Ghana's Digital Crossroads: The Regulatory Future of Innovation, Licensing, and Professional Control under the Proposed NITA Bill

Justice Akpadie
IT Consultant, Accra, Ghana
jakpadie@gmail.com

Blessing Egbe
AI Governance Expert & Ethics Advisory, Lagos, Nigeria |
egbeblessing241024@gmail.com

Richard Kwadwo Nyarko
AI Researcher / Data Analyst / Research & Policy developer / IT Law & Communication Expert , Accra, Ghana
oguaafisherman@gmail.com

An Independent Assessment of Policy Design, Institutional Power, and Digital Economy Governance

1. The Genesis and Mandate of the NITA Bill: An Evolution from Act 771

The legislative proposal known as the National Information Technology Authority Bill (NITA Bill) represents a significant pivot in Ghana's approach to governing its burgeoning digital economy. It seeks to supersede the foundational National Information Technology Agency Act, 2008 (Act 771) and substantially expand the mandate and powers of the National Information Technology Agency (NITA). This evolution reflects a strategic decision by the current administration to transition from a more advisory and supportive role for NITA to one of a powerful, proactive regulator of the entire ICT sector. The driving force behind this shift, as articulated by the Ministry of Communication, Digital Technology, and Innovations, is the perceived need to bring order, accountability, and "sanity" on what is described as a fast-growing but chaotic technology ecosystem. The central argument posits that proper regulation is essential to protect consumers, improve service standards, strengthen digital trust, and ensure that all technology companies operating within Ghana adhere to fundamental legal and professional requirements. The Bill, therefore, is framed not merely as a technical update but as a necessary intervention to secure the long-term health and integrity of the nation's digital infrastructure and services.

The proposed NITA Bill delineates an expansive new set of authorities for the agency, transforming it into a multi-faceted regulatory body. One of the most contentious provisions is the requirement for mandatory licensing for a wide array of ICT businesses and service providers. This would encompass software companies, fintech firms, cloud service providers, data centers, digital platforms, and ICT contractors, effectively making a license a prerequisite for legal operation. Beyond licensing, the Bill empowers NITA to establish and enforce technical standards for ICT products and services, oversee public-sector ICT procurement processes, monitor compliance across the sector, and engage in direct regulatory enforcement. The enforcement toolkit includes the power to maintain a public register of all ICT providers, issue binding directives to non-compliant entities, and, most significantly, suspend or revoke licenses to operate. Furthermore, the Bill introduces a novel requirement for the certification of ICT professionals, stipulating that individuals cannot be appointed to work in certain public or private institutions without first obtaining certification from NITA.

This marks a profound departure from the original 2008 framework under which NITA was established. While Act 771 concentrated on national IT policy development and implementation within the public sector, the new Bill signals an intent to regulate the entire value chain, from the individual professional to the multinational corporation operating a data center in Accra. The expansion of NITA's role is explicitly confirmed

through NITA's own public consultation materials, which acknowledge the review of Act 771 into the new National Information Technology Authority Bill, 2025.

AI Governance Dimension: What the Bill Omits

What the NITA Bill's architects have not adequately addressed is the strategic incoherence created by its silence on artificial intelligence. The Bill is being proposed at precisely the moment that Ghana has launched its National AI Strategy 2025–2035, which explicitly identifies AI as a priority engine of national development across eight sectors including healthcare, agriculture, financial services, and public administration. These two legislative instruments, one aimed at governing the ICT sector broadly, the other at positioning Ghana as a continental AI leader are proceeding along parallel tracks without any apparent coordination of their regulatory architectures. The NITA Bill makes no specific provision for AI systems, AI practitioners, or the governance of algorithmic decision-making in any of its licensing, certification, or enforcement frameworks. This is not a minor gap. It means that the Bill could create regulatory obligations for a software developer building a conventional web application while leaving entirely ungoverned the deployment of an AI system making automated credit decisions, medical diagnostic recommendations, or public service allocation determinations affecting millions of Ghanaians.

The contrast with the EU's approach is instructive here. The EU AI Act, which operates alongside rather than in competition with broader ICT regulation, specifically classifies AI systems by risk tier and imposes differentiated requirements on high-risk applications. Ghana's NITA Bill takes the opposite approach: broad, uniform licensing requirements for all ICT businesses, with no differentiation for AI systems whose potential for harm, bias, and accountability failure is qualitatively different from conventional software. A government that certifies an ICT professional without any assessment of their competency in responsible AI development is not addressing the sector's most consequential governance challenge. The Ministry of Communication, Digital Technology, and Innovations must reconcile the NITA Bill's regulatory architecture with the commitments Ghana has already made under the National AI Strategy and under UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI, adopted by 193 countries in 2021 and signed by Ghana.

The government's position, championed by Communications Minister Samuel Nartey George, frames NITA's expanded powers as a corrective measure bringing much-needed structure to an unregulated frontier. This is a defensible argument for conventional ICT services. It is an insufficient argument for AI governance, where the regulatory challenge is not merely one of professional standards and business formalization but of algorithmic

accountability, data sovereignty, and the rights of citizens affected by automated systems. The NITA Bill, in its current form, would create the institutional apparatus for sector governance without embedding within it the governance principles that AI deployment specifically requires.

The contrast between the two frameworks is stark. Where Act 771 served a developmental and supportive function, the NITA Bill envisions a state-led model of governance characterized by active market intervention. However, this vision of top-down control is met with fierce opposition from a significant segment of Ghana's dynamic tech community. Critics, including prominent figures like Bright Simons, have labeled the Bill a "digital straitjacket" that threatens to stifle the very innovation it claims to support. Their primary concern is that the mandatory licensing and certification regime will act as a severe barrier to entry, disproportionately harming the self-taught developers, freelance coders, and early-stage startups who form the creative and economic engine of the ecosystem. The fear is that NITA will morph from a facilitator of digital growth into a restrictive gatekeeper, controlling not just who can sell technology services, but who can even practice them. This fundamental conflict between the government's desire for order and the tech community's demand for freedom highlights the deep ideological divide at the heart of the debate over Ghana's digital future.

2. Comparative Regulatory Landscapes: Lessons from Nigeria, Kenya, India, and the EU

To fully appreciate the significance and potential consequences of Ghana's NITA Bill, it is essential to situate it within a broader international context. No single foreign model provides a perfect template, but an examination of regulatory philosophies in Nigeria, Kenya, India, and the European Union reveals distinct trends and alternative pathways that Ghana could consider. These comparisons highlight the unique nature of the NITA Bill's provisions, particularly its focus on licensing businesses and certifying professionals, which diverges from the predominant global emphasis on data protection and privacy.

In Africa, several nations are actively developing their digital regulatory frameworks, offering valuable regional precedents. Nigeria's approach has been notably progressive, evolving from the Nigerian Data Protection Regulation (NDPR) 2019 to the more robust Nigeria Data Protection Act (NDPA) 2023. This legislative progression signifies a move towards codifying data protection rights in a manner similar to Europe's GDPR. The NDPA imposes sweeping obligations on organisations processing personal data,

including ensuring a lawful basis for processing, adhering to data minimisation principles, and implementing safeguards for cross-border data transfers. However, Nigeria's regulatory focus remains squarely on data governance and individual privacy rights; it does not include provisions for the general licensing of ICT service providers or the mandatory certification of individual ICT professionals, which are central features of the NITA Bill. Similarly, Kenya's efforts appear concentrated on data privacy enforcement and implementation, reflecting a regional trend toward strengthening data governance frameworks.

India offers another advanced model of digital regulation with its Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (DPDPA). This legislation introduces comprehensive data protection obligations for any organisation handling personal data within India. As with Nigeria and Kenya, the focus is on protecting citizens' data, not on regulating the act of software development or certifying individual tech workers. At the global level, the European Union presents the world's most comprehensive and harmonised regulatory architecture for the digital sphere. Key pillars of this framework include the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which sets a global benchmark for data privacy, and the AI Act, the first-ever comprehensive legal framework specifically governing artificial intelligence. The EU's strategy is to shape the global digital environment by setting standards that other nations may seek to emulate for market access.

Regional AI Governance Context: The Continental Framework Ghana is Not Engaging

The comparative analysis above focuses primarily on jurisdictions outside Africa. However, Ghana's regulatory choices must be evaluated against an equally important regional governance architecture that the NITA Bill, in its current form, largely ignores: the African Union's Continental AI Strategy (2024) and the emerging ECOWAS digital governance framework.

The AU Continental AI Strategy, adopted in 2024, establishes a continent-wide framework for responsible AI development that explicitly calls on member states to develop national AI governance instruments aligned with AU principles on data sovereignty, algorithmic accountability, and inclusive AI deployment. Ghana, as a signatory to the AU framework and as a country with continental AI leadership ambitions embedded in its National AI Strategy 2025–2035, has a specific obligation to ensure that its domestic regulatory instruments advance rather than undermine that alignment. The NITA Bill's absence of any AI governance provisions is directly inconsistent with this commitment. A national ICT regulatory framework that does not address AI systems cannot credibly claim to support Ghana's stated ambition of

becoming Africa's leading AI hub.

ECOWAS is similarly in the early stages of developing a regional digital governance framework that will eventually impose coordination obligations on member states regarding data flows, cross-border digital services, and technology standards. Ghana's financial sector AI systems, agricultural data platforms, and cross-border e-commerce infrastructure already operate within a regional ecosystem that extends beyond national boundaries. A national licensing and certification regime designed without reference to this regional ecosystem risks creating regulatory fragmentation that imposes compliance costs on regional operators and reduces Ghana's attractiveness as a hub for pan-West African digital services.

Additionally, Ghana's status as a signatory to UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) adopted by 193 countries creates specific governance commitments around transparency, accountability, privacy, and human oversight of AI systems. The UNESCO Recommendation explicitly calls on member states to develop regulatory and institutional frameworks that operationalise these principles within their national contexts. The NITA Bill represents precisely such a national regulatory framework opportunity. Its failure to incorporate UNESCO's AI ethics principles is a missed alignment that will need to be corrected either through amendment of the Bill or through parallel regulatory instruments, an outcome that creates unnecessary duplication and regulatory uncertainty.

These examples from India and other African nations underscore a clear pattern: regulators are increasingly focusing on data privacy, AI governance, and consumer protection as the primary tools for building digital trust. Ghana is charting a distinct course by prioritising business licensing and professional certification, but this course must at minimum be consistent with the regional and international governance commitments Ghana has already made. A NITA Bill that is silent on AI governance is a Bill that is already out of step with the continental architecture Ghana claims to want to lead.

3. Comparative Overview of Data Protection & Digital Regulation Frameworks

Table 1: Comparative Digital Regulatory Frameworks — Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya, India, EU, and AU

Feature	Ghana (NITA Bill)	Nigeria (NDPA 2023)	Kenya (DPA 2019)	India (DPDPA 2023)	EU (GDPR + AI Act)
Primary Focus	Broad ICT licensing, certification, standards	Data privacy & protection	Data privacy & protection	Data privacy & protection	Data protection + AI system governance
Business Licensing	Mandatory for all ICT service providers	Not required under NDPA	Not required	Not required	Sectoral only (telecoms, financial)
Professional Certification	Mandatory for defined ICT roles	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	Not centrally mandated
AI-Specific Governance	None — significant gap	Emerging (AI Ethics Guidelines 2024)	Limited provisions	Draft AI framework in development	Comprehensive (EU AI Act risk tiers)
Regional Framework Alignment	AU strategy not reflected; UNESCO AI Ethics gaps	Partial AU alignment	EAC digital governance alignment	National framework; limited regional binding	Full EU digital single market harmonisation
Inclusion / Gender Provisions	None specified in Bill	Limited	Limited	Limited	Non-discrimination requirements in AI Act
Underlying Philosophy	State-led digital order, professionalisation	Rights-based digital privacy	Trust-building & accountability	Citizen consent & digital rights	Rights + innovation balance; AI precautionary principle

Authors' compilation from EU AI Act (2024); Nigeria Data Protection Act (2023); Kenya Data Protection Act (2019); India DPDPA (2023); AU Continental AI Strategy (2024); UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI (2021); NITA Bill (2025).

This comparative analysis reveals that Ghana's NITA Bill contains unique elements not widely replicated in other jurisdictions. While many countries are moving towards greater regulation, the specific combination of mandatory business licensing and individual professional certification is a hybrid concept that borrows from traditional regulatory models (like those for doctors or lawyers) and applies them to the fluid and rapidly evolving tech industry. This makes a simple "copy-paste" solution from any single country impossible. Instead, the choice before Ghana is whether to follow the African and global trend of data-centric regulation or to pioneer a new model of comprehensive, professionalizing regulation that carries both significant potential rewards and substantial risks. The experiences of other nations suggest that effective regulation requires a clear focus and a balance between oversight and fostering innovation

4. Economic Implications: Balancing Investment, Competition, and Entrepreneurial Burden

The passage of the National Information Technology Authority Bill is poised to have profound and multifaceted economic consequences for Ghana, touching upon investment flows, market competition, and the viability of its vibrant startup ecosystem. The government's perspective frames the Bill as a catalyst for attracting institutional capital by reducing market risks and enhancing overall professionalism. From this viewpoint, a formal licensing and certification regime would signal to domestic and foreign investors that Ghana's digital sector operates on a stable, predictable, and accountable footing.

However, a counter-narrative, advanced by many in the tech community, warns of severe negative economic repercussions, particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and startups. The most immediate and tangible impact would be a significant increase in the cost of doing business. Provisions such as mandatory licensing fees and the costs associated with professional certification programmes could prove prohibitive for early-stage ventures. Ghana's own startup ecosystem saw funding decline from over USD 120 million in 2024 to an estimated USD 56–90 million in 2025, signalling a difficult transition toward profitability and sustainability. In this environment, any additional regulatory burden could be the tipping point that forces many promising young companies out of business.

Furthermore, the licensing requirement threatens to alter the competitive landscape of Ghana's digital market in potentially undesirable ways. By erecting bureaucratic barriers to entry, the Bill could favour larger, better-capitalised corporations that can easily absorb compliance costs, while squeezing out smaller competitors, independent consultants, and freelancers. There is also a specific concern regarding a reported ban on foreign consultants, which could isolate Ghana's market from valuable international expertise and best practices. Another controversial economic provision is the imposition of a 1% tax on the gross revenue of all IT businesses. If enacted, this tax would represent a direct and ongoing financial burden on all firms in the sector, regardless of their profitability, and could disproportionately impact smaller companies and startups.

Inclusion and Gender: Who Bears the Greatest Economic Cost of Mandatory Certification?

The economic analysis of the NITA Bill's burden has largely been conducted in aggregate terms. When disaggregated by gender and socio-economic background, however, the distributional consequences are significantly more troubling than the general startup ecosystem narrative suggests.

Women in Ghana's technology sector already operate under structural disadvantages. Research on digital adoption across Ghana confirms that male practitioners are significantly more likely than female counterparts to access formal certification pathways, due to intersecting barriers including lower rates of tertiary education in STEM fields, disproportionate domestic labour burdens that limit time for certification preparation, and weaker professional networks that provide access to certification support and sponsorship. The NITA Bill's mandatory certification regime, by imposing a standardised formal qualification requirement that assumes equal access to certification preparation, effectively encodes these existing inequalities into the regulatory framework. A female self-taught developer who has built a functioning software business through practical skills acquisition would face the same certification requirement as a male graduate of the University of Ghana's Computer Science department but would face materially greater barriers to meeting it.

The economic cost of mandatory certification also falls disproportionately on practitioners from lower-income backgrounds who entered the tech sector precisely because its relatively low formal barriers made it one of the most accessible pathways to economic mobility. Ghana's tech ecosystem has historically functioned as a meritocratic space where demonstrated capability could substitute for credentials that high-cost formal education confers. The NITA Bill's certification requirements, if implemented without explicit inclusion provisions, would close this pathway at exactly the moment when digital skills are most needed as a vehicle for broad-based economic development.

The World Bank has previously noted that policies and regulations significantly affect market outcomes, including prices and access to digital services, underscoring the sensitivity of this issue. A Bill that is silent on inclusion is not a neutral instrument. In a context of documented gender gaps and socio-economic stratification in digital access, regulatory silence on inclusion is a form of active exclusion. The government's stated goal of professionalising the sector will not be achieved if professionalisation means homogenising the sector around the demographic profile of those who can most easily afford formal certification.

5. Innovation and Professionalism: Fostering Talent vs. Creating Barriers

The NITA Bill presents a critical tension between the goals of raising professional standards and the imperative to foster a vibrant, inclusive innovation ecosystem. On one hand, supporters of the Bill argue that mandatory certification for ICT professionals is a necessary step toward elevating the status of the tech profession in Ghana, aligning it with established fields like engineering and medicine. By requiring certification from NITA for appointments in certain public or private

institutions, the government aims to ensure that only qualified individuals work on critical national infrastructure, financial systems, and healthcare data platforms. This could theoretically lead to higher-quality projects, improved system reliability, and enhanced cybersecurity posture across the nation. In sectors like digital health, where system integration is complex, having a standardized pool of certified professionals could facilitate interoperability and accelerate project timelines . The objective is to instill a culture of professionalism and accountability, moving the sector away from a perception of being a loosely organized collection of hobbyists and small operators toward a respected and regulated profession.

However, this pursuit of formal standards is viewed by many technologists as a direct threat to the ethos of innovation that has defined Ghana's digital boom. The primary criticism is that mandatory certification creates an unnecessary and exclusionary barrier to entry, particularly for self-taught developers, freelancers, and students who lack access to expensive formal education or certification programs . The tech community champions a meritocratic ideal where demonstrable skills, portfolio of work, and problem-solving ability should be the primary criteria for employment, not pieces of paper issued by a state body. Imposing such a requirement risks disenfranchising a generation of talented, non-traditional learners who are the lifeblood of the startup ecosystem and contribute significantly to the informal economy. This concern is amplified by the fear that NITA's certification criteria might become outdated or disconnected from the rapidly changing realities of modern software development, prioritizing theoretical knowledge over practical, hands-on experience. The result could be a system that certifies individuals who are proficient in older technologies while failing to recognize the skills of those working with cutting-edge tools and methodologies.

The impact on innovation is perhaps the most deeply felt concern. The process of obtaining a license and certifications is inherently bureaucratic and time-consuming. Critics argue that this administrative overhead would divert precious human and financial resources away from the core activity of innovation, building and iterating on new products and services. Startups, in particular, thrive on speed, agility, and the ability to experiment with minimal friction. Introducing a regulatory hurdle before a company can even begin operations could severely hamper this iterative process. The fear is that the Bill will criminalize activities like unlicensed software development, turning the act of building a prototype into a potential legal offense . This chilling effect could deter aspiring entrepreneurs from taking the first steps into the digital economy, ultimately shrinking the pool of new ideas and solutions. The government's goal of improving standards is laudable, but the method proposed—a top-down, state-enforced certification regime—is seen by many as blunt and counterproductive. A more collaborative approach involving industry stakeholders in setting standards might achieve the same goals with less collateral damage to the ecosystem's innovative capacity. The central question is whether the pursuit of a few certified professionals is worth the potential loss of thousands of untapped innovators.

6. Governance, Digital Rights, and State Overreach

Beyond its economic and professional implications, the National Information Technology Authority Bill raises significant questions about governance, digital rights, and the potential for state

overreach. The government's position emphasises that the Bill is necessary to bring order and accountability to the digital sector, framing NITA's expanded powers as a tool for good governance. The ability to maintain a register of ICT providers, monitor compliance, and enforce standards could, in theory, make public-sector ICT procurement more transparent and efficient, reducing opportunities for corruption and ensuring taxpayer money is spent wisely.

However, this enhanced state capacity for surveillance and control comes with inherent risks to digital rights and freedoms. The power to suspend or revoke licenses gives NITA significant leverage over the companies and individuals operating in the digital space. There is a legitimate fear that this power could be wielded for political purposes, allowing the government to target dissenting voices, critical media outlets, or activist groups by denying them access to essential digital services or platforms. The requirement for certification also raises concerns about freedom of expression and the right to pursue a profession. By defining who is "qualified" to be an ICT professional, the state enters a subjective domain that could be used to marginalise experts who hold dissenting political views or who utilise unconventional methods of learning and working.

AI Governance Dimension: Algorithmic Accountability and the Regulatory Vacuum

The governance analysis of the NITA Bill must reckon with a dimension that the existing commentary has not adequately addressed: the bill's complete silence on algorithmic governance creates not merely a regulatory gap but a dangerous misalignment between Ghana's regulatory infrastructure and the actual governance challenges the country faces.

Ghana's public sector is already deploying or procuring AI-enabled systems. Digital identity verification systems, automated benefit eligibility tools in social protection programmes, AI-assisted procurement and tax compliance systems, and algorithmic tools in the financial sector are operational or in development. Each of these systems makes automated decisions that affect citizens' lives in consequential ways. The NITA Bill's licensing and certification framework, even if perfectly implemented, governs only who can provide the ICT services that host or deliver these systems—not what the systems do, how they make decisions, what data they use, who they affect, or how citizens can challenge automated decisions that harm them.

This is the core accountability gap: a regulatory framework that licences the vehicle but says nothing about the road rules. Under the current NITA Bill architecture, a licensed and NITA-certified company could lawfully deploy in Ghana an AI credit scoring model trained predominantly on data from demographic groups that don't reflect Ghana's population, producing systematically biased outcomes for rural borrowers, without any regulatory obligation to audit the model's performance, disclose its methodology, or remediate harms. The same company could deploy an AI-powered hiring system that discriminates against women applicants through proxy variables, without any regulatory mechanism to detect or address that discrimination. These are not speculative risks—they are documented patterns in AI deployment globally, including in developing economy contexts where the data infrastructure for AI training is least representative of local populations.

The AU Continental AI Strategy specifically calls on member states to develop regulatory provisions ensuring that AI systems deployed in public sector contexts are transparent, auditable,

and subject to human oversight. Ghana's NITA Bill, as currently drafted, provides none of these provisions. This means that Ghana's most consequential governance challenge, ensuring that AI systems operating within its borders serve the public interest rather than embedding and scaling existing inequalities, is entirely outside the regulatory perimeter that the NITA Bill establishes.

The debate also touches upon the broader issue of regulatory capture and bureaucratic inefficiency. The effectiveness and fairness of the NITA Bill will depend entirely on the capacity, independence, and integrity of the NITA bureaucracy responsible for its implementation. If NITA becomes a politicised institution susceptible to influence, the Bill's provisions could be used to entrench the interests of a few connected firms at the expense of the wider public. Therefore, alongside the Bill, there must be robust mechanisms for parliamentary oversight, judicial review, and public accountability to prevent the abuse of NITA's considerable powers. The challenge for Ghana is to design a regulatory framework that enhances governance without sacrificing the digital liberties and freedoms essential to a healthy, democratic society.

7. **Constitutionalism, Administrative Power, and the Risk of Digital Bureaucratic Expansion**

The NITA Bill, in its current form, does not merely regulate technology; it redistributes institutional power within Ghana's digital state architecture. By granting NITA licensing authority, certification powers, compliance oversight, and enforcement capacity over both institutions and individuals, the Bill effectively transforms a technical agency into a quasi-professional, quasi-economic, and quasi-administrative regulator with far-reaching influence over participation in the digital economy. Such concentration of authority raises important constitutional and administrative law questions that the current policy debate has insufficiently examined.

At the centre of this concern is the problem of regulatory proportionality and procedural accountability. Regulatory institutions in democratic systems derive legitimacy not only from statutory authority but also from safeguards against the arbitrary exercise of power. Yet the Bill, in its current orientation, appears to confer broad discretionary authority on NITA without a correspondingly robust framework for independent review, transparent appeals processes, participatory oversight, or narrowly tailored enforcement limitations. This creates the risk of what contemporary governance scholarship increasingly describes as digital bureaucratic expansion, in which technical regulation gradually evolves into institutional overreach through the administrative accumulation of unchecked powers.

The concern is especially significant in the context of digital economies because access to digital participation increasingly determines access to employment, innovation, commerce, education, and public discourse itself. A licensing regime governing participation in the ICT sector therefore has consequences extending beyond market regulation into questions of economic liberty, professional freedom, and democratic inclusion. In practical terms, the denial, suspension, or revocation of certification or licensing status may operate not merely as a technical sanction but as a restriction on an individual's ability to participate in one of the country's most important sectors of economic mobility and knowledge production.

The comparative global trend further complicates Ghana's proposed approach. While jurisdictions such as the European Union have expanded digital regulation significantly, they have simultaneously strengthened procedural safeguards through judicial review rights, transparency obligations, data subject protections, human rights impact assessments, and independent supervisory mechanisms. The legitimacy of digital regulation in these jurisdictions do not only rest on regulatory power but on institutional restraint. The NITA Bill, however, appears to expand regulatory authority without embedding equivalent constitutional guardrails capable of ensuring that such authority remains accountable, proportionate, and rights-consistent.

This institutional imbalance is particularly problematic in contexts where digital governance intersects with political power. Without explicit statutory protections, broad regulatory discretion may create opportunities for selective enforcement, politicization of licensing decisions, or indirect suppression of dissenting digital actors under the guise of compliance enforcement. Even where such abuse is not intended, democratic governance frameworks are designed precisely on the assumption that concentrated discretionary authority requires structural checks. A digitally regulated society cannot rely solely on institutional goodwill; it must be constructed on enforceable principles of transparency, fairness, reviewability, and procedural justice.

The broader implication is that Ghana's digital transition is not simply a technological transformation but a constitutional one. The NITA Bill, therefore, should not be evaluated solely through the lenses of innovation, investment, or professional standards. It must also be assessed as part of the evolving constitutional architecture of the digital state. The future of digital governance in Ghana will depend not only on whether regulation exists, but on whether that regulation remains democratically accountable, procedurally restrained, and compatible with the constitutional values that underpin an open society.

8. Synthesis and Policy Recommendations for a Balanced Digital Future

The deliberation surrounding Ghana's National Information Technology Authority Bill encapsulates a pivotal moment in the nation's digital trajectory, forcing a confrontation with the fundamental trade-offs between regulation and innovation. The government's push for the Bill is rooted in a genuine need to address the chaos, informality, and inconsistent quality prevalent in a rapidly expanding but poorly governed sector. Its proponents rightly point to the necessity of building digital trust, protecting consumers, and professionalising a vital economic engine. However, the intense opposition from the tech community serves as a crucial warning against the unintended consequences of heavy-handed, top-down regulation.

The comparative analysis of regulatory models in Nigeria, Kenya, India, the EU, and the African Union reinforces the uniqueness of the NITA Bill's approach. While these jurisdictions are all moving towards greater digital regulation, their focus is predominantly on data privacy, consumer protection, and increasingly on AI governance not on the wholesale licensing of businesses and certification of individual professionals. Ghana is charting a distinct course that carries significant risks, especially in an economic climate where startups are already facing funding challenges.

Ultimately, the core of the issue is one of proportionality: the goal of raising standards and ensuring accountability is valid, but the means chosen must be proportional to the ends sought.

To navigate this complex landscape, the following policy recommendations are proposed:

First, adopt a phased, risk-based licensing model. Instead of a one-size-fits-all mandate, the Bill should be amended to establish a tiered system of regulation. Low-risk activities, such as freelance web development, could remain outside the mandatory licensing requirement. In contrast, high-risk activities involving critical national infrastructure, sensitive financial transactions, or the management of protected health information should be subject to stricter scrutiny. This risk-based approach would focus regulatory resources where they are most needed, minimising the burden on the majority of the sector that poses little systemic risk.

Second, establish an independent, multi-stakeholder certification board. To avoid conflicts of interest and ensure credibility, NITA should not act as both the regulator and the certifier. An independent body, composed of representatives from industry, academia, professional associations, and civil society, should be tasked with developing and overseeing certification standards. This would lend legitimacy to the certification process, ensuring that standards are relevant, up-to-date, and fairly administered.

Third, introduce regulatory sandboxes. To foster innovation within a controlled environment, the government should create designated zones where startups and innovators can test new products and services with temporary exemptions from certain licensing or certification rules. These sandboxes would allow for experimentation and rapid iteration while providing a safety net for consumer protection, a model successfully employed in jurisdictions like the UK and Singapore.

Fourth, conduct a thorough review of high-impact provisions. Specific, controversial provisions such as the proposed 1% tax on gross revenue and the ban on foreign consultants should be rigorously evaluated. Their economic impact should be modelled, and their necessity against alternative, less burdensome measures should be clearly justified.

Additional Recommendations: AI Governance, Inclusion, and Regional Alignment

Fifth, amend the Bill to incorporate AI-specific governance provisions. The NITA Bill must be amended to include a dedicated chapter or schedule addressing the governance of artificial intelligence systems deployed within Ghana's borders. At minimum, this should include: a risk-based classification of AI systems aligned with international frameworks including the EU AI Act and the AU Continental AI Strategy; mandatory algorithmic impact assessments for AI systems deployed in public sector contexts; transparency and explainability requirements for automated decision-making systems affecting citizens' rights or access to services; and clear accountability provisions specifying who is responsible for AI system failures and how affected citizens can seek redress. This amendment would align the NITA Bill with the National AI Strategy 2025–2035 and with Ghana's existing commitments under UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI.

Sixth, embed inclusion provisions into the certification framework. The certification regime, if retained, must incorporate explicit provisions addressing the documented barriers that women, self-taught developers, and practitioners from lower-income backgrounds face in accessing formal certification pathways. This should include: recognition of prior learning and competency-based assessment pathways that do not require conventional formal qualifications; subsidised certification programmes for practitioners from underrepresented groups; representation requirements for women and youth on the certification board; and impact assessment requirements before certification standards are finalised, ensuring that their distributional consequences are evaluated before implementation. A certification framework that does not address inclusion will systematically reproduce existing inequalities in the professional composition of Ghana's digital sector.

Seventh, mandate explicit regional governance alignment. The NITA Bill should be amended to require NITA to maintain active engagement with the AU Continental AI Strategy implementation process, ECOWAS digital governance framework development, and the UNESCO AI ethics implementation agenda. Ghana cannot govern the AI systems affecting its citizens within national boundaries alone when those systems increasingly operate across regional ecosystems. NITA's legislative mandate should carry an explicit obligation for regional engagement—not as an observer but as a contributor shaping standards that reflect Ghana's interests and experience. This regional engagement is not optional for a country with Ghana's stated continental AI leadership ambitions; it is a structural prerequisite for them.

By pursuing these balanced and evidence-based reforms, Ghana can achieve its legitimate goals of enhancing professionalism and governance without sacrificing the innovative spirit that defines its digital future. The objective should be to build a regulatory framework that is smart, flexible, and supportive—one that guides the sector toward maturity while remaining accountable to the full diversity of Ghana's digital population, aligned with the continental governance architecture Ghana aims to lead, and fit for the AI-driven technological reality that is already reshaping every sector the Bill purports to govern.

References

A Comparative Analysis of Nigeria's NDPA and the EU's GDPR. (2025). *ACM Digital Library*. https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3700794.3700799

Attigah, E. (2025). *The NITA Bill 2025 is a digital straitjacket – Why Ghana must reject it*. LinkedIn. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/regulating-ghanas-digital-future-without-licensing-israel-esq-9w2sf

European Union. (2025). *AI Act: Shaping Europe's digital future*. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai

International Telecommunication Union. (2023). *Global digital regulatory outlook 2023*. https://www.itu.int/dms_pub/itu-d/opb/pref/D-PREF-BB.REG_OUT01-2023-PDF-E.pdf

International Telecommunication Union. (2025). *Measuring digital development*. https://www.itu.int/dms_pub/itu-d/opb/ind/D-IND-SDDT_AFR-2025-PDF-E.pdf

International Telecommunication Union. (2021). *Digital trends in Africa 2021*. https://www.itu.int/dms_pub/itu-d/opb/ind/D-IND-DIG_TRENDS_AFR.01-2021-PDF-E.pdf

International Telecommunication Union. (n.d.). *Publications on ICT regulation*. https://www.itu.int/pub/d-pref

International Telecommunication Union. (n.d.). *Collaborative digital regulation country reviews*. https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Regulatory-Market/Pages/collaborative-regulation-country-reviews/default.aspx

Kenya Data Protection Act, 2019. (2019). Government of Kenya.

Migration, free movement and regional integration. (2019). UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000260669

Nigeria Data Protection Commission. (2023). *Nigeria Data Protection Act 2023: Compliance is mandatory*. LinkedIn. https://www.linkedin.com/posts/blessing-etu-5a1997147_this-development-reinforces-a-critical-reality-activity-7429516189304942592-Msuo

Regulating Ghana's Digital Future Without Licensing Curiosity. (2025). LinkedIn. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/regulating-ghanas-digital-future-without-licensing-israel-esq-9w2sf

The regulation of health data sharing in Africa: A comparative study. (2024). *PubMed Central*.https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10800019/

Data privacy in healthcare: Global challenges and solutions. (2025). *PubMed Central*. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12138216/

Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023: Compliance roadmap. (2023). LinkedIn. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/digital-personal-data-protection-act-2023-compliance-jxbw

Digital trends in Africa 2021. (2021). International Telecommunication Union. https://www.itu.int/dms_pub/itu-d/opb/ind/D-IND-DIG_TRENDS_AFR.01-2021-PDF-E.pd

Digital Business Laws and Regulations Report 2025–2026: Ghana. (2025). ICLG. https://iclg.com/practice-areas/digital-business-laws-and-regulations/ghana/

Ghana Digital Acceleration Project. (2022). World Bank. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/938111649959522167/pdf/Ghana-Digital-Acceleration-Project.pdf

Global approaches to digital sovereignty: Competing definitions and contrasting policy. (2023). ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371865306

ICT infrastructure sharing framework for developing countries: Case of mobile operators in Kenya. (2015). ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281379570

IMF. (2025). *Ghana: Fifth review under the arrangement under the extended credit facility*. https://www.elibrary.imf.org/view/journals/002/2025/343/article-A001-en.xml

India Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023. (2023). Government of India.

Nigeria Data Protection Act, 2023. (2023). Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Open Knowledge World Bank. (n.d.). *Competition advocacy for digital markets in Africa*. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/147e5d73-75be-4455-8c5d-f3469f70578e/content

World Bank. (n.d.). *ICT sector performance and regulatory frameworks*. https://documents1.worldbank.org

World Bank. (n.d.). *Regulators and ICT sector performance*. https://documents1.worldbank.org

World Bank. (n.d.). *Digital governance and infrastructure reports*. https://documents1.worldbank.org

- UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. https://en.unesco.org/artificial-intelligence/ethics
- African Union. (2024). Continental Artificial Intelligence Strategy. https://au.int/sites/default/files/documents/44004-doc-EN-_Continental_AI_Strategy_July_2024.pdf
- European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (Artificial Intelligence Act). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj
- European Commission. (2024). Commission guidelines on the definition of an artificial intelligence system. https://ai-act-service-desk.ec.europa.eu

- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389–399.

Ghana National AI Strategy:

- Ghana Ministry of Communication, Digital Technology and Innovation. (2025). National Artificial Intelligence Strategy 2025–2035. Accra.

Regional Governance:

- NITA. (2025). National Information Technology Authority Bill, 2025. Public Consultation Materials. Accra: Ministry of Communication, Digital Technology and Innovations.

Inclusion & Gender:

- FAO / UN Africa Renewal. (2023). Closing Africa's gender tech gap will boost agri-food systems. https://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/july-2023
- PMC / SAGE Journals. (2023). Drivers and intensity of adoption of digital agricultural services by smallholder farmers in Ghana. PMC10731230.
- World Bank. (2022). Ghana Digital Economy Diagnostic. Washington, DC.

AI in Developing Economy Contexts:

- The regulation of health data sharing in Africa: A comparative study. (2024). PubMed Central. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10800019/
- A Comparative Analysis of Nigeria's NDPA and the EU's GDPR. (2025). ACM Digital Library. https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3700794.3700799