

“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
Begoro**

Date: 24th February, 2010

Venue: Begoro FSD Conference Room



MSD Members Present:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Nana Adu Ofori | CBAG, Apapam |
| 2. Dina Gyimah | Farmer, Ahwenease |
| 3. Kwabena Kusi | NTFP, Apapam |
| 4. Sefah Kwasi | Carpenter, Adadientem |
| 5. Kwaku Appiah | Carpenter, Apapam |
| 6. Bellet Robert | Chainsaw Operator, Kwesi Komfo |
| 7. Dickson Adu | Chainsaw Operator, Akwedum |
| 8. A.A. Bempong | Carpenter, Abasaase |
| 9. Benefo Antwi | Carpenter, Begoro |
| 10. S.H. Amenyo | Carpenter, Begoro |
| 11. Bempong Kwakye | Machine Owner, Begoro |
| 12. K.N. Adjabeng | Farmer, Begoro |
| 13. Kwame Ofori-Attah | Machine Owner, Begoro |
| 14. Samuel K.Dzamdi | Machine Owner, Begoro |
| 15. P.C. Appah | BNI, Begoro |
| 16. Benefo Amshadai | Sawmiller, Begoro |
| 17. Nana Kyei Boatey | Farmer, Begoro |
| 18. F.K Asiedu | Planning Officer, FDA |
| 19. Nana Dokua | TA, Kyebi |
| 20. Nana Adu Tiekou | TA, Begoro |
| 21. Margaret Amponsah | Farmer, Begoro |
| 22. P.E. Azidoku | MOFA, Begoro |

Observers:

- | | |
|--------------------|------------------|
| 1. Emmanuel Yeboah | DFM, FSD, Begoro |
| 2. Kwame Agyei | APM, Begoro |
| 3. Isaac Gyekye | FSD, Begoro |
| 4. Kweku Amoako | FSD, Begoro |
| 5. Mercy Odame | FSD, Begoro |

Project Team

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Emmanuel Fosu | PA, EU CSM Project |
| 2. Samuel Forson | RA, FORIG |
| 3. Ben Opoku Asare | CFW, EU CSM Project |

Apology:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Inspector Amo Mensah | GPS, Begoro |
|-------------------------|-------------|

Absent:

1. Joseph Amfo Antwi Sawmiller, Begoro
2. Kyebi Traditional Authority Representative
3. East Akyem municipal Assembly Representative
4. Table Top Millers Representative

Acronyms

- | | |
|--------|---------------------------------------|
| • BNI | Bureau of National Investigation |
| • CBAG | Community Biodiversity Advisory Group |
| • CFW | Community Forestry Worker |
| • CSM | Chainsaw Milling |

- DFM District Forest Manager
- DLMSD District Level Multistakeholder Dialogue
- FC Forestry Commission
- FDA Fanteakwa District Assembly
- FSD Forestry Services Division
- MOFA Ministry of Food and Agriculture
- NPC National Project Coordinator
- NTFP Non Timber Forestry Produce
- PA Project Assistant
- TIDD Timber Industry Development Division
- VPA Voluntary Partnership Agreement

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 10:10 am. Madam Dinah Gyimah prayed for the commencement of the meeting.</p> <p>2.0 Introduction A brief introduction of all stakeholders present and the team from the secretariat was made by the CFW.</p> <p>3.0 Apologies The CFW announced the apology from Inspector Amo Mensah of the GPS who was on duty and could not attend the meeting.</p> <p>4.0 Chairman’s welcome address The DFM who chaired the meeting thanked members for attending the meeting. He reminded members of the importance of the MSD process and the issues at stake and the role of stakeholders in contributing to finding a lasting solution to the illegal CSM. He finally urged all stakeholders to participate effectively in meeting.</p> <p>5.0 Purpose of the meeting The CFW presented the purpose of the meeting as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Give feed back to stakeholders who were not at the national MSD 2. ➤ Find out the perception of stakeholders about the recommended options prior to and after the SWOT analysis of the options ➤ Undertake SWOT analysis of the recommended option ➤ Brief stakeholders about national plantation programme <p>6.0 Reading and Acceptance of Previous Minutes The previous was read and after some few typographical errors corrected, Mr Adjabeng</p>	

moved for acceptance. This was seconded by Mr Benefo Antwi.

7.0 Feedback from MSD 2

Nana Adu Ofori, one of the national MSD members from the district gave account of what transpired at the national MSD 2. The report covered:

- Inauguration of the national MSD steering committee
- Speeches of encouragement by invited personalities
- Perception of stakeholders on the recommended policy options prior to the SWOT analysis
- SWOT analysis tools
- SWOT analysis of the recommended policy options

The CFW and the PA took turns to add some few issues to the report by Nana Adu Ofori's and also answered some questions by the stakeholders.

8.0 Stakeholders preferred option before SWOT analysis

The objective behind this exercise prior to the SWOT analysis was explained by the PA. In order not to influence one another members were asked to secretly write on papers their preferred option and results collated by the RA of FORIG. Below are the outcome:

Option 1 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills only) = 0 (0%)

Option 2 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills and artisanal millers) = 21 (95.5%)

Option 3 (Domestic lumber supplied by Artisanal Operators only) = 1 (4.5%)

9.0 SWOT analysis

The PA explained the SWOT analysis tool to members and after some few questions and clarification, members went into three groups with each group analysing one option.

9.1 Presentation of SWOT analysis result

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

10.0 Stakeholders preferred option after SWOT analysis

After the SWOT, stakeholders were asked once again to state their preference using the same method. The outcome did not change:

Option 1: (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills only) = 0 (0%)

Option 2: (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills and artisanal millers) = 21 (95.5%)

Option 3 (Domestic lumber supplied by Artisanal Operators only) = 1 (4.5%)

11.0 Brief on the National Tree Planting

The CFW briefed the members on the National Plantation Programme and the effort the project is making to link stakeholder to the programme. The CFW urge stakeholders to take advantage of the programme to plant more trees in the district.


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 and advised them give feedback to their

constituents/members in their communities.

Signed: 
Emmanuel Fosu(PA) – Recorder

Signed: **for** 
Emmanuel Yeboah(DM) – Chairman

**Annex
Outcome of Group Discussions (SWOT ANALYSIS)**

Options	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
1 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ They have legal access to the timber resources. ➤ Their method of milling is efficient. ➤ They have an organized association which makes working with them easy. ➤ Have ability and capacity to produce lumber in different sizes and to meet domestic demand. ➤ Have well trained personnel. ➤ Traditional authorities are more willing to deal with sawmillers than other groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inability to fell and convey trees in valleys and mountainous areas. ➤ Strong desire to export lumber than to supply to domestic market. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Are more recognized by banks and can easily assess loan facilities. ➤ There is an existing market for the lumber produced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Continue existence of chainsaw milling ➤ High production cost as a result of increase in tax. ➤ Increase in unhealthy competition (between sawmills)
2 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills and artisanal millers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The blend will produce high quality lumber at affordable prices. ➤ Available labour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Improper training of artisanal millers can lead to occupational hazards. ➤ The blend may lead to corrupt practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To develop new laws and policies to effectively manage forest resources ➤ Satisfy the local market ➤ Provide employment to people in rural communities. ➤ Will generate revenue to the government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Dwindling forest resources. ➤ The current enmity between the two groups has potential of causing conflicts.
3 (Domestic lumber supplied by Artisanal Operators only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is available labour ➤ Their activities are less destructive to land, food crops and young trees. ➤ The operation of artisanal millers will increase government revenue through the payment of taxes and stumpage fees. ➤ Their chain of operation utilizes the entire tree logged. ➤ Artisanal millers have a strong relationship with farmers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Artisanal millers may not comply with laws on forest. ➤ They lack knowledge on proper tree felling practices ➤ Their activities may lead to loss in biodiversity. ➤ Do not compensate farmers adequately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Provide employment to people in rural communities. ➤ To develop programmes to support artisanal millers ➤ There is market for the lumber produced. ➤ For government institutions to properly manage forest resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The forest is depleting ➤ Banks are not willing to offer loan facilities to artisanal millers. ➤ Sawmillers may sabotage artisanal millers.

Questions that needs to be considered:

1. Will the government reduce tax in order to reduce production cost of sawmillers to make their lumber affordable to the average person?
2. Will sawmillers be willing to supply to the domestic market?
3. Are sawmillers ready and willing to open outlets in every village or community in order to make lumber readily accessible to all people?
4. Will the prices of lumber produced by sawmillers be affordable to the average person?
5. Will the lumber for the domestic market be of the same quality as those intended for export?
6. Will the 100% domestic supply of lumber has any link with social responsibility agreement?

7. Is artisanal milling supplying lumber to the domestic market the best way to handle the issue of illegal CSM?
8. How readily is land available for afforestation?
9. What motivation is there for chainsaw operators who want to undertake afforestation?
10. What motivation is there for tenant farmers who nurture trees to maturity?
11. Who determines the price in the case of artisanal and sawmillers supplying lumber to the domestic market?
12. Who regulates the activities of artisanal and regular sawmillers?