

2 **Status of Postharvest Operations in Upper East Region of Ghana:**
3 **The Case of Maize Producers**
4
5
6

7 **ABSTRACT**

8 **A baseline survey was conducted in the Upper East Region of Ghana to**
9 **assess current postharvest practices and factors influencing long and**
10 **bulk storage of maize. The research tools employed were field survey,**
11 **farm visits and key informant interviews. Twenty farmers were randomly**
12 **selected from each community making a total of 120 farmers. Household**
13 **structure on average is made up 7±5 individuals, mean age of household**
14 **heads was 47 years compared to their wives age of 38 years. Maize is**
15 **mostly stored in polypropylene sacs and jute sacs on raised platform in**
16 **household stores. Majority of respondents indicated that post-harvest**
17 **losses during storage are critical challenges to production and household**
18 **food security. The main causes of loss were insect pest, rodents and grain**
19 **moulds. Majority of farmers store maize for 5-8months. Though some local**
20 **and synthetic grain protectants were used, post-harvest losses in 1 year**
21 **of storage were still beyond acceptable limits. However, there was high**
22 **willingness to adopt new efficient methods of crop protection like**
23 **biological control. The idea of community storage methods was still not a**
24 **technology farmers may adopt; due to a myriad of socio-cultural reasons.**
25 **The results of the baseline study will guide the implementation of the**
26 **project as well as serve as reference point for future impact assessment.**
27 **Overall, integrated strategies involving clean farm operations, use of**
28 **appropriate storage technologies and provision of improved storage**
29 **structures are required to reduce current losses.**

30
31 **Key words: Maize farmers, postharvest losses, storage and biological control**
32
33

34 **INTRODUCTION**

35 Maize (*Zea mays* L.) has become an important staple food crop in all parts of Ghana. Currently, maize
36 based cropping systems have become dominant in drier northern savanna areas of Ghana where
37 sorghum and millet were the traditional food security crops. According to SRID (2011), maize is the
38 most cultivated in Ghana, occupying up to 1.0 Million ha on arable land compared to rice (197
39 Thousand ha), millet (179 Thousand ha), sorghum (243 Thousand ha), cassava (889 Thousand ha),
40 yam (204 thousand ha) and plantain (336 Thousand ha) (SRID, 2012). Currently, Ghana is net-
41 importer of maize even though it has great potential to be self-sufficient and net-exporter. Per capita
42 consumption of maize is estimated at 44 kg/person/year (FAOSTAT, Feb 2013). Declining yields of
43 maize are now observed due to decreasing soil fertility and high cost of fertilizer. Over the last 2
44 decades, a myriad of maize varieties, cultivars and hybrids have been released. These genotypes
45 possess traits such as early maturing, drought resistance, diseases and pest resistance, striga
46 resistance, as well as additional nutritional values such as quality protein, yellow and sweet corn.

47 Grains of these genotypes possess diverse textural, physical and compositional characteristics which
48 relate differently to light, moisture and temperature as well as susceptibility to pests and disease
49 pathogens; particularly during prolong storage. This requires commensurate postharvest techniques
50 and strategies to contain harvested surpluses. Also, due to intensification and productivity increase,
51 the need for bulk and prolong storage has become critical. This increase can be attributed to
52 government and donor assisted projects such as providing subsidies on agricultural inputs.
53 Nonetheless, current storage methods are suited for small-holder farmers requiring storage of less
54 than 1 ton. Interventions to introduce large storage units such as community warehousing, community
55 grain banks or metal silos which can contain several tons of grain is still constrained by national
56 agricultural policies as well as low adoption from farmers.

57
58 One of the challenges faced by African countries in achieving food security is high postharvest losses.
59 It has been estimated that the value of postharvest losses in sub-Saharan Africa is about US\$48
60 billion a year. In Ghana, for example, postharvest losses for maize, cassava and yam are estimated to
61 be 35%, 35% and 24%, respectively (CTA 2014). According to the World Bank (2011) important
62 volumes of cereals are lost after harvest in developing countries which worsens the hunger situation.
63 In addition to the lost in volumes, quality of grain is also compromised resulting in lower market
64 opportunities and nutritional value. In fact, in 1975, the United Nations brought postharvest storage
65 losses into international focus when it declared that "further reduction of postharvest food losses in
66 developing countries should be undertaken as a matter of priority" (FAO 1981).

67
68 Generally, stored maize can be damaged by insect pests if they are not properly conditioned and
69 protected (Obeng-Ofori, 2008). It has been found with maize in Ghana that for every 1 percent
70 damage above 5 percent (damage referring to grains with insect holes), the value decreases by 1
71 percent. So if undamaged grain is worth US\$1.00/kg, then grain with 10 percent damage is worth only
72 US\$0.95/kg, and with 20 percent damage it is worth only US\$0.85/kg. These potential losses in value
73 can make a substantial difference to a family's livelihood (DFID Crop Postharvest Program) FAO. This
74 challenge may be exacerbated due to cropping intensification and introduction of hybrid cultivars.
75 Maize is harvested towards the cessation of the rainy season and stored during the drier months of
76 the year. Maize is often stored on cobs in traditional grain silos or shelled into jute and polypropylene
77 sacs with or without protection for storage. However, pest infestation is a perennial constraint; the
78 conditions favorable for grain storage are as well suitable for insect pest reproduction.

79
80 On-farm infestation of notorious storage pests such as larger grain borer (*Prostephanustruncatus*),
81 lesser grain borer (*Rhyzoperthadominica*), maize weevil (*Sitophiluszeamais*), granary weevil (*S.*
82 *granarius*) as well as mycotoxins accumulation, are a threat in grain storage. Indiscriminate use of
83 common grain protectants such as Actellic (Pirimiphos methyl), bioresmethrin (pyrethroid) phostoxin
84 and Gastox (Aluminium phosphate) is widespread among small-holder farmers (Sugri, et al 2010).
85 Most farmers acquire agro-chemicals from non-accredited input dealers without any training on
86 appropriate use. There is the need to integrate production and postharvest practices to achieve
87 quality food for consumers. Integration of good agronomic operations, pest management and
88 appropriate storage techniques to minimize pest damage is therefore very essential. This project
89 seeks to improve agricultural productivity and farm family livelihoods by deploying improved storage
90 and handling practices to reduce postharvest losses of smallholder farmers in the Upper East Region
91 of Ghana (Osei-Agyeman, et al 2014).

92
93 As part of activities of the project titled 'containing productivity increases of maize in Northern Ghana
94 through large-scale storage methods', a baseline study was initiated to generate relevant information
95 to describe the prevailing socioeconomic conditions in the project communities. The results of the
96 baseline study are expected to guide the implementation of the project and to serve as a data base
97 (reference point/measuring scale) against which progress can be measured. The study will also
98 measure the levels of key project indicators to inform the setting of targets. This will also help in the
99 design of the indicator performance tracking table (IPTT). Moreover, it will provide the basis for future
100 impact studies. More specifically the baseline study will; Assess crop (maize) production system in the
101 project communities, identify maize postharvest challenges and the causal factors, provide inventory
102 the existing storage methods. The study will as well assess the level of awareness of using biological
103 control methods in maize storage, assess the willingness to adopt biological control, and estimate the
104 rates of adoption of existing storage methods and determine the factors affecting adoption of
105 improved storage methods.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Area

The Upper East Region (UER) of Ghana lies between longitude 1015'W to 005'E and stretch from latitude 10030'N to 1108'N. The region lies in the Sudan savanna agro-ecology, which forms the semi-arid part of Ghana. The area is part of what is sometimes referred to as interior savanna and is characterized by level to gently undulating topography. Important crops include millet, sorghum, maize, rice, sweet potato, groundnut, cowpea, soybean, cotton onion and tomato. The sheanut tree grows wild and it is an important cash crop. It has alternating wet and dry seasons with the wet season occurring between May and October during which about 95% of rainfall occurs. Maximum rainfall occurs in August-September, and severe dry conditions exist between November and April each year. Annual rainfall ranges from 800-1200 mm. There is wide fluctuation in relative humidity with low values as much as 30% in dry season and above 75% in the wet season (www.ghanadistricts.com).

Approach

The study used different data collection methods. These included both quantitative methods (questionnaires) and qualitative (participatory rural appraisal tools, focus group discussions, key informants interviews) methods. Besides that, secondary data were obtained through desktop research of literature on existing studies already done on similar subjects. Semi-structured questionnaire was developed and administered to multi-phase purposive and randomly selected farmers within the project district to enable us obtain data for the project to assist in project implementation.

Focus group discussions (Chambers, Robert 1993) were carried out with randomly selected farmers within the project districts. This was aimed at collecting qualitative data to support the data gathered by the farmer questionnaire and also serve as a means of triangulation to ensure that the data is realistic and reliable. This was guided by a pre-printed checklist tailored to meet some of the information needs of the study.

Sampling Technique

The population of interest for the study included all farmers in Bawku East, Binduri and Pusiga District of the Upper East Region of Ghana. The unit of study is the farmer who we define for purposes of this study as an individual who lives and farm within the selected communities. A purposeful, random and multi-phase sampling approach targeting maize producing communities and households was adopted. This procedure allowed us to take a representative sample with characteristics that can be generalized for the entire population which it represents.

The sample size was determined using the following formula:

$$N = (Z^2PQ \div D^2).$$

Essentially three factors determine the size of the sample for a survey within a population:

Estimated prevalence of the variable studied – in this case, farmers in the community. The confidence level aimed at the acceptable margin of error.

N: required size of the sample

Z: confidence level of 95% (standard deviation of 1.96).

P: estimated prevalence of farmers in the project area (80%), i.e. the proportion of the target population with a given characteristic.

Q: 1-P.

D: margin of error of 5 % (standard deviation of 0.05).

$$N = 3.8416 \times 0.8 (0.1/0.0025) = 122$$

A total of 122 farmers were randomly sampled from a purposive sample of two communities in the three districts of the Upper East region. The communities were selected because of their attitude to farming and response to project requirement.

Data was collected from farmers using structured questionnaires via face-to-face interview. Questions covered household demographics including age, household size, education and gender of household members. Household assets were inventoried to include both agriculture and non-agriculture assets and, crops and livestock inventories. An agricultural system module surveyed crop production and

165 agricultural land use, storage methods, post-harvest trainings, etc. The data was analyzed using
166 SPSS software.

167

168 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

169

170 **Demographic Information**

171 *Table 1-4* provide a summary of the demographic structure of the households sampled. In all, 42% of
172 respondents were female farmers and 58% male farmers (Table 1). Household structure on average
173 was made up of 7±3 individuals (Table 2). The mean age of household heads was 47 years compared
174 to their wives whose mean age was 38 years. The results also showed that migration of household
175 members was not common during the rainy season but up to 10% migrate down south when
176 agricultural activities decline. The observations indicate that most of the household heads (99%) were
177 involved in crop production. The annual agricultural related household income for about 26.1% of
178 farmers ranged from 100.00- 2,000.00 GHS as the lowest category whereas the biggest category of
179 8100 -10,000.00 GHS constituted about 18.5% of farmers surveyed. Farmers within the income
180 brackets of 4,000.00 – 8,000.00 constituted about 43.6% of farmers surveyed (Table 3).

181 **Table 1: Gender of respondents**

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Female	50	42
Male	70	58
Total	120	100

182

183 **Table 2: Household composition and age of respondents**

Description	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
(N = 120)	HH size	7	3	2	22
	Age (HHH)	47	14	26	78
	Age (WHH)	38	10	18	70

184

185 **Table 3: Income status of households**

Income (GHS 00)	Frequency	Percentage
1-20	31	26.1
21-40	14	11.8
41-60	26	21.8
61-80	26	21.8
81-100	22	18.5
Total	119	100

186

187 Majority of respondents (63%) had no formal education, only 26% had basic education and 10% had
188 post-basic education (Table 4). Petty trading is considered as an occupation by very few households
189 (2.5%). Majority (84.2%) of the respondents were crop farmers, 7.5% of the respondents were
190 employed in other sectors, 2.5% were students and only 3.3% unemployed (Table 5).

191

192 **Table 4: Educational status of respondents**

Education level	Frequency	Percentage
None	75	63
Primary	15	13
JHS/Middle school certificate	16	13

SHS/Technical school	12	10
Non-formal	2	1
Total	120	100

193

194 **Table 5: Primary occupation of respondents**

	Frequency	Percentage
Student	3	2.5
Farmer	101	84.2
Unemployed	4	3.3
Employed	9	7.5
Petty Trader	3	2.5
	120	100

195

196

197 **Cropping Systems**

198 Majority (89%) of respondents were engaged in crop production while a little minority were involved
 199 in animal (7%) and tree (4%) production as the main livelihood strategies (Table 6). Major livelihood
 200 crops include maize, sorghum, millet, soybeans, cowpea, sweet potato and vegetables (Table 7).
 201 Maize is cultivated on up to 4 acres and a maximum land size of 15 acres. The range for cowpea is 2-
 202 12 acres, while Bambara beans, groundnut and sweet potato recorded the least production area of
 203 1, 2 and 2 acres, respectively.

204

205 **Table 6: Main farming systems in the study area**

Farming type	Frequency	Percentage
Crop production	107	89
Tree crop Production	5	4
Livestock marketing	8	7
Total	120	100

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

Table 7: Main crops and acreage of production

Crops	Acreage Mean	(Ha) Min.	Max.
Maize	4	0	15
Sorghum	1	0	4
Soybeans	2	0	5
Cowpea	2	0	12
Vegetable	2	0	3
Millet	2	0	9
Groundnut	1	1	2
Bambarabeans	1	1	1
Sweet Potato	1	1	2

Total land size of HH	8	1	45
-----------------------	---	---	----

215

216 **Maize Post-Harvest Operations and Losses**

217 In Table 8, 95.8% perceived high levels of post-harvest losses in recent times while 4.2 % of the
 218 respondents were adamant. The main causes of maize grain damage were insect pests (69.1%),
 219 rodents (16.6%), grain moulds (6.7%), weight loss (4.2%) and loss of flavor/nutrition (1.7%). Only
 220 1.7% of the respondents recorded no incidence of post-harvest losses and pest infestation at storage
 221 (Table 9). Dzisi et al. (2007) identified field and post-harvest losses as the most important constraint
 222 limiting maize production in Ghana. They reported losses in the field and post-harvest sectors as 5-
 223 10% and 15-20% respectively. Edusah (2006) reported losses of up to 15 to 30%, which is close to
 224 the range reported (10-25) by respondents of this study.

225

226 **Table 8: Incidence and estimated maize postharvest losses under farmer storage**

Incidence of produce infestation at storage			Quantities of losses incurred (%)		
	Frequency	Percentage	Range	Frequency	Percentage
Yes (incidence)	115	95.8	0 - 8	29	24.2
No (incidence)	5	4.2	10 – 25	67	55.8
			27 - 60	24	20
			TOTAL	120	100

227

228 **Table 9: Description of major causes of maize postharvest losses**

Main causes of losses	Frequency	Percentage
Insects infestation	83	69.1
Rodents	20	16.6
Grain moulds	8	6.7
Weight loss	5	4.2
Quality (taste/ aroma/colour)	2	1.7
No incidence	2	1.7
Total	120	100.0

229

230 **Maize Storage Methods**

231 Table 10 describes the various storage methods used in the study area. Majority of farmers, 40% and
 232 27.5%, store maize in poly-sacs and jute sacs respectively. The use of poly-sacs has gradually
 233 replaced jute sacs due to low cost and ready availability. Though, the use of PICS sacs has recently
 234 been introduced, only few farmers opt for them apparently due to high initial cost. Up to 16.6% of
 235 farmers store their maize for 1-4months, 64.2% store maize for 5-8months, and 17.5 store up to 9-
 236 12months (Table 11). Only 1.7% store maize store maize beyond 12 months confirming that they
 237 produce in small quantities for subsistence. Only small quantities 1-3bags are stored by 37.5 % of
 238 respondents and up to 37.5% store 4-10bags, only about 8.3% stored more than 25bags of maize
 239 (Table 11).

240

241 **Table 10: Maize storage methods**

242

Maize storage methods	Frequency	Percentage	Ranked	Reasons for selection
Bare floor	15	12.5	3	Easy to store, affordability
Stored in jute sacs	33	27.5	2	Availability, durability,
Stored in poly-sacs	48	40	1	Availability, durability, low cost
Stored mud silos	10	8.3	5	Common traditional method, regulate grain use
Stored in maize ban	14	11.7	4	Regulates use of maize/ reduce wastage

Total 120 100

243
 244 Poly-sacs was ranked the most preferred storage method. This finding is supported by a study by
 245 **USAID PHHS Final Report (2012)**. The reason for that rank is that it is not expensive, ready
 246 availability and durable. Jute sacs was ranked second most preferred and the reason was that it is
 247 available and durable. Bare floor, maize ban and mud silos were ranked 3rd, 4th, and 5th respectively.
 248 A survey concluded in Northern Ghana by ADRA and OIC demonstrated that that mud silos offer the
 249 benefits of improved food security by reducing storage losses with low cost. However the use of this
 250 technology is very low in the upper east region of Ghana.

251
 252
 253

Table 11: Duration of maize at storage

Duration of storage			Volume of produce stored		
Storage period	Frequency	Percentage	Bags	Frequency	Percentage
1-4 months	20	16.6	1-3bags	45	37.5
5-8 months	77	64.2	4-10bags	45	37.5
9-12 months	21	17.5	11-25bags	20	16.7
1-2 years	2	1.7	Above 25 bags	10	8.3
Total	120	100	Total	120	100

254
 255
 256



Pest Management Strategies Adopted by Farmers

267
 268 Results from focus group discussions indicated that farmers' prior knowledge on the type, severity
 269 and time of pest infestation in different commodities guided their choice of pest management. Table
 270 12 provides a summary of approximate time of pest infestation and management options for different
 271 crops. Close to 44.2% of the respondents noticed pest infestation within 1-4 months, 33.3% within 5-
 272 8months, while 12.5% noticed no pest incidence. From the group discussions, over 50% of
 273 respondents alluded that, except in cowpea and Bambara nuts, pest infestation occurred late at 6
 274 months after storage. Farmers therefore applied postharvest chemicals few months after storage or
 275 when some level of infestation was noticed. Where storage was anticipated above 4 months, over
 276 50% of farmers used some kind of protection. The use of biological control was not a familiar term;
 277 probably this control measure has not been introduced into the area. Only 1.7% of farmers resorted to
 278 the use of botanicals such as *neem* products, pepper, *mahogany* bark, *Jethropha* and other local oils.
 279 Majority use insecticidal dust (43.4%) and phostoxin (13.3%) for pest management. It was realized
 280 that only 1 respondent use ash to actually prevent pest attack (0.8%). The common grain protectants
 281 were *Actellic* (Pyriphos methyl), *bioresmethrin* (pyrethroid) *phostoxin*, *Gastox* (Aluminium phosphate),
 282 *Wander77 powder*.
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288

289
290
291

Table 12: Period of pest infestation and common pest management strategies

Months after storage	Frequency	Percentage
1-4	53	44.2
5-8	40	33.3
After 8	12	10
No pest incidence	15	12.5
Total	120	100

Methods of maize grain protection	Frequency	Percentage
Only drying	48	40
Botanicals (neem, mahogany etc)	2	1.7
Photoxin tablet	16	13.3
Insecticidal dust	52	43.4
No measure taken	1	0.8
use of ash	1	0.8
Total	120	100

292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301

Farmers expressed their willingness to adopt both the poly-tank storage method and the biocontrol storage method. Those who indicated they will agree to adopt the poly-tank method were about 45% while those who strongly agreed also scored 45.8%. 55.5% of the farmers indicated they will agree to adopt the biological control method while 31.1% said they strongly agree to adopt the biological control method. From all indications the farmers are willing to adopt both the poly-tank and biological control method of maize storage in the Bawku municipality as shown in Table 13.

Table 13: Willingness to adopt new storage techniques

I will adopt a new poly-tank storage method		
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	0.8
Disagree	1	0.8
Neither agree nor disagree	9	7.6
Agree	54	45
Strongly agree	55	45.8
Total	120	100

I will adopt biocontrol storage method		
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	1	0.8
Disagree	2	1.7
Neither agree nor Disagree	13	10.9
Agree	66	55.5
Strongly agree	37	31.1
Total	119	100

302
303
304
305
306
307
308

Conclusion and Recommendation

Overall, 42% of respondents were female farmers and 58% male farmers. Household structure on average is made up of 7±5 individuals, mean age of household heads was 47 years compared to their wives 38 years. Majority of the household heads and their wives had no formal education and their

309 primary occupation was crop production. Household wealth was largely concentrated on crop
310 production and other off-farm livelihood such as agro-processing and petty trading. Maize was mostly
311 stored in polypropylene sacs (40%) and jute sacs (27.5%) on raised platform in household stores.
312 Close to 95.8% of respondents indicated that post-harvest losses during storage are critical
313 challenges to production and household food security. The main causes of loss were insect pest
314 (69.1%), rodents (16.6%) grain moulds (6.7%), weight loss (4.2%) and loss of flavour/nutrition (1.7%).
315 Up to 16.6% of farmers stored their maize for 1-4months, 64.2% store maize for 5-8months, and
316 17.5% store up to 12months. Only 1.7% store maize beyond 12 months; confirming that they produce
317 in small quantities for subsistence.

318
319 The major crops produced in the study area included: maize, millet, sorghum, peanuts, bambara nuts,
320 soy beans and sweet potato. The use of poly-sacs was ranked the most preferred storage method
321 due to ready availability and low cost. Jute sacs was ranked second most preferred and the reason
322 was that it is available and durable. The concept of community storage is still not a technology
323 farmers may adopt; due to a myriad of socio-cultural reasons. Though some local and synthetic grain
324 protectants were used, post-harvest loses in 1 year of storage were still beyond acceptable limits.
325 However, there was a high willingness to adopt new efficient and effective methods like biological
326 control, hermitic triple layer bags and poly-tank methods, which are being introduced to the
327 communities.

328
329 The results of the baseline study was expected to guide the implementation of the project as well as
330 serve as reference point for future impact evaluation. The overall objective of the project was to
331 evaluate, deploy and disseminate medium to large scale storage methods and integrated pest
332 management strategies for bulk and prolong storage of maize, which show minimal influence on food
333 quality and safety. Overall, integrated strategies involving clean farm operations, use of appropriate
334 storage technologies and provision of improved storage structures are required to reduce current
335 losses. Quite recently, the Purdue Improved Crop Storage (PICS) triple-layer hermetic bags have
336 been promoted as a potential insecticide-free, long-term storage of cowpea and maize. However, cost
337 and access are still challenges requiring the attention of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture of
338 Ghana. Although farmers were aware of these insects, they showed generally poor knowledge of their
339 control. Majority used chemical protectants indiscriminately during storage. These were not only
340 ineffective but pose health risks to the farmer and consumers. The need for training of farmers and/or
341 agricultural extension officers on proper post-handling practices for grains is therefore require.

342
343
344 We wish to acknowledge the USDA- Scientific Cooperation Research Program for supporting this
345 study.
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368

369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423

References

1. Amoako, C., Nyamaah-Koffour, K., Adu, V., Okyere-Boateng, S., Nsiah, M. K., and Aning, S. K. (eds.). Proceedings of Sunyani Polytechnic Lecture Series II. Qualitytype Ltd., P. O. Box AN 7314, Accra-North.
2. Chambers, Robert (1993). "Methods for analysis by farmers: The professional challenge," *Journal for Farming Systems Research Extension*: Vol. 4, No. 1. pp. 87-101.
3. CTA. Analysis of the Postharvest Knowledge system in Ghana Case study of cassava. <http://knowledge.cta.int>
4. Dzisi, K. A., Addo, A., and Bart-Plange (2007). Strategies for the Development of Good Maize Processing, Handling and storage Systems in Ghana. In: Nsiah- Gyabaah, K., Agyepong M.,
5. Edusah, S. E (2006). Agriculture, Science and Technology for Wealth Creation and Sustainable Development of Ghana: The Role of Small-Scale Industries in Food Processing and Preservation in Ghana. In: Nsiah- Gyabaah, K., Agyepong M., Amoako, C., Nyamaah-Kuffour.
6. FAO. Food Agriculture Organization Statistics. (2013).
7. FAO, "Food loss prevention in perishable crops." *FAO Agricultural Services Bulletin* (1981)
- 8.
9. K., Adu, V., Okyere-Boateng, S., Nsiah, M. K., and Aning, S. K. (2007). Proceedings of Sunyani Polytechnic Lecture Series II. Qualitytype Ltd., P. O. Box AN 7314, Accra-North.
10. Obeng-Ofori, D (2008). Major stored product arthropod pests In: Post-harvest Science and Technology (Cornelius, E.W and Obeng-Ofori, D. eds.), Smartline Publishing Limited, Accra: pp67–91.
11. Osei-Agyeman Y, Nutsugah SK, Komkiok JM, Sugri I, Bidzakin JK and Naanwaab C. (2014) Containing productivity increases of maize in Ghana through large-scale storage methods. Annual Report of the USDA/North Carolina A&T State Univ., and CSIR-Savanna Agricultural Research Institute, Ghana and USDA- SCRP Project: pp1-23.
12. SRID. Statistics Research and Information Department of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Ghana. 2012.
13. SRID. Statistics Research and Information Department of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Ghana. 2011.
14. Sugri, I., R.A.L. Kanton, J. Yirzagla and F. Kusi (2010). Review of crop storage practices and estimate of postharvest losses in Upper East Region of Ghana. In Annual Report of CSIR-Savanna Agriculture Research Institute, Tamale Ghana: Pp209-211.
15. USAID Post-Harvest Handling And Storage (PHHS) Project Final Report (2012)
16. www.ghanadistricts.com
17. *World Bank Report, Responding To Global Food Price Volatility And Its Impact On Food Security (2011)*