

Democracy Watch

Volume 7, No. 2
June-November 2006

ISSN: 0855-417X

In this issue

☛ Unsettling revelations in the midst of the World Cup euphoria	Page	1
☛ Entrenching political patronage in Ghana	Page	2
☛ Unclear message from the National Honors Awards	Page	3
☛ Halting steps in the advancement of human rights in Ghana	Page	5
☛ The MCA in Ghana: avoiding another case of the "resource curse"	Page	7
☛ Ghana's stagnating decentralization experiment	Page	9
☛ Governance matters arising from the cocaine scandal: a preliminary comment	Page	10
☛ Transfer of convicted persons bill: who benefits??	Page	11
☛ The CHRAJ findings against Dr. Richard Anane and aftermath	Page	12

EDITORIAL TEAM

Editors-in-chief

- E. Gyimah-Boadi
- H. Kwasi Prempeh

Members

- Kwadwo Appiaggyei-Atua
- Kojo Pumpuni Asante
- Audrey Gadzekpo
- Edem Selormey

Democracy Watch is published with funding from the Ghana Research and Advocacy Program (G-RAP)

IN THE ANNALS OF GOVERNANCE

Unsettling revelations in the midst of the World Cup euphoria

On June 28, 2006, a rank-and-file supporter of the New Patriotic Party popularly known as "Appiah Stadium," who has earned notoriety as a "serial radio caller," revealed in a radio conversation that the Government had sponsored about 150 Ghanaian individuals to travel to Germany to watch the World Cup. Appiah Stadium also revealed that similar government sponsorship had enabled him and some others to travel to Egypt to watch the 2006 Africa Cup of Nations. It was his exclusion from the list of beneficiaries to the World Cup that apparently motivated Appiah Stadium to blow the whistle on what, until then, had been a secret practice involving the use of public resources for private ends.

Government spokespersons initially reacted to the revelations by seeking to discredit the source, going to the extent of calling Appiah Stadium 'crazy.' When the ad hominem response failed to persuade the public and the media, Government and party spokespersons responded with the argument that those who had benefited from the government largesse in this matter included not only NPP faithful but also individuals associated with the NDC. Presumably, as long as there is 'bipartisanship' in the allocation of public resources to private individuals

for private ends, the defenders of this practice see nothing wrong with this kind of behavior.

The matters brought to the fore by Appiah Stadium's whistle-blowing highlight the persistence of a culture of neo-patrimonialism in the management of our public affairs and resources. For too long in our nation's history, influential government insiders, notably within the Executive Branch, have exercised unregulated discretion in the use of the public resources entrusted to their care. As a result, public resources have often been distributed on the basis of personal loyalty and without regard to any known process or rules, thereby benefiting friends, close relatives, and political insiders. It is not difficult to see how this practice has also facilitated and fueled corruption (which is generally defined as the use of public office and resources for private gain).

"Appiah Stadium's whistle-blowing highlights the persistence of a culture of neo-patrimonialism in the management of our public affairs and resources"

The use of public funds to sponsor the private pursuits of individual citizens is not new in Ghana. There is, in fact, a longstanding tradition of the Government paying, for example, for medical treatment abroad for certain public figures. There is also the well-

known government subsidization of Ghanaians attending the annual hajj in Mecca. But as with many practices, which began during an era of personal rule and untrammelled presidential discretion, there is no known statutory warrant or regulation governing these highly personalized uses of public funds. The practice continues largely as a matter of habit, but also because it offers every incumbent government yet another opportunity to play their favorite game, political patronage.

“The idea of a ruling party establishing an employment unit in its party offices raises concerns about the entrenchment of patronage and clientelism within Ghana’s body politic”

Government sponsorship of selected Ghanaians to attend international sports and other kinds of events even as spectators, can be justified, of course, especially because Ghanaian spectator representation at these high-profile international events lends much-needed moral support to our participating teams. But what is worth doing is also worth doing properly: the means matter, in addition to the ends. If the Government felt the need to select and sponsor some Ghanaians to boost spectator support for the Black Stars at the World Cup, the best and proper way to proceed was to announce its intention to institute a form of qualified lottery to select suitable persons for the sponsorship. It could, for example, have invited the leading soccer teams in our national league to each nominate a fixed number of its ‘best supporters’ to compete in a lottery to select those who would be sponsored to attend the World Cup as spectators. In fact, had the Government handled this matter in a transparent and fair manner not only would it have set a new precedent in transparency, it would also have earned for itself the respect and admiration of all Ghanaians for the opportunity to compete on fair terms for a seat in the spectator stands at the World Cup. Instead of charting a new path in this area, the Government chose to follow the old and discredited path toward neo-patrimonialism. ■ ■

Entrenching political patronage in Ghana

In August 2006, the NPP opened a new Greater Accra Regional Office. If that was the extent of the story, the news would be unexceptional. However, the new party office also boasts an “employment center,” and the inaugural ceremony featured the President. The idea of a ruling party establishing an employment unit in its party offices raises

concerns about the entrenchment of patronage and clientelism within Ghana’s body politic.

The idea of the state as a patron with various interest groups, stakeholders and individuals as clients has become a political reality, particularly in third world politics, resulting in an entrenched political culture where politicians distribute and allocate scarce public resources on the basis of loyalty and personal relationships. In Ghana, the political class has long used state resources as largesse to satisfy the private demands of its clientele. Nepotism in public sector recruitment, corruption and non-meritocratic contract decisions in the area of public procurement, selective enforcement of laws, and wanton abuse of incumbency have been some of the consequences of this ‘privatization’ of public power. With the establishment of a party-affiliated employment center, the NPP appears determined to institutionalize political patronage and take it to an all time low.

“Political parties compete in elections with the intention of securing political power. But such power, once obtained, is meant to be used for the common good; it is not supposed to be used to deliver private benefits to the party’s membership”

It is common knowledge that the rank and file of the ruling NPP, especially its working-age supporters, have voiced persistent complaints that the Kufuor administration has “neglected to look after them,” when it comes to the provision of employment opportunities. Lack of employment opportunities is, however, a widespread crisis for the urban and rural youth, a fact that provided the motivation for the Government’s decision, during its first term in office, to establish a national unemployment register. The in-house employment center set up by the NPP’s regional office is a reflection of the political pressure that the rank-and-file of the party is putting on the party leadership and the Government to attend to “its own.” However, the party’s seeming capitulation to this pressure from below, while understandable from a self-interested standpoint, sends the wrong signal about the role of political parties in our system of government, and in particular the nature of the party’s relationship with its rank and file membership.

Political parties compete in elections with the intention of securing political power. But such power, once obtained, is meant to be used for the common good; it is not supposed to be used to deliver private benefits to the party’s

membership. What the party and its members gain by winning an election is not the opportunity to improve their personal fortunes and circumstances to the exclusion of the rest of the citizenry. Rather, the party's members must hope to share in the collective benefits that might flow from a successful implementation of the party's programs and policies. Supporters of the ruling party should not demand or expect to obtain direct, quid pro quo benefits from their party or government. Nor, for that matter, should the party promise any such benefits or act in a manner that might give legitimacy to its supporter's demand for special treatment and non-meritocratic entitlement to scarce public resources, including public employment.

Political parties must offer the people a vehicle through which to articulate and mobilize their shared concerns and interests and ensure that such interests are fairly represented and considered in the formulation of policy and the subsequent allocation of resources. It is through the policies and programs they implement while in office that a ruling party tries to satisfy the demands and aspirations of its supporters. A ruling party betrays its mandate to serve the common good when it turns itself into an employment agency to seek and channel employment opportunities exclusively or directly for its members. This is not a legitimate and proper role for a political party under our system of government.

“As a matter of good governance, projects and schemes that are expected to be funded on a continuing basis from the national budget must be established by legislation in order to regularize their legal status as a budget item”

The problem of unemployment facing graduates of our middle, secondary and tertiary institutions is a real and deep-seated one, and one that is bound to give every government and ruling party the jitters, particularly as the general elections approach. However, there cannot be a partisan solution to this “non-partisan” problem. Instead of attempting to escape a general problem by looking for a band-aid “solution” that has partisan boundaries erected around it, the ruling party must work with its Government to devise and implement policies, programs, plans and projects. The government must also create an enabling environment for the business community to create sustainable opportunities and avenues for meaningful self-employment as well as incentives for private sector operators to grow and thus expand employment. The NPP would be wise to back off from this ill-advised idea

of establishing an in-house employment office for its job-seeking supporters. ■ ■

Unclear message from the National Honors Awards

It is said that a nation that neglects to recognize and honor its heroes and heroines is one that may not be worth dying for. The New Patriotic Party (NPP) Government therefore deserves to be commended for its decision to institute a National Honors Award that would give the State an opportunity and the occasion to identify and pay tribute to a selected number of citizens who have made exceptional contributions to the life and progress of the nation. The first annual National Honors Awards was held at the Accra International Conference Center on June 30, 2006. In all, a total of 160 Ghanaians were honored by His Excellency the President Mr. J.A. Kufuor at this inaugural event.

The inherent power of the President to bestow national honors on certain selected citizens is not in dispute, given his customary status as the First Citizen of the Republic and the “Fount of Honor”. However, if, as appears to be the intention, the National Honors Award is to become a regular, perhaps annual, affair, then it needs to be institutionalized and structured in such a way as would guarantee its survival past the tenure of the government or party that launched it.

First, there must be legislation establishing the National Honors Awards program. Although there is a longstanding practice of Ghanaian presidents or heads of state “establishing” new publicly funded programs and policies (and even offices) by mere presidential pronouncement, the better policy in a constitutional democracy is to proceed by way of express legislation, rather than by presidential fiat. As a matter of good governance, projects and schemes that are expected to be funded on a continuing basis from the national budget must be established by legislation in order to regularize their legal status as a budget item. A National Honors Award that is established by an Act of Parliament becomes, in effect, a binding legal commitment of every government, for as long as the legislation remains on the statute books. On the other hand, a National Honors Award that is willed into being solely by presidential pronouncement, and that lacks the additional backing of legislation, will likely be perceived as a “pet project” of the particular President and, lacking a statutory basis, is unlikely to last beyond the term of that president.

Second, the selection of the honorees for the National Honors Award must be done according to a well-defined

process and publicly articulated criteria and classification scheme. Again, the best way to institutionalize the idea and remove it from needless partisanship is to entrust the nominating and pre-selection process to a National Honors Award Commission, which, in turn, would advise and make recommendation to the President on the final honorees. Or perhaps, this is a task that could be specifically assigned to the seemingly under-worked Council of State. In the latter case, the Council will receive and review nominations and make appropriate recommendations to the President on the final selection of honorees. Regardless of which body is tasked with administering this project on annual basis, the issues relating to process, organization, and the criteria for these awards must be spelled out in legislation establishing the National Honors Award.

“National honors, especially if they are going to be an annual affair, must be reserved for an exceptional few”

Coming specifically to this year’s First National Honors Award, there are a few observations to be made. First, the list of honorees was dominated overwhelmingly by politicians, past and present. What message is this intended to convey? Is a career in politics the most distinguished form of the service to the nation? Or is this simply a case of one group of politicians (the incumbents) indulging in self-congratulation and class solidarity by bestowing special honors on fellow members of the political class. This latter view is given credence by the fact that a disproportionate number of the politician-honorees belong to the same faction of the political class as the incumbent government.

In contrast to the high prominence given to politicians and the old bureaucratic elite in the maiden National Honors Award, Ghana’s farmers and agricultural entrepreneurs, including, notably, the peasant cocoa farmer and laborer upon whose enterprise and toil much of Ghana’s late-colonial and postcolonial development has been underwritten, did not get quite the prominence and recognition they deserve. Neither did the 2006 National Honors Awards take due cognizance of the contributions of our professional class, including, for example, the new breed of science and technology professionals and entrepreneurs who have helped to bring Ghana into the information and internet age as well as professionals and entrepreneurs in such areas as finance and investment who are helping to put in place the building blocks for Ghana’s transformation into a modern market economy. If the

National Honors Award is intended, in part, to signal our collective judgment of what careers, vocations, and pursuits are honorable and important, then the 2006 awards, taken as whole, simply missed the mark.

One problem with skewing national honors in favor of members of the political and bureaucratic/public sector managerial class is that it endorses access and proximity to state power—and the trappings of power—as the surest ticket to personal success in our national life. Because access to the “top” in our country has historically been a matter of patronage or non-meritocratic selection, than of merit or genius, allocating national honors on the basis of the offices that a person has occupied in the past (or currently occupies) is, in effect, to reward position or status, rather than a proven record of achievement and contribution.

Problems of selection bias aside, the number of Ghanaians honored at the 2006 National Honors Awards—a total of 160—is simply excessive. National honors, especially if they are going to be an annual affair, must be reserved for an exceptional few. Perhaps this being the inaugural event, there was a deliberate effort to ‘clear the backlog.’ To preserve the value of the award, it is important that its ‘supply’ be kept under control. The size of the honoree group also affects the quality and integrity of the selection process. When national honors are bestowed only on an exceptional few, the selection process is more likely to be driven by considerations of merit and excellence than if the honors are granted to a large number of people. ■■

The Food and Drugs Board’s temporary ban on adverts

On August 30, 2006, the Food and Drugs Board (FDB) announced that it had placed a temporary blanket ban on the advertisement of drugs, herbal medicines and any product that claimed to be for the cure or management of disease. The Board justified its decision on the grounds that it had observed with great concern the misleading nature of some advertisements, and the unsubstantiated and false claims made through these adverts.” The FDB “ban” drew angry protests from organizations like the National Media Commission (NMC), Advertisers Association of Ghana (AAG) and Ghana Independent Broadcasters Association (GIBA). The most cogent objection concerns the authority of the FDB to impose such a ban, as well as the validity of a ban imposed in such a sweeping and “informal” manner.

Drug advertising in the country is regulated by the Food and Drugs Law (PNDC Law 305B) as amended by Food and Drugs Act, 1996 (Act 523). Among others, Law 305B provides that it is an offence to sell or advertise any drug, cosmetic, or related product, in contravention of the existing rules, or in a manner that is false or misleading as regards its character, constitution, efficacy, potency, and safety (section 14). The law states further that no person shall advertise a drug to the general public if it relates to a sickness specified in Schedule 2 to the law (section 15). Among the Schedule 2 sicknesses are sexually transmitted diseases (including HIV/AIDS), cancer, diabetes, epilepsy, heart disease, hernia, and pneumonia. The law also requires that a drug be certified by the Food and Drugs Board before it can lawfully be advertised. Furthermore, the law delineates the functions of the Board, which are basically to advise on matters relating to the administration and implementation of the law, monitor compliance, and ensure adequate and effective standards for food and drugs. The letter of PNDC Law 305B is breached routinely (and with impunity) by drug marketers, and media operators, particularly the FM radio stations, which have generally aided and abetted these violations of the law.

“... restrictions imposed on a constitutional right must be done in the form of a “law,” which may be either an Act of Parliament or a properly authorized regulation of a statutorily empowered agency ”

According to the Board, they decided to apply the blanket ban because these unlawful practices have continued despite several interventions by the Board, “which had included disclaimers, education campaigns, media workshops, arrests and prosecutions jointly undertaken by the Board and the Police.” But, the Board’s past failures to enforce compliance does not entitle them to take whatever action they deem most effective, ignoring the law and the Constitution in the process. The Board’s directive does implicate rights guaranteed by the Constitution, notably the right to freedom of speech and expression, including the freedom of the press, which are secured against arbitrary infringement under Article 21(a) of the Constitution.

The Constitution, of course, makes the enjoyment of its enumerated rights “subject to respect for the rights and freedoms of others and for the public interest.” Thus, the public interest may warrant the imposition of certain restrictions and limitations on a constitutionally guaranteed

right. However, even where there is a public interest justification for the scope of a right to be restricted, the restriction must be imposed in a manner prescribed by the Constitution and must not reach so broadly as to endanger or abrogate the right entirely. Specifically, restrictions imposed on a constitutional right must be done in the form of a “law,” which may be either an Act of Parliament or a properly authorized regulation of a statutorily empowered agency.

In this instance, the Board cannot simply announce a ban and expect that such an announcement will have the force of law. Moreover, the sheer breadth and indiscriminate nature of the ban announced by FDB gives it the character of a prior restraint, which is a restriction of expression imposed even before a violation has occurred. Because the ban fails to discriminate between offending ads and non-offending ads, it penalizes the entire industry for the sins of specific marketers. Clearly, the rights of non-offending marketers cannot be sacrificed in order to rein in the activities of those acting in violation of the law. ■ ■

Halting steps in the advancement of human rights in Ghana

Ghana’s record in the protection of human rights has improved remarkably over the period since the implementation of the 1992 Constitution. Ghana continues to sign and ratify important international human rights instruments, including, most recently, the Convention against Torture. The Government has also passed important “rights-friendly” legislation such as the Human Trafficking Act of 2004 (which should be re-titled as the Prohibition against Human Trafficking Act).

Disappointingly, none of the new legislation enacted in the area of human rights under the Fourth Republic appears to have come about as a result of Government’s own initiative. In nearly all cases, legislative action has been reactive, not proactive. And often, where legislation has been enacted at all, Government has proceeded somewhat grudgingly and with little intrinsic commitment supporting their actions.

A case in point is the newly enacted Disability Act. Although its enactment is constitutionally mandated in order to give effect to the provisions of Article 29 of the Constitution, the Disability Act of 2006 (which should be more appropriately titled, Protection of the Rights of the Persons with Disability Act) came into being 13 years after the Constitution became the supreme law of the land. Passed by Parliament on June

30, 2006, the law did not receive the President's signature for an additional two months.

Although some might argue that what matters, ultimately, is the passage of the law, it is important to recognize that a law's ability to change the status quo depends critically on effective enforcement. Yet, even more so than passage of the law, enforcement rests heavily on the commitment of the Government. However, where the passage of the law itself has been attended by needless hesitancy, foot dragging, and a lukewarm attitude on the part of the government, it is reasonable to doubt what level of commitment the government will be willing to put behind meaningful enforcement of the law. The passage of any human rights legislation is sure to earn the Government credit and high marks in the eyes of the international human rights community. But only a commitment to meaningful enforcement at home will make a difference to the lives of the intended beneficiaries of the law. However, confidence within the domestic beneficiary community that such enforcement would be forthcoming is bound to be weak if during the pre-enactment stage the Government failed to demonstrate and signal a strong and resolute commitment to the ideals contained in the bill.

The Disability Act

The Disability Act 2006 is an important addition to the stock of national legislation intended to protect and advance the rights and interests of certain socially disadvantaged groups and individuals. Based on the "social model," the Disability Act proceeds on the premise that the disadvantage of disability arises not from the physical or medical condition of the person with the disability, but stems from the social attitudes, prejudices and misconceptions that cause the persons with the disability to be marginalized and discriminated against. Thus, the law seeks to overcome the disadvantage of disability by breaking down and removing socially constructed barriers that hinder the mainstreaming and progressive development of persons with disabilities in such areas as education, health, employment and spatial access.

The Domestic Violence Bill

The Domestic Violence Bill (a better name would be the Anti-Domestic Violence Bill), which had been stalled for a number of years in the halls of the Executive branch, has finally made its way onto the legislative calendar. The long journey to Parliament has, however, affected the content of the bill, as some of its provisions were sacrificed or watered down on the way, leaving the current draft a much weaker version of the original. The ideological feud over

the bill, however, has not abated. Conservative opponents of the bill remain steadfast in their rejection of the proposed criminalization of rape within the marital context. Under prevailing human rights norms, consent to marriage cannot reasonably be deemed to include implicit consent to be abused and humiliated, including being raped, by one's spouse.

“...however culturally permissible the practice may have been at some earlier time, it is difficult to see how marital rape can continue to enjoy immunity from criminal sanction in the face of Article 26(2) of the Constitution, which expressly and absolutely prohibits customs or customary practices that ‘dehumanize or are injurious to the physical and mental well-being of a person.’”

Moreover, however culturally permissible the practice may have been at some earlier time, it is difficult to see how marital rape can continue to enjoy immunity from criminal sanction in the face of Article 26(2) of the Constitution, which expressly and absolutely prohibits customs or customary practices that “dehumanize or are injurious to the physical and mental well-being of a person.” Passing a robust, as opposed to a weak and status quo-friendly, law against all forms of domestic abuse is a far more important demonstration of commitment to the rights and well-being of women and children than naming a Minister for Women and Children's Affairs without enacting any fundamental change in the legal and customary regime that most directly affects the lives of women and children.

Prison Conditions

The 2002/2003 Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAJ) report on the conditions in our nation's prisons reveals a disturbing picture of neglect, dehumanization, and persistent disregard of the rights and dignity of incarcerated persons, many of them pregnant women and juveniles. The CHRAJ report also reveals that about 25% of the prison population is made up of criminal defendants held on “remand” pending the conclusion of their trials. In some cases, such “unconvicted prisoners” have been held behind bars for as long as 5 years. These remand “prisoners” are, in effect, being forced to pay the price and bear the burden of the inefficiencies and failures on the part of the police, prosecutors, lawyers, and judges who operate our nation's criminal justice system. The proposition that, “justice delayed is justice denied,”

appears to have no meaning at all when it comes to accused persons held on remand.

“The proposition that, “justice delayed is justice denied,” appears to have no meaning at all when it comes to accused persons held on remand”

The problem of remand prisoners held in our jails and prisons for unreasonable lengths of time calls for urgent reform of our criminal justice system, including a clamp down on the abuse of adjournments by our lawyers, prosecutors and judges. There is also the need to examine non-custodial sentencing options, especially for first-time juvenile offenders and other persons convicted of non-violent crimes. In fact, CHRAJ and other stakeholders in the criminal justice system have voiced support for non-custodial sentencing alternatives, as a way to address the problems of prison congestion and the related deplorable conditions in our prisons. It is hoped that the Prisons Council, the Police Council, the Judicial Council, CHRAJ, and the Ministry of Justice will give this problem their collective attention and initiate meaningful reform to address the crisis of injustice in our jails and prisons. ■■

The MCA in Ghana: avoiding another case of the “resource curse”

The Millennium Challenge Account (“MCA”) is a U.S. Government initiative designed to improve the quality and effectiveness of U.S. foreign assistance to the developing world. Managed by the Millennium Challenge Corporation (“MCC”), the MCA funds are made available to eligible countries for mutually agreed upon development goals. The countries that are considered eligible are those that have met certain standards and demonstrated a commitment to continue along the path of liberal political and economic reforms. Countries deemed eligible must then prepare and submit to the MCC compacts which must specify in great detail, how the country proposes to apply, monitor and evaluate the use of MCA funds. The MCA-Ghana Compact is supposed to be the product of a broad-based national consultative process. Countries whose compacts are subsequently approved by the MCC qualify for the release of MCA funds.

Ghana’s MCA compact was signed on August 1, 2006, at

a ceremony in Washington, D.C. In total, Ghana is earmarked to receive a grant of over \$500 million under the MCA. Ghana began working on its MCA Compact when it was selected in May 2004 as eligible to qualify for MCA funds. Ghana’s MCA Compact was submitted on October 26, 2005. The ensuing process involved numerous consultative meetings between the Government of Ghana and the MCC, with participation extended to the larger Ghanaian policy community, key private sector representatives, as well as environmental and gender equality advocates. Ghana’s part of the bargain also included the passing, in early 2006, of the Millennium Development Authority Act (Act 702). The Act established a Millennium Development Authority (MiDA) to manage and oversee Ghana’s MCA program.

For countries like Ghana, the MCA represents something of a windfall. The MCA program has a great deal of potential. The projects outlined for execution aim at achieving sustainability by building upon already ongoing and reasonably institutionalized domestic efforts. It is further anticipated that successful projects could be replicated in other areas. In addition, the significant involvement of the recipient country in the formulation and implementation of the projects can contribute to capacity-building.

The billion cedi question is whether the MCA will become a “resource curse,” another wasted opportunity for progress. Indeed, many questions remain about whether the MCA program in Ghana can live up to its potential.

The goal of the MCA in Ghana is the “reduction of poverty through economic growth led by agricultural transformation.” This goal is to be achieved through projects and plans to significantly increase cash and food crop production and enhance the competitiveness of selected crops in local and international markets. Three geographical areas of Ghana have been chosen to benefit directly from MCA funds—the Afram (Plains) Basin, the Northern Agricultural Area, and the Southern Horticultural Area. Ghana’s Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy for 2006-09 (GPRSII), which identifies agriculture as the engine for growth and structural transformation of the Ghanaian economy, informed the priorities identified in Ghana’s MCA compact.

Ghana’s successful qualification for the MCA grant is a sign of the global recognition of the steady progress in economic management, social development and democratic governance that the country has achieved under the Fourth Republic. It also affirms the current government’s stable commitment to political and economic reform. To qualify

for the MCA, Ghana, like other countries vying for qualification, was evaluated on 16 performance indicators, falling within the categories of “Ruling Justly” (control of corruption, voice and accountability, government effectiveness, rule of law, civil liberties, and political freedom); “Investing in People” (public primary education spending, primary girls’ education completion rate, public expenditures on health, and immunization rates); and “Economic Freedom” (inflation, fiscal policy, trade policy, regulatory policy, and the days and costs of starting a business). To qualify, a country must score above the median on half of the indicators in each of the three categories, and not score below the median on corruption.

Thus, the mere fact of Ghana’s qualification attests to the remarkable progress the country has made in its political and economic governance since it made the eventful transition to democratic rule in 1993. The MCA qualification process, however, revealed notable gaps and deficits in some important areas. For example, while Ghana scored above the median on all of the indicators in the area of “Ruling Justly” for the three FYs (2004-06) under consideration, for FYs 2005-06 Ghana scored below the median on primary education completion for girls. In addition, Ghana repeatedly scored below the median on several “Economic Freedom” indicators such as days to start a business and fiscal policy for FYs 2004-05 and 2006, as well as inflation for FY 2006.

In keeping with Ghana’s MCA compact a total of 23 districts in the three geographic areas have been selected to directly benefit from MCA funds. These districts were apparently selected on the basis of their agricultural growth potential, scope for rural poverty reduction, and private sector participation in the growth process. On the basis of these criteria, questions have been raised as to why within the Northern Agricultural Area no districts in the Upper East and Upper West regions are included in the MCA Compact.

Concerns also remain over the absence of clear guidelines for implementation and monitoring and overall governance of the project. An important innovation of the MCA program, and the logic that connects the various projects, is reliance on market mechanisms. For Ghana, MiDA’s role will be to serve as coordinator of the various actors along the production chain. That is, MiDA will contract out work to intermediaries, such as consultants, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and other service providers, who, in turn, will be directly engaged with local-level actors, such as agricultural producers. In addition, to

facilitate coordination between the government and MiDA, a ministerial taskforce has been established, and several ministries have representatives on MiDA’s team. Yet, it is not entirely clear how local-level operators will be engaged in the implementation of MCA projects. Currently, it is expected that district assemblies and rural banks will be the key local-level structures involved in implementation, although guidelines on how these structures will be involved and monitored do not seem to be currently available.

Yet another threat to the success of the Ghana MCA is the absence of functioning mechanisms for accountability and clear criteria by which progress will be tracked and evaluated. Two anticipated features of the program may enhance accountability. First, the disbursement of MCA funds in installments will help to monitor progress on current projects before new disbursements are allocated. Second, the establishment of a Fiscal Procurement Agent for MiDA accountable to the MCC would also help to foster accountability in procurements under the program. Regarding monitoring and evaluation, a workshop bringing together representatives from the MCA, MiDA, Ministries, and the University of Ghana was held in Accra in May 2006 to develop appropriate criteria. However, the precise monitoring and evaluation plan will not be publicly available until the first disbursement, approximately 60 days after the signing of the compact. This plan to release the criteria concurrently with the first disbursement is highly problematic given the great need for detailed monitoring to help identify pitfalls and to structure interventions in response to the likelihood of changes in conditions on the ground, especially in the early stages of implementing the program.

It is doubtful whether local level actors have the capacity to gather and analyze data for credible monitoring and evaluation. Furthermore, it is unclear what steps are being taken to build such capacity ahead of implementation of the project.

Finally, questions remain as to the impact the MCA will have on domestic revenue mobilization and generation efforts. The MCA is conceived largely as a supplement to Ghana’s over-stretched development resources. However, given the relatively un-ambitious manner in which successive Ghanaian governments have pursued domestic revenue generation and mobilization (including the persistent under-pricing of scarce public assets like timber, public lands, energy, etc.), as well as the perennial emphasis on sourcing resources externally, there is genuine concern that the MCA “windfall” might create a “moral hazard” of sorts by causing Government to become complacent in its efforts to generate and mobilize revenue from existing and potential domestic sources. ■ ■

Ghana's stagnating decentralization experiment

Ghana's fledgling decentralization experiment is in definite need of a jump-start. The recent nomination, approval and appointment of a youthful activist minister for the reconstituted Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Environment coincides with a rekindled nationwide desire to revive the decentralization program. Various stakeholder meetings on the subject, including the recently-held Ghana Consultative Group Annual Partnership Meeting and the June 2006 CDD Round Table on Decentralization, have all come to the broad conclusion that the country will not meet its economic and social goals of becoming a middle income country in nine years without an accelerated program of decentralization.

The challenges of decentralization have been many. They are threatening to roll back progress and perhaps cause its collapse. Political decentralization has been strongly emphasized, but weaknesses have persisted. Notwithstanding constitutional prohibitions, political partisanship has persisted in the District Assemblies and has gone unchecked by the Electoral Commission and other oversight bodies. The political appointment of the District Chief Executive (DCE) continues to raise questions of downward accountability and effective political and administrative decentralization. By virtue of the fact that s/he is appointed by government, the DCE accounts largely to the President and scarcely to the local community. The resultant upward loyalty is further manifested in DCEs rigidly following central government instructions rather than local demands, which in turn undermines grassroots support for the implementation of district programs and bottom up accountability. In the meantime, a potentially powerful instrument of grassroots accountability such as the provisions contained in the Model Standing Orders of the District Assemblies (DAs), for vetting of DCE nominees by assemblies, remain only an administrative provision applicable on a discretionary basis. As already stated in an earlier issue of Democracy Watch (Vol. 6 No. 2), "if democratic accountability at the district level matters, as it should, then the standard laid out in Model Order 16 for M/DCE nominees to be vetted prior to approval must be made mandatory for all Assemblies"

Progress with administrative decentralization has been equally slow. There is considerable confusion among sector ministries over the policy, transfer of power, functions and

resources. These challenges have been further exacerbated by the introduction of the Local Government Act 2005 (Act 565), which re-centralizes Health and Education while removing sectors like Fire, Game and Wildlife from the list of decentralized sectors. The move is retrogressive and amounts to giving up on decentralization rather than promoting it.

Moreover, the decentralization process has so far largely failed to engage local private sector stakeholders to collectively identify possibilities for local level resource mobilization and wealth creation. In addition, the lack of coordination between national initiatives and donor activities make district level development a slow and inefficient process.

Inertia and inaction further aggravate the problem of effectively implementing the decentralization agenda. A recent CDD roundtable discussion on decentralization confirmed that government plans to reduce the composition of unit committees had yet to be given legislative backing after almost a year of consideration by Cabinet.

“if democratic accountability at the district level matters, as it should, then the standard laid out in Model Order 16 for M/DCE nominees to be vetted prior to approval must be made mandatory for all Assemblies”

Thus, in September, Ghana went into another local government election and reconstitution of assemblies and their substructures without much needed legislative changes. Sixteen thousand Unit Committees (UCs) and District Assemblies (DAs), involving about 280,110 individuals, were supposed to be elected or appointed, mostly without any remuneration. This means that for another four years Ghana's local government structure is going to continue to be saddled with unwieldy substructures that rely unrealistically upon the altruistic values and voluntary services of its officers. It also means that the DAs are going to continue to be bedeviled by UCs that are never properly constituted because they lack the requisite number of members and/or never convene meetings because they lack a quorum. Thus, the pressing need to comprehensively review, overhaul, and make Ghana's district substructures leaner, motivated and more effective remains unrequited.

Real fiscal autonomy is a key pre-requisite for effective local decentralization and development. However, fiscal

decentralization has lagged so far in Ghana. Current legislation centralizes public finance, effectively holding up funds in central ministries and departments while functions are transferred to the DAs.

“Real fiscal autonomy is a key pre-requisite for effective local decentralization and development”

Aligning national budgeting and accounting for the needs at the local level has proved to be a difficult task, thus contributing to the overall mess of fiscal decentralization. At the same time, the Assemblies remain overwhelmingly dependent on central government funding. In addition, significant weaknesses prevail in the manner in which Assemblies have tended to use the discretionary components of the District Assembly Common Fund (DA CF): they have tended to deploy limited funds into ill-advised and poorly conceived capital projects and direct investments. ■■

Governance matters arising from the cocaine scandal: a preliminary comment

In April of 2006, the Minister of the Interior empanelled a Committee, under the chairmanship of Justice Georgina Wood, to investigate the alleged disappearance of 77 parcels of cocaine, each weighing 30kgs, from the vessel MV Benjamin that had berthed at the Tema Port. Related to this incident was the disappearance from the exhibit room of the Narcotics Control Board (NACOB) of 5kgs of cocaine that had been obtained from the MV Benjamin following a raid of the vessel by agents of the National Security Council, the Navy and NACOB.

The mysterious disappearance from the MV Benjamin of substantial quantities of illegal drugs that were supposedly under the watch of the country’s law enforcement and intelligence agencies, and the related disappearance of parcels of drugs in the custody of the country’s narcotic control authorities, are only the latest in a series of dramatic and high-profile drug scandals that have plagued the country’s law enforcement establishment and related agencies. In January 2004, NACOB arrested six persons at a Tema location for importing and possessing 674 kgs of cocaine (with an estimated “street value” of US\$14 million). The suspects were tried, convicted and sentenced to 20 years in jail. Curiously, the 674 kilograms of cocaine

reported and confirmed by the Executive Secretary of NACOB at the time of arrest had diminished to 588.33 kilos at the time of the trial. In September 2005, another drug bust operation took place in East Legon, which netted 588 kilos of cocaine and two Venezuelan suspects. Certain senior police officers are alleged to have collected bribes to influence the conduct of the investigations and prosecution involving the two Venezuelans.

The work and proceedings of the Georgina Wood Committee have been second-guessed from the beginning by all manner of forces, among them, the obvious political opportunists seeking to politicize and extract partisan advantage from the scandals, journalists too eager to reveal and offer their own interpretations of twists and turns in the various stories, and media-styled “social and political commentators” seeking to command non-existent authority for their personal opinions.

Amidst all the drama, the Wood Committee proceeded calmly and diligently. It also undertook its assignment in the full glare of the public, as it opened its proceedings to the media. Regrettably, because no prior ground rules were laid for press coverage of the public proceedings or reporting concerning matters heard in camera, the media conducted themselves with a great deal of license, often propounding and circulating conspiracy theories and conducting trial by media. This parallel investigation and trial by media seriously prejudiced public opinion about the Committee’s work and findings.

“...Parliament should take off where the Wood Committee left off by demanding an institutional audit of these agencies and asking some tough questions of, and demanding remedial action from, the Ministers with responsibility in the affected areas”

In the course of the Committee’s proceedings, certain matters came to light that raised questions about the code of conduct and ethics applicable to law enforcement officers. The centerpiece of the Committee’s investigation, which also provided the basis for much of the public and media theorizing and rumor-mongering about the extent of senior-level police complicity in various drug cases, was a secret audiotape of a meeting alleged to have been held between certain key figures believed to be involved in the domestic side of the drug trade and a high-ranking law enforcement officer. The disputed circumstances of this

meeting have raised unanswered questions about what the official police policy or code of conduct is regarding such matters as the depth and level of “fraternization” with suspects. It is unclear what is considered legitimate and reasonable for a law enforcement officer to perform her/his investigative or information-gathering work effectively. The rules regarding police use of informants is also unspecified.

The most worrying aspect of these recent drug scandals is the unflattering attention placed on possible institutional failure in the country’s law enforcement and drug interception apparatus. Curiously, the police administration announced personnel changes, including promotions and demotions, during the same time as certain officials in the police top brass were themselves under scrutiny for their acts of commission and omission in connection with some of the matters under investigation. It would be even more curious if these ill-timed personnel changes were approved. The lapses and failures identified in the operations of the Immigration Service, National Security Council, NACOB, CID, and the Ghana Police Service call for a comprehensive review of our law enforcement, investigative and drug interception systems and institutions. Perhaps Parliament should take off where the Wood Committee left off by demanding an institutional audit of these agencies and asking some tough questions of, and demanding remedial action from, the Ministers with responsibility in the affected areas. ■ ■

Transfer of convicted persons bill: who benefits?

In May 2006, the Government introduced to Parliament a new bill titled “Transfer of Convicted Persons Bill.” If passed into law, the bill will enable citizens of Ghana, serving jail terms in foreign prisons, to be transferred to Ghana to complete their sentences. A reciprocal facility will be extended to foreign persons serving time in Ghana’s prisons.

The Memorandum accompanying the bill explains that the proposed legislation is necessary to bring Ghana in conformity with the Commonwealth’s “best practices” on transfer of convicted foreign persons. Another claim made on behalf of the proposed law is that it will help to decongest our prisoners of foreign inmates and permit the removal of Ghanaian inmates suffering inhuman conditions in certain foreign prisons. The bill proposes to remove certain obstacles in the current Extradition Act, 1960 (Act 22) that stand in the way of international prisoner transfers.

Many Ghanaians remain unconvinced by the official reasons provided in defense of the Transfer of Convicted Persons Bill. Besides the obvious “why now” question, there is the question of how this matter came to find a place on the Government’s legislative agenda, given that there has been no known public grievance concerning Ghanaian inmates in foreign prisons or foreign inmates in Ghana’s jails. In fact, one is not even sure whether the Government has accurate information on the number of foreign inmates in Ghana’s jails or of the population of Ghanaians serving sentences in foreign prisons or exactly where they are located. In short, what is the public problem that this proposed legislation is designed to cure? Finding the official rationale unconvincing, some Ghanaians have dubbed the bill the “Amoateng Bill,” a reference to the NPP Member of Parliament currently facing trial in the United States on drug-related charges and who, if, convicted, might be a beneficiary of the facility the bill proposes to establish. The Bill indeed raises more questions than it answers, and the Government, as the sponsor of the bill, has thus far failed to carry its burden of persuasion.

First, where, in fact, did the idea of this Bill originate? It is doubtful that this is an idea original to this Government. Is the Government acting at the behest of certain foreign countries that are eager to rid their prisons of foreign, including Ghanaian, inmates and make some savings in the process? It is important that the Government make full disclosure with regards to this matter, so that the bill’s merits and demerits can be assessed in its proper context.

Given that there are probably significantly more Ghanaians in foreign jails than there are foreign country nationals in our prisons, Ghana is likely to be a “net importer” of prisoners under the proposed law. How is that going to help decongest our prisons? Besides, to what extent are conditions in Ghana’s prisons more humane and prisoner-friendly than prisons abroad? What study does the Government have to support this supposition? Will Ghana be paid by the “prisoner exporting” countries? While the idea of a new “international trade in prisoners” is an unsettling proposition, it is still worth asking, what net benefit Ghana stands to gain from this law.

For example, what kind of criminal convict does the Government expect to bring back home to Ghana? If, as it is fair to assume, a disproportionate number of Ghanaian inmates in foreign prisons are serving time for involvement in drug trafficking, how would bringing this kind of criminal back to Ghana benefit the country? How will the presence in Ghana’s jails of such potentially “deep pocket” criminals connected to international networks help the integrity and

security of our prison system? How will it help the Government's efforts to fight the growing use of Ghana as a transit point (and, increasingly, as a consumer destination) in the illegal drug trade?

The Bill also raises constitutional concerns. For example, what if the crime for which the returned prisoner was convicted and sentenced by a foreign court is not punished by the same sentence or in the same manner under the laws of Ghana? In that case, what would be the constitutional basis for holding that person as a prisoner in Ghana? Can the Ghanaian authorities constitutionally hold a person in prison who has not been tried, convicted, and sentenced to a term of imprisonment under Ghanaian law? Do our prison authorities have the constitutional authority to enforce domestically the criminal laws and penalties of other countries? These and other concerns need to be forthrightly addressed by the Government before Ghanaians can be persuaded to accept this bill. ■■

The CHRAJ findings against Dr. Richard Anane and aftermath

After 18 months of investigations and hearings, and 23 panel sittings, the Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAJ) finally announced its decision in the "Anane Case" on September 15, 2006. The Commission investigated certain conduct of Dr. Anane, during his tenure as Minister for Health and, then, as Minister for Transportation in the Kufuor Administration. The point of the investigations was to determine whether the conduct in question amounted to corruption, conflict of interest or abuse of power by the Minister. The Commission's action was triggered by a series of reports and revelations in the Ghanaian press alleging that the Minister had fathered a child out of wedlock with an American whom he had met in the course of an official business abroad, and to whom he had allegedly made substantial monetary payments for the upkeep of his child. In deciding to investigate these allegations on its own initiative, CHRAJ was following its past precedents, including its earlier investigation of the allegations surrounding the so-called "Hotel Kufuor" affair, which examined the President's role in a hotel purchase transaction involving his son.

The Commission needs to be commended for completing its investigations on the Minister, for the bold recommendations it made, and for making the findings available to the public as well as to His Excellency, President Agyekum Kufuor. The final submission of the CHRAJ

investigation into the allegations is a victory for due process and the rule of law in Ghana. It has proven CHRAJ's resoluteness, determination and fortitude to execute its mandate competently, efficiently and within the confines of the law.

Similarly, the Ghanaian press and the general public should be commended for their patience and support of the painstaking work of the commission throughout the period of the investigations, sittings and even the last minute postponement of the release of its findings. The understanding and patience shown by the public and the media also affirm the public confidence reposed in the commission and its leadership. Ghanaians' support for such institutions of restraint on State power helps to strengthen public accountability and integrity in public life.

It is equally important to commend Dr. Anane for doing the honorable thing to resign from his position as Minister in the wake of the Commission's findings and recommendations. This is rare in a political culture in which Ministers and other such influential public officers typically carry about with impunity even in the face of serious evidence of malfeasance. One notes with little surprise the reactions of various interested parties to the recommendations of the Commission and Dr. Anane's resignation. It is hoped that these groups will continue to support and respect the laws of the land while Dr. Anane, in exercise of his constitutional rights, pursues his preferred course of action. By resigning, Dr. Anane saved the President the task of having to fire one of his closest Ministers. Obviously the Minister would not have resigned had the President insisted on keeping him on his team regardless of the Commission's recommendation. In that regard, the President too must be commended for respecting the Commission's recommendation and encouraging his Minister to step down.

With respect to the recommendations of CHRAJ, we endorse the Commission's call for senior public officers to be put through orientation and training in conflict of interest avoidance and management and for reform of the country's laws on corruption. Some of the commission's findings also reinforce the need for changes to the existing legislation governing public office assets declaration.

The Commission's negative finding on the allegation of corruption is, however, somewhat puzzling. Though the Commission found that the Minister himself remitted a total amount of \$30,000 to his paramour, the Commission failed to exercise its constitutional and statutory authority to draw

the appropriate negative inferences and presumption, pursuant to Article 286(4) of the Constitution, which states that, "Any property or assets acquired by a public officer after the initial declaration required by clause (1) of this article and which is not reasonably attributable to income, gift, loan, inheritance or any reasonable source shall be deemed to have been acquired in contravention of this Constitution." Consistent with this provision, and with section 6 of the Public Office Holders (Declaration of Assets and Disqualification) Act 1998 (Act 550), CHRAJ should have examined and ruled on the Minister's financial capacity to make remittances in an amount possibly in excess of his known income.

The Commission omitted to follow a similar line of inquiry with regard to Mr. Collins Duodu, the Ministers 'special assistant,' on the rather curious theory that the latter is not a public officer in the meaning of the Constitution. However, in view of the Commission's conclusion that it found hard to believe that the Minister would not know about the \$73,000 paid by his special assistant to his paramour, the Commission should have similarly established whether Mr. Duodu had the financial wherewithal to remit or access such cash amounts. This would have assisted the commission to strengthen its case that Mr. Duodu did not act alone or on his own accord. ■■

**CDD-GHANA DEMOCRACY PROGRAMS
JUNE - NOVEMBER 2006**

**May 3
Round Table Discussion on Strengthening Metropolitan/
Municipal/District Assembly Accountability**

The round table discussion came off at the Elmina Beach Resort in Cape Coast. The Deputy Minister for the Central Region and Acting Cape Coast Municipal Chief Executive, Nana Ato Arthur, chaired the function. The main speakers were Mr. Cletus Avoka, a private legal practitioner, Mr. Kwame Gyasi of the University of Ghana Business School, and Hon. Kwesi Esseku, Presiding Member of the Effutu District Assembly. The function was chaired by Nana Ato Arthur. The Friedrich Neumann Foundation (FNF) provided the funding.

**May 10
CSO/Donor Partners Network Meeting**

As part of preliminary preparations for the implementation of the USAID program on "Strengthening Parliamentary Process in Ghana", the Center called a Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)/Donors meeting at the CDD Conference Room to moot the idea of setting up a structure for CSOs/Donors to coordinate parliamentary support activities. The meeting was attended by Ted Lawrence and Sam Ocran, both of USAID; Simon Manu, IBIS; Boadi, FES; Mohammed Sanni, LRC; and Marilyn Aniwa, CPC.

**May 24
Afrobarometer Global Release**

On the eve of Africa Day, CDD released the 18-country results of the Afrobarometer Round 3 at the Golden Tulip Hotel in Accra. The event was held simultaneously in Cape Town, South Africa; Kampala, Uganda; and Michigan, USA. A panel discussion composed of the following: Dr. Audrey Gadzekpo, senior lecturer at the University of Ghana, a commentator on the media, and a member of the Afrobarometer International Council, spoke on : "The Media and Democratic Reforms"; Mr. Vitus Azeem, budget analyst at ISODEC spoke on "Poverty in Ghana in relation to the Ghana Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (GGPRS); and Dr. Francis Appiah, Executive Secretary of the Governing Council of the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) spoke on "NEPAD Deepening of the Democratic Process". The panel debate was planned to determine the efficacy and relevance of their positions, policies and programs vis-à-vis the perceptions, demands and needs of Africans. Professor Leonard Wantchekon, Afrobarometer national partner for Benin and lecturer in Politics and Economics, New York University, and Prof. E. Gyimah-Boadi, Executive Director, CDD-Ghana, presented the Global Results.

**May 30
Press Conference on the Disability Bill Passage**

CDD held a press conference to share with the media and the public some of the comments made by CDD to the bill. The Committee on Employment, Manpower and State Enterprises has incorporated some of the comments into the bill for discussion by Parliament. The Bill has since been passed.

“ Democracy is never a finished task; it is always a work-in-progress that can progress, stagnate or regress depending on the actions and omissions of the governed and the government ”

E. Gyimah-Boadi

June 13
Exploring and Deepening the Linkage Between Corruption and Human Rights.

The Center conducted a one-day seminar at the Cresta Royale Hotel to explore the linkage between human rights and corruption. The seminar was chaired by Ms. Anna Bossman, Acting Director, CHRAJ. Presentations were made by Mr. Charles Ayamdo, Deputy Director, Anti-Corruption Unit, CHRAJ and Mr. Brian Sapati, Head of the Corporate Governance Program at GIMPA.

June 19
RTD on Advocacy for Reduction in Numbers of Local Govt Sub-Structures

The Center organized a roundtable conference to advocate for amendments to the Local Government law to reduce the number of Unit Committees, size and quorum requirements for flexibility and effectiveness in order to promote the cause of decentralization in Ghana. Mr. Adeene Kanga, Deputy Chairman of the Electoral Commission (Finance and Administration), Mr. Cletus Avoka, private legal practitioner, and Mr. Kojo Anaisie Yarquah, Presiding Member, Cape Coast Municipal Assembly and Central Regional Representative of NALAG presented papers on the topic. The event was chaired by Hon. Appiah-Pinkrah,, Vice Chairman of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Local Government, Rural Development and Environment. In attendance was the Minister for Local Govt, Rural Development and Environment, Hon. Stephen Asamoah-Boateng.

June 22
Annual Liberal Lecture

The 2006 Annual Liberal Lecture focused on the theme of deepening decentralization in Ghana. The lecture titled: "Is Ghana Ready for Subsidiarity?" undertook a critical review of achievements and limitations in the implementation of decentralization in Ghana to date. The lecture highlighted practical difficulties in the way of deepening decentralization and especially subsidiarity in Ghana. The lead presenter was Prof. Wisdom Tettey, University of Calgary. Dr. Esther Offei-Aboagye, Director, Institute for Local Government Studies, gave a critique of the presentation. The function was chaired by Mr Eric Boateng, Head of Programs, CDD.

June 23-25
Consultative Stakeholders' Forum for Monitoring and Evaluation of Ghana's APRM Program of Action

The forum was held at the Greenland Hotel, Agona Swedru. CDD attended and made an input at the invitation of the National African Peer Review Mechanism Governing Council.

June 24 - 29
Transitional Justice

CDD attended the first Steering Committee meeting of the ATJRN and a workshop organized in Liberia by the network. Franklin Oduro and Wahab Abdul Musah, both from CDD, acted as facilitators for the 4-day workshop where they led various presentations touching on the experiences of Ghana in the transitional justice process. Other participants were Ezekiel Pajibo, Centre for Democratic Empowerment (CEDE),

Liberia; Nahla Valji, Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR), South Africa; Victoria Baxter, American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), USA; David Backer, Independent Consultant, Stanford University, USA.

July 8
Training Workshop for Local Level Pre-Election Monitors

The Center held a training workshop for local level election monitors at CDD conference room. 43 people nationwide attended the program and were deployed immediately after the program. The workshop was facilitated by Mr. John Larvie, Senior Program Officer, CDD, and was assisted by Fred Tetteh, Senior Electoral Officer, Electoral Commission and Mr. Simon Manu, Program Officer, IBIS.

July 15-16
Effective Media Coverage of Parliament

A workshop was organized by the Center at Marina Hotel in Dodowa as part of the USAID program "Strengthening Parliamentary Processes in Ghana". The program was aimed at sharpening the skills of the parliamentary press corps to effectively report on Parliamentary activities. The 1st Deputy Speaker of Parliament; Hon. Freddie Blay, delivered the keynote address. Other presenters were Hon. Osei Kyei-Mensah Bonsu, Majority Chief Whip; Hon. Iddrisu Haruna, Minority Spokesperson on communications; Mr. George Sarpong, Executive Director, National Media Commission; Mr. S. N. Darkwa, former Clerk to Parliament; Hon. Kofi Attor, former Member of Parliament; and Dr. Audrey Gadzekpo, Senior Lecturer, School of Communication Studies, University of Ghana.

July 17
Bi-Annual Meeting of the CLPA Committee

CDD hosted the first bi-annual meeting of the Constitutional, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Committee of Parliament. Prof. Kofi Quashigah, Dr. Ebow Bondzie-Simpson and Dr. Audrey Gadzekpo presented papers.

July 20
Video Conference with House of Commons, UK

The conference was held at GIMPA for the Research Department of the office of Parliament. The program aimed at engaging the research department of the British Parliament and the research department of the Parliament of Ghana on how to adopt a research department (UK) model for the research department of Ghana's Parliament. The UK team was led by George Bruce, MP. The Ghana team comprised Osei Kyei-Mensah Bonsu, John Mahama, Evans Paul Aidoo, Nii Adu Mante, Benjamin Ayeh, Larbick Joseph and Joseph Darko-Mensah, all Members of Parliament.

July 29 – August 3
Sensitization Workshop on the Inclusion of the Disabled in Local Level Elections

The Center conducted three different workshops in Kumasi, Tamale and Ho to sensitize people with disabilities to participate in local level election to be held in September.

Each of the workshops attracted approximately 175 participants. The Ho workshop was chaired by Mr. Larry Dissah, Regional Director, Dept. of Social Welfare. The other resource persons were Hon. Mawutor Goh, Ho Municipal Chief Executive, Harry Asimah, District Director, NCCE, Mr. Nicholas Halm, GFD, Mr Selormey Adukpoh, Dep. Municipal Electoral Director.

.....
August 10

Dissemination Workshop on Victims Survey Report

A dissemination workshop took place in Takoradi, Western Region, to share with participants and the public expectations and conditions of victims interviewed during the NRC process. The workshop was jointly facilitated by Daniel Armah-Attoh, Research Officer, and John Larvie, Senior Program Officer, both staff of CDD. The workshop was chaired by Awulae Annor Adjei III, Traditional Chief of the area. It was attended by 165 participants.

.....
August 31

Annual Democracy and Governance Lecture

The second CDD Annual Democracy and Governance Lecture ("Kronti Ne Akwamu") was held at the British Council Hall. The lecture was delivered by the immediate past Speaker of Parliament Hon. Peter Ala Adjetey, and was chaired by Rev. Prof. S. K. Agyapong, Vice Chancellor, Methodist University. Prof. Gyimah-Boadi, Executive Director, CDD gave the open statement. The program was attended by about 180 people.

.....
September 6

Review Workshop on Good Governance in Land Tenure/ Administration Systems in Ghana

The review workshop was held at the Coconut Groove Regency Hotel, Accra. Funded by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations, the focus of the review workshop lay in the definition of best practices for addressing governance issues in a tenure pluralism setting. The lead consultant was Prof. Kasim Kasanga of KNUST. Hon. Ofosu Asamoah, MP for Kade, chaired the function. Participants included Members of the Parliamentary Committee on Lands and Forestry, FAO, traditional chiefs, academics and stakeholder institutions. The research report was presented by the lead Consultant at the Expert Meeting on Good Governance in Land Tenure and Administration at FAO in Rome, Italy, on September 26. FAO had indicated its full satisfaction at the quality of presentation made by Prof. Kasanga.

.....
October 16

Payment of Reparations

A 2-man New York-based ICTJ technical support team, Mr. E. Okyere-Darko and Ms. Kelli Mudell, began to work with the Government on the payment modalities to the victims of abuse following the NRC process. Other related activities included institutional reform. CDD facilitated the team's working visit.

.....
October 17

Dissemination Seminar at Elmina

The 2006 CDD-FNF Economic Governance Program on the theme "Strengthening Metropolitan/Municipal/District Assembly Revenue Generation for Sustainable Development"

took the form of a research with the view to coming up with recommendations to enhance the local revenue mobilization capacity of the MMDAs. The results of the research were disseminated at a seminar held at Elmina. The Cape Coast Municipal Assembly was used as a case study for the research. Mr. E. Tenkorang, a research fellow at the Institute of Development Studies, University of Cape Coast, who conducted the research, led the discussion at the seminar. Other speakers at the seminar were Dr. Buntu Siwisa, a Research Associate from the Institute of Democracy in South Africa (IDASA), who spoke on "Revenue Mobilization: Concept and Best Practices – Comparative Analysis" and Mr. Kobina Amoah, Director of the Micro-Finance Unit of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, who spoke on "The Case of House Numbering and Street Naming in Ghana's Districts." The Central Regional Minister, Nana Ato Arthur, chaired the function, and was assisted by the Cape Coast Municipal Coordinating Director, Mr. G.B.L. Siilo. In attendance were Prof. E. Gyimah-Boadi, Executive Director of CDD-Ghana and the Director of the Friedriect Neumann Foundation, Mr. Ernst Specht. In all, 24 participants and 14 media personnel attended the program.

.....
October 18

Training Workshop for the Research Department of Parliament

The Center organized a one-day training workshop for the staff of the Research Department of Parliament. There were three presentations. Mr. M. Misraroda, Press Manager, Evangelical Press House, gave a presentation on the topic "Determining Contents for Publication." Mr. Wiafe Akenteng of the Department of Psychology, University of Ghana, spoke on "Data Collection Techniques." A presentation on "Editing and Proof-reading" was given by Ms. Mercy Anane-Frempong. Dr. K. Appiagyei-Atua of CDD was the moderator.

.....
October 24

Meeting with Liberia's Truth & Reconciliation Commission and Coalition Partners

In collaboration with Prof. (Mrs.) Henrietta Mensah-Bonsu of the Faculty of Law, University of Ghana, CDD hosted a one-day meeting to share in Ghana's NRC experience from the perspective of Civil Society institutions. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Eric Okyere-Darko of ICTJ.

.....
November 3-5

Retreat/Workshop on Non-Custodial Sentencing (NCS)

CDD in collaboration with CHRAJ and the Ministry of Justice, organized a 3-day retreat/workshop at the Greenland Hotel, Agona Swedru. This follows a request from the Ministry of Interior for CDD to organize a workshop for all the state and non-state stakeholders for the adoption and implementation of NCS. Present at the workshop included the Minister for Interior, Hon Albert Kan-Dapaah, Deputy Attorney-General Hon K. Osei-Prempeh, Justices Seth Twum and Modibo Ocran, both of the Supreme Court of Ghana, and institutional heads of the departments/bodies dealing with NCS. Justice (retired) VCRAC Crabbe chaired the meeting. A joint visit to the Winneba Prison and what the group observed there brought a tremendous impact on the entire deliberations. A Working Group and Technical Committee were instituted to help actualize the outcomes and related issues. A communiqué was also issued. ■■

The Ghana Center for Democratic Development
(CDD-Ghana)

95 Nortei Ababio Loop, North Airport Residential Area
P.O. Box LG 404, Legon
Accra-GHANA

Phone: 233-21 776142/ 763029/ 784293 - 4

Fax: 233 21 763028

e-mail: cdd@ghana.com

Website: www.cddghana.org

CDD-Ghana Publications

- Briefing Paper Vol. 1 Nos 1- 4
- Briefing Paper Vol. 2 Nos 1- 4
- Briefing Paper Vol. 3 Nos 1- 4
- Briefing Paper Vol. 4 Nos 1- 4
- Briefing Paper Vol. 5 Nos 1- 4
- Briefing Paper Vol. 6 Nos 1- 4
- Critical Perspectives Nos 1- 23
- Research Papers Nos.1- 16
- Conference Proceedings

The Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD-Ghana) is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit and public policy oriented organization based in Accra, Ghana. It is dedicated to the promotion of society and government based on the rule of law and integrity in public administration. The Center's mission is to promote democracy, good governance and the development of a liberal economic environment. In so doing, CDD seeks to foster the ideals of liberty, enterprise and integrity in government and society at large.