

“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
Juaso**

**Date: 2nd March, 2010
Venue: Juaso Roman Catholic Hall**



EU Chainsaw Project



This project is financed by the European Union

Members Present

Name	Stakeholder Group
1. Sampson Apem	Farmer
2. Amoako Dankwa	Chainsaw Operator
3. John Ababio	Machine Operator
4. Yaw Preko	Operator
5. Emmanuel Torso	Small scale miller
6. Joseph Torso	Small scale miller
7. Apo Francis	Carpenter
8. Isaac K. Adu	Carpenter
9. Acheampong Isaac	Carpenter
10. Ofosu Tawiah	Chainsaw Operator
11. Kwasi George	Machine Owner
12. Stephen A. Sarkodie	Farmer
13. Amoh Koranteng	MOFA
14. Okyere Darko	NADMO
15. Edward Mawusi	Chainsaw Operator
16. Ebenezer Agyarkwa	FSD
17. Nana Owusu Achiaw II	TA
18. Samuel Akortia	FSD
19. Arko Tettey	Community Development
20. Yussif Ibrahim	GNA
21. Adusei Kwame	Lumber broker
22. Abdul Mumuni	Timber Milling Industry
23. Dickson Ofori	Timber Milling Industry
24. Opoku Tiwaah Gertrude	Community Development
25. E. V. Boadu	NCCE
26. Otoka Mensah	Carpenter

Observers

1. Victor Atta Asare	FSD
2. Lydia Kwadu	FSD
3. Michael Kyei Appiah	FSD
4. Kyei Kofi	FSD
5. Evelyn A Konadu	FSD
6. Patrick Anyaani	FSD

Project Secretariat Team

1. Jane Aggrey	ACO, TBI Ghana
2. Ernestina Osei	FORIG
3. Isaac Owusu	CFW

Acronyms

ACO	Assistant Communication Officer
CFW	Community Forestry Worker
CSM	Chainsaw Milling
DCE	District Chief Executive
DLMSD	District Level Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue
EU	European Union
FC	Forestry Commission
FORIG	Forestry Research Institute of Ghana
FSD	Forestry Services Division
GNA	Ghana News Agency
GNFS	Ghana National Fire Service
MOFA	Ministry of Food and Agriculture
MSD	Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue
NADMO	National Disaster Management Organization
NCCE	National Commission on Civic Education
SWOT	Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, Threat

TA
TBI
VPA

Traditional Authority
Tropenbos International
Voluntary Partnership Agreement

Agenda:

The agreed agenda for the meeting were:

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

Proceedings	Action
<p>1.0 Opening The meeting began with an opening prayer by Mr. Torso, a small scale saw miller at 10:15 a.m.</p> <p>2.0 Introduction The facilitator, ACO proceeded with the programme by introducing members of the Juaso District MSD and gave a brief outline of the meeting. The DFM, Mr. S. Akortia gave a brief background on the national afforestation program to members stating that the main purpose is to help reduce the effects of climate change which is a major problem worldwide and also create employment opportunities. He outlined some of their strategies to be undertaken during the programme. He mentioned that the district assembly, GNFS, FC, TA and FORIG etc. are some of the stakeholders who would be involved in the program. He also enlightened participants on the VPA process.</p> <p>3.0 Reading and Acceptance of Previous Minutes The previous minutes were read and the necessary corrections made. A representation of the DCE proposed that minutes should be made available well before the next meeting to give members time to read through. This proposal was accepted. Finally members accepted the minutes.</p> <p>4.0 Feedback from MSD II The CFW and Mr. Torso reported on the national MSD II, covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ the inauguration of the national MSD steering committee ➤ the speeches of encouragement ➤ Stakeholders' preference of the three recommended policy options ➤ SWOT analysis ➤ Evaluation of MSD II <p>The results of the SWOT analysis from the national MSD II was not read to members because the facilitator did not want that to influence their thinking during the SWOT analysis which was part of the agenda.</p> <p>5.0 Raising issues of concern about each option Members were put into groups to raise issues of concern that needs to be considered with respect to the adoption of any option. The results from this exercise are appended to this minute.</p> <p>6.0 Stakeholders' preference of the tree policy option before SWOT analysis Members were guided by the facilitator to rate their preference for the three proposed options before the SWOT analysis of the options as a means of having a fair idea of</p>	<p>Secretariat & CFW</p>

participants' perception on the options. The ratings were done secretly on papers and results collated by a research assistant from FORIG as follows:

Option 1 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills only) = 1(3.8%)

Option 2 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills and artisanal millers) = 20 (76.9%)

Option 3 (Domestic lumber supplied by Artisanal Operators only) = 5 (19.2%)

7.0 SWOT Analysis

The facilitator explained the SWOT analysis tool to members. Members were put into groups with each group analysing an option.

8.0 Presentation of SWOT Analysis Result

Leaders of the various groups presented the outcome of the SWOT analysis. See appendix for the results of the SWOT analysis.

9.0 Stakeholders' preference of the tree policy option after SWOT analysis

A second preferred option was carried out after the SWOT analysis. The essence of this was to know participants' perception on the option after in depth deliberations. The following are the results from the second rating.

Option 1 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills only) = 1(3.8%)

Option 2 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills and artisanal millers) = 16(61.5%)

Option 3 (Domestic lumber supplied by Artisanal Operators only) = 9 (34.6%) .

10.0 Date for Next Meeting

The date for the DLMSD III was to be communicated to members after the third national MSD meeting.

11.1 Closing

The facilitator thanked all present and advised that they send feedback messages to members of their communities. The meeting ended at 1:50pm



Signed:

Jane Aggrey (DLMSD II Facilitator)



Signed:

Isaac Owusu (CFW)

Results of the SWOT Analysis of the Options

Option 1: Sawmills to supply the domestic market with legal lumber			
Strengths	Weakness	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sawmills have the capacity to produce lumber on a large scale ➤ Sawmilling creates employment ➤ The operation of sawmills generates revenue for government through the payment of taxes ➤ Saw millers are well organized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Most sawmillers lack good management skills ➤ Most sawmills lack commitment to communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is legal backing for the operations of sawmills ➤ Sawmillers have easy access to credit facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Persistent Illegal logging in their concessions ➤ Forest destruction by bush fires ➤ Undulating landscapes limits their area operation ➤ Low pricing on the local market will affect their production ➤ Unstable electric power supply causing damage to equipments and reducing production
Option 2: Sawmillers and other players supply legal lumber to the domestic market			
Strengths	Weakness	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Labour is available for operation ➤ There is available machinery and technology for efficient production ➤ The blend has the capacity to meet domestic market demand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lack of adequate financial resources, especially with artisanal milling, to enhance business ➤ Lack of well trained staff for artisanal milling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Potential legal recognition for artisanal milling ➤ Existence of ready market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Dwindling resource base ➤ Interferences by traditional authorities and farmers in the operations of the two parties ➤ Potential persistence of Illegal logging
Option 3: Improved chainsaw milling to supply the domestic market with legal lumber			
Strengths	Weakness	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Labour, improved technology and equipments are availability for operation ➤ Artisanal milling creates employment for local people ➤ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Chainsaw operators lack capital to pay for cost of improvement ➤ There is the potential to abuse permits given by the FC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ It is a way to improve local peoples' access to tree and tree resources ➤ it is an opportunity to increase revenue ➤ Efficient and effective management and protection of the resource ➤ Cost of monitoring and policing will be reduced ➤ Reduction in risk of operation ➤ Reduction in rural-urban migration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Depleting forest resources

Questions that needs to be considered:

Option 1: Sawmills to supply the domestic market with legal lumber

- Can sawmills meet domestic lumber supply considering their inability of supplying the 20% as stated?
- How will the lumber be marketed since there are no sawmills in the villages?
- Can the forest be sustained by afforestation projects to allow for sustained sawmill production?

Option 2: Sawmillers and other players supply legal lumber to the domestic market

- How will the competition for the resource and associated conflicts be addressed?

- Will this enhance effective management of the resource base?
- How will taxing be done and collected?
- How will the finished products be priced for uniformity?
- How will artisanal millers operate, with permits?

Option 3: Improved chainsaw milling to supply the domestic market with legal lumber

- How will the new machinery and technology be acquired?
- Are there enough tree resources to be utilized?
- What happens to infiltrators?
- How will permits and concessions be acquired?
- How will they operate, as individuals or associations
- How will the lumber be marketed?