



CENTRE FOR CLIMATE CHANGE & FOOD SECURITY (CCCFS)

Head Office: Kumasi – Ghana W/ Africa.

**Motto: Healthy Environment,
Nutritious food & Healthy people**

TO ALL MEDIA HOUSES

+233543143533

+233273010303

info@cfccfs.org

CCCFS

Centre for Climate Change &
Food Security

www.cfccfs.org



28th Sept. 20

AN ASSESSMENT OF NDC'S MANIFESTO ON CLIMATE CHANGE COMMITMENT AND FOOD SECURITY

The Centre for Climate Change and Food Security (CCCFS) would like to put out our opinion per our review of NDC's manifesto on the areas of **climate change** and **food security** in line with our organisation's vision and mission.

1. Background

Climate change issues have gained global traction because of the impact climate change has on almost every facet of human existence. To address the issue, there have been many global accords including the famous Paris accord that seek to galvanise governmental commitments from various countries in addressing the problem.

Food security on the other hand, which relates to climate change as an either a positive or negative outcome, continue to be a global agenda because some 690 million people representing 8.9% of the world's population, are hungry. SDG 2 envisions eradication of hunger by 2030.

Ghana is a signatory to almost all the international accords, declarations, treaties etc on these two interlinked issues. That is why, academics and civil society must continuously benchmark government's performance or commitments to the realisation of these international commitments. The manifesto, having become an integral part of Ghana's politics, gives an insight on the aspirations of future governments, making it an important document for assessing potential governments. This is exactly what we seek to do with this piece of work.

2. General Observations

1. This assessment looks exclusively at what NDC intends to do should it win the next election as presented in its manifesto. We, therefore, delink completely, all previous achievements of the party that have implicit or explicit implications for climate change combat and food security from this assessment. The focus here is on post-2020 events.

Subsidiaries:

Feeding Ghana, Food for Africa, Aspiring Young Africa Farmers.

2. We shall also disqualify promises that in our opinion, are already being pursued by the current government. Emphasis is put on fresh ideas in the areas under discussion.

Our assessment set out to answer the following questions using SMART as the broad measurement instrument –

- a. Are there specific promises on climate change combat and food security?
- b. Are there general promises that are not specific but have unintended effects on climate change combat and food security?
- c. If there are any such promises in respect of questions a & b above, are they realistic and achievable?

3. Scoring

We intend to answer questions a & b quantitatively through a simple counting and to qualitatively answer question 3 using the SMART instrument. Each letter in the measurement instrument, SMART, is assigned a 20% score, altogether making 100%. Each promise is assessed using this criterion and then, a cumulative average is extracted for all promises.

4. Climate Change

Question: Are there specific promises on climate change combat?

Our findings/comments:

- We found five promises made specifically to address climate change in the manifesto under five different themes. By identifying specific promises on climate change, our second level question is no longer applicable. We find this gratifying and highly commendable, that, there is a deliberate effort in the form of the party's vision, to combat climate change in the context of the global efforts.
- For the sake of easy reference by readers, we reproduce the five promises identified here:
 - a. Environment, Science, Technology & Innovation on point (pages 57, point g)
 - reintroduce ZOIL to involve the youth in planting coconut for coastal protection against climate change and job creation.
 - b. Land and Natural Resources (page 58, point m)
 - create a Youth in Climate Change and Afforestation Programme (YiCCAP) in partnership the private sector for afforestation and job creation.
 - c. Water and Sanitation (page 93, point a)

- develop Ghana's water & sanitation sector to improve all citizens' health, optimise agricultural and industrial production to create employment, and build national climate change resilience.

d. Local Governance and Decentralisation (page 113, point k)

- establish a Waste Management Fund by amending the Customs and Excise (Duties and Other Taxes) (Amendment) Act, 2013 (Act 863), to garner the resources needed to address waste management and create green jobs as part of our response to the global climate change Agenda.

e. International Relations and Foreign Affairs (Page 123, point p)

p. increase collaboration within the United Nations, the Commonwealth, and other multilateral organisations to fight existing and emerging threats to global peace, security, and sustainable development including climate change and global warming, international terrorism, cybercrime, piracy, money laundering, narcotics trade, human trafficking and pandemics.

- Question b is no longer applicable since
- The promises have been assigned numbers in a descending order where 1 represents the first promise and so on, for easy identification and counting.
- Table 1 gives a breakdown of the scores we assigned to each promise.

| PROMISES | S | M | A | R | T | TOTAL (%) |
|----------------------|----|----|----|----|---|-----------|
| 1 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 75 |
| 2 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 3 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 60 |
| 4 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 5 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 60 |
| AVERAGE SCORE | | | | | | 71 |

Verdict: NDC manifesto scores 71% on the combat against climate change.

5. Agriculture and Food Security

Some 2% of Ghanaians representing 2 million in nominal terms, are estimated to be hungry. Ghana as a signatory to the SDGs, should be working to eradicate hunger in its entirety by 2030. The possibility of achieving this, will be based on government's agriculture programmes.

Question: Are there specific promises on food security?

Our findings/comments:

- The expression ‘food security’, appears only twice and were loosely used as a generic term. Under Agriculture and Agribusiness, subheading **6.11.1**, the manifesto states “The **food security**, cash and industrial crops development as envisaged by the national Food and Agricultural Sector Development Policy (FASDEP) will remain the defining framework for the development of the crops and livestock sectors in the short to medium term”. Similarly, under the same subheading, it is stated “The cereals, legumes and starchy staples contribute significantly to our national GDP and **food security**”. It is commendable that a broad framework has been designed to achieve food security. While the second statement is a reinforcing statement and so not a promise, we consider the first statement though intermingled with other objectives, a specific food security promise and shall assess it. The programmes to achieve the promise per the NDC manifesto, are reproduced here –
 “Hence, all policy, programme and project objectives and activities will be targeted at increasing and sustaining the production and productivity of the various crops as follows:
 - a. cereal crops: maize, rice, sorghum and millet
 - b. starchy staples: yam, plantain, cassava, sweet potato and cocoyam
 - c. legumes: soya bean, groundnuts, beans
 - d. vegetables: tomato, pepper, okro
 - e. work with stakeholders to develop reliable markets for primary agricultural produce”

Question: Are there general promises that are not specific but have unintended effects on food security?

Our findings/comments:

- All the promises made under agriculture except for cash crops, can be said to have direct implications on food security if well implemented. In total, we counted 3134 of such promises. Subsidiary promises which are aimed at giving clarity on how a promise would be actualised are not counted distinctly as promises.
- The NDC promises under agriculture, are grouped into thematic areas. For each area, we counted the number of promises made. For want of space, we cannot reproduce the entire contents here but table 2 gives a breakdown on sections/subsections and promises counted under each for evaluation.

| Section | Title | No of promises counted |
|---------|---|------------------------|
| 6.11 | Broad framework (our own title) | 4 |
| 6.11.2 | Cocoa Sector Strategic Policies and Interventions | 9 |
| 6.11.3 | Aquaculture | 4 |
| 6.11.4 | Marine and Riverine Fishes | 8 |
| 6.11.5 | Poultry and Livestock | 5 |
| 6.11.6 | Management of Pre-mix Fuel | - |
| 6.11.7 | Horticulture | 1 |
| 6.11.8 | Special Programmes | - |
| 6.11.9 | Irrigation development | 3 |

NOTES:

- ✚ Subsection 6.11 – bullets a, b, c, f, j, and k are not considered promises. They are broad policy statements. Bullet d (2) is counted as a promise since it will be novel and in line with actualisation of the Maputo declaration on budget funding for agriculture. Bullets e, g, h, and i were considered as promises in addition to d (2).
- ✚ 6.11.2.7 and 6.11.2.9 were not counted because it almost the same as the under promises under this section.
- ✚ 6.11.2.11 and 6.11.2.12 were not counted because we deemed them as having no bearing on food security though they good policies.
- ✚ Subjection 6.11.6 was not considered as a promise since it is not distinct from issues surrounding marine fishing.
- ✚ Subjection 6.11.8 – these are deemed as vehicles to be used for the achievement of the promises under agriculture. They therefore have cross-cutting semblance with the other promises as such not considered as distinct from those we earlier counted.
- ✚ 6.11.1 is not captured under this table because we have in response to question (a) above on food security, considered this entire section as bothering on food security and treated therefore under that question.
- ✚ Counting of promises was done in a descending order beginning from 6.11 done to the last promise under agriculture except those promises that we disqualified from counting. In such cases, the next promise on the list succeeds as the following number.

Question: If there are any such promises in respect of questions a & b above, are they realistic and achievable using our SMART instrument?

Our findings/comments:

- This question applies since we have identified promises under questions a & b and so we do a rating of the promises using our scale as contained in table 3.

| PROMISES | S | M | A | R | T | TOTAL (%) |
|----------------------|----|----|----|----|---|--------------|
| 1 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 2 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 3 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 75 |
| 4 | 20 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 65 |
| 5 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 65 |
| 6 | 20 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 65 |
| 7 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 8 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 9 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 70 |
| 10 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 11 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 65 |
| 12 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 50 |
| 13 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 70 |
| 14 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 60 |
| 15 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 60 |
| 16 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 60 |
| 17 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 60 |
| 18 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 60 |
| 19 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 20 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 50 |
| 21 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 22 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 50 |
| 23 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 24 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 25 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 50 |
| 26 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 50 |
| 27 | 20 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 0 | 60 |
| 28 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 80 |
| 29 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 65 |
| 30 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 55 |
| 31 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 55 |
| AVERAGE TOTAL | | | | | | 66,45 |

Notes on tables 1 and 3

- ‘S’ requires a promise or vision to be specific. The elements of specificity include – but not limited to – unambiguous project title, how you intend to execute the project, pointed direction of end results, and KPIs. We realised that most of the promises lacked one or more of these essential elements.
- ‘M’ requires the promise to be measurable. The elements of measurability include – but not limited to – deadlines, quantities, quality, costs, etc. We realised that most of the promises lacked one or more of these essential elements.
- ‘A’ requires the promise to be attainable. The elements of attainability include – but not limited to – achievability of the promise taking expertise, time, costs, scope, resources, etc into cognisance. We realised that a few of the promises lacked one or more of these essential elements.
- ‘R’ requires the promise to be relevant. The elements of relevance include – but not limited to – importance, impact, etc of the promise. We realised that almost all promises had these essential elements.
- ‘T’ requires the promise to be time-oriented or time-bound. All the promises in the manifesto, lacked the ‘T’ element as none of the promises, was assigned timelines. Though we know governments hold office for a period of 4 years, it would be good if the manifesto gave at least, an estimated time of start and completion of programmes/projects outlined.

Verdict: NDC manifesto scores 66% on the food security and agriculture.

Conclusions and Recommendations

- Using the three-dimensional scale for assessing food security, i.e., affordability, quantity, and quality, we note, that, the promises largely promote quantity but are very silent on affordability and quality. There is just a slight hint on quality arising from the aspect that deals with disease control but that pales into insignificance when benchmarked against the gamut of issues that make up quality. That said, it is however pleasant that the manifesto seeks to address food security challenges with a focused programme.
- On affordability, it is not automatic that, increase in food quantity may necessarily plummet food prices though it is the rational outcome from the interplay between the forces of demand and supply. This is because, while some parts of Ghana may experience glut of food, other parts may face dearth of food – underscoring an uneven

food distribution system over the years. So, while areas that experience glut of food may have food prices plummeting, those that experience dearth, may have increments in prices. Also, in an unregulated market such as ours, the potential of hoarding by sellers to instigate shortages for a future exorbitant pricing, exists which will then defeat the cardinal element of affordability. Our recommendation, therefore, is that, potential governments must seek to couch deliberate policies to deal with our irregular food distribution system and the exploitative market system in order to achieve affordability in the face of abundance.

- On quality, this is achieved through a careful production technique that reduces residues of chemicals in food, producing highly nutritious food, and food that generally fits the consumer expectations. In this regard, we do not find any of the promises attempting to address the issue of quality. It is our recommendation that, future governments, should turn their eyes on organic agriculture as an efficient alternative method of producing quality food while at the same time, preserving the environment. Additionally, standard setting for all food products must be taken seriously as we have come to know how some producers disregard basic hygiene in the cause of production. Limits for agrochemical use by farmers should be set to ensure food safety.
- The special commitments to combat climate change is highly commendable. We ask the media and civil society to take the matter of climate change seriously and bring it to the front burner of national discourse as our very existence, is threatened by this canker.

Sulemana Issifu

Director of Research, Centre for Climate Change and Food Security

Email: issifusulemana@outlook.com

Zoom: issifusulemana@outlook.com

Skype: issifusulemana

Phone: +491629352295