, 2009
*These are quantities they are actually ready to market to the GSFP

3.5 Commonly Reared Animals

The animals that are commonly reared in the study area include; goats, sheep, fowl, grasscutter, and rabbits. However, these are in small quantities are not for sale but used as securities; they are sold only when there is an emergency. The farmers were reluctant to sell their animals to the GSFP since they cannot ensure their constant supply since is mostly used
as security. In view of this when it comes to animals for the GSFP then, the caterers can look at areas beyond the districts covered.

3.6. Benefits of the GSFP to the farmers
This objective seeks to determine whether the farmers in the study area do benefit from the GSFP; if they do then how does the programme benefit them. Table 3.7 illustrates that, 122 of the farmers representing about 61% of them are aware of the GFSP, although they do not have adequate knowledge about the various actors involved, their roles and responsibilities. However, the media has played a significant role in their awareness.

It is interesting to note that, Small Scale farmers have not had any profound benefit from the GSFP. In table 3.7, it is evident that, only 21% of the farmers have benefited from the GSFP nevertheless, the only source of benefit was the fact that their children are fed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the GSFP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Knowledge</td>
<td>Electronic media</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Print Media</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family and Friends</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seen pupils being fed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefited from the GSFP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you benefit</td>
<td>Food for our kids</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply of foodstuffs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ECASARD Field survey, April, 2009*

3.7 Key Challenges of the Farmers
The major challenges that the farmers are facing comprise; lack of access to credit/loan, Lack of access to ready market, Pests and Diseases, High cost of inputs and Lack of access to Machinery services.

3.8 Farmers’ Fears
In their bid to supply to the GSFP, the farmers expressed certain fears theses includes;
• The fear that the caterers might buy on credit and if they do, payments might delay
• The fear that the prices of the foodstuffs will not be the same as the going market price
• Again they expressed the fear that if they should produce for the GSFP and they refuse to absorb the produce they will be worse off
• The fear that when there is a glut, caterers will divert their attention to other markets.
Chapter Four

4.0 Conclusion
The results shows that, more than 70% of the FBOs in the study area are effective; this can be seen from the way most of them are registered, meet at least once a month, have properly elected executives and regular payment of dues. The farmers cultivate all year round hence constant supply of the produce can be assured. The commonly cultivated crops that the farmers in the area are willing to market are maize, cassava, pepper, tomatoes, beans, okro and other leafy vegetables because the study area falls within the coastal savanna where most of these crops are cultivated.

Again 92% of the farmers said they cultivate purposely to sell with 97% of them willing to market their produce to the GSFP. Sixty-one (61%) of respondents have heard of the GSFP and this was mainly through the electronic media, however, only 21% of them have benefited from the programme. The only benefit has been that children of respondents are fed at school.

5.0 Recommendations
As regards the conclusions of the study, the third objective of the programme which seeks to boost the domestic food production seems a reality since most of the food stuffs that are mentioned in the GSFP manual are cultivated in these farming communities. This is also a step in the right direction since it will lead to an increase in the output of the farmers thereby improve their livelihood.

Further studies that would cover all the actors in the implementation of the GSFP is required. Their views should be collated and used to review the implementation of the programme so far to ensure participation and benefits for all stakeholders.

It is also recommended that if farmers/FBOs are represented at SIC level this will ensure and enhance linkages between them and the major stakeholders in the District.

This will surely help to achieve or meet the third objective of the programme which will eventually result in alleviating rural poverty. Again it will also ensure commitment and responsibility of all the stakeholders in the successful implementation of the GSFP.
6.0 Way Forward

1. All food items for the programme should be obtained from small scale farmers in the country so as to pursue the objective of home grown school feeding programme
2. Farmer Based Organizations (FBOs) should form commodity clusters
3. All food supplies to the GSFP (school) should be purchased from the commodity clusters within the community/District
4. Commodity clusters should ensure constant supply of food products to the GSFP. (This will involve signing of MoU with the District Assembly to involve them in purchase and supply of produce)
5. Implementation of the value chain concept
6. Mechanism for guaranteed commodity prices should be established.
7. Promotion and establishment of School farms
8. Introduction of Peri-Urban Agriculture
9. To introduce a low intensive Agricultural Technology in the area to ensure increase productivity

Although it is obvious that the GSFP do contribute to the Ghanaian economy in diverse ways, the extent of its contribution in quantitative terms to the economy has not yet been explored. However, such information will be important to policy makers, development partners and others.

In view of this, ECASARD has designed this instrument (see Appendix 4) which can be used to capture such contribution so that GSFP’s contribution through agriculture to the economy can be quantified.

What must be done?

1. Formation and strengthening of FBOs
2. Building capacities of FBOs in the areas of
   i. Group dynamics
   ii. Skills acquisition
   iii. Agro business / value chain program
   iv. Sensitization of farmers on GSFP
v. Advocacy and lobbying

vi. Gender awareness creation

vii. Modern technologies and efficient farming practices/Post harvest loses
### Appendix 1: Questionnaire for Baseline Survey

1. Name of Facilitator:  
2. Date:  
3. Name of village:  
4. Community:  
5. District:  
6. Region:  
7. Type of Community:  
   1. Urban  
   2. Mixed Urban/Peri-Urban  
   3. Predominantly Agricultural/Rural  
8. Name of Household Head:  
9. Age:  
10. Sex:  
   1. Male  
   2. Female  
11. Education:  
   1. Primary  
   2. Secondary  
   3. Tertiary  
   4. No Education  
   5. Other (Specify)  
12. Religion:  
   1. Christian  
   2. Moslem  
   3. Traditionalist  
   4. Other (Specify)  
13. Marital Status:  
   1. Single  
   2. Married  
   3. Divorced  
   4. Other (Specify)  
14. Family Size:  
   1. 1-3  
   2. 4-6  
   3. 7-9  
   4. Other (Specify)  
15. How many household members do farm work?  
   1. Adults  
   2. Children below 15yrs  
16. What is the main function of your farm?  
   1. Food  
   2. Income  
   3. Both  
17. How much of the household food supply comes from the farm?  
   1. Most  
   2. About Half  
   3. Less than Half  
18. Which crops/animals do you grow/rear per year?  
   Rainy season:  
   Acres/Number  
   Dry Season:  
   Acres/Number  
19. Which additional crops would you like to produce/rear?  
20. How do you use produce from the above crops/animals?  
   1. Home Consumption  
   2. Sale  
   3. Processing  
   4. Storage  
21. What methods do you use for storage?  
   1. Shed  
   2. Warehouse  
22. Who decides how crops produced are to be used?  
   1. Husband/Man  
   2. Wife/Woman  
   3. Both  
23. Who markets the food crops/animals?  
   1. Husband/Man  
   2. Wife/Woman  
   3. Other (Specify)  
24. Do you cultivate crops all year round?  
   1. Yes  
   2. No  
25. What is the size of your farm (acres/hectares) approximately?  
26. Who owns the land?  
   1. Freehold  
   2. Leasehold  
   3. Other (Specify)  
27. How is the soil fertility in your area?  
   1. Poor  
   2. Adequate  
   3. Good  
28. What is the yield of your produce/year?  
   (Approximate)  
29. Have you heard/know about the GSEP?  
   1. Yes  
   2. No  
29a. If yes, Specify
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Have you in any way benefited from GSFP activities in your community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30a. If yes, indicate benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Do you supply food crops/animals to the GSFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31a. If yes specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crop/animals</strong></td>
<td>Quantity/Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Will you be willing to supply crop produce/animals to the GSFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32a. If yes, specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crop/animals</strong></td>
<td>Quantity/Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Are you a member of an FBO?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33a. If yes, indicate the name of the FBO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33b. How many members do you have?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33c. Is your Organization registered?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33ci. If yes, indicate date of registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33d. What is the main type of activity/commodity of the organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33e. Do you have Executive Members?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33f. How often do you meet as an FBO?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33g. Do you pay monthly dues/how do you finance the activities of the FBO/group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. If No, Will you be willing to form/join a FBO with other farmers with the same objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. What are the key Challenges in your production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If no, go to Ques 34*
## Appendix 2: List of FBOs Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>FBOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ga West</strong></td>
<td>Amamorley Vegetable Grower Association, Kojo Ashong Estraining Agric Ventures, Kwashikuma Vegetable Growers Association and Okusibiade Vegetable Growers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dangme West</strong></td>
<td>Agomeda Farmers Association, Dangme west mango Association, Kordiabe Vegetable Growers Association, Nyemsoum Farmers Association, Agomeda, Sota Gari Women’s Co-operative and Power Pineapple Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adenta</strong></td>
<td>Amanfrom Women's Gari processing, Cattle Farmers Association Ehi Farmers Group, Frafraha Farmer's Group, Nmiadjor Farmers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tema</strong></td>
<td>Ebenezer Women’s Group, Gonyiten Farmers Association, Mokoledze Farmers Association, New Change Women Farming Group and Okushibri Commercial Crops and Vegetable Farmers Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Findings from the sensitization programme on the GSFP

1.1 Selection criteria
It was observed that most communities visited were not aware of the mode of selection of schools for the programme. Some schools in the Ga West District met the criteria for selection to participate in the program yet they were not selected. This is a reminder to the GSFP to ensure that the selection criteria being used is adhered by the DICs and DAs

Criteria for selection of Communities/ Schools

- Willingness of community to put up basic infrastructure (e.g. Kitchen, store room, latrines) and to contribute in cash or kind
- Commitment of the District assembly toward the programme and the level of readiness and interest towards sustaining the programme
- Poverty index by GLSS data and NDPC poverty mapping
- Low school enrolment and/or attendance rate and gender parity index
- High drop-out rate
- Low literacy levels
- Presence or planned provision/expansion of health and nutrition interventions
- Communities/school not already covered by other feeding programmes
- Poor access to potable water
- High communal spirit and/or community management capability

Source: GSFP operations manual, 2008

1.2 Selection of Cooks
Community members were not aware of the selection procedure for cooks. They were ignorant about the qualification needed to be a cook and the recruitment process. Community members did not know the whereabouts of the matron/cooks. Women in the communities of the sensitization exercise expressed the desire to be cooks whenever the GSFP became functional in those communities.
1.3 Decentralization (DIC&SIC)
The DICs and SICs which are committee’s setup to implement activities at the Districts are
not in place. The Adenta Municipality has its DIC inaugurated and one School also has got
its SIC in place. Unfortunately, the members of the SIC committee are not aware of their
roles and responsibilities in the feeding programme.
The questions that need to be answered are how the schools, matrons and cooks are selected
are whether it is it the core function of the DAs or the DICs to do the selection.

1.4 Farmers’ role in GSFP and assistance
Most of the farmers in the GSFP benefiting communities are not aware that their farm
produces are to be purchased by the programme and so no efforts are put in place. Their
produces are not purchased by the matrons/cooks for the preparation of foods. The farmers
expressed confidence and optimism that they could supply the Feeding Programme with the
needed foodstuffs.

1.5 Community Ownership/Involvement
Community ownership of the feeding programme is not visible. Most benefiting communities
visited are not aware of the schools benefiting from the programme. Some expressed surprise
and wondered why the elders of the communities were not informed of the programme. The
communities seemed not bothered about the programme and think it is a government and
donor owned.

1.6 Knowledge on GSFP Activities
It was observed that communities’ knowledge on their roles and responsibilities as
stakeholders of the GSFP was found to be unsatisfactory. Community sensitization on GSFP
activities were not carried out initially before the programme commenced. Communities are
of the opinion that sensitization on activities of GSFP be carried out so that they are better
placed to play their roles.
1.7.1 Food Delivery
It was reported by most communities that the food served was of poor quality, insufficient and delayed in arriving at the schools. School children had sometimes washed their plates as serving plates were inadequate contrary to the provisions in the operation manual.

2.0 Case studies

2.1 Madam Fatima’s Experience
At the Pantang community school, a village in the Ga East District of the Greater Accra Region which had been selected as one of the schools to benefit from the School Feeding Programme in February 2009 is without a School Implementation Committee (SIC). Again the Pantang community is not aware that the community school had been brought on board the GSFP.

Ms Fatima Addy, who is an opinion leader at Pantang and also a leading member of the Abooman Women’s Group a Farmer Based Organization of the ECASARD network at Pantang observed the deficiency/anomaly. Ms Fatima participated in the Training of Trainers (ToT) workshop organized by SNV/ECASARD on the role of FBO’s in the implementation of GSFP for some selected FBOs in five Districts of the Greater Accra Region on 11th February 2009.

Ms Addy after the ToT Workshop observed that the matron and the cooks lived far away from Pantang and food prepared for the community school was always served late and very often inadequate. As a result and most invariably some primary six pupils are not served because by the time the food is served from the lower classes to the higher classes reached them, it got finished.

Since Pantang Community school feeding had been assigned to the matron who catered for Abokobi schools, the workload and the number of pupils catered for by the matron had increased hence the issue of inadequacy of food and time of service. In addition the Pupils of Pantang Community School have been asked to pay one Ghana cedis per pupil for the use of the Abokobi’s school Kitchen facility which the school authorities have refused to pay.
In view of the above development, Mad Fatima Addy and Ms Charlotte Armah members of ECASARD and facilitators of SNV/ECASARD sensitization programme on the GSFP engaged the National Secretariat GSFP in March 2009 to get the issues confronting the community resolved.

Assurances given by an Officer of the National Secretariat to address the issues as soon as possible and got the DIC and SIC formed by the end of March had not been addressed.

As at the end of April, the issues raised continue to persist. It is our opinion that the DICs and the SICs; which are mandated to manage the GSFP at the District and School levels respectively are very important institutions/committees of the GSFP and must be formed immediately.

2.2 Case Study 2: Frafraha Community
In this community, the Schools feeding programme was on going. Both DICs and SICs were in place. They expressed disappointment in the DIC for the fact that before the inception of the programme in the community, they were contracted to submit names of cooks/matrons from the community which they did. The DIC sidelined all their nominees and brought in different people outside the community to cook the food.
According to them what has worsened the issue was that names they submitted were women who already sold food in the school. These women stopped their work to cook for the GSFP and are now without jobs.
They are also not aware that the foodstuffs are to be bought from the community and are buying the food from outside the community.
The community is also supporting the programme by providing water since its inception .The community buys water for the programme on school days. This shows community’s commitment and willingness to support the GSFP.

2.3 Case Study 3: Ashale Botwe
The programme started in the school in December 2008. As at April 2009 the community members were not aware their school was benefiting. The community was not sensitized on
what they could offer and also benefit as farmers. The members wondered why they were not sensitized to save them some money since they would have decreased the amount of money given to the children for school and invest in other areas. There is no SIC in place.

Listening to some complaints and stories regarding the inadequacy of the DICs to inform the communities of the GSFP, we are of the opinion that the sensitization exercise or outreach programme will be phenomenal to ensure accountability, transparency and commitment of all stakeholders in the implementation of GSFP.

3.0 Conclusion
The GSFP has come to stay and is a fact. It can help the country achieve the MDGs 1 and 2 and increase local food production. Guidelines concerning its implementation should be strictly followed to ensure its sustainability. The various committees (DIC, SIC) should be established and functional. This will ensure problems associated with selection of cooks are addressed. Selection criteria for schools seemed not followed. Guidelines for selection should be followed to ensure communities that really need the programme benefit.

Community ownership and involvement is crucial in the sustenance of the programme. This will also ensure transparency and accountability by the implementers of the programme. These communities will demand accountability from programme implementers and also provide the support required to the programme when they begin to feel a sense of ownership.

Building the capacities of all the various stakeholders is essential to ensure the programme sustainance. The farmers’ role in supplying food to the programme is key in increasing local food production and reducing hunger and poverty among the rural populace. Farmers’ awareness and involvement in the programme is not clearly visible. Farmers in benefiting communities should be sensitized on their roles and rights concerning the programme so that they demand such from implementers. The Chief Farmer in the communities should be a member of the SIC to help organize the farmers and liaise with the matrons/cooks to work out modalities for purchasing of farm produce.
The GSFP holds one of the keys to unlocking the door of extreme poverty and hunger, increasing school enrolment and food security in the country. This will help our children’s children to grow and eat what they grow. We would then produce what we eat and eat what we grow. Efforts should be placed more on the Rights based approach which involves making communities aware about their roles and responsibilities in holding the government accountable.

4.0 Recommendations/Way forward

- Abridged version of operations manual should be made available to stakeholders and communities as a reference material. It should contain roles and responsibilities of implementers and what they are to do when challenges crop up/ arise.

- Sensitization of key stakeholders and community should be a prerequisite for the introduction of the programme to a community to ensure ownership, transparency and accountability of implementers.

- Modalities of procurement of foodstuffs from local farmers should be clearly laid out after various consultations with all stakeholders in the District.

- Support should be given to GSFP in building the capacities of DIC, SIC for the committees to be functional and effective.

- In communities that have benefited from other feeding programmes in the past, must be given priority in selection since some have the required infrastructure and are committed to support the programme.

- In adjacent communities’ schools, commencement of the programme should start concurrently to avoid the movement of pupils from one school to another and create the false impression that enrolment has increased.
Appendix 4: Questionnaire to solicit the value of foodstuffs purchased by caterers of the GSFP

1. District……………………… Questionnaire no………..
2. Name of School……………….
3. Name of community…………..
4. Date:…………………
5. Period(Month, week etc)……………..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity purchased</th>
<th>Unit price(GH¢)</th>
<th>Total amt spent(GH¢)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maize</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes for the unit

1. Number
2. Bags(100kg)
3. Bags (16kg)
4. Bags(91kg)
5. Baskets
6. Bottles
7. Gallons
8. Boxes(52kg)
9. Others( please specify)