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Executive summary

Introduction

The Ghana School Feeding Programme (GSFP) is a combined initiative from the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), the Government of Ghana (GOG) and the Government of the Netherlands as a part of Ghana’s measures to reach the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). In the GSFP pupils in selected public primary schools get a healthy lunch every school-going day to increase enrolment, retention and attendance, and to increase the health of the children. Besides, the programme also aims at boosting domestic food production and the reduction of poverty by the home-grown component of the GSFP. It does so by providing ready-market for the local farmers in the communities of the beneficiary programme schools.

Since the pilot in 2005 the programme has grown rapidly and now covers about 600,000 children at some 1000 schools. Although it has been too early for impact studies, evaluations of the implementation and functioning of the programme have provided positive and negative results. On the one hand, enrolment and attendance are increasing as a result of the implementation of the GFSP but on the other hand, strengthening the local food network by purchase from local farmers is far below expectation. Some studies about the GSFP did report and attempted to explain the limited market relation between the GSFP and local farmers in beneficiary communities, in particular in terms of problems that are faced by farmers in Ghana and problems in the institutional arrangement of the programme. This study aims at obtaining a comprehensive picture of the situation at local level, including both the GSFP schools and the farmers. To put the local situation in the proper context, a more general evaluation is executed as well. Consequently, opportunities for the strengthening of the relation between the GSFP caterers and local farmers can be identified in order to change the GSFP into a sustainable and endogenous structure of the local market mechanisms in Ghana.

Objectives

The overall aim of this study was to: Investigate possibilities to strengthen the collaboration between schools and local farmers in the Ghana School Feeding Program by studying the functioning of the programme at community/local level.

The following objectives were set-up:

1. To assess the functioning of the GSFP, in schools with a strong relation and collaboration with local farmers and in schools with a weak relation and collaboration with local farmers.
2. To investigate the factors and arguments from the schools and farmers which limit or facilitate the school-farmer relation and collaboration within the GSFP.
3. To point out aspects of the programme design and functioning that limit or facilitate the school-farmer relationship, particularly at local level.
4. Formulate specific recommendations to strengthen the school-farmer relation/collaboration, e.g. in terms of policies, changes in GSFP design/functioning or any type support.

Methodology
In this study, extensive case studies of GSFP-schools were combined with a general evaluation of the programme. Three different district/municipal assemblies were included in the study, and in these districts/municipals a total of seven GSFP schools were studied. Different people involved in the programme were interviewed at different governmental levels and at the schools and observation of programme activities provided valuable complementary data. The data were analysed using a coding-system, which were later specified into sub-codes. The combination of macro- and micro-information in respect to the programme provided clear insight in the functioning of the GSFP and the encountered difficulties.

Results
Feeding of the children is happening on a daily basis in the visited schools, partly due to the highly motivated caterers of the programme. However, the large majority of the food is not bought from local farmers but at the market or from food suppliers. This limited market relation between caterers of the programme and local farmers is caused by a combination of problems in the programme functioning and issues linked to the role of either caterers or farmers. For caterers the practical benefits, in terms of time, money, availability and credit possibilities, of buying from other sources explain their limited efforts to buy from local farmers. Besides, their role in the programme is focused on feeding the children, which means that buying from local farmers is not a priority for them. Farmers are, due to the limited demand of the GSFP, combined with their farming situation at the moment and difficult credit options, still dependent on market traders. These problems are all, partly or entirely, linked to the overall functioning of the programme. There is low community participating and ownership due to malfunctioning of the School Implementation Committee (SIC) and District Implementation Committee (DIC). The problems with the latter also cause the Ministry of Food and Agriculture not to be involved. An underlying cause for this is the lack of binding agreements between collaborating ministries and the National Secretariat (NS) of the GSFP. Furthermore, a major limiting factor for local purchase is the delay in fund release and to a lesser extent, the caterer model that is used.
This snapshot of some of the most important results about why there is low local purchase show that the local market situation is not facilitating local purchase by caterers. Besides, GSFP efforts to create a favourable situation for caterers and farmers to build a business relation have been low. The results also show that a development approach, as was taken in the analysis of the overall programme functioning, is not assisting in integrating the GSFP into the local market systems in Ghana. Coming back to the objective; identifying opportunities to improve the relation between the GSFP and local farmers, results in an addition to this aim, namely creating a favourable situation for the business relation
between caterers and farmers that will facilitate the integration of the GSFP as an endogenous element into the local market structures in Ghana.

The opportunities for improvement that were identified, based on the results of the study, are separated into three categories:

1) **Actors;** in terms of actors the role of the SIC and DIC should be changed or their roles should be taken over by other, more promising, committees. Besides, the position of the caterers needs to be redefined.

2) **Unexploited resources;** in terms of unused resources a major opportunity is the linking role agricultural extension officers could play in the programme. Moreover, farmers could set-up professional farmer groups to take over the role of the middle-men. Together, this pro-active position of farmers and the support of extension officers have great potential. Last, linking caterers with suppliers of nationally produced food has the opportunity to boost the investment in the national economy.

3) **Binding agreements and guidelines;** in terms of binding agreements the involvement of MOFA could be ensured by drawing binding agreements between this ministry and the NS at national level. In terms of guidelines, clear guidelines about local purchase for caterers are a practical and relatively easy option to boost local purchase.

**Discussion**

An important conclusion of the combined results is that the GSFP is an exogenous product; and to make it an autonomous and sustainable product, the GSFP needs to be incorporated in the financial system of the local markets in the communities. Local ownership of the programme is likely to cause people to make decision in favour of the programme and moreover, the GSFP can have wide implications for local farmers than only the economical benefit of an increasing demand which may lead to farming expansion. Still, the economic importance for individual should never be underestimated. Consequently, and although the general results of this study are similar to other studies about the role of farmers in the GSFP not mentioned before, the GSFP should aim at creating favourable market conditions for the business relation between the caterers and farmers.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations are direct measures that can be executed to strengthen the relation between farmers and caterers, increase local purchase and make the situation for the market relation between caterers and farmers more favorable;

Institutional recommendations:

1) Draw binding agreements between the GSFP and the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.
2) Provide caterers with guidelines about food purchase.
3) Separate allowances for caterers and cooks from feeding money and pay them directly from DA.

4) Link caterers with food suppliers and/or farmer groups that supply nationally produced food items that do not grow in all parts of the country.

5) Put in place a nutritionist who, in collaboration with caterers, makes menu which are based on food which is locally available.

6) Farmers in Ghana should set up functioning Farmers’ Groups to strengthen their position on the market.

7) The GSFP should be integrated in the network of the agricultural extension officers of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.
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1. Background information and study rationale

1.1 Introduction: The Ghana School Feeding Program and Poverty Reduction

The Ghana School Feeding Program (GSFP) was an initiative of the New Partnership for Africa’s development (NEPAD), together with the governments of Ghana and the Netherlands. The program is part of the measures aiming to achieve the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (UN MDGs) concerning hunger, poverty and primary education (AOP, 2008). The program started in 2005 with 10 pilot schools in different regions of the country and the implementation period runs until the end of 2010, when the aim is to include over one million children (GOG, 2006). The basic concept of the GSFP is to provide children going to kindergartens and primary schools in the poorest regions of the country with a hot and nutritious meal at school (GOG, 2006).

The overall objective of the GSFP is to ‘Contribute to Poverty Reduction and Food security’. More specifically, the objectives of the program are three-fold. First, the program aims at the traditional objectives of school feeding programs (SFP); increasing school enrolment, attendance and retention rates. Second, the program aims at reducing hunger and malnutrition among children going to public kindergartens and primary schools. The third objective of the program is to strengthen food production networks (AOP 2008). This has to be achieved by the home-grown component of the program which means the schools provide a market for the agricultural products of farmers in the community. On the long run, this aspect of the program aims at structurally strengthening the local food production and consumption network within the participating communities. This in turn has the potential to boost domestic food production and increase the food sovereignty of the country (Quaye, 2007).

As pointed out before, the program is still in its implementation period. Still, positive results concerning the ‘classic’ objectives of SFP have been observed. Different monitoring reports, from NGOs like SNV, GAIN and WFP but also the annual reports of the GSFP itself, reported increased figures concerning pupil enrolment and attendance at the beneficiary schools of the program, compared with schools not serving meals. Still, there are problems with the level of nutrients in the meals, the system in which caterers provide the meals and, looking at higher governmental levels, with the overall governance of the program (SEND, 2008; WFP, 2007; GOG, 2008). The major problem however has to do with the objective to strengthen local food networks. Studies and monitoring showed that the market relation between schools and farmers, in which the GSFP schools provide a ready-market for the supply of the agricultural products of the local farmers, is generally weak and little business between them is taking place (SEND, 2008; WFP, 2007). Recent studies done on this topic have focused on arguments for this weak collaboration on the side of the farmers in this respect, i.e. farmer-related problems with producing for the GSFP. This study aims at investigating the weak school-farmer relation/collaboration within the GSFP, meaning the side of the schools and the overall programme is taken into account, in order to come up with possibilities for
improving the relation, which are both practical and effective for the local situation. Therefore, the objective of this research is to investigate possibilities to strengthen the relation and collaboration between schools and local farmers in the Ghana School Feeding Program by studying the functioning of the program at community/local level.

1.2 History and rationale for School Feeding Programs

School feeding programs are not new. In the last decades of the 20th century there have been different forms of projects in countries all over the world where children received food at school, aiming at reducing malnutrition and/or improving learning abilities. Already in 1986, a review of school feeding program evaluations showed moderate positive results in terms of enrolment, attendance, health and performance in class (Levinger, 1986). Over the years several arguments against SFP have been presented. First, it was argued that children who start school are already past the critical years of growth, when nutritious food is most essential for physical development. Besides, children who are not healthy/good enough to go to school are no reached with SFP. In recent years however, education is recognized as being essential for human and economic development. Next, several SFP projects have been criticized for not being sustainable since they were dependant on imported food. On the other hand, there are people who claim that this food from outside the country is an offset for further development. Other people prefer the possibility of running SFP locally, meaning the food for the project is produced in the county itself, preferably at local level. For this to be feasible however, adequate resources are needed (Roger and Coates, 2002). The GSFP categorises as a programme belonging to the latter group since of the main pillars of the project is to buy locally produced products for the meals. Indeed, as will become abundantly clear in this report, the availability of a great variety of resources largely determines the success of the programme in this respect.

Overall, SFP, and in particular HGSFP, are increasingly popular. The WFP for example puts major efforts in supporting feeding projects. Around the beginning of this year the WFP supported SFP in 70 countries worldwide, form which 40 in Africa alone (WFP Fact sheet).

Originally, the main arguments to start SFP were to decrease malnutrition and improve health among school-going children. The rationale behind this is that malnutrition and hunger negatively affect brain behaviour and cognitive capacities, i.e. leading to low educational outcomes. Also children’s’ access to school, attendance and behaviour in class and affected by hunger (WFP, 2006).

There has been extensive research into the classic objectives of school feeding programs, reducing hunger and malnutrition and, increasing enrolment, attendance and retention. Several studies have shown these the results of SFP in different contexts:
• In Peru, SFP providing breakfast at school increased school attendance and lowered drop-out rates. Furthermore, the health status of the included children improved and their cognitive functions increased as well (Jacoby, 1998).

• Studies about several SFP in Jamaica showed that the cognitive functions of pupils improved. However, during these studies it also became clear that other school characteristics, such as proper organization and physical facilities, greatly affect the outcomes and impact of SFP (Grantham-McGregor et al, 1998). This means that solely providing food is not enough to gain positive results and that other aspects of the school and education, e.g. skills of teachers, toilet facilities etc, need to be included in the programs. Particularly since generally SFP lead to increased enrolment, which in turn worsens these problems, these complementary services/facilities should be targeted to gain optimal results.

• The WFP was one of the major initiators of worldwide SFP in recent years. From 2002 to 2005 this organization studied more than 4,000 schools in 32 counties in sub-Saharan Africa, covering over 1 million pupils. The results from this study showed that providing food at school positively affects the enrolment, in particular in the first year of the program in which the absolute enrolment increased with an average of 28% for girls and 22% for boys. After the first year only programs which also include take-home ratios for girls still saw increasing enrolment of girls of about 30% annually. At schools who only gave children food at school, so-called on-site feeding programs, the increase in enrolment of pupils went back to what they were before the program started (WFP, 2006).

1.3 Food Security and local food networks

Data on the overall status of food security of Ghana are varying. Statistics about 2006 indicate that Ghana was to a large extent self-sufficient in producing food, meaning that the quantity of food that was produced nationally came close to being enough to feed the country (WFP, 2007). In 2006, and in the 15 years before that, commercially imported and aid food made up about 4.7% of the countries’ total need (GoG, 2006). Still, although enough food may have been present in the country, insufficient resources cause a lack of food in households (WFP, 2007). In contrast, information from MOFA in FADEP II states that the country is by far not sufficient in terms of food production. Data presented show that Ghana produces 51% of its cereal needs, 60% of the total demand for fish, 50% of the meat that is needed and 30% of other raw materials that can be processed in agro-based industries. Furthermore, for several crops the production is insecure as the growth and survival of these plants are largely determined by e.g. the weather. These crops include vegetables such as tomatoes and unions, and products such as roots and tubers (FASDEP II, 2007). Consequently, one year the demand for these crops may be met whereas in other years the supply is too low and products have to be imported or there is unavailability.
Food insecurity in the country is one of the important arguments for investing in (local) agricultural development. Development in terms of growth, technology and product-quality of the agricultural sector in Ghana is also essential for national and regional development. Extended activities such as transport, (food) processing and the increasing demands and incomes of farmers lead to reduced poverty and higher rate of economical growth (FASDEP II, 2007). Moreover, farming has the potential to create jobs and to increase the returns of the resources of the poor, e.g. labour and land. Besides, this can lead to a decrease in food staple prices, which is important as the majority of the buyers of the food are poor (Quaye, 2008). Linked to the importance of agricultural development for national food-security is the fact that 50.6% of the labour force in the country is directly engaged in the agricultural sector (according to a census from 2000). It is estimated that 2.74 million households are dependant on agriculture for their livelihood, either with farming crops or keeping livestock. Besides, 90% of all farmers are small-scale farmers with less than 2 hectares of land (FASDEP II, 2007). Moreover, at the moment the output/production of agriculture in Ghana is relatively low taking into the account that farming is the main form of employment in the country. Since the year 2000, the contribution of agriculture to the total Ghanaian GDP varied between 35.8 and 37%. From 2000 to 2005, agricultural growth increased from 4 to 6%, however this is mainly caused by the cocoa industry. For food security and poverty reduction in rural areas, the capacity of small-scale farmers needs to be strengthened, in order to create sustainable production, leading to economic development and wealth within the agricultural communities (GOG, 2006).

The existing food insecurity together with the importance of the agricultural sector for poverty reduction and occupation clearly demonstrate the need for the development of a strong food network. Moreover, since the large majority of the farmers have small-scale businesses in rural areas, strengthening local food networks essential to reach the objectives of reducing poverty and food security among the population of Ghana. The Ministry of Food and Agriculture defines food security as “good quality and nutritious food, hygienically packaged, attractive presented, available in sufficient quantities all year round and located at the right place at affordable price (FASDEP, 2003).

An important, but relatively new, approach to hunger and poverty reduction is food sovereignty. About a decade ago, there was a decreasing believe that hunger was mainly caused by a lack of food and there was an increasing believe that the conventional measures and policies to solve the problem of hunger were not effective. Food sovereignty developed as a new food policy framework that should be more efficient and that would address the needs of the poor. This approach uses the human right approach, so the right of all people to basic need such as food, as a tool to achieve its goals. The concept of food sovereignty therefore is a political and legal concept, more than for example a development tool. Linked to the fundamental concept that people have rights is the idea that people at local level, meaning the farmers who actually produce the food, should be in control over the productive resources, including (new) (bio) technologies. The latter is an important aspect since, when new technologies would still be owned by multinational companies they would continue to control food production. Other important arguments in the debate for the...
The concept of food sovereignty is imbedded in the GSFP, which makes this program different than several other school feeding programs. The GSFP is set up to have wider implication for farmers, besides the direct objectives related to children going to school. To strengthen local food production and consumption systems the GSFP uses locally grown food, such as maize, rice, soybean, cowpea etc. Also, objectives are to reduce post harvest losses, provide a market for the farm products and support farmers in increasing their production. Ultimately, these combined measures should lead to enhanced food sovereignty (Quaye, 2007).

Practically, the guidelines of the GSFP said schools should target to buy at least 80% of the food for the meals from local farmers. It was calculated that with this target the total of investments in the national economy would be US$ 147 million by the end of the implementation period in 2010 (GoG, 2006). However, studies have shown he target of 80% is not reached in the large majority of the cases, and that the incentive of a local market is not enough to get farmers to produce for the schools (SEND, 2008; WFP, 2007).

The idea of serving meals at schools to provide local demand for farmers in the community can be compared with so-called community-supported agriculture (CSA), a similar structure emerging in industrialized counties such as Germany, Japan, Us and Switzerland. CSA networks are based on a direct relation between the local farmers and the local consumers in which the costs and products of the market are shared.

Often, the face-to-face relationship between producer and consumer is seen as the distinguishing factor of local food networks in which social relations, responsibility and economic goals are combined. The actors of the local network are socially embedded in the local social network. This brings along responsibilities and may lead them to make decision in favour of the entire network instead of individual prosperity. On the other hand, even in a local food network the role of economic behaviour should never be under-estimated. The actors make decisions along the spectrum of marketness, meaning the relevance of prices in transactions, and instrumentalism, meaning to what extend actors prioritize economic goals. Low instrumentalism and marketness reflect prioritization of non-economic goals such as friendship, family, ethnic relations, spirituality/religion and responsibility. In contrast, high instrumentalism and marketness reflects little consideration of non-economic values (Hinrichs, 2000).

In 2007, a case study evaluation of the GFSP done by the WFP, showed the potential of the programme to have a positive impact on local farmers. In Sene District in Brong Ahafo Region the GSFP developed a link with the local FBO which proved to be beneficial. In some other isolated cases e.g. in Tibung community in the Northern Region, agricultural production in the community increased because of the market the GSFP provided for the farmers. Still, it has to be mentioned that success stories are rare. Important for the success of the GSFP in respect to boost agriculture seem to be the model that is used for food supply, with the
school-based model (explained in paragraph 1.4) being most successful in boosting agricultural production, and whether the local farmers grow food items that are used by the GSFP (WFP, 2007).

SFP have a long history in Ghana, starting in the 1950’s when pupils in Catholic primary and middle schools received take-home ratios of food. Several agencies have been active in the field of SFP in Ghana, such as ANDRA, SEND and World Vision, but the WFP and CRS became the two leading organizations in the field. The North of the country has always been the main aim of the SFP activities because of the high food insecurity and poverty in the area. The initial objectives from the 1950’s, improving nutritional status of pupils and increasing enrolment and retention, were expanded with aims to reduce poverty, food security and gender inequality (WFP, 2007).

1.4 Design of GSFP

In late 2005, the GSFP was launched. With this programme, the concept of using home-grown food stuffs was introduced in the school feeding in Ghana, since existing programmes were largely dependent on imported food aid. Moreover, whereas the existing programmes were active in a specific part of the country, the GSFP aimed to be national (WFP, 2007). The programme started with 10 pilot schools, one in every region, and in December 2008 20% of all primary school pupils were said to benefit from the programme. At the end of the implementation phase, in December 2010, the programme aims to include over 1 million pupils (AOP, 2009).

1.4.1 Stakeholders in the governance and functioning of the GSFP

The governance of the GSFP spreads from the national government to the local communities where the actual program activities are executed. To a large extent, understanding the governance of the program means knowing the different actors, their roles, responsibilities and their relationships among each other.
Fig. 1: Schematic representation of major actors in GSFP, and their relationships (adapted from Annual Operations Plan, 2009).
Next, all the actors are briefly described in terms of their major roles and responsibilities in the programme.

**National Level:**

- **Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development and Environment (MLGRDE)**
  This ministry is the core of all inter-governmental cooperation and relations and has the role of keeping oversight on the whole program (AOP 2008).

- **Program Steering Committee (PSC)**
  This committee has been set up in 2008 and partly took over tasks, such as Ministerial membership, of the Inter-Ministerial Committee (IMC) which facilitated the start of the program and the National Technical Committee (GOG, 2006).

- **National Secretariat (NS)**
  This are the head quarters of the GSFP, where the program is coordinated and managed. This body will include experts who will advise the other national bodies on all aspects of the program and is responsible for the execution of procedure on national level, ensuring reporting and accountability. Furthermore, this body will support the DIC and SIC, e.g. implementation, content and capacity building.

- **Collaborating ministries (CM)**
  Actually this stakeholder consists of various stakeholders, in the form of different ministries. All of the collaborating ministries have a supportive and executing role relating to their expertise. The main collaborating ministries are:
    - Ministry of Education Youth and Sports (GES)
    - Ministry if Health (MOH)/Ghana Health Service (GHS)
    - Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MOFA)
    - Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MOFEP)

**Regional and District level:**

- **Regional Coordination Offices (RCO)**
  The regional coordination offices play a key role in reporting to higher levels and ensuing accountability to higher levels. Furthermore they mainly monitor the district level.

- **Office of the Regional Coordinating Council (ORCC)**
  These councils support the RCOs, provide a link with the district level and are more practically involved in supporting the DA in (the development of) their activities.

- **District Assembly**
  The districts assemblies are the core implementation and managing body of the GSFP. They receive and distribute the funds for the program and are responsible for good governance towards
the lower levels. Their tasks include setting up functioning DIC and SIC, providing necessary infrastructure and mobilizing community support for the schools.

- **District Implementation Committees (DIC)**
  These committees are directly involved in overseeing the schools in the district and are the main school-coordinating body. An important role in this committee is for the District GSFP liaison (DGL) who links these committees to higher and lower levels, in particular in terms of feedback and communication.

- **Local/Community Level:**
  - **School Implementation Committees (SIC)**
    These committees are the implement, plan and execute the actual activities of the program. Besides the activities at school these committees should also lead community mobilization and develop the link with the local community and farmers. Other important stakeholders at school level are the matron, cook or caterer and the local farmers.

Next to the governmental bodies, there are several so-called strategic partners who play important roles in the GSFP. Although all of them support the GSFP, they all have different activities. Whereas some of them, e.g. Dutch Government, are just financial sponsors, NGOs often provide technical assistance and experimental knowledge about prior SFP they have run. Since the strategic partners play various roles in the program, the way and level of collaboration with the GSFP differs.

The main strategic partners of the GSFP are:

- Dutch Government and Dutch Embassy in Ghana
- World Food Program (WFP)
- Netherlands Development organization (SNV)
- Social Enterprise Development Organization (SEND Foundation)
- International Centre for Soil Fertility and Agricultural development (IFDC)
- Ghana Agriculture Initiative Network (GAIN)
- AgroEco – Organic farming
- Plan International, Ghana
- School feeding Initiative Ghana Netherlands (SIGN)

**1.4.2 Situation at local level**

Evaluations and interviews with several key-persons show that the GFSP has not been functioning as was designed in all beneficiary communities. Below the three main structures that have developed and been
identified are discussed. Several key-persons note that the caterer-model is most applied and also has been identified as most desirable and practical by the national level.

1) **Situation with a hired cook:**
   In this situation the school has employed one or more cooks to do the buying of products and the cooking of meals. They get a monthly salary and a separate budget to buy food. The WFP identified the so-called School-based model, in which the decision-making process lies at the grassroots and all activities take place within the community (WFP, 2007). According to the WFP, this model reaches the objective of buying from local farmers and, since the entire range of activities are based in the community, indeed this model seems most appropriate for providing a market for local farmers.

2) **Situation with a food supplier:**
   In this model, schools hire an external supplier to provide in the food, which can be either registered company or an unofficial business run by an individual. Most often, the suppliers provide the schools with food once a week based on the orders of the head teachers. The food is mainly bought outside the community, e.g. on market days in the regional capitals. The food is cooked by cooks who are employed by the schools. This model probably came into existing to solve problems in budget delays since suppliers can pre-finance the food. However, there are mainly negative points to this model, such as lack of inclusion of local farmers and lack of food when the supplier does not deliver (WFP, 2007).

3) **Situation with a external caterer:**
   In the last situation, schools hire caterers that deliver complete meals to the schools. They get paid based on the number of pupils and are these caterers are often hired by Metropolitan/district Assemblies to cook in central kitchens for several schools. Positive and negative points of this model are largely similar to the food supplier model. Caterers can pre-finance the food, the cooks are often experienced and schools can focus entirely on education. On the other hand however, caterers do not have to buy from local farmers, missing the local food network objective, schools have little power in this model and monitoring the caterers is difficult (WFP, 2007). Linked to the latter, caterers can spend less on the food as was designed by the program to increase their own profit. This however can diminish the quality of the food.

Although the first model looks to be most appropriate for the objectives of the GSFP, in reality the latter model is most applied and suitable for schools. Since in this model the schools have actually no role in the feeding and cooking activities, there are no relations with local farmers and local ownership is not build. The position the caterers take within the programme determines to what extent the community and local farmers are involved. This can be facilitated by e.g. establishing a SIC which is concerned with GSFP issues or hiring a caterer and cooks from the local community. In contrast, limiting factors in this respect
include the profit-aim of the caterer, a lack of responsibility of the caterer and a lack of social links the caterer has with the community.

The next paragraph reviews the evidence about local purchase in the GSFP and shows indeed that the market relation between the GSFP and local farmer is underdeveloped.

### 1.5 Functioning of (Ghana) School Feeding Program

During a presentation about the GSFP during the Meet-the-Press series in Accra in July 2008, the national coordinator of the GSFP at that time discussed the challenges that the program encountered. In terms of collaboration it was explained more effort had to be directed at closer collaboration between the stakeholders of the program and clearer description of the role and responsibility of each of the partners. Moreover, the connections and relationships between the partners had to be improved (Report Presentation GSFP July 2008). Furthermore, there is evidence that a substantial number of the DIC have not been functioning efficient, as designed by the program. Besides, a number of the enrolled schools do not have a SIC and when SIC are in place they were often not functioning properly. For example, many SIC did almost never held meetings, and, probably partly because of this, decision about the program were made by a limited amount of stakeholders involved in the actual execution (SEND Ghana, 2008). Furthermore, communication and monitoring is not working properly, in particular at the district and local level. School lack information on how the program is supposed to function which leads to problem in the execution (SNV, 2008).

Although the GSFP is still in its implementation phase, studies have shown the programme is successful in reaching the direct objectives of increasing school enrolment and attendance (VSO, 2008 and SEND Ghana, 2008). A research conducted by the World Food Program for example, reports that enrolment in beneficiary schools of the GSFP increased by 20.3%, compared to 2.8% on non-beneficiary schools (WFP, 2007). Concerning the coverage of children the programme is on schedule, with 596,501 children in December 2008 (AOP, 2009). However, the representation of poor schools is low and, linked to this; the participating schools are not equally distributed over the different regions (SNV, 2008).

In terms of the long-term objective of the program, increasing local food production by providing a local market, little to no progression has been observed. Evaluations done in the last years showed no significant positive impacts were made on the production of farmers and their income in communities of the GSFP (SEND Ghana 2008, WFP, 2007). More specifically, a field study done by SNV shows that the target of spending at least 80% of food expenditures of local products is not met (SNV, 2008).

The evaluations mentioned above, and several other researches, investigated the reasons for the weak collaboration between the schools in the GSFP and the local farmers:

- In a monitoring report published by SEND Ghana in 2008 SIC explain that they do not buy from local farmers partly because the food is already provided by the DA. Linked to this is the
experience that the DA and suppliers of food deal directly with the caterers of the school without involving the SIC. Other reasons mentioned were that the food production in the local community was not high enough to meet the demands of the school and that the SIC did not receive the funds to buy food (SIGN, 2008).

- A report from Wageningen University, the Netherlands, investigated the constraints farmers had against up-scaling their farming, i.e. going from subsistence farming to entrepreneurial farming which is part of the change farmers should make when participating in the GSFP. The findings indicated there were a broad range of reasons not to expand farming, which were summarized in four categories. The first group includes constraints linked to production and processing, meaning difficulties with capital, land and labour. The second group of constraints relates to the unpredictable risks and uncertainties farmers have to deal with in terms of climate, market forces, corruption, lack of information etc. The third group of constraints consists of the lack of incentives to invest. The current conditions in most rural areas make most activities rather unprofitable. Moreover, farmers feel that much of what they would earn would be taken away by (extended) family or taxes anyway. The fourth and last group of constraints found in the study relates to the mindset of farmers which restricts entrepreneurship. Things like culture and religion often limit the motivation for new activities related to farming and there is a general believe in consuming rather than saving and mistrust in the government (Eenhoorn and Becx, 2009).

- A research done by students from Haas School of Business International Business Development Program, a program of the University of California Berkeley, show similar constraints encountered by farmers. Besides the unpredictable demand of the GSFP (due to e.g. changing prices), this research also identified difficulties with the production and processing of the crops, making it difficult to expand farming. Next, need for immediate cash, contacts with so-called ‘market-queens’ and preferences for imported products (rice) restrict farmers from selling to the GSFP (Haas School of Business International Development Program, 2008).

- The case study report of the WFP, conducted in 2007, identified several major problems that limit small farmers to take the opportunity to expand farming for the GSFP. Firstly, the farming population in Ghana is ageing. Young and educated people, who are more likely to take risks and respond to opportunities, stay away from farming due to the limited opportunities. Moreover farming is seen as a way of life rather than just as an occupation. A second problem limiting farming expansion is the limited use of new technologies. Farmers do not have the required resources, such as financial capital, to get technological equipment. This leaves them dependant on the labour force in their households which limits production capacity. Related to the general lack of resources there is also a gender issue. Although women make up the largest part of the small scale farmers, in some part of the country they are not allowed to own property or to get a loan because of culture and/or religion. This limits the opportunity for investments in farming in these parts of the country. A difficulty for all farmers is that there are no strong value chains for their
products and they are left to do their own marketing. Since they often lack market skills and they have no knowledge about the agricultural business this leads to e.g. lost of crops. Two other major problems relate to difficulties with farming land affecting about 70% of the farmers in Ghana and, bad agricultural infrastructure such as irrigation facilities. The lack of the latter combined with the dry and wet seasons, limit the time per year crops can grow. The changing climate, in particular the global warming, is also thought to deteriorate the conditions for farming in Ghana.

These researches show farmers in Ghana face several difficulties and the study of Eenhoorn and Becx especially showed the constraints limiting expansion. It has to be mentioned though, that the GSFP does not only have the opportunity to facilitate expansion of farming activities. There are also opportunities for giving farmers more power within the market, the collaboration of farmers, new roles farmers can play in their communities etc. These possibilities are elaborated upon in the discussion section.

For now, the main limiting factors in terms of farming seem to be poverty, i.e. lack of financial and physical capital, lack of knowledge about farming and agricultural business, the environment and the general mindset of farmers. The research conducted by SIGN showed there are also problems on the side of the GSFP that limit a collaborating relation between local farmers and schools. Although it is very difficult to solve all problems schools and farmers encounter in respect to strengthening their collaboration, changes in the governance or design of the program could contribute to the elimination of part of the difficulties.

1.6 Problem statement and research objectives

In theory, the GFSP has great potential to support farmers in Ghana, to reduce poverty and strengthen food networks within the country. In practise, little progress has been made in this respect due a combination of a lack of various resources at the side of the farmers and institutional and design-related issues at the side of the GSFP. However it is not clear how these problems interact and limit the market relation between the GSFP and local farmers. Moreover, previous studies virtually did not look at the facilitating factors of this relation and the opportunities for improvement, i.e. strengthening the market relation between the GSFP and local farmers. To fill the gaps of knowledge about this topic to support the programme in reaching its poverty- and food security-related objectives, the following study objective and sub-objectives were developed:

Investigate possibilities to strengthen the collaboration between schools and local farmers in the Ghana School Feeding Program by studying the functioning of the program at community/local level.

This overall objective can be divided into four more specific goals, relating to the sub-questions:

1. To assess the functioning of the GSFP, in schools with a strong relation and collaboration with local farmers and in schools with a weak relation and collaboration with local farmers.
2. To investigate the factors and arguments from the schools and farmers which limit or facilitate the school-farmer relation and collaboration within the GSFP.

3. To point out aspects of the programme design and functioning that limit or facilitate the school-farmer relationship, particularly at local level.

4. Formulate specific recommendations to strengthen the school-farmer relation/collaboration, e.g. in terms of policies, changes in GSFP design/functioning or any type support.
2. Research framework and methodology

2.1 Research set-up

In this chapter the research methods and tools used to collect the data for finding possibilities to strengthen the market relation between the GSFP and local farmers is discussed and explained. Before the final methodology was drawn, an extensive literature and program documents study was done. Besides, the actual research period started with interviews with key-persons and information gathered during this phase also proved to be important in developing the methodology.

For the main data collection it was decided to focus on several case studies of GSFP schools and communities. In three different districts, the assemblies and two schools were visited and there different people who play a role in the GSFP were interviewed. Emphasis was placed on the local actor network of the GSFP, the way food was purchased and the role of local farmers in food supply.

In this chapter the different methods and tools used during the case studies of the districts and the schools are explained. It will become clear that the used methodology is purely qualitative and focuses on in-depth information and understanding the local functioning of the programme. However this limits the external validity of the results this qualitative focus was preferred because of the objectives of this study; to find possibilities to strengthen the market relation between the GSFP and local farmers understanding of local functioning of the programme is essential.

2.2 Research questions and conceptual framework

Before the development of the methods and tools, the objectives were used to formulate specific research questions. The following main- and sub-research questions were developed to guide the study.

What are practical and effective possibilities to strengthen the relation and collaboration between beneficiary schools of the GSFP and their caterers, and the local farmers in the community, in order to enhance local food networks?

1. How is the GSFP functioning, in particular at local level in terms of school-farmer cooperation, looking at the nine indicators of good governance; participation, adherence to the law, effectiveness, efficiency, accountability, transparency, subsidiarity, equity/inclusiveness and sustainability?
2. What are facilitating and limiting factors for schools and local farmers to develop a demand-supply relationship?
a. What are arguments, at the side of schools, not to collaborate/strengthen the relation with local farmers?
b. What are arguments from the side of the school to collaborate/strengthen the relation with local farmers?
c. Which problems do schools face in (strengthening) their relation/collaboration with local farmers?
d. What are arguments from the local farmers not to collaborate/strengthen the relation with schools from the GSFP?
e. What are arguments from the local farmers to enhance the collaboration/strengthen the relation with schools from the GSFP?
f. Which problems do farmers encounter in (strengthening) the relation/collaboration with schools from the GSFP?

3. Which aspects of the program limit or facilitate the relation between the beneficiary schools and the local farmers?
   a. Which aspects of the design of the GSFP and/or the current functioning of the program limit the relation and collaboration between the beneficiary schools and the local farmers?
   b. Which aspects of the design of the GSFP and/or the current functioning of the program facilitate the relation and collaboration between the beneficiary schools and the local farmers?

4. What are the possibilities for strengthening the school-farmer relation in GSFP communities which would lead to successful collaboration between these two actors?

In order to answer the research questions the grass-root point of view combined with a more general programme analysis was thought to yield the most complete answers. The combination of micro- and macro programme analysis/evaluation enables better understanding of the programme functioning as local practises or problems can be linked to overall programme design, functioning and difficulties encountered. In practise this meant that different levels of governmental GSFP bodies were included in the study. Before the methodology was developed, the implications about the study design mentioned above were used to develop an analytical framework for the development of the methods and the analysis of the data. The analysis of the local GSFP (food)-network was based upon of the functioning of the GFSP at local level that was conceptualised in the background information, i.e. programme design, monitoring and evaluation studies and partly on interviews with key-informants. This actor-network was rather abstract as it was difficult to come to one final framework as different sources provided different and conflicting information in this respect. Moreover, in the course of the study a picture of the endogenous local network be was formed which, based on this study, is the way forward for the GSFP. This local network is depicted
in Figure 2 and guides the development of the methodology and the course of the study into the direction the GFSP needs to go.

The link with the overall programme design and functioning was made by putting this abstract network within the different governmental levels, based on the idea that the collaboration and communication between and the functioning of the different governmental bodies and levels determine local programme functioning to a large extent. Moreover, several indicators were used to evaluate the functioning of the GSFP. The indicators that were used were initially developed by UNESCAP to measure the level of ‘good governance’ of programs (UNESCAP, 2007). Since governance is reflected in the practical functioning of the program and governance is included in the evaluation, these indicators provide a useful theoretical tool. Besides, they can easily be adapted to the functioning and goals of the GSFP, which also make them applicable. The nine indicators of good governance and functioning, adapted from UNESCAP for the GSFP, are:

1. **Participation:**
The opportunity for people who are affected by the program to influence the governance and/or decisions made in the program. For the GSFP these people include the school staff, the people in the community and the local farmers.

2. **Adherence to the programme design**
This indicator says that everybody, at whatever level of society, has to follow the rules of the programme design. In the GSFP this means that all the governance, decisions and activities need to be in line with the program regulations and design.

3. **Effectiveness**
This indicator focuses on the extent to which the program reaches its objectives, i.e. whether the current functioning of the program is successful in reaching the desired outcomes and outputs.

4. **Efficiency**
Efficiency means the extent to which resources are used economically in order to reach the desired objectives. In other word, if the resources available are used most optimally leading to the best outcomes.

5. **Accountability**
The responsibility of decision-makers to explain and justify their decision about the program and the resulting outcomes. This means that all people involved in the GSGP, from national to local level, have to be held responsible for their part of the program.

6. **Transparency**
This indicator covers the extent to which the procedures, regulations, decisions etc. of the program are accessible and clear to all people involved, and to which extent they are verifiable. Optimal functioning of the GSFP requires a certain degree of transparency for all participants.

7. **Subsidiarity**
Subsidiarity is the principle that decision about the program are made on the most appropriate level for the issue concerned. For the GSFP this related to the extent of decentralization since the main activities are carried out on the lower levels, meaning they are the appropriate level for many issues to be discussed.

8. **Equity and Inclusiveness**
This principle says that nobody should be excluded from the program based on gender, religion, race etc.

9. **Sustainability**
The extent to which the GSFP will be able to function successfully on the long run and also, the likelihood the current program will have positive effects for an extended period of time. In other words this means this indicator investigates whether the current functioning of the program can be effective for a long time. In the GSFP Programme Document 2007-2010 “sustainability refers to meeting the needs of the present generation without compromising the needs and of future generations.” (GOG, 2006: 7). With this the GSFP explicitly includes environmental sustainability.

The figure below visualizes the theoretical framework on which this study is based. The focus of evaluation is on the local food network in GSFP beneficiary communities, however part of the governance by higher governmental levels is taken into account when they are important in terms of influence/impact on local functioning. The nine indicators of good governance and functioning are the theoretical basis for this functional evaluation. Besides, an actor map of the designed local functioning provides a picture to identify where problems are located, where the design does not fit with practical functioning, possibilities for strengthening the GSFP local food network, etc.

During the analysis of the overall functioning of the programme using the nine indicators of good functioning, it became clear that this model is not appropriate for the aims of this study. The model was useful in that it showed the pitfall of using a developmental approach and it emphasized the importance of market forces, also in micro market systems such as communities in Ghana. This issue is elaborated on in the results and discussion part.
Fig 2: Framework of school-farmers relationship
2.3 Methods and Tools

In figure 3 the activities in this study are depicted schematically. The different methods are discussed more extensively in the following paragraphs.

2.3.1 Literature/document study and interview with key-persons

The first stage of the research consisted of a thorough literature and document study on SFP in general, the GSFP specifically, local food networks, food security and agricultural biotechnology. The main aims were to gain proper knowledge about the design and current functioning of the GSFP, experiences in other countries with SFP and strengthening local food networks, the use of biotechnology in developing counties etc.

When basic information was gathered from the literature study, interviews with key-persons began. The main aims of these interviews were to:

- Gather information about the practical functioning of the program, which is often difficult to find in documents and/or monitoring reports.
- Knowledge and opinions from experts about the research topic, i.e. the relation between schools of the GFSP and the local farmers.
- Data on the participating schools in order to select appropriate schools for the case-studies.
- Collect additional documents etc. which are not (yet) published.
Interviews were held with:

1. National Secretariat GSFP – National Coordinator
2. National Secretariat GSFP – Director of Finance
3. National Secretariat GSFP – Regional Officer Greater Accra
4. National Secretariat GSFP – Director of Finance
5. AgroEco/GOAN about Organic School Garden Project – International Advisor
6. Embassy of the Netherlands – First secretary Development Cooperation, Health and Gender Issues
7. Ministry of Food and Agriculture: Women in agricultural development directorate – Director directorate
8. Ministry of Food and Agriculture: Policy Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation directorate – Deputy Director
9. An International Center for Soil Fertility and Agricultural Development (IFDC) – Coordinator AISSA Network Agribusiness Program
10. Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development - Focal Person GSFP

For these interviews semi-structured interviews were used. Before each interview a script was developed including all questions and topics that needed to be addressed. However, since the interviews are largely exploring, there was much room to expand on certain topics or add or leave out others. After each meeting a summary of the interview is made within 24 hours.

2.3.2. District/Municipal Assemblies

The visits to the field consisted of two parts; the interviews at the district assemblies and the case studies of the selected GSFP schools. The districts that were included in the study were selected based on the following criteria:

- Farming is widely employed in the district/municipal
- GSFP already implemented for at least one year in the district
- Practical in visiting from Accra in terms of distance and accessibility; this is sometimes referred to as ‘convenience sampling’, defined as a non-probability technique that has the advantages of reducing costs and simplifying project administration (Malhotra, 1999).

Based on these criteria the following districts were selected:

1. Akuapim North (capital: Akropong), Eastern Region
2. Akuapim South (capital: Nsawam, Eastern Region
3. Dangme East (capital: Ada Foah), Greater Accra Region
The inclusion of the last district, Dangme East, had two advantages. First, two regions were included instead of one, which increases the validity of the data. Second, since this district lies at the coast and has different soil characteristics etc., farming was slightly different than in the other two districts/municipals. This meant that the results could be generalized over more types of farmers.

In every district, the DA was the starting point of the data collection. At this level, interviews were held with the people who are working on the GSFP and agriculture:

- District Coordinating Director (DCD); who is in charge of all the projects in the district.
- Desk Officer; who deals with the daily functioning of the projects and activities in the district.
- District Finance Officer (DFO); who handles the financial part of the GSFP
- Director of the Municipal/District agricultural development unit (DADU/MADU); who is in charge of the department of the MOFA at district level.

Although a general plan about who to interview at the DA was made before visiting the field, changes were made due to a different role division than expected and the transfer of employees. All interviews, except for some min-interviews concerning only a few questions or topics, at DA level were recorded and summarized in extensive summaries.

### 2.2.3. GSFP schools

The core part of this study consisted of 7 case studies of selected schools of the GSFP. It was chosen to select a limited number of schools to be able to collect in-depth qualitative data about the functioning of the program at these schools without being limited by time. The rationale was that this method is most suitable to get a proper understanding of the relation between schools/caterers and local farmers and the role of the latter in the GSFP. This understanding is essential to make recommendations about possibilities for strengthening the relation and collaboration between schools/caterers and local farmers.

The selection of the schools happened randomly at the National Secretariat of the GSFP. However, since one of the goals was to include schools with strong and weak relations with local farmers, the final selection took place at district level. To avoid leaving the representation of schools with weak and strong relation with local farmers entirely to coincidence, the pre-selected schools were discussed at district level and when necessary changed.

The criteria for the pre-selection of the schools were::

1. Ghana School Feeding implemented for at least one year; to ensure the program is entirely implemented and collaboration between the school/caterer and local farmers had time to develop.
2. School must have at least 300 pupils; to ensure the school has substantial demand in terms of food items/meals.
3. School must be situated in a rural area; to ensure the presence of farmers thus possibility of including them in the program. Moreover, the schools had to be accessible enough from the capital town from the district to visit them in one day. This means that, however to a lesser extent than with the selection of the districts, convenience sampling was used.

Table 1: General information of visited schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>District/ Municipality</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Number of pupils (included in GSFP)</th>
<th>More than one year of GSFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anhuntem Darmang Presby Primary School</td>
<td>Akwuaipim South</td>
<td>Village (Darmang)</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nana Osae Djan Primary School</td>
<td>Akwuaipim South</td>
<td>Town (Nsawam)</td>
<td>+/-1000*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsawam Methodist Primary A, B &amp; C + Nsawam Wesley Kindergarten A + B.</td>
<td>Akwuaipim South</td>
<td>Town (Nsawam)</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casesarkope Presby Primary School</td>
<td>Dangme-East Village (Caesaroke)</td>
<td>Village (Caesaroke)</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elavanyo Basic School</td>
<td>Dangme-East</td>
<td>Small town (Elavanyo)</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>Yes (Pilot school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul Methodist Primary School</td>
<td>Akwuaipim North</td>
<td>Town (Akropong)</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onyame Bekyere Primary School</td>
<td>Akwuaipim North</td>
<td>Village (Onyame Bekyere)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since this school was unexpectedly included in the study official enrollment figures could not be obtained and the figure given by the head teacher is included in the table.

Additionally, one school in Northern Region was visited. This is one of the schools that has implemented the Organic School Garden Project (OSGP), an initiative of AgroEco and GOAL. More information about the rationale for the inclusion of this school is given in the result chapters.

The case studies generally comprised interviews with the caterer, head teacher and local farmers in community. Also, observation of the cooking activities provided the opportunity to talk to the cooks, pupils and teachers. Other activities included market visits and interviews with an extension officer and farmers groups. Appendix A provides a complete overview of the activities at the different schools.

Although the methodology was drawn up before visiting the field, specifying the different activities and interviewees, this plan was not followed strictly. Since the studies aimed at understanding the local network rather than comparing different schools and regions, the methodology was changed when necessary. Furthermore, similar to the selection of interviewees at the DA and national level, the chain-referral method was used.
For the interviews during the data collection semi-structured interviews are used. For the observation of the daily functioning a checklist is made to ensure all topics and questions concerning the functioning are covered. The content of all methods is based upon the 9 indicators of functioning from the conceptual framework, the information from the interviews with key-persons and the literature/document study about the GSFP, food networks etc.

The next figure visualizes the different activities of the case studies and how these are linked to each other.

![Activities and chain referral during the school case studies](image)

**Fig. 4: Activities and chain referral during the school case studies**

### 2.4 Data processing & data analysis

For all in-depth interviews a semi-structures script was developed. Questions and topics were selected but, partly because all questions required an open answer, there still was room for new topics and comments, introduced during the interview. During the case studies all in-depth interviews were recorded. During the interviews key-informants and experts notes were made. A report was made of all interviews within 24 hours. For the observation of the schools a checklist was developed to ensure all aspects of functioning were consciously monitored. Moreover, at the end of each day spent at the schools a daily report was written to properly document all aspects of program functioning. Lastly, concerning the mini-interviews with pupils, teachers and community-members, a summary of all interviews in these three groups was made at the end of the case study.
The data was analyzed according to the method of coding and sub-coding. Main topics were identified based on the collected data; these included ‘finance’, ‘buying food’, ‘market mechanisms’, etc. Next, all interview and observation reports were colour-coded according to the developed scheme. To enhance oversight and reduce losing data, the following step was to prepare separate documents for each code. In these documents, sub-codes were used to further order the data. These sub-codes divide the main codes into more specific topics. While classifying the data for each code into the different sub-codes, they were also ordered according to respondent group, e.g. head teachers, caterers, etc.

2.5 Study limitations and data validation

2.5.1 Study limitations

An important factor that limits the generalisation of the study results is the number of districts and schools that were included in the study. In total, 3 districts and 8 schools were visited. Although information was obtained from more caterers and for more schools, this is still a relatively small selection. However, since there were time constraints that had to be taken into account and since the aim of the study was to obtain qualitative in-depth data instead of broad quantitative data, the choice was made to visit this limited number of DA and schools. Consequently, the results cannot be generalised easily to other GSFP communities. Another limitation related to the actual activities that were executed is the way and the number of farmers that were interviewed. It selection procedure of using the schools and the caterers to include farmers appeared to be more difficult and time-consuming than expected. However, this problem was not found to be of major importance since after several interviews the saturation point was reached and very little new information came up during interviews with farmers. Consequently, in some instances it was chosen to spend time on other activities, e.g. visit the market with the caterer or consult the nutritional officer of the district, instead of trying to interview more farmers.

As explained in the methodology, part of the interviewees’ selection was based on the chain-referral method. In particular during the interviewees before the district and school visits but also there referral to schools and farmers was done via other interviewees. Moreover, since in 2 districts the focal persons were not present, chain-referral was used to interview the second most appropriate person. Earlier, the reasons for using the chain-referral method were discussed but it has to be mentioned as well that by selecting part of the interviewees in this manner the internal validity is threatened. As people can consciously decide who and who not to introduce to the research they can influence the results. Also, since the referral was different in each district not all results can be compared.

Also, as mentioned earlier, the activities were not the same between all the DA and schools, mainly due to local differences and opportunities for activities (e.g. visiting the market, or the number of available
farmers). However, in this study this is not perceived as a real limitation since understanding the local network has more priority than comparing GSFP situations.

The final limitation discussed relates more to the research- and information environment in Ghana instead of to the content of the methodology. The information flow and accessibility in Ghana is low which makes it hard to get proper understanding of what is happening in the field of study. In particular since the study dealt with a programme in the country a substantial amount of the necessary literature and documents were country specific and from e.g. the government and NGOs. Moreover, there is little communication and transparency about the activities, in particular in terms of research and evaluations, of stakeholders. Besides the limitations for this study this also limits efficient and effective programme functioning and monitoring. At the end of this study period it became clear that there were more stakeholders, in particular NGOs that were working on the topic of the GSFP and local farmers. Although these studies complement each other and provide a broad evidence base for further actions within the programme, awareness of the different studies could have led to collaboration and more efficient research.

2.5.2 Data validation

To enhance the internal and external validation of the results of this study several measures were used. First of all, the interviews with key-informants during the first phase of the interview provided information concerning the practical functioning of the program which helped to select the appropriate people to include in the study and to develop proper questions for the interviews. In developing the scripts for the interviews the validity was increased by asking for the same information in different ways (to increase the chance to discover when people were not telling the truth) and by checking information collected from other interviewees. This cross-checking between different participants also consisted of asking more people the same questions (to see if the same information was provided).

After data collection the preliminary results were presented in order to receive feedback from people working in the field. Additionally, the results were compared with similar research done on the GSFP and the role of local farmers, of which the results are presented in the discussion section.
3. Functioning of the Ghana School Feeding Programme

This is the first chapter discussing the result of the study. Chapter 3 gives an overview of the overall functioning of the programme, focusing on the implications this has for the market relation between the GSFP and farmers. Chapter 4 discusses the limiting and facilitating factors for this market relation from the point of view of the two partners in this respect, the caterers of the GSFP and the local farmers. Next, chapter 5 continues with the limiting and facilitating factors for the relation based on the programme design and its overall functioning. The last results chapter, chapter 6, explores the opportunities for strengthening the market relation between farmers and caterers, based on the previous chapter however new results are incorporated as well.

This chapter discusses the overall functioning of the GSFP according to the nine indicators of good functioning that were included in the conceptual framework. This information is important to understand the local functioning of the programme and problems that are encountered in the local market network in which farmers and caterers function. Moreover, it supports the identification of opportunities for improvement as it provides information on what is possible and available in terms of resources etc. within the programme network.

There is one problem in respect to the model that was used to evaluate the functioning of the GSFP that was identified during the analysis of the results. This model is built on a ‘development-way’ of thinking and therefore provides a subjective approach in the analysis. The implications for the results due to this development approach are more elaborated on in the discussion section.

3.1 Participation

Participation: The opportunity for people who are affected by the program to influence the governance and/or decisions made in the program. For the GSFP these people include the school staff, the people in the community and the local farmers.

Looking at the programme design, it is clear that the GSFP aims at having high participation in terms of this definition, since the programme aims at having high community involvement and ownership. In practise however, there are great differences in to what extent people involved in the local functioning of the programme can influence governance and/or decisions. Also, there is variety in to what extent people, who in theory should be involved, have a role in the GSFP. From the different case studies it becomes clear that the extent to which the community and the school are involved in the programme is different among schools, but never optimal. Determining in this respect is the role of the caterer and the way the programme was started.
At all but one school the SIC were found to be not functioning. The exception was the Elavanyo Basic Primary school in Dangme-East which was one of the 10 pilot schools of the GSFP nation-wide in 2005. Here it is explained that the school used to have an active SIC. The members were involved in monitoring the finances, buying the food and checking the meals. But since the caterer is working on a contract base and is solely responsible for the money and the food their involvement and activities decreased. The only role members of the SIC still seem to have at this and other schools is to check the quality of the food (for more information see box 1).

Caterers mention that SIC-members visit the kitchen to see how the food is prepared and to check the quantity and the quality. At some schools the PTA executes some of the functions of the SIC, such as checking the food and discussing the GSFP in their meetings. The SIC is responsible for creating a feeling of ownership within the community and for mobilizing local farmers to supply the GSFP. The malfunctioning of these committees is therefore likely to be one of the reasons for the limited market relation between the GSFP and local farmers. However, since there were no schools with good functioning SIC the extent of local purchasing could not be compared and moreover, at the pilot school where the SIC had been an active body, local purchasing did not seem to be better than in other schools.

One difficulty in developing a functioning and involved SIC is that most of the members have another job and other responsibilities. In rural areas these people are most often farmers who, especially in the farming seasons, are too busy working on their fields. In the towns the members are also employed, and often have official working hours, meaning their time and motivation for SIC activities is also limited. Besides, being a member of the SIC is voluntary and not paid, meaning the participation of people is mainly dependant on personal motivation. Moreover, since the programme design specifies the different members of the SIC (representative of the chief, representative of the church, etc.) it can happen that people are ‘officially’ part of the SIC while they have no motivation or time for this function.

Another aspect determining the extent to which the community is involved in the GSFP is the role the caterer adopts within the programme and how she sees her function. The individual motivation to include the community, e.g. to communicate with them about the programme or to approach local farmers to buy from them, is an important factor but the programme organisation in this respect is also important. Initially, the food provider in the GFSP was called a matron who worked closely together with the head teacher and the SIC. Now the food providers are officially called caterers and have a contract with the DA defining their responsibilities. As mentioned above, at the pilot school in Dangme-East the activity of the SIC decreased when the caterer started to work based on a contract.

The appliance of the caterer-model may have been an important reason for the limited development of the market relation between the GSFP and local farmers.
Again, it has to be stressed that the caterer system does not mean that the local community is not involved. In practise probably more determining in this respect than the caterer system is the motivation of the caterer to involve the community. In Akuapim-North the caterer of the Nyame Bekeyere is actively trying to get the community involved and to buy from local farmers. As the only caterer is this research she explicitly stated the benefits the GSFP could have for the community. Still, as many products are not (always) available from the surrounding farmers she still travels to the district market and to Accra to buy food.

As for the pupils in the GSFP schools; in theory they have no power to influence the programme but in practise it was observed that several caterers changed the menu because of their taste.

At almost all schools one or more meetings were held to inform the teachers and or the parents and community members about the content and aims of the programme, including the possibility for local farmers to sell to the programme. Only at the Akropong Methodist Primary School the head teacher explains that she does not remember any meetings, “…the caterer just started to bring the food”. It is interesting to note that this was the only school where there was almost no communication between the caterer and the school staff and this was the only the caterer did not cook at the premises of one of her other schools she provided for.

---

Box 1: Good practises of the SIC are ending at the pilot school Elavanyo Basic in Dangme-East

The SIC consist of a representative of the village chief, one of the religious leaders, the youth leader, the chair of the PTA, the chair of the SMC, the women organizer, the assembly man, and the head teacher. Before the new caterer-model was introduced the SIC was involved in planning the food purchases, they monitored how the money was spend and solved arising problems. Next to the SIC, the school also had a Purchasing Committee that consisted of the head teacher, the matron and two SIC-members. The head teacher and one of those SIC-members would always accompany the matron when she went to buy the food. Besides, the head teacher was the one collecting the GSFP funds from the DA and the SIC was involved in planning how it would be spend. Meetings were held twice per term or when difficulties had to be discussed.

Now, after the change to the caterer-model, the caterer collects the money from the DA and is responsible for buying the food. The head teacher explains that “the SIC doubts the new system since they do not see the money anymore”. The members are no longer involved in the planning the purchases or going to the market; now they mainly check the food and make sure food is provided everyday. The last time they had a meeting was last term and then they discussed the new caterer-model…the head teacher thinks there are not going to be meetings anymore.
3.2 Adherence to the programme design

Adherence to the programme design: This indicator says that everybody, at whatever level of society, has to follow the law. In the GSFP this means that all the governance, decisions and activities need to be in line with the program regulations and design.

Although not all actors in the GSFP perform their role, the core activity of the programme, giving school children a healthy meal at school, is being executed. During the case studies it was observed that there are many gaps between the programme design and the actual actions of the different actors, but the focus here lies on those gaps that influence the market relation between the GSFP and the local farmers:

- In none of the visited districts the DA set up functioning DIC. Only in Akuapim-South the DA members said their DIC was functioning, that the members communicated with each other about the GSFP, although meetings were not held very often. Generally DA members admitted that no to very few meetings were held but that the directors of the different district departments of the collaborating ministries were members of the DIC. This appeared not be true as all the visited district departments of agriculture and education expressed that they (almost) never attend meetings and that they never hear anything about the GSFP. Moreover, the DA did not provide the proper infrastructure, such as kitchens etc. that is part of the implementation process.

- The Regional Coordinating Offices and Office of the Regional Coordinating Council at the regional level are supposed to play an important role in linking the national level to the lower levels in terms of reporting and accountability and to give assistance to the DA. However, in practise it seems they are little involved. People at district level never mention cooperation with, reporting to or monitoring from the regional level; they always refer to national level. It is possible that it is not clear to them which person or institution belongs to which level and the regional level indeed plays a role but also at national level interviewees never mentioned these regional bodies.

- MOFA has failed in providing the necessary assistance to farmers to support them in supplying to the GSFP. In this respect it should be taken into account that the collaborating ministries of the programme are not officially linked to the GSFP; they is no official agreement that states they are obligated to provide the support/activities which were outlined for them in the programme design. This is discussed in more detail in the paragraph about accountability but it looks to be an important factor in the low involvement of MOFA.

The consequence of the first and last point discussed above for the market relation between the GSFP and farmers is mainly in terms of a lack of active linking by agricultural extension officers. This is elaborately discussed throughout the rest of this report. In contrast, the lack of active involvement of the regional level is relatively neglected, mainly because so little data were collected about this topic. This means hard conclusions are difficult to draw but implications can be made.
The lack of involvement of the regional bodies was shown by the lack of monitoring of the district level and the fact that interviewees at the DA never mentioned they received any type of support in the implementation process of the GSFP. Since both these activities are part of the task of the regional level, this does show there is a problem in their commitment to the GSFP.

### 3.3 Effectiveness

**Effectiveness:** This indicator focuses on the extent to which the program reaches its objectives, i.e. whether the current functioning of the program is successful in reaching the desired outcomes and outputs.

This study did not aim at measuring the impact of the GSFP but still the collected data give an indication about the extent to which the objectives are reached, or are expected to be reached, at the included schools.

Head teachers, teachers and caterers all saw improvement in terms of enrolment, attendance, health and learning capacity of the pupils. However, this study is concerned with creating a ready-market for the local farmers. Still, since the aim was not to depict the impact of the GSFP on local farmers this is a general picture of to what extent the market relation between the GSFP and the local farmers has developed.

From the 7 visited caterers, there were 2 who never bought food items from local farmers. All other caterers, including the 5 caterers working in Akuapim-South, purchased food items from local farmers to some extent. Generally, perishable items such as fruit and vegetables are bought from local farmers and, in some individual cases, palm oil or cassava (dough) for banku. Linked to the finding that local purchases virtually consisted only of perishable items is the finding that local purchases were only done in the harvesting season of the agricultural cycle, thus at the time the farmers harvest their crops and have fresh products to sell.

Figure 5 shows the food flow in the local GFSP network. When the caterers were asked about their main sources of food, 2 from the 5 caterers who bought directly from local farmers, named them as being one of the regular food suppliers. The other caterers had to be probed before they answered positively to whether they bought directly from local farmers. Virtually all caterers and head teachers answered that the district market (Nsawam in Akuapim-South, Kasseh market at Ada junction in Dangme-East and Koforudia in Akuapim-North) and often also a market in Accra (ex. Makola market) were the main sources of ingredients. At these district and national markets everything that the caterer needed is available. A last source of food items were big suppliers, either companies or individuals. The caterers in Akuapim-North were found to have individual relations with suppliers and in Akuapim-South the caterers received food items from these big suppliers via agreements between these suppliers and the DA. Later in the results this type of food purchase will be discussed in more detail.
Table 2 specifies what the caterers bought from local farmers; the answers from caterers and farmers in this respect were parallel. It also shows whether there were other items that were used in the GSFP menu and that, according to farmers and MOFA employees, were produced in the district but not directly bought from farmers by the caterers. In appendix B a specified overview can be found about the ingredients of the different menus, the crops produced by farmers in the different district and the items that caterers buy directly from local farmers.

In some instances it was argued that many food items that were bought at the markets were still coming from the district, although they were not bought directly from local farmers. This would mean that local buying does not only entail buying directly from the local farmers but also includes part of the food that is purchased at the markets since it is coming from farmers in the district. However, it was found that few farmers sell their products on the markets themselves; they are middle-men who make a living by buying products from local farmers and selling those at the market. A similar finding was done in a study, done in the same period, about street food as an agent to increase food security for the urban poor in Accra (Seferiadis, 2009; forthcoming).

It can be argued that this mechanism of indirect purchase from local farmers part of the objectives if the GSFP, as it indeed does increase the demand for local farmers. On the other hand, this indirect way of selling eliminates the benefits of local purchasing, mainly in terms of money and close ready-market for the farmers, which means it should not be seen as local purchasing in the GSFP.
It appeared to be difficult, both for caterer and for farmers, to specify the amount of food items that was dealt with in the relation between farmers and the GSFP. It looks like items are locally bought when farmers and caterers can easily contact each other, farmers are willing to bring the items to the school and the products are in season.

**Table 2: Local purchase of food**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
<th>Caterer buys directly from local farmers?</th>
<th>Items bought from local farmers:</th>
<th>Products not bought from local farmers, but locally available:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information from:</strong></td>
<td>Caterers, head teachers, farmers</td>
<td>Caterers, head teachers, farmers, observation</td>
<td>Farmers, MOFA employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akuapim-South</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darmang Presby</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kontonmire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Okro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palm-nuts/oil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist A, B, C</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nana Osae Djan</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kontonmire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Okro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palm-nuts/oil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dangme-East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesarkope</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>Gari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>Kontomire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>Palm-nuts/oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Okro</td>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garden Eggs</td>
<td>Beans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elavanyo</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>Gari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>Kontomire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>Garden Eggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Okro</td>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akuapim-North</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyame Bekyere</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gari</td>
<td>Yam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>Beans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>Fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other vegetables (ex. onion, carrots, cabbage, sweet/green pepper)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palm-nuts/oil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akropong Methodist</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plantain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other vegetables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Box II: Buying food at the market; where does it come from?

“The food at the market (in Nsawam) mainly comes from the district...75% comes from the district. The other 25% is from outside the district and are products that are out of season or not produced here”, Deputy Director DADU, Akuapim-South.

“The food in the market comes from the surrounding villages, or at least from the district”, Caterer Darmang Presby, Akuapim-South.

Many interviewees in this study thought much of the products that were available at the district markets were indeed coming from farmers in the district. Logically, as not all possible items are farmed in every district, part of the products at the market come from other places in the country. However it was observed that there were items that were farmed in the district, or could be farmed in the district, but were bought from people that ‘imported’ them into the district, or could be farmed in the district, but were bought from people that ‘imported’ them into the district, and there were items that were coming from other countries whereas they are also grown in Ghana.

In Dangme-East the caterers used beans and gari that were coming from Togo or were bought at the market in Techiman in the Ashanti-Region. As this is a big market the products that are either imported or coming from that or the Northern Regions. Eggs were bought from a lady that got them from a factory in Tema. In Akuapim-South cabbage was bought from a lady that bought it at the market in Kumasi. Meat and fish came from Tema.

Nevertheless, many market ladies that were suppliers for the GSFP bought the food items in the district. These included waakye leaves, fruit, tomatoes, onions, sometimes gari, yam, konmonmire, palm nuts, soybeans.

Naturally, things different between districts; in Akuapim-South the pepper that was used often came from Cote D’ivoir, whereas in the other districts this was grown in the district.

Lastly, products such as tinned tomatoes, spices and cooking oil always came from outside the district.

Moreover, although ‘local’ products could be bought at the district markets some caterers went to Accra, Koforudia etc. to buy these items in bulk. Besides, rice was always coming from outside the district, and often even from Asia, while it could be farmed in the districts.
3.4 Efficiency

Efficiency: means the extent to which resources are used economically in order to reach the desired objectives. In other words, whether the available resources are used in such a way the most optimal outcomes are obtained.

The caterer-model, that came up earlier, facilitates the efficient use of money. In theory, the caterer receives the total amount of GSFP funds which has to cover the expenses for food, the allowances of the kitchen staff and the caterer’s own allowance. This means the caterer actually works as a small business; the more efficient she spends the money, the more individual profit she makes. In practise it is clear that the caterers feel very responsible for providing the pupils with proper meals and they do not seem to work aimed at making much profit. Still, according to the caterers the budget is tight which means they are forced to spend their money carefully. Moreover, because they often have to buy on credit they spend more money as this is more expensive than paying directly.

Furthermore, the existing policy- and community networks that also are implemented in the design of the GSFP are not used to their full potential.

First, it appeared that in every district MOFA already has a developed network of extension officers who work with farmers to educate them about farming. These extension officers are the most suitable support in linking farmers to the GSFP. Since they have much knowledge about the agricultural situation in the districts and have relations with the farmers they can, as MOFA also emphasises, direct caterers to farmers, tell farmers to sell to the GSFP and convince/support farmers in changing their crops to be able to supply (more) to the programme. In principle extension officers only need to be educated about the programme and introduced to the GSFP schools in their operational area within the district.

The direct reason that the agricultural extension officers are not involved in the GSFP network is because the district departments of MOFA are not involved in the implementation and programme –oversight at district level. This in turn is caused by the institutional incapacity or lack of commitment of the DA, leading to non-existing and/or non-functioning DIC. Indirect, an important reason probably is that there are no binding agreements between MOFA and the GSFP at national level.

Second, at local level the local power structures and networks that in theory are implemented in the SIC are not used since the SIC are not functioning properly. Involving prominent community members is a widely used and effective way of creating local ownership and motivation for a programme. As one caterer says:

“At the start of the programme I informed the village committee about the possibility for local farmers to buy from the programme. They took the message to the community”. Caterer, Nyame Bekyere, Akuapim-North.
Although there is no strong evidence that in this case the caterer-farmer relationship is better compared to other communities since this particular caterer was very motivated to buy from local farmers, it shows that people working in the programme in the community also see the value of using the local structures and power relations to reach the desired situation.

### 3.5 Accountability

**Accountability:** The responsibility of decision-makers to explain and justify their decision about the program and, the resulting outcomes. This means that all people involved in the GSGP, from national to local level, have to be held responsible for their part of the program.

Although the results do show some flaws in the accountability of the GSFP, it can be questioned whether optimal accountability is a prerequisite for a beneficial market relation between the caterers and local farmers. As discussed in more depth in the discussion section, not all of the indicators that are used to evaluate the overall functioning of the GSFP need to be met in order for the programme to be successful. After the discussion of the status of accountability in the GFSP, it is explained why some of these results may be of limited importance.

The results show that the reporting processes, important in keeping people responsible for their actions, is not adequate and differs between districts. In Akuapim-South and Dangme-East caterers need to request the release of funds from the DA to their individual account with a letter of request, written by themselves, and a letter of confirmation from the head teacher, in which is stated that the caterer has provided meals for the pupils over a certain period of time. Moreover, after spending the money the caterers need to show the receipts of their purchases to the DA, the DFO or the desk officer. For items without an official receipt, such as purchases from local farmers, they need to fill in a so-called certificate of honour stating the purchases and the prices. In Akuapim-North in contrast, caterers only need to request the money with a letter; proof of cooking or expenditure information is not necessary.

Furthermore, the head teachers fill in daily reports about the cooking activities and sends reports to the DA with information on the number of pupils, the quality of the food etc., however this is very irregular. Moreover, people working at DA, head teachers and caterers all gave different answers in respect to reporting and accountability which shows that the procedure is not clear.

The results above, together with the information on how the DA and the National level communicate, show that nothing is done with the information on how the caterers spend their money. The DA makes monthly and quarterly reports for the regional coordinator of the programme, mainly about enrolment and general finances. Besides, the National Secretariat can ask the DA to provide additional information which is then communicated:

> 'Sometimes they (NS) require info from us about the programme…or about the implementation…and then we find it for them' (DCD, Akaupim-North)
As was already mentioned when discussing the lack of involvement of the regional bodies, there is very limited monitoring of the district level. The reporting from the DA to higher levels consists of the quarterly monitoring reports which are mainly about enrolment and finances, and at times the NS requires enrolment information at other times. The interviewees who talked about this issue always refer to “Accra” or the “National Secretariat” when they talk about the level to which they report.

In terms of monitoring of the DA and the DIC, the DCD in Akuapim-South mentioned that the ‘national level makes surprise visits to the district’ and the focal person in Akuapim-North explains that ‘since one year nobody came from the national level, only the auditors’, which most likely were the auditors from Price Water House Coopers who did an evaluation in 2008. It is clear that there is virtually no monitoring of the activities of the DA. However the GSFP is supposed to be a decentralised programme, better monitoring during the entire implementation period could have facilitated better DIC set-up and functioning and maybe a higher feeling of responsibility for the GSFP among the DA members.

On a higher, an important reason for the low accountability of the collaborating ministries is that they are not included or linked to the GSFP in an official way. This is to say, no MOU (memorandum of understanding) or other binding agreements have been drawn up between the GSFP or the MLGRD and the ministries which are supposed to play a role in the programme, most importantly being the MOH, the MOE and the MOFA. Consequently, the collaboration of these ministries in the programme are largely build on good-will and it is not possible to really held these actors responsible for the activities they are supposed to carry out. Probably an equally important problem in this respect is the financial issues of each of these ministries.

The main problem resulting from a lack of accountability is that activities relating to the GFSP are not executed and that the exact reason is difficult to identify. Still, as later is explained in more detail, when the market relation between caterers and farmers develops in such a way that local buying is beneficial for both parties, it is not (or no longer) essential that the purchases are closely monitored. What is more, a sustainable and functioning business relation between caterers and farmers does develop by ensuring accountability, but by creating a situation in which this relation is beneficial for both actors.

3.6 Transparency

Transparency: This indicator covers the extent to which the procedures, regulations, decisions etc. of the program are accessible and clear to all people involved, and to which extent they are verifiable. Optimal functioning of the GSFP requires a high degree of transparency for all participants.

Virtually nobody of the interviewees at district or local level indicated that they were not well-informed about the content of the GSFP, the rules, regulations, guidelines, etc. The only people that said they were
left out and did not receive information were the people working at the departments of the collaborating ministries, in case of this study especially the District/Municipal Agricultural Development Units. Still, they seemed to be well aware of the programme objectives and the role MOFA should, or could, play in this respect. However, this knowledge was mainly gained by using the media and not by involvement of the DA.

Interesting for the aim of this study, when the interviewees at district level were asked about the content the GSFP, the focus was placed on the benefits for the children and the parents; local farmers were hardly included. This is best illustrated by the following quotes.

“(the GSFP is) a good government intervention that is supposed to bring improved education in terms of enrolment and retention”, DCD, Dangme-East.

“To increase enrolment is the most important goal”, DFO, Akuapim-South

“it is good, it is good. For the fact that in the classroom it will help to increase enrolment. And then, if you look at most of the areas we operate (the GSFP is introduced) the poverty rate is very high, and educational levels are low. It will help the children to grow. The parents do not have the nutritional food. Now if they go to school they get nutritious food from the GSFP and that will help their body”. DCD, Akuapim-South.

“The program is introduced...it is funded by one of our developing partners...I don’t know if there are other partners. Basically, it is aimed at providing at least one balanced meal to school children (per day)...to improve their nutritional status, health and to make them more alert in school. A lot of children go to school often on an empty stomach...or they cannot get a good meal before they go to school. It is aimed at the educational status...to make sure they grow up well. Research has shown that most of our children are undernourished, and have stunted growth”. DCD, Akuapim-North.

Also among the caterers the emphasis of the GSFP is placed on the nutritional and educational benefits for the pupils. In the interviews however it also did become clear that they were aware of the poverty-reduction objective and thus the idea that the food should be bought from local farmers. Some of them say this objective was an important reason to buy from local farmers.

Another issue concerning the transparency of the programme is the definition of ‘local’. Since the programme want the caterers to buy local products from local farmers it is important that it is clear what is meant with local. Although some people rightly see local products as products that come from the community or surrounding communities many people, especially those at school level and this involved in
food purchase, refer to local when they talk about food that is coming from Ghana. Moreover, besides the design talking about the aim to buy from local farmers they are no guidelines for the caterers on how to purchase food.

“...for the gari we use local beans...the caterer orders them from the North”, cook, Akropong, Akuapim-North.

The latter, together with the emphasis on health and educational benefits, make that the caterers do not put much effort in buying from local farmers. The answers during the interviews suggest that they do not see buying the food from local farmers as part of their responsibility. Moreover, they are pride of their job because they provide children with a nutritious meal that makes them healthier and better in school; not because they help to create ready-market for local farmers.

3.7 Subsidiarity

Subsidiarity: is the principle that decision about the program are made on the most appropriate level for the issue concerned. For the GSFP this relates to the extent of decentralization since the main activities are carried out on the lower levels, meaning they are the appropriate level for many issues to be discussed.

With the decentralisation principle in the GSFP the management aims at high subsidiarity; besides the general national guidelines the decisions in the programme should be made at district and local level in order to adjust them to the local situation.

The DA and DIC however, although aware of their role within the GSFP, do not show a high feeling of ownership and involvement in the programme in terms of making decisions and making the programme work in their district. People at the DA do mention that the DA “has the autonomy to make decisions” (DFO, Akuapim-South) or “take decisions that we think is good for the programme in the district” (DCD, Akuapim-South), but actual measures, decisions or actions supporting the implementation which were not part of the national guidelines cannot be recalled. The next quote probably explains the role the DA/DIC have currently in the programme in a better way:

“As we (DA) oversee everything (about the GSFP) we certainly have an input to make...we plau a participatory role. We have to make sure the schools receive the funds but we cannot change much. Our power is to inform the NS about what we want to have done”. DCD Dangme-East.
Decisions that are made by the DA, not even de DIC, are the selection of caterer and sometimes cooks, the schools for the programme and the details of the release of funds and the request for this. For example the DA in Akuapim-South decided to keep paying the allowances of the caterers and cooks, even after the change to the caterer-system and in Akuapim-North it appeared that the caterers do not need to include a letter of conformation of the head teacher when they request the funds.

Partly because of the lack of power and involvement of the DA/DIC, theoretically the community has much freedom to adjust the functioning of the GSFP to the local situation. However in practise little independent decisions are made by people in the community that benefit the programme. In all schools the caterer showed to be in charge of buying the food and thus spending the money, and for cooking and providing the children with a meal. This, together with the limited involvement of the SIC, explains the low level of decision-making at community-level.

3.8 Equity & Inclusiveness and Sustainability

The last two indicators of good functioning of the GFSP, equity &Inclusiveness and Sustainability, are discussed together since little results can be given for both indicators.

Equity & Inclusiveness: This principle says that nobody should be excluded from the program based on gender, religion, race etc.

First, excluding people based on gender, religion, race, etc. does not happen in the GSFP. In almost all visited schools all children that wanted to start could be enrolled and when there were enrolment limits this was due to a lack of resources, e.g. teaching staff, class rooms, etc.

Sustainability: The extent to which the GSFP will be able to function successfully on the long run and also, the likelihood the current program will have positive effects for an extended period of time. In other words this means this indicator investigates whether the current functioning of the program can be effective for a long time. In the GSFP Programme Document 2007-2010 “sustainability refers to meeting the needs of the present generation without compromising the needs and of future generations.” (GoG, 2006: 7). With this the GSFP explicitly includes environmental sustainability.

Second, looking at the sustainability of the GSFP, the essential issue is in terms of finances. The GSFP is concerned with large amounts of money and only the feeding costs are about $ 24 million in 2009. At the moment this money is split between the Government of Ghana and the Government of the Netherlands, and the first has even higher costs due to costs for administration, organisation and employees of the programme.
The study showed that it is difficult to pay the DA the GSFP money at the right time; which implies difficulties at the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, where the money initially is distributed. Since the programme is expanding and aims to include twice the number of pupils at the end of 2010 than it does currently, these financial difficulties are likely to worsen.

The money for the feeding, organisation and activities of the GSFP needs to come from somewhere. The bulk of the money is for feeding, meaning it goes to the caterers who use it to buy food products. However they need to be financed, the sustainability of the programme would already be greatly enhanced when the demand of the GSFP in terms of food items would be integrated in the local and district markets. Currently, the programme is exogenous to the local structures with the consequence that to make it function as designed, activities are necessary to adjust the local market structure in order for the GFSP to fit in. More efficient and sustainable however, is to attempt to make the GSFP an endogenous element of the market structures in Ghana. Interventions that attempt to achieve this need to be sustainable in terms of their content, meaning for example that after implementation no further resources are needed. Furthermore, interventions need to aim at making local purchase the most beneficial way to demand and supply food products, for respectively the caterers and the farmers.

3.9 Conclusion

This chapter showed that for most of the nine indicators of good functioning that were used for the evaluation; the implications of the problems identified can often be linked to the market relation between caterers and farmers. In most cases, the results and identified problems concerning the different indicators could not be seen separately as they are interrelated. The lack of participation at local level for example, is directly linked to the lack of adherence to the programme design. Similarly, the problems regarding the lack in transparency and accountability are related.

The analysis of the GSFP in this chapter was based on the nine indicators that were adjusted from UNESCAP. Although they are useful in identifying the essence of problems and their underlying causes, in terms of supporting the objective of this study they are rather means than ends. As was already touched upon in the paragraph about accountability in the GSFP, good scores at each of the indicators that are used for the analysis of the overall programme functioning, are not essential to reach the desired market relation between caterers and local farmers.

This analysis also makes clear that the mere aim of this study is to create a favourable situation, in which the market relation between the GSFP and local farmers develops spontaneously. In using the indicators to evaluate the programme, it became clear that for most indicators the GFSP does not functions optimally. However, the same analysis showed that at the moment the programme would indeed be functioning properly according to these indicators, this would not automatically lead to all the programme objectives being reached, including the objective about local purchase. The exception is ‘effectiveness’ as this
indicator talks about the objectives; but achieving the best situation in terms of the other eight indicators
does not lead to reaching optimal effectiveness.
Table 3 summarizes the main weaknesses of each indicator that showed to have negative implications for
the establishment of a market relation between caterers and farmers. Moreover, the next column indicates
the opportunities the results in this chapter show to change the current situation.

Table 3: The implications of the functioning of the GSFP according to the nine indicators:
weaknesses and opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>No interest to participate in (contribute to) GSFP.</td>
<td>• Change of caterer-model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transfer tasks of SIC to other actor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to</td>
<td>Implementation activities not executed, leading to improper functioning</td>
<td>• Binding agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the programme</td>
<td>(not in line with design).</td>
<td>• Change or transfer from tasks from SIC and DIC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Low; farmers did not belong to the standard food-suppliers of caterers.</td>
<td>• Involving agricultural extension officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrate national food suppliers in GSFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Guidelines for food purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Use of existing structures such as MOFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extension officers’ network and local social/power relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Accountability is low and actors in the GSFP do not feel responsible.</td>
<td>• Change role of caterers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Binding agreements at national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Low; in particular little emphasis on objective to include local farmers.</td>
<td>• Involving collaborating ministries, such as MOFA. at district level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Awareness-raising about possibilities of GSFP for farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiarity</td>
<td>Low; important decisions are made at national level which means the GSFP does not adjust to local situations.</td>
<td>• Creating motivation for the programme, so people start using the position/power they have in the GSFP structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and</td>
<td>The only ‘problem’ that can be mentioned in this respect is the fact that not all public schools benefit from the GSFP.</td>
<td>• Expansion of programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>The main problems for the sustainability are the financial situation and the limited integration of the demand of the GSFP in the local market structures.</td>
<td>• Create favourable conditions for the establishment of a market relation between caterers and farmers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The market relation between the GSFP and local farmers: limiting and facilitating factors for farmers and caterers

In chapter 3 it was explained that the GSFP does buy food items from local farmers in the communities, but that this market relation has not developed to its full potential. This chapter discusses the limiting and facilitating factors for this relation from the point of view of the demand and supply side, the local farmers in the beneficiary communities and the caterers of the GSFP-schools.

4.1 Facilitating and limiting factors for caterers

This paragraph provides an overview of the facilitating and limiting factors in terms of buying from local farmers, for caterers in the GSFP. In the current situation, the limiting factors outweigh the facilitating factors, or in other words the benefits from buying from other sources are bigger than those related to buying from local farmers. It becomes clear that there is a difference in this respect between caterers working in urban or rural schools.

For all caterers, the main beneficial factor to do business with local farmers is that the farmers can offer their products cheaper than the market-sellers. Since market-sellers are an extra actor in the chain from farmer to buyer, they need to increase the price to make profit. Also, when farmers sell their own products they need to increase the price as they have to pay for the transport from the farm to the market. Consequently, when caterers buy from farmers at the farm-gate the prices are relatively low. For rural caterers however, this benefit is larger since they are generally close to farmers. Urban caterers need to pay for the transport of the items back to their schools which may partly or entirely cancel out the financial advantage of buying at the farm-gate. It has to be mentioned though, that one urban caterer explained that she sometimes meets the farmers close to their farms to do business and that the farmers later bring the bought products to her school-kitchen. In this situation they have costs for travelling to the farmers to make the buying agreements but no costs for transporting the food. It appeared that in most of these cases the products were still cheaper than at the markets, even though the farmers do have transport costs.

The demand side of the market relation between the GSFP and farmers is made up of the people that are involved in the food purchase for the schools. As explained earlier, in theory the SIC members should be involved in this but in practise it was observed that in all cases the caterers alone were responsible for the food purchase.

Putting it simple, in the current situation it is less practical for caterers to buy food items from local farmers compared to other sources, such as the market or food suppliers. Buying from these other food sources has several practical benefits for the caterers, over buying from local farmers. These practical benefits mainly concern time, the possibility to buy in bulk, availability and the possibility to buy on credit:
• Time; district markets offer the possibility to buy all the necessary food items at one place whereas going around in the community to order and/or purchase food items is time-consuming. Similarly, food suppliers provide in bulk and often take it directly to the school which also saves time.

• Buy in bulk; buying at district markets and from suppliers both offer more possibility to buy food items in greater quantity. The caterers showed a preference for having great quantities of items in stock since it saves time and money. Caterers from schools in Dangme-East and Akuapim-North even make the effort to travel to Accra, partly to buy food items in bulk.

• Availability; local farmers in the visited districts can only supply part of the necessary ingredients, according to the caterers they cannot supply the necessary quantities and their supply is bound to the farmer’s season(s). This means that, depending on the soil and the crops that are grown, there are only certain periods per year that the farmers can sell their harvest.

• Buying on credit; the late releases of GSFP funds force the caterers to seek credit possibilities when they do their purchases. Although there are caterers who do buy on credit from local farmers this is perceived to be easier at the market and from food suppliers. Smallholder farmers do prefer ready-cash and when they do sell on credit they are eager to get their money; as one caterer explains:

‘From farmers I know very well I can buy on credit…..but they keep stressing me about their money’, Caterer Nyame Bekyere Primary, Akuapim-North

Fig. 6: Practical purchases at the market: (left) buying in bulk and (right) good relations so buying on credit is possible.

In respect to these practical benefits, there are differences between caterers working in rural and urban schools. Unsurprisingly, the benefit of time and distance to the market is bigger for urban caterers. However, for all caterers it is beneficial that the market provides virtually all items at the same place; urban caterers have the extra advantage that they are generally close to the market, which consequently saves
more time. Also, generally urban caterers are physically further away from farmers than rural caterers. This is an extra limiting factor.

Taking this together, urban caterers have maximal benefits from buying e.g. at the market and moreover, they need to do more effort to come into contact with local farmers. Indeed, the caterers from urban schools in this study they buy less from farmers in the surrounding communities compared to caterers in rural GSFP schools.

Another aspect contributing to the limited local purchase relates to the mind-set of caterers. Although most of them were aware of the poverty-reduction objective included in the programme, the caterers see themselves first and foremost as food providers for the school children. Because they put the feeding of the children as their highest and most often only priority, the other roles they are supposed to play in the programme get less to no attention and effort. This mindset explains that caterers look for the most economic and efficient way to provide the meals. Consequently, the practical benefits of buying food at the market and from suppliers largely explain the way food is purchased.

The finding that caterers do not feel any responsibility for including local farmers in their practices is actually in line with the caterer-system mentioned before. Since the caterers work on contact-base, stating that they are responsible for feeding the children on every school day, it is not surprising that this is where caterers put their priority. Moreover, there are no practical guidelines for the caterers about food purchase.

During the introduction period of the GSFP at the schools there was, according to interviewees, always attention for the objective to buy from local farmers. However no follow-up support or information seemed to be provided. Consequently, caterers look for manners to buy food which are primarily beneficial for them instead of the overall objective of the programme.

Fig. 7: Caterers feeding the children, for them their most important task in the GSFP.
4.2 Facilitating and limiting factors for farmers

In this paragraph, the facilitating and limiting factors to sell to caterers of the GSFP for farmers are discussed. In the end it becomes clear that the market position of farmers is the main limiting factors but that the will among farmers to link up with caterers in present.

For farmers it would be beneficial to sell (more) to the GSFP. Many of them indeed mentioned they would be interested in linking up with caterers in nearby schools. The main benefits for farmers are in terms of time and money;

- Time; selling to the GSFP in the community means that there would be no, or at least, less need anymore to travel to the market to sell the products there. This would save time.
- Money; related to the decreased number of market visits is the benefit in terms of money. When farmers can sell their products in the community they do not need to pay the costs of transporting their products to the market. This is similar to the benefit rural caterers have when they buy from local farmers.

Interesting to see is that a number of farmers that sell to the GSFP answer that they like the programme so much because it on the one hand helps their children to go to school and, on the other hand, saves them money and food because they only need to give their children a meal twice a day instead of three times. When it is asked explicitly the farmers generally answered that they like selling to the programme but none of them mentions the possibility of selling to the GSFP as being the main personal benefit of the GFSP in their community.

On the supply side of the market relation that is investigated in this study, are the farmers in the beneficiary communities of the GSFP and surroundings. From the point of view of the farmers, the factors limiting a market relation with the GSFP schools are not very straightforward and are for a large part based in the current system of farming. Although many farmers say they would like to sell (more) to the GSFP there are several reasons why this is not practical or beneficial for them.

One important limiting factor based in the farming practices of Ghana concerns the pre-financing by so-called middle-men. In Dangme-East and Akuapim-South the directors of the district agricultural units explain that this happens and in Dangme-East and Akuapim-North there are farmers who mention this practise. As farmers often lack the financial resources for farm input and their access to financial support from e.g. banks is low, a system of pre-financing by middle-men developed. These market traders provide farmers with money to buy e.g. seeds, fertilizer and pesticides and after thereby purchase the harvest in advance. The disadvantage for farmers however is that, since they are dependant on the money of these middle-men to be able to start farming, these pre-financers can largely decide the final price they want to
pay for the products. Still, this system is not entirely negative for the farmers as they do obtain the financial means to farm and they have a buyer for their products. For the business relation between the GSFP and the farmers however, this system is an obstacle. As it forces the farmers to sell to the middle-men they cannot sell to the GSFP and consequently, the caterers are forced to buy from other sources.

Next, the results do suggest that the demand of the GSFP is not enough to motivate farmers to put effort in establishing a relation with the caterer or make changes in their farming activities. This is not explicitly said by all farmers, but also became clear from the stories of the caterers and observation.

The demand of the GSFS does not seem to be high enough to make up a significant, or at least significant from the point of view from the farmers, part of the entire supply. This means farmers do need other demand and this probably is one of the reasons farmers do not put more effort in trying to sell to the GSFP. For this particular study, this is partly explained by the type of crops that were grown by the farmers and thus could be sold to the GSFP. Since the crops were mainly fruits and vegetables and the caterer does not need these in major quantities such as rice or beans, the amount that in theory could be supplied by local farmers was relatively low. Moreover, since the majority of these items are perishable it is not possible for caterers to buy them in bulk and store them. Consequently, it is more attractive for farmers to sell to middle-men because they are certain their entire harvest is sold. However, it can still be said that the GFSP did not motivate farmers to start growing another crop, e.g. rice or beans, which are used in large quantities.

Fig. 8: Left: Local farmers who all have children at Darmang Presby in Akuapim-South. Right: The Mampong Farmer’s group in Akuapim-North.
4.3 Conclusion

Looking at the practical situation in which caterers and farmers are operating and expected to develop a business relation, it is clear there are more limiting than facilitating factors for them which explains the current situation in which there is low local purchase. For caterers it is more practical to buy from other sources due to benefits in terms of time, availability, quantity and credit possibilities. Although these benefits are larger for caterers working in an urban environment, for caterers from rural schools they seem to still be significant. The benefit of lower farm-gate prices compared to prices of food from other sources is not enough to make caterers buy mainly from local farmers. On the other hand, farmers would like to supply to the GSFP for time-related and financial benefits. However, the current system in which they are farming combined with the relatively low demand of the GSFP caused a lack of effort and motivation to develop a market relation with caterers.

Overall, it is clear that the limits for respectively buying from local farmers and selling to the GSFP outweigh the benefits in this respect for caterers and farmers and thus explain the finding that little business is being done in the community. In the next paragraph the situation is further explained, when the limiting and facilitating factors for the market relation between farmers and the GSFP in the programme design and organisation are discussed.
5. The market relation between the GSFP and local farmers: limiting and facilitating factors

5.1 Limiting factors in the programme design and functioning

The case studies in the field have shown that there are factors limiting the market relation between the GSFP and the local farmers which are not based at the grass-roots of the programme; they can be explained by the design and/or guidelines of the programme or by the overall organisation.

An important reason that not only makes it difficult for caterers to buy from local farmers, but also limits smooth functioning of the programme overall, is the late release of funds. In all cases in this study the DA did not receive the money for the GSFP in time. Consequently, they could not pay the caterers in time which gave major problems in buying food. In Akuapim-South it became clear that the DA pays the caterers, whether they received the GSFP-funds from national level or not. The DA uses ‘their own money’, as it is explained by caterers and DA members, and later deducts this prey-payment when the funds from national level are received. In Akuapim-North the DCD says they also finance the programme with their own money but this was not confirmed by caterers in that district. In Dangme-East people at the DA explain they do not have money to help the caterers when the funds are not paid in time. Generally, all caterers mention they have problem with financing, although the degree of difficulty depends partly on whether the DA is able to support them with money before the GSFP funds are released.

Another important factor in this respect is the possibility for caterers to buy on credit. As a solution for the lack of money caterers purchase food items on credit; they get the food but pay later. Since virtually all caterers have market relations with market women there is enough thrust to be able to buy on credit when necessary. There were also cases however, where caterers had to shift to other sellers to be able to pay on credit-base. It is also possible to buy on credit from local farmers but as they are rather impatient to receive their money it is easier to ask market women for credit.

In terms of local purchasing the late release of money and consequently the credit issues make a market relation between the GSFP and the local farmers less attractive for both sides. Since farmers want, and are often in need, for ready-cash this issues makes selling to the GSFP less attractive and selling on the market more attractive. Similarly, the difficult credit possibilities in the communities make is also more attractive for the caterers to purchase the food at the market or from suppliers.

Sometimes, one of the consequences of the delays in funds release is that caterers and/or the DA shift to food suppliers, which can either individual people or companies. In Akuapim-South caterers and DA members explain that the DA started to support buying from suppliers since it became difficult for the caterers to obtain the necessary ingredients due to the delays in funds release. According to the DA the
suppliers do not want to sell on credit to individual caterers; they want a bigger institution to guarantee their payment and thus the DA got involved. However, the desk officer at the DA communicated with the suppliers and made sure the payments were made. Rice is bought from the Ghana Rice Company, beans and groundnuts are ordered from the North of the country.

The caterers from the visited schools in Akuapim-North both had personal relations with suppliers. One caterer orders rice, beans and cooking oil from the Ghana Rice Company in Accra and pays on credit. The other caterer also buys rice from the Ghana Rice Company but groundnuts, (soy) beans and corn are ordered from farmers in the Northern Region who deliver it to the school.

Buying on credit though, is relatively expensive since the creditors increase for the favour of selling on credit. In other word, if the money from the GSFP would be released in time which would make local purchasing more attractive, there would be a financial benefit.

A non-financial issue related to the lack of support within the programme functioning for the development of a business relation between the caterers of the GSFP and local farmers in beneficiary communities.

The case-studies of the schools showed that, in the situations local purchases happened, the initiatives for this came from the caterers and local farmers themselves. In some instances, the SIC and/or PTA were also said to be involved in identifying local farmers and linking them to the GSFP but often this was only at the starting phase of the programme at the school. Although the initiatives of the caterers and farmers are in itself positive as it shows motivation for this business relation and provides opportunities for the development of a sustainable market relation between these actors, the programme design stated additional support would be provided to facilitate local purchase. Until now, this additional support has not been provided and also, the market relation between the GSFP and local farmers did not develop far.

Within the development and establishment of the market relation between local farmer and the GSFP an important role was reserved for MOFA. At district level their main activity is the education of farmers in terms of better farming, technologies and marketing. In the programme design the role of MOFA was to support the linkage between the GSFP and the local farmers; the agricultural extension officers working in the field could identify farmers for the GSFP and support farmers to produce for the ready-market of the GSFP. In practice however, MOFA is not a collaborating partner in the GSFP.

The results from this study suggest that the main problem for the lack of MOFA involvement lies at district level. Due to the malfunctioning of the DIC, MOFA is not included in the implementation of the programme. Interesting to mention is that the interviewed people from the municipal/district agricultural development units were very well aware of the role the agricultural extension officer could play.

A last important issue concerning linking the GSFP to local farmers relates to responsibility. In chapter 3 it was already explained that the accountability in the programme is low, but moreover, who carries the final responsibility for developing the market relation between caterers and farmers is not clear. Several actors are mentioned to have a role in this, such as the caterers, the extension officers of MOFA and the SIC, but
these descriptions are in terms of activities they need to carry out to support the development of the business relation; nobody carries the final responsibility or overview.

5.2 The menu of the GSFP as facilitating agent

Actually, this paragraph was supposed to deal with the facilitating factors in the programme design and overall functioning that facilitate the market relation between caterers and local farmers. However, the study could not identify clear facilitating factors in this respect. Naturally, in theory there are numerous aspects of the programme design that aim to be facilitating and supporting in terms of the business relation between the GSFP and local farmers, but in practise most of these are not executed.

Still, the results showed opportunities at different level and concerned with different aspects of the GSFP where changes could lead to more local purchase by caterers. One of these is the menu that is used by the caterers and since the menu was difficult to categorise as either a limiting or facilitating factor, the situation and opportunities in terms of the menu are discussed here.

In theory the menu, and thus the ingredients that are used for the meals, plays a determining role in to what extent local purchasing is possible for the caterers. The way the menu is drawn up is not clear; in Akuapim-South some caterers say they receive a menu from the DA every term; another caterer mentions the district caterers make the menu and send it to the DA for approval. In Akuapim-North the district is not involved; the caterer received a general menu from the NS but say they adjusted it to local products. In Dangme-East the caterer of the pilot school says she received a menu at the start of the programme but she changed many meals according to the taste of the children. The caterer of the newly included school says she makes the menu herself at the start of each term.

All together it becomes clear that the menu is not made in collaboration with the district health departments and the nutritionist. When talking to the nutritionist in Akuapim-South he says he was included in the preparation of the menu for the first GSFP in that district but after that he was not involved anymore in any way. Comparing the meals given by the nutritionist and the meals that are on the menu of the first GSFP-school in the district it becomes clear that about half of the meals are still the same and the other half has changed.

As mentioned, most caterers either make their own menu, sometimes together with other caterers, or they adjust the menu. Although some of them say they change the menu according to local products and tastes, observation shows that the menu is not always followed and even more, the meals do not consist of products from the region. However this is only partly clear on the menus, most meals are based on rice or beans. During the school visits the meals were waakye, rice and stew or gari with beans. In the visited district these items were not, or in very little quantities, produced and consequently needed to come from outside. The frequent use of rice and beans also is a consequence of the financial delays. Rice and beans showed to be relatively easy products to buy on credit at the market or from suppliers. Moreover, all caterers and head teachers mentioned that rice was the pupils’ favourite dish.
Apart from the unclear development and use of the menu, there is a great opportunity to use the menu as a guiding agent for caterers and farmers. When the menu is solely based on local products, buying from local farmers becomes more attractive to caterers. This could lead to a change in the buying habits from caterers, which is likely to positively affect for the relation between caterers and farmers. To achieve this, agricultural extension officers could play a role in developing a menu based on local products and to link caterers with farmers. However, it should be taken into account that some products, which are fixed ingredients of the meals, cannot grow in all parts of Ghana. It is therefore that that possibility of linking caterers to national food suppliers is a promising opportunity; this is further discussed in chapter 6.

5.3 Conclusion

In all, it can be concluded that in the programme design and the overall functioning of the GSFP there are more factors that limit the (development of) a marker relation between the GSFP and local farmers than that there are factors facilitating this. The late release of funds forces caterers to buy on credit which I is often not possible when buying from local farmers. Besides, caterers buy from suppliers, partly due to the late release of funds, who supply the caterer with food from other parts of Ghana. It can be said that within the programme design nobody is responsible for objective of local purchase and this shows in how the GSFP is currently buying its food. One issue that has potential to facilitate local purchase is the menu of the GSFP schools. Overall, currently the menus are not made as the design outlines however this does not need to be a bad thing. When, in whatever way, the menu is adjusted to locally available products ad taste it makes it easier for the caterer to find much of the food within the communities.
6. The market relation between the GSFP and local farmers: opportunities for improvement

In the three previous chapters the main results of the study have been discussed. In this chapter this information will be linked and integrated, sometimes with new results, to show possibilities to improve the market relation between the GSFP and the local farmers. The chapter divides the opportunities into three categories; new actors/actor-network, the possibilities of non-used resources and binding agreements and guidelines. For some of the opportunities to actually work, changes or interventions in more than one of these categories are necessary. It is also possible that changes or interventions in different categories will enhance each other’s impact. Consequently, several aspects to which opportunities are linked are mentioned several times, in different categories.

In figure 10 the relation between farmers and caterers in the GSFP is placed centrally. In the boxes around this, the different opportunities for making the market relation between caterers and farmers more beneficial to both these actors are depicted. The menu as facilitating agent was already discussed in the last paragraph.

Fig. 10: Schematic representation of the opportunities for creating a situation in which establishing a market relation between caterers and farmers becomes more attractive. The arrows indicate whether these proposed changes primarily affect the caterer, the farmers or the demand-supply relation between them.
6.1 New actor roles

Several opportunities for the improvement of the market relation between the GSFP and farmers relate to actors of the GSFP changing their role or to the inclusion of new actors in the network. Sometimes, these changes in roles would go together with excluding actors from the network or taking roles away from a certain actor.

As became very clear in earlier chapter, the DIC and SIC are not functioning. Since these are the two main bodies involved in establishing the link between local farmers and the programme, their function and participation should either be strengthened or their tasks should be transferred somewhere else.

**District Implementation Committee**

Stricter guidelines and monitoring systems concerning the functioning of the DA and the DIC could improve the functioning of this body. However, this is not in line with the decentralisation aspect of the GSFP. Moreover, this study suggests that the Ghana Education Service at district level would be appropriate to take over (part of) the steering and organising role of the DA.

During this study the Ghana Education Services in the visited districts provided information about the enrolment in the GSFP schools and their role within the programme. Their regular role is to provide the official enrolment figures of the beneficiary schools for the fund distribution. It was also mentioned that when educational circuit officers visit GSFP schools they inform about the functioning of the programme and in Akuapim-South it was mentioned that educational health officers also check the kitchens and hygiene when they visit a GSFP school. The motivation of the GES for the GSFP that was observed, in particular in Akuapim-South and Akuapim-North, suggests that this body may be more effective in executing GFSP activities at district level.

The monitoring of food purchases could relatively easily be included in the work of educational circuit officers or educational health officers. Since their daily activities consist of visiting schools to monitor a variety of school and educational aspects, this inclusion would simply mean the monitoring of an extra aspect. Taking the possibility to increase the role of the GES a step further, (part of) the organising role of the DA could be transferred to the GES. Currently, the DCE is responsible for setting up a DIC and for calling their meetings. However, this position already is very busy and does not specifically relate to education. Although the GSFP goes beyond education, the director of the district offices of the GES may be more motivated to establish the DIC and organise meetings.

**School Implementation Committee**

Similar to the DA and DIC, stricter guidelines and monitoring systems could improve the functioning of the SIC. Again, this is not in line with the decentralisation aspect of the GSFP and moreover, it is doubtful whether this is the most efficient manner to enhance the relation between caterers and farmers. A very straightforward solution to motivate SIC members is to pay them for their function in the committee; however this is not beneficial for the financial situation and the sustainability of the programme. Another
option is to make the composition of the SIC more flexible, meaning that people who actually want to be part of the committee can join instead of the current method where appointment of members is based on the guidelines of the programme.

Based on the study a more promising possibility would be shifting the role(s) of the SIC to other bodies to make this committee (partly) unnecessary. This could be attempted by giving the PTA the roles of the SIC and involving the agricultural extension officer of the region in their activities. The other activities and responsibilities of the PTA may facilitate the inclusion of GSFP issues in their meetings; as they are meeting anyway it is a relatively small effort to add the GSFP to their discussion. Besides, when this committee would link up with the agricultural extension officer in their area, that person could inform the local farmers and facilitate collaboration with the caterer of the school.

**Caterers**

The caterers that were interviewed in this study were all motivated and capable women. As mentioned earlier in the report, their priority is to feed the children in their school. This mind-set does not facilitate local purchase, in particular since it was also found that the caterers are virtually solely responsible for the purchase of food. Besides, although the programme design states that caterers should buy from farmers, there is no other way the caterers are made responsible for this, e.g. through accountability or monitoring systems. Positive in this respect however was that most of the caterers seemed to be aware of the objective to include local farmers. Moreover, they could explain the (potential) benefits of the programme for the local farmers.

Taking these findings into consideration, it is likely that more awareness about the responsibility of caterers to buy from local farmers, especially with the caterers themselves, may indeed lead to a better market relation with farmers. It is also important that local purchases are made more attractive from an economical and practical point of view. The latter is important as there is no unwell to buy from local farmers among the caterers; they are mainly practical benefits in doing business with market sellers and/or food suppliers. In practise, the guidelines could be clearer in stating the responsibility of caterers to buy from local farmers. In particular with more monitoring this could lead to more efforts from caterers to do business with local farmers. However, best results are likely to be only obtained when buying from local farmers is more attractive for caterers than buying from other sources, since this would lead to genuine interest and effort from caterers.

Part of the problem with the low priority of local purchase for the caterers, is the caterer system itself. As this contract makes them solely responsible for providing the meals, their attention is averted from the farmers-objective, especially with the current delays in fund release. Changing back to the initial system, where the caterer was called a matron, was paid by the DA and did not bear sole responsibility for the cooking, could facilitate more effort from caterers (or matrons). Still, there is no evidence that in the matron-system local purchase was significant and more pro-active measures are necessary to establish a good-functioning market relation between caterers and local farmers.
Box III: Case study of IFDC-GSFP project in the Northern Region

The importance of the attitude of the caterer became abundantly clear during a visit to a school in the Northern Region, close to Tamale, which is enrolled in the IFDC programme. One of the activities of IFDC in West-Africa is linking small-scale farmers to a market and in line with this project, within the GSFP they have small project where they actively try to link schools with the GSFP and their caterers to the local community and in particular the farmers. In practice, one person is hired by the IFDC to link 6 different GSFP schools to their communities. There are 6 schools for every district in the Northern Region.

At the visited school it is explained that the feeding goes on well and the head teacher explains that he likes the GSFP more than the previous feeding programmes, mainly due to variety of meals. The caterer is a woman coming from Tamale and was introduced by the DA when the GSFP started; the cooks are from the village and already worked for the previous programme on a voluntarily basis. However, the IFDC linking person has been working at this school for a year now; the caterer still buys virtually all the food at the market in Tamale.

Talking with one of the leaders of the farmer’s group in the village it becomes clear that this man has good contact with the IFDC man but that, as already became clear at the school, the farmers in the village and the caterer did not develop any kind of market relation. Interesting to see is that the farmers do grow a variety of crops and there are also some processors, of e.g. rice, in the village, who have been educated by the IFDC man to increase the quality of their product. It also becomes clear that the GSFP is a well-known project in the village. The farmer for example explains that the cooks of the programme, who come form the village, have not been paid in a very long time.

It is noteworthy that the farmer explains that, although they have contact with the man of IFDC and thus are fully aware of the GSFP objective to buy from the community, they never approached the caterer of the school. He does say though that it would be beneficial for them to sell to the school, because of similar reasons heard in from other farmers in this study; benefits in terms of time and money. He actually states that because the caterer comes from town she buys everything there; it is suggested she has suppliers there with whom she has agreements.

Overall, although it is difficult to make hard conclusions in this respect, this visit does suggest that the attitude of the caterer to buy locally is essential and that, even when someone is supporting the farmers to become a good trading partner for the GSFP, the caterer should be involved and motivated.
6.2 The possibilities of unexploited resources

In the setting in which the GSFP is functioning, there are existing structures and systems which are not used in the programme, but are likely to have a positive impact on the relation between caterers and local farmers, when they could be efficiently included in the GSFP functioning. Since these resources are already functioning systems or structures, little additional resources are necessary to e.g. hire new people, set-up the project etc. This benefit is extremely important against the background of the financial sustainability of the programme.

Agricultural Extension Officers

The most important unexploited resource in the setting of the GSFP is the network of agricultural extension officers of MOFA. Although the programme design does explain the way MOFA could/should be involved in the GSFP, in practise this is not happening. From the interviews with extension officers and the DADU/MADU directors it becomes clear that linking farmers to market and teaching them market skills is one of their tasks, besides their main priority teaching them better farming methods. The interviewees from DADU/MADU were perfectly aware of the role MOFA could play in the GSFP:

“Since the programme is about food and feeding MOFA should be involved...we could tell the farmers to produce for the GSFP; marketing is major problem. If I was a member (of the DIC/GSFP) I could tell the GSFP where all the products could be bought. When MOFA would be included in the GSFO, the extension officers could link the farmers to the schools and caterers. I see myself as part of the farmers. We are on the side of the farmers and then the GSFP on the other side. We could sensitize the farmers that there is ready-market for certain products. For some products there is not much market (demand); we could sensitize the farmers to vary their products and start producing things needed by the GSFP, e.g. maize. We know where maize or rice can be produced...then we can tell the farmers there to produce those products since there is ready-market of the GSFP”. Dir. DADU Dangme-East.

For the GSFP it is most important that the District Agricultural Development Departments are involved in the implementation and running of the programme since in the end the extension officers working for the DADU/MADU actually could be the link farmers to the GSFP. It was argued that the DCE of the districts failed to organise meetings for the DIC and invite DADU/MADU and, even when measures in this respect were taken at national level, its success depends on whether the DA take their responsibility in setting up a functioning DIC. Still, making MOFA aware of the role they could play in the programme and the fact that this is not happening at the moment is probably a first step.

Farmer groups

Related to the opportunities of MOFA in the GSFP is the possibility of having farmer groups as suppliers for the GSFP. Farmer based organisations already exist in Ghana but until now, have not yielded great
benefits for its members. Talking to two FBO in Akuapim-North made clear that they were benefits in terms of social support, knowledge transfer and more opportunities to get a loan. However, advantages in terms of a more powerful position at the market or other market-related benefits were not mentioned.

Farmer groups and the GSFP could benefit from each other; the farmers could supply the caterers with cheap and fresh products and the GSFP would not only increase their market but also serve as an incentive to build and strengthen their organisation. The farmer group could take over the position of the middle-men (market traders) in the current situation and form a professional cooperation with which the caterers could do business.

MOFA could play a role in the forming of these farmer co-operations. This is based on the information that the farmer groups included in this study were partly built and functioning due to the efforts of the agricultural extension officer in their area. Education about how to build a professional organisation or how to come to business agreement could be included in the teaching package of the agricultural officers.

Food suppliers

In the GSFP design it is outlined that the first priority in terms of sources for food is the local community, secondly the district and thirdly the national food market. The local community is the first priority since these investments are most likely to decrease poverty among farmers. Nevertheless it is not always possible to buy all food items from local farmers due to low supply or simply because some products cannot be grown everywhere. Indeed, caterers buy many products at district markets where part of the food is imported, such as the rice in figure 11. Here lies an opportunity to make the programme more effective in terms of investing in the national food/farm industry.

![Fig. 11: Rice used at the visited schools: produced in Vietnam, Thailand and China.](image)

At the moment, most caterers buy their products at the market and do not pay attention to where the food they buy is produced. Consequently, in the kitchens of other caterers it was obvious the rice mostly came from outside the country and at the market it was explained that beans are often coming from Togo. Since
beans, and even more rice, make up a substantial part of the meals the caterers that used the rice and beans coming from Ghana most likely used more national food in terms of quantity compared to the other caterers.

In Akuapim-South the caterers are supplied by big food suppliers via the DA and in Akuapim-North the visited caterers had individual relations with the Ghana Rice Company and local farmer from the north of the country that supplied them with rice, beans, maize and cooking oil. These ways of purchasing assure that the money is invested in the national economy instead of spent on imported products.

These food sources in the form of food suppliers who trade in nationally produced items and direct relations with farmers in other parts of the country have the potential to increase the amount of nationally produced food that is used in the GSFP and thus the amount of money that is invested in the national economy. Since technical and environmental issues limit the growth of all types of crops in every part of the country (farmers mention soil characteristics and weather conditions), the inclusion of these food sources in the GSFP are likely to increase the national impact of the programme as compared to just focusing on local purchase.

The National Secretariat and other bodies involved in the programme, most effectively MOFA, could play a role in linking caterers to food suppliers or farmers/farmer’s cooperation who want to supply to the GSFP. These suppliers could register at the GSFP and possibly be checked on e.g. the quality of their products.

**6.3 Binding agreements and guidelines**

**Ministry of Food and Agriculture**

It became clear that the activities allocated to MOFA are not executed. Although a major reason is the lack of functioning DIC in which MOFA would have a seat, another important factor is the lack of binding agreements between the GSFP and the collaborating ministries at national level. Since MOFA is not officially linked to the programme, the GSFP are not priorities and the ministry cannot be held accountable for not doing their activities. An effective change therefore would be to formulate an official contract with MOFA, specifying their role and responsibilities in the programme. Consequently, MOFA is bonded to their responsibilities by law, making them accountable. Moreover, since it was found that people working at MOFA are perfectly aware of the linking role they could play in the GSFP, binding agreements may lead to success.

It has to be mentioned that it would not be surprising when MOFA wants to receive money for their GSFP activities, at the moment they officially commit themselves to the programme. In particular since budget limits were found to be a reason for not executing activities related to the GSFP, it is likely MOFA only want to commit to the objectives when they are allocated with GFSP funds.
Food purchase guidelines

In paragraph 6.1 it was mentioned that changing the role of the caterers in the programme, making them aware of the farmer objective of the GSFP, would facilitate local purchase. It was also mentioned that other incentives are also necessary for the development of a successful business relation between caterers and local farmers. One of these incentives could consist of guidelines about the purchase of food.

Currently, caterers do no receive clear guidelines about where and how they should buy food. Consequently they look for the most practical way to do the purchase for them, which at the moment does not include buying from local farmers. Guidelines that would lay out how and where to look for food could drastically change the manner food is obtained. Besides explaining why food should be bought in the locality, information could be provided about how to approach farmers, how to come to agreements and how to build long-lasting relationships with them. These guidelines could also include information about food suppliers for food that is not available in the region (or for which the supply is low and thus the price high) and the role of the agricultural extension officers.

6.4 Conclusion

There are different opportunities in which the market relation between caterer and farmers can be strengthened, or in other words, in which the amount of food that is bought in the community can be increased. In terms of actors, an attempt could be made to change the DIC and SIC into functioning units. More promising however is to transfer (part of) their roles to other bodies, respectively the GES and the PTA. In terms of unused resources there is a great opportunity in the form of the agricultural extension officers. Including them as link between farmers and caterers is one of the most promising opportunities, especially since the network of extension officers is already present. A pro-active position of farmers could be facilitated when farmer would set up co-operations to take over the role of the middle-men. Next, linking caterers actively with suppliers of nationally produced food is likely to increase the investment in the national economy. In terms of binding agreements, contracts or MOU with collaborating ministries assure their active participation and execution of the activities that were assigned to them. Besides, guidelines for the caterers about local purchase may be effective in boosting buying from local farmers.

The effectiveness of these measures is multiplied when they are combined. When extension officers link farmers and caterers to each other, caterers are likely to put more effort in this opportunity for suppliers when they were provided with guidelines identifying farmers as their main suppliers or when people in the community or at school express the wish for locally produced items. Similarly, the inclusion of food suppliers in the GSFP is likely to be more effective when extension officers are also included, since they also can play a linking role.
7. Discussion, conclusion and recommendations

This chapter covers the discussion of the results, the main conclusions of the study and the recommendations for strengthening the relation between the GSFP and the local farmers in the communities. The discussion of the methodology is in paragraph 3.4.1; limitations of the study.

Discussion of the results

From exogenous to endogenous

Taking into account the results of this study, the objectives that were set still are to be relevant. However, the main objective, finding opportunities to strengthen the market relation between the GSFP and local farmers, has to be reconsidered. Although this is still part of the solution, the objective needs to be widened. Next to a strong relation between caterers and farmers it is necessary that the market structure in which these actors are functioning favours the development of a business relation between them; that the local market situation changes in such a way the GSFP can integrate. Besides the fact that such a favourable situation facilitates the sustainability and autonomy of the GSFP, it will lead to the development of a relation between caterers and farmers.

The reconsideration of the objective was largely based on the finding that the GSFP is an exogenous structure in the Ghanaian local markets. Although this was not one of the objectives of the study, the results show the programme is not embedded in the networks and systems in Ghana and therefore is not functioning ‘automatically’; without policy interventions. To make the programme sustainable and at the same time effective and efficient, it should ideally functioning without the intervention or incentives from outside, meaning laws, financial input etc., so actually as an endogenous network.

Recently, the WFP established a framework for HGSFP and identified six factors that determined the degree to which HGSFP can benefit small-scale farmers (WFP, 2009). According to the WFP it is important to look a whether the food govern to the children is based on local tastes and consumption patterns, the degree of political support for the programme, the institutional capacity to implement the programme, small-scale farmers’ productivity and capacity to respond to the needs of the programme, the availability of funds and the capacity to maintain the programme over time, even if small-scale farmers’ productivity is still low. This study concluded that, for a HGSFP to be beneficial for local farmers, the main determining factor is to what extent the designed structure of the GSFP is embedded in the local market; in other words, to what extent the GSFP is an endogenous structure. For this situation there are several important criteria that, based on this study, determine the benefits a HGSFP has for local farmers:

1. **The extent to which food purchase from local farmers in beneficial to the farmers and to the caterer.** This study showed that the decision concerning where food is bought or to whom products are sold in the end is determined by what brings most benefits. Consequently, the
endogenous functioning of the market relation between caterers and farmers can only be brought about when such a beneficial situation is facilitated. Note that, although many of the benefits that mentioned here are economical, but that other issues such as status or a feeling of responsibility can play equally important roles.

2. **The inclusion of (an) institution(s) that actively work to involve small-scale farmers and link them to the programme.** Since the study showed that the market relation between caterers and farmers does not develop spontaneously additional measures are needed to accomplish this.

3. **The use of existing structures to implement the programme instead of creating new committees and networks.** The results of the study show that little motivation and effort is invested in creating the new programme structures. Moreover, since it was observed that there are motivated people at all governmental levels, there are opportunities to implement the regulating and governing processes of the GFSP in existing bodies and structures.

4. **Whether, at institutional level, actors are held responsible for their tasks within the GSFP.** Institutionally, it is important that actors are held accountable for their responsibilities because otherwise they do not execute their tasks. It has to be mentioned that for the market relation between caterers and farmers, it is believed that personal motivation, i.e. the believe that purchase from local farmers is indeed beneficial, is essential instead of structures to for example, hold caterers responsible for buying from local farmers.

5. **For the sustainability of the programme, the availability of funds is essential.** In order to create a beneficial market relation for caterers and farmers the assurance that caterers are able to pay for their purchases is likely to be important.

**Developmental approach as pitfall of design**

A contributing factor of the result that the GSFP is exogenous to the market system sin Ghana was the model that was used to evaluate the overall functioning of the programme; the nine indicators of good governance. Although in principle it was concluded that this model as not appropriate to use for this analysis, it did abundantly make clear that the entire GSFP structure is not part of the Ghanaian structures, and therefore is not functioning as designed.

The model that was used in this study involved the nine indicators of good governance, which were adapted from the nine indicators of good governance of UNESCAP. When the study was designed this model seemed appropriate as it covers all aspects of a programme and is able to identify where problems are situated. Analyzing the data of the research afterwards however, made clear that this approach is not optimal for the objectives of this study. It became clear that the analysis of the GSFP, based on the ‘nine indicators’ approach did not fit with the results of the in-depth case studies of GSFP communities. Moreover, the approach seemed to define the GSFP as an exogenous project and gives the impression that the programme cannot be successful if the nine indicators are not sufficiently met. Although the successful evaluation in terms of the different indicators is indeed the aim of the model, this is actually not appropriate.
for the GSFP. The indicators of the approach are not objective entities but place the programme within the subjective development approach. However, the GSFP is not a classic development programme in terms of its content, although some of the objectives are development related and also are objectives of development organisations.

As mentioned, another problem of this approach is that a developmental point of view is not in line with the objectives of this study. However the use of the indicators of the model can support the identification of problems, successful programme functioning is not related to good scores in terms of these indicators. Mentioned at the beginning of the discussion was that the actual aim of the recommendations is that the GSFP changes into an endogenous part of the local markets in Ghana. To achieve this, it is not necessary that the programme meets the requirements as they are often identified for development projects. For the GSFP to become an endogenous structure it is not essential that the accountability or transparency is high. It is possible that caterers and farmers develop a well-functioning demand-supply relation without the national level being aware of the local situation. Similarly, caterers and farmers do not need to be aware of the programme design when they are trading with each other.

The last problem that was identified when using the model of nine development indicators concerns the free market. The use of this model diverge the attention from the free market forces that have a role in the programme, or actually in the supply-demand relation between caterers and farmers.

The indicators that were used in this study are not appropriate to evaluate the GSFP and to guide the programme towards endogenous functioning in the local market structures in Ghana. This raises the question which indicators are most appropriate to use in this respect. The ‘mistake’ that was made with using nine development-related indicators suggests that direct, programme-related measures are most appropriate. To monitor if the GSFP is working in terms of providing demand for local farmers, it is necessary to look at whether farmers indeed sell to caterers, and experience this as being beneficial for them, and similarly, whether caterers indeed buy from farmers, and experience this as being beneficial. Besides the straightforward indicators whether food is traded between farmers and caterers, other benefits of this relation may be valued and facilitate the decision to trade with each other.

The general findings of this study are in line with other recent studies about the GSFP and the link with local farmers;

- A study done by SEND Ghana, published in May 2009, showed that overall; the complementary services were below expectation. For the agricultural component of the programme the study found that food was mainly obtained from open markets in and outside the districts and stakeholders in over 90% of the visited schools stated that food items were not directly purchased from local farmers. Moreover, in 87% of the beneficiary communities farmers did not benefit from any extension services from the MOFA and the directors of Agriculture at district level were not
involved in the implementation of the GSFP and not aware of its objectives, strategies etc. The study found that weak institutional collaboration between the GSFP and the decentralised collaborating ministry departments as the main reason causing the lack of complementary services (SEND, 2009). This, and the lack of involvement of the agricultural departments at district level, is similar to the findings in research.

Note that, although generally the findings in this study are similar to the findings of SEND Ghana, one noteworthy finding of this study does not correspond. The directors of the district Agricultural departments in this study were actually perfectly aware of the content of the GSFP and of the role MOFA should or could play in the programme. Consequently, this provides a major opportunity to include the MOFA, in particular their agricultural extension officers, to create favourable conditions for farmers and caterers to establish a market relation.

- Another study, done by ECASARD and SNV, and published in May 2009, showed that 200 farmers in 5 districts in the Greater Accra Region did not benefit from the GSFP in terms of ready-market or more income; the only benefit 21% of them pointed out were the benefits the programme had for their children (ECASARD/SEND 2009).

However this first impact study is negative, it should be considered that in the methodology of this research the participating communities were not selected based on the presence of the GSFP. Consequently, only a small amount of the participating communities were beneficiaries of the programme which in itself can explain the lack of impact. Still, it is interesting to see that, similar to this study, ECASARD also found that farmers see the benefits the programme has for their children as their individual profit of the programme.

Besides, the results of this study confirm the conclusions from earlier research, which was already discussed in the introduction.

- An evaluation of the GSFP, done by SNV and published in November 2008, concluded that the community (members of the SIC) are almost not involved in the food purchase and that this is the sole responsibility of the caterer. Furthermore, it also showed that there is little record keeping about the food purchases and that the involvement of DA/DIC in schools varies greatly.

However, all these studies were primarily observatory and to a lesser extent explanatory. In particular the situation of caterers and farmers, and their arguments pro or con the market relation between them, has been left aside. This study on the other hand, does provide in-depth information about these topics. Still, the similar general findings of these other studies increase the external validity of this study.

**Local purchase and market functioning**

The subject of this study was the market relation between the GSFP and the local farmers in the communities where the GSFP is implemented at one or more schools. The study design of the programme said that if the GSFP schools would buy at least 80% of the ingredients for the meals from local farmers the
total benefit for the national economy would be $147 million by the end of the implementation period in 2010 (GOG, 2006). Moreover, in the AOP of this year it was stated again:

Importantly, it is expected that this strategy will be supported by the spending of 80% of the feeding cost in the local economy, as the community of the school, before the district as a whole for the direct sourcing of inputs (AOP, 2009, page 9).

There are two important comments to make here. First, the programme design talks about the investment in the national economy whereas the objectives and impact of the programme mainly seem to concern increasing the income of local farmers and increasing their production. Also the aims to reduce poverty and strengthen local food production suggest that the main target is the locality of the GSFP schools. Secondly, it is not unquestionable that 80% of the food is coming from Ghana, meaning that those expenditures are indeed invested in the national economy, but the results from this study and other clearly show that in terms of local purchasing the 80% target is not reached (SEND, 2008; WFP, 2007).

This and other studies show several reasons for the lack of local purchasing in the GSFP. From an economical point of view, the caterers of the GSFP are on the demand side of the market and the local farmers are one of the possible suppliers. The programme already explicitly outlined that the implantation entailed providing incentives to develop the market relation between the farmers and the GSFP however these have not been given. Without many doubts the involvement of MOFA, better guidelines about purchase strategies for the caterers and other measures could improve the desired market relation within the GSFP communities. Nevertheless, since the caterers and farmers operate in a relatively free economy where market forces operate, the market relation could have been developed spontaneously; without interference or support from the government or other organisations. The ready-market demand of the GSFP was thought to be a great incentive for local farmers to approach the GSFP as a supplier or to start farming targeted at supplying the GSFP. All this has not happened and in trying to establish a functioning market relation between the GSFP and local farmers this has to be taken into account. Incentives should create an economically beneficial environment for the market relation between famers and caterers and, more importantly, should be sustainable.

Moreover, linking the theory about community-supported agriculture of Hinrichs to the thought above, the argument that a sustainable market relation should develop spontaneously and that new incentives should make the GSFP-farmer relation more attractive in terms of economic goals, even stronger. Hinrichs says, as already discussed in the introduction of this report that the social relations and responsibility in local networks may lead to individual actors taking decision in favour of the total network instead of individual gain. However, even in a strong local network, the economic drive of people should not be underestimated (Hinrichs, 2000). For the caterers in the GSFP this means that their personal profit objective should not be
underestimated and local farmers in the GSFP communities will always consider the price and practical benefits before deciding who to sell to. Consequently, in strengthening the local food network of the GSFP, the economic goals and benefits of all actors should be considered.

Another aspect of the market structure in Ghana is the high reliance on the local (informal) network and the fact that secure farmers-trader relationships are underdeveloped, shown by a research into the vegetable market in Ghana (Poole et al., 2003). Since this study was also concerned with vegetables and small-scale farmers, the results of this research are interesting in respect to the results about the market of the GSFP. The high reliance on the local informal network for information about market demand and new commodities is comparable with the finding in this study that many farmers do not know market prices and rely on friends and people in their surrounding for this information. Still, it depends on to what extent farmers have contact with the agricultural extension officer of their area as it that case, that person seems to be the main source of information. The fact that farmers know little about the market mechanism decreases the power they have in negotiations with traders since, as explained by several farmers in this study, ‘have to agree without knowing what e.g. the real price is’. Another similar finding was that relations with traders were undeveloped. Although farmers in this study mentioned to have familiar traders with whom they regularly do business, there still was uncertainty and farmers ran high risks while dealing with these trades.

In the research of Poole et al, the option of contacts between farmers and traders was investigated. Establishing contracts has several benefits for farmers and may therefore be an option to link them to caterers in the GSFP.

On the other hand it can be argued that the limiting factors in the market relation between the GSFP and local farmers are largely also causing general poverty and the general weak role of farmers in Ghana. This would mean that supporting the development of a strong market relation between the GFSP and local farmers can indeed serve as a broader poverty-reduction measure.

**The possibilities of the GSFP for local farmers and the benefits of local farmers for the GSFP**

The focus of the GSFP in terms of the benefits of the programme for local farmers is directed at the increased demand the GSFP provides in the community, the incentives this gives farmers to expand farming and the final impact of decreased poverty among the farmer households. The study of Eenhoorn and Becx, already mentioned in the introduction, also mainly focuses on the farming-expansion that can be facilitated by the GSFP. Creating local demand is the core aspect of the inclusion of farmers in the GSFP; however besides the incentive for farming-expansion this link can create more benefits for farmers.

The practical benefits of supplying directly to the GSFP are for many farmers already great advantages. Besides, having supply-agreements with caterers decreases the risks of their farming activities and is likely to change their position towards middle-men. Since they are not or only partly dependant on their demand, their trading position with middle-men. Their role as supplier of the GSFP might also give them more/a
higher status within the community and more self-respect, as they are contributing to the future of the children in the community.

Another beneficial benefit which could be developed within the GSFP is the demand of the caterers for processed food. In this respect processing of food means transforming the harvest product into something ready for cooking or consumption. For caterers to buy e.g. rice, beans, maize-dough or cassava-dough in the community, these products should be ‘ready to cook’. This gives farmers in the communities an incentive to start specializing in the processing steps of one or more products. This in turn, enables them to sell a more advanced product at the market or to traders which can boost the economy in the community.

Besides the advantages the GSFP offers to local farmers, it should not be overlooked that local farmers also offer advantages for the caterers and the GSFP. The prices at the farm-gate are relatively low, the products are as fresh as possible and the farmers often deliver everything to the kitchen. Besides these practical benefits, the caterer is likely to receive more status since the programme is more embedded in the community. Also, strong relations with farmers may help in solving problems, e.g. when funds are too late or when products are needed fast. Moreover, when the caterer has a fixed place among the buyers of the farmers, national price increases could have less negative impact on the programme as farmers might be willing to keep their prices relatively low.

**Further research**

The results of this study provide ideas for several other studies;

- A study focusing on the actual impact the GSFP will have on local farmers, in terms of demand-increase, income and poverty-reduction, once the programme is implemented to its maximal capacity. This is necessary to determine the amount of resources that can be accounted for, to invest in creating a favourable market situation for caterers and farmers to do business.

- A study looking at the position of small scale farmers at the Ghanaian market. Information about their role in terms of power and independence/dependence provides information on useful support systems for farmers, the benefits of the GSFP for the farmers and, to what extent the limited efforts of farmers to supply to the GSFP are caused by personal motivation, dependence on traders etc.

- A study investigating the possibilities to decrease the costs of the GSFP. Since the high costs are a major problem in terms of sustainability, possibilities to decrease the costs need to be explored.

**Recommendations**

In this study the aim was to identify opportunities to strengthen the market relation between the GSFP and local farmers, in order to increase the amount of food items bought in the community. In the discussion part it was explained that another approach, with similar implications and aims, is to focus on how to make the
programme an endogenous part of the Ghanaian local markets. Since this approach is likely to both increase local purchase and autonomous sustainability, recommendations are also focused to achieve this. In chapter 6, several opportunities for the GSFP were already discussed extensively. The recommendations are activities that can be executed immediately and aim to be more practical and are addressed to the institution or governmental body that needs to take responsibility for that particular task.

The Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development;
The oversight ministry of the Ghana School Feeding Programme should attempt to build binding agreements between them, the NS of the GSFP and the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. More generally, binding agreements should be made with all the collaborating ministries of the programme. A Memorandum of Understanding could be drawn stating the responsibilities of the particular collaborating ministry in the GSFP, time-limits specifying when activities need to be carried out, and budget allocation for those activities. In the case of MOFA, agreements need to be established about how the agricultural extension officers in the districts could be involved in the GSFP implementation and functioning in order for them to link caterers to ‘their’ farmers.

The National Secretariat of the Ghana School Feeding Programme;
The National Secretariat of the GSFP should develop clear guidelines about the manner of purchasing food items for the caterers in the programme. New, but certainly also caterers who already work for the GSFP, should receive an explanation/training about this manual, for example from an agricultural extension officer. This would offer the opportunity to involve farmers in these meetings, whereby role-plays and information exchange already may lead to business agreements.

The National Secretariat/the District Implementation Committees;
The National Secretariat and the District Implementation Committees should start paying the caterers and the cooks of the programme; the money for the caterers and cooks should no longer be included in the GSFP funds that are paid to the caterer. Consequently, the profit-objective of the caterer would decrease as she has a fixed salary (or allowance as the call it), the motivation of the cooks would increase and thus, commitment and sustainability of the local programme functioning are improved.

The National Secretariat/the Ministry of Food and Agriculture;
The National Secretariat and the Ministry of Food and Agriculture need to develop a network between food suppliers that trade in nationally produced food and caterers and extension officers in districts where certain products cannot be grown. Food suppliers that trade with farmers in a fair manner and farmer groups that collectively supply their products need to be linked with focal person and the caterers in districts where items such as beans or rice are not grown.
The National Secretariat;
The National Secretariat should put on place one or more nutritional officers who in every district, preferably in collaboration with MOFA and caterers, develop a menu based on food stuffs that are or can be locally produced. The current menu system is not functioning; however also with new menus monitoring is essential to see whether caterers indeed follow the guidelines.

The Farmers in Ghana;
Farmers in Ghana should take the initiative to work together in Farmer’s Groups, and they need to be supported in this effort. The existing Farmer’s Based Organizations rarely go beyond practical, social and small agricultural support. Farmers who work together or who represent themselves in groups have a much stronger position within the market.

Ministry of Food and Agriculture and their Agricultural Extension Officers;
The Ministry of Food and Agriculture should integrate the GSFP within their network. This study showed that MOFA is aware of their possible role and, since the GSFP could be used to meet the goals of MOFA, agricultural extension officers need to be motivated and supported to spend time on the GFSP, e.g. inform farmers about the supply possibilities, facilitating agreements between caterers and farmers and supporting the caterer to adjust the menu to local products and seasonality of them.
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## APPENDIX A: ACTIVITIES IN THE FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts/Activities</th>
<th>Akuapim-South</th>
<th>Dangme-East</th>
<th>Akuapim-North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Assembly</td>
<td>Interview DCD</td>
<td>Interview DCD</td>
<td>Interview DCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview DFO</td>
<td>Mini-interview DFO</td>
<td>Interview focal person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview focal person</td>
<td>Interview Dir. DADU &amp; Extension Officer</td>
<td>Interview Dir. DADU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview Dep. Dir. DADU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>Darmang Presby Primary</td>
<td>Caesarkope Presby Primary</td>
<td>Nyame Bekyere Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview head teacher</td>
<td>Interview head teacher</td>
<td>Interview head teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview caterer</td>
<td>Interview caterer</td>
<td>Interview caterer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation cooking + feeding</td>
<td>Observation cooking + feeding</td>
<td>Observation cooking + feeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Farmers interviewed</td>
<td>3 Farmers interviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit to market with caterer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>Nsawam Methodist A, B, C</td>
<td>Elavanyo Basic</td>
<td>St. Paul Methodist Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview head teacher A, B</td>
<td>Interview head teacher</td>
<td>Interview head teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mini-interview head teacher C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview caterer</td>
<td>Interview caterer</td>
<td>Interview caterer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation cooking + feeding</td>
<td>Observation cooking + feeding</td>
<td>Observation cooking + feeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit to market with caterer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>Nana Osae Djan Primary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview head teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview caterer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation cooking + feeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview extension officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 2 farmer groups; in total +/- 30 farmers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AAPPENDIX B: COMPARISON OF INGREDIENTS IN THE MENU, LOCAL AVAILABILITY OF PRODUCTS AND LOCAL PURCHASING.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Item</th>
<th>Used in Menu?</th>
<th>Available from local farmers?</th>
<th>Purchased from local farmers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td>5  6  7</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava (dough)</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  N</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>N  N  N  Y</td>
<td>N  Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yam</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gari</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantain</td>
<td>N  N  N  N</td>
<td>N  Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinned tomatoes</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spices</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y     ?  ?</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>N  N  Y     ?  ?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kontomire</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okro</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y     ?  ?</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden eggs/squash</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vegetables like</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onion, carrots, cabbage,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet/green pepper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm nuts/oil</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
<td>N  Y</td>
<td>Y  Y  Y  Y  Y  Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green = yes, Red = No, Orange = not clear

Schools:
A: Akuapim South:
  1: Darmang Presby
  2: Methodist A, B, C
  3: Nana Osae Djan Primary
B: Dangme-East
  4: Caesarkope Presby
  5: Elavanyo Basic
C: Akuapim-North
  6: Nyame Bekyere
  7: Akropong Methodist