

“Developing alternatives for illegal chainsaw lumbering through multi-stakeholder dialogue in Ghana and Guyana”

European Commission programme on Tropical Forests and other Forests in Developing Countries

Second District Level Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue (DLMSD II) Minutes

Assin Foso

Date: 26th February, 2010

Venue: Municipal Assembly Hall, Assin Foso



SD Members Present:

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. A.A. Asante | MOFA, Breman Asikuma |
| 2. A.K.A. Deyegbe | MOFA, Twifu Praso |
| 3. Atta Escobar | MOFA, Assin Foso |
| 4. C.T. Adikah | MOFA, Breman Asikuma |
| 5. Cromwell T. Acquah | MOFA, Breman Asikuma |
| 6. Daniel Abaka | Lumber broker, Assin Foso |
| 7. Gerald Sackey | ANMA, Assin Manso |
| 8. Ajah Donkor | Lumber broker, Assin Foso |
| 9. Nana Kwadwo Tweneboah | TA, Assin Manso |
| 10. Francis Ayisi | Carpenter, Assin Nyankomase |
| 11. Charles Koomson | Chainsaw Operator, Twifo Praso |
| 12. Mustapha Salifu | Transporter, Assin Foso |
| 13. Daniel B. Ankrah | Carpenter, Assin Juaso |
| 14. David K. Amoah | ANMA, Assin Foso |
| 15. Isaac Entsiey | Environmental Health, Twifo Praso |
| 16. Joseph Abaka | Chainsaw Operator, Assin Foso |
| 17. Joseph Blay | Judicial Services, Assin Foso |
| 18. Kwame Mosie | Chainsaw Operator, Assin Adeambra |
| 19. Nana Afanse IV | TA, Assin Foso |
| 20. Nana Kwakye Andoh | TA, Assin Foso |
| 21. Patrick Danso | RFF, Cape Coast |
| 22. Yaw Yeboah | Chainsaw Operator, Assin Adeambra |

Apology:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Mr I.C.Y. Ametorgbor | DFM, Assin Foso |
|-------------------------|-----------------|

Project Team:

- | | |
|------------------|---------------------|
| 1. James Parker | NPC, EU CSM Project |
| 2. Seth Duodu | CFW, EU CSM project |
| 3. Emmanuel Fosu | PA, EU CSM project |
| 4. Samuel Forson | RA, FORIG |

Acronyms

- | | |
|---------|---|
| • ANMA | Assin North Municipal Assembly |
| • CFW | Community Forestry Worker |
| • FORIG | Forest Research Institute of Ghana |
| • CSM | Chainsaw Milling |
| • DFM | District Forestry Manager |
| • DLMSD | District Level Multi-stakeholder Dialogue |
| • EU | European Union |
| • MOFA | Ministry of Food and Agriculture |
| • MSD | Multi-stakeholder Dialogue |
| • NPC | National Project Coordinator |
| • RA | Research Assistant |
| • PA | Project Assistant |
| • RFF | Regional Forest Forum |
| • SWOT | Strength Weakness Opportunity Threat |
| • TA | Traditional Authority |

Agenda:

The agreed agenda for the meeting are:

- Reading of previous minutes
- Reports from the national MSD 2
- Stakeholders preference of the three proposed policy options
- SWOT analysis of three proposed options
- National plantation programme

Proceedings	Action
<p>1.0 Opening The CFW called the meeting to order at 10:30am. He formally welcomed the DLMSD members to the meeting.</p> <p>2.0 Introduction The participants made self introduction, stating their stakeholder group and the town/community they are coming from.</p> <p>3.0 Apologies The CFW announced apology from the DFM of Assin Foso who was on official duty out of the district.</p> <p>4.0 District Manager’s Welcome Address The CFW on behalf of the DFM welcomed members and expressed his gratitude for the zeal with which members have been attending the DLMSD meetings to discuss issues concerning illegal CSM and find solutions to the problems. He said that, the MSD process is an ongoing activity which builds on previous issues discussed. He stressed the importance of stakeholder groups maintaining the same people for the process so that they can keep track of developments, contribute effectively during meetings and inform or educate the stakeholder group which they represent.</p> <p>5.0 Purpose of the meeting The PA presented the purpose of the meeting as follow: <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Give feedback from the national MSD 2.➤ Find out the perception of stakeholders about the recommended options prior to and after the SWOT analysis of the options➤ Carry out SWOT analysis of the recommended options➤ Brief members on national plantation programme</p> <p>6.0 Reading and Acceptance of Previous Minutes The previous minutes was read and after correcting some typographical errors, Mr. Joseph Abekah moved for acceptance of the minutes and this was seconded by Mr Atta Escobar.</p> <p>7.0 Feedback from MSD 2 Mr Yaw Yeboah, a chainsaw operator reported on what respired at national MSD 2. The report covered: <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Inauguration of the national MSD steering committee➤ Speeches by the invited personalities</p>	

- Perception of stakeholders on the recommended policy options
- SWOT analysis tools
- SWOT analysis of the recommended policy options

8.0 Preferred option of stakeholders before SWOT analysis

The PA explained the rationale behind collecting information on the preference of stakeholders prior to the SWOT analysis and the method. Members wrote secretly on a piece of paper their preferred option and the results collated by a research assistant from FORIG. The outcome were as follows:

- Option 1 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills only) 1 = 6.25%
- Option 2 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills and artisanal millers) 14 = 87.5%
- Option 3 (Domestic lumber supplied by Artisanal Operators only) 1 = 6.25%

9.0 SWOT Analysis

The NPC explained the SWOT analysis tool afterwards, he put members into three groups with each group analysing each policy option.

9.1 Presentation of SWOT Analysis Result

Leaders of the various groups presented the outcome of the SWOT analysis. See annex for detailed outcome. Some time were allowed for questions and further explanations.

10.0 Preferred option of stakeholders after SWOT analysis

The outcome of the stakeholders preference of the recommended policy options after the SWOT analysis changed: Below is the outcome:

- Option 1 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills only) 3 = 18.75%
- Option 2 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills and artisanal millers) 9 = 56.25%
- Option 3 (Domestic lumber supplied by Artisanal Operators only) 4 = 25%

11.0 Brief on the National Tree Planting


The CFW briefed the members on the national plantation programme and the role the project is playing to liking up stakeholders to participate.


12.0 Date for Next Meeting

The date will be communicated to members after the third national meeting.

13.0 Closing

The CFW thanked members for coming. He advised the members to make sure they meet at regular intervals to discuss issues pertaining to the project and make sure they send feedback to their members. Meeting ended at 3:00 pm

Signed: 
Emmanuel Fosu(PA) – Recorder

Signed: 
Mr I.C.Y Ametorgbor(Dist. Mgr) – Chairman

Outcome of Group Discussions (SWOT ANALYSIS)

Options	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ They have the equipment and are well resourced to supply lumber to the domestic market. ➤ They have access to the timber resource. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Their market area is limited because they do not have outlets/channel of supply in the rural communities. ➤ Sawmillers are more interested in exporting than supplying the domestic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is market for the lumber produced. ➤ There is labour available to carry out their activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The unstable power supply threatens their sustainable production.
Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills and artisanal millers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The two parties have high capacity to supply domestic and export markets. ➤ Collaboration to fully utilize tree fell. ➤ The blend has the ability to produce more quality lumber in high quantities. ➤ Each of the two groups has peculiar skills to produce lumber effectively and efficiently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Disunity among groups(sawmillers and artisanal millers) has potential of affecting their productivity ➤ Poor or lack of managerial skills may affect the output of artisanal millers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The adoption of the blend is supported by the VPA process which allows for the use of legal lumber on the domestic and export markets. ➤ There is high level of demand for lumber domestically. ➤ Banks and other financial institutions are ready to offer loans to groups to do business. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The difficulty in price determination for lumber produced by the two groups. ➤ Artisanal mills (logosol and wood mizer) are not common on the Ghanaian market. ➤ The cost technology for artisanal milling may be expensive to allow for easy adoption.
Domestic lumber supplied by Artisanal Operators only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Artisanal milling needs relatively little capital to start. The equipments used require less expertise. ➤ Activities of artisanal millers are comparatively less destructive ➤ The technology used can work in seemingly inaccessible areas. ➤ Can make use of lesser known species. ➤ Artisanal millers have good relation with rural dwellers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Most artisanal millers lack education on occupational hazards and safety leading to harmful practices. ➤ Majority of artisanal millers lack education on proper tree logging practices. ➤ The absence of associations hinders their accessibility to credit facilities. The technology used may not allow for large scale production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Their closeness to the resource and rural communities allows for community access to lumber. ➤ There is ready market for lumber produced. ➤ cheap labour is available for use Labour is readily available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The payment of taxes and stumpage fees may increase the price of lumber on the domestic market. ➤ Forest resources are dwindling ➤ Conflict for the resource may arise.

Questions that needs to be considered:

1. Is the government ready to release available timber concession to both the sawmillers and artisanal millers?
2. Will the government provide proper training to the artisanal millers in the use of the improved technologies?
3. Can the timber resources sustain both sawmills and artisanal millers?
4. Who determines the prices of lumber for the sawmillers and the artisanal millers?