

“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
Nkawie**

**Date: 26th February, 2010
Venue: Catholic Church Hall**



DLMSD Members Present:

1. Samuel Owusu	Hunter
2. Beatrice Gyaw	Farmer
3. Paul Kwadwo Beechem	Chainsaw Operator
4. Amos Ampong	TA
5. Francis Hamenu	CFC
6. Lawrence Hanson	GPS
7. J.K. Osin	CFC
8. Degraft Takyi	CFC
9. Samuel Asare	GNFS
10. Nana Yeboah	Judicial Service
11. Samuel Brenya	DFF
12. Rita Gyawu Dankwa	FSD
13. Mavis Serwa	FSD

Project Secretariat Team

1. Mercy Owusu Ansah	NF/CFA, EU CSM Project
2. Jane Aggrey	ACO, TBI Ghana
3. Enerstina Osei	FORIG
4. Isaac Sintim Yabbey	CFW

Acronyms

ACO	Assistant Communication Officer
CFC	Community Forestry Committee
CFW	Community Forestry Worker
CSM	Chainsaw Milling
DFF	District Forest Forum
DLMSD	District Level Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue
EU	European Union
GNFS	Ghana National Fire Service
GPA	Ghana Police Service
FORIG	Forestry Research Institute of Ghana
FSD	Forest Service Division
MSD	Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue
NF/CFA	National Facilitator/Community Forestry Advisor
SWOT	Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, Threat
TA	Traditional Authority
TBI	Tropenbos International

Agenda:

The agreed agenda for the meeting were:

- Reading of previous minutes
- Feedback from national MSD 2
- Prioritization of issues from MSD I
- Stakeholders preference of the three proposed policy options
- SWOT Analysis of the 3 options
- National tree planting programme

Proceedings	Action
<p>1.0 Opening The meeting started at 10:30 am with a prayer by Paul Kwadwo Bechem</p> <p>2.0 Introduction There was a self introduction of all present including the secretariat team.</p> <p>3.0 Reading of previous minutes The previous minutes was not read because majority of members who were present at the previous meeting were not able to attend the second meeting due to an FSD meeting which was running concurrently with DMSD II.</p> <p>4.0 Feedback from national MSD 2 The NF/CFA reported on national MSD II, covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inauguration of the national MSD steering committee ➤ Speech of encouragement ➤ SWOT analysis <p>The results from 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 Prioritisation of issues from MSD I A list of issues from MSD I was presented and the facilitator helped the members through the prioritisation of those issues. The results are appended to this minute.</p> <p>6.0 Preferred option of stakeholders before SWOT analysis Members were guided by the facilitator to state their preferred option. This was aimed at getting a fair idea of members' perception on the three options prior to the SWOT analysis. Each member wrote secretly on papers and results collated by a research assistant from FORIG as follows:</p> <p>Option 1 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills only) = 1 (20%) Option 2 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills and artisanal millers) = 0 Option 3 (Domestic lumber supplied by Artisanal Operators only) = 4 (80%)</p> <p>7.0 SWOT analysis The facilitator explained the SWOT analysis tool to members. Members were put to three groups with each group analysing an option.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>9.0 Preferred option of stakeholders after the SWOT analysis Another data on the preferred option of stakeholders were collected after the SWOT analysis. The aim of this was to find out whether members' perception on the option after</p>	

the SWOT analysis has changed. The following are the results:

Option 1 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills only) = 1 (20%)

Option 2 (Domestic lumber supplied by sawmills and artisanal millers) = 2 (40%)

Option 3 (Domestic lumber supplied by Artisanal Operators only) = 2 (40%)

10.0 National tree planting programme

The CFW briefed the members on the national plantation programme launched by the president at Offinso, its role and how local people can benefit from the plantation establishment.

11.0 Date for Next Meeting

The date for the DMSD III was to be communicated to participants after the third national MSD meeting.

12.0 Closing

The CFW thanked all present and advised that they send feedback messages to members of their communities. The meeting ended at 1:00pm



Signed:
Mercy Owusu Ansah (Chairperson)



Signed:
Jane Aggrey – Recorder

Annexes

Outcome of Group Discussions (SWOT ANALYSIS)

Option 1: Sawmills to supply the domestic market with legal lumber			
Strengths	Weakness	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sawmiller have permits to operate ➤ They are well organized which makes supervision easier ➤ Have the technology and machinery to produce on large scale ➤ Sawmilling creates employment ➤ There is legal backing for sawmill operation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sawmillers have marketing stations concentrated in urban areas which prevents local people access to lumber ➤ Most sawmillers lack proper managerial skills ➤ The cost of operating a sawmill is high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The demand for lumber locally is high ➤ Sawmillers have easy access to credit facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Unsustainable supply of utility services ➤ Problems with resource allocations ➤ High taxation ➤ Dwindling timber resource base
Option 2: Sawmillers and other players supply legal lumber to the domestic market			
Strengths	Weakness	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is labour available for operation ➤ The blend has the ability to meet local lumber demand ➤ Improved technology and machinery are available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inability to pay for cost of improvement on the part of artisanal millers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ It is an opportunity for chainsaw operators to be organised ➤ Competition for market leading to potential reduction in cost of lumber 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Potential occurrences of conflicts due to problems with resource allocation, prices etc. ➤ There is limited resource available ➤ Potential differences in prices ➤ Potential problems with utility services
Option 3: Improved chainsaw milling to supply the domestic market with legal lumber			
Strengths	Weakness	Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is availability of labour ➤ Artisanal milling has increased production efficiency ➤ Artisanal milling produces high quality lumber 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CSM not well organized ➤ Lack of proper supervision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ High demand for lumber locally ➤ Availability of technology and machinery ➤ Possibility of legal backing ➤ To organize CSM into cooperatives ➤ Obtain permits to operate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Resource available is limited ➤ High Taxation will affect production ➤ Artisanal millers have limited access to credit facilities ➤ Proper supervision and monitoring is lacking

Prioritization of Issues from MSD I

No.	Issues listed	Groups that listed the issue	Remarks
1	Local demand and overland export	1	Priority
2	Characteristics of the local market	1	High priority
3	Alternatives to substitute lumber	1	Priority
4	Importing timber for processing	1	Low priority
5	Alternatives to supply legal lumber to the domestic market	1	High priority
6	Formation of cooperative to use improved technology	1	High priority
7	Improved chainsaw to take over supply of lumber to the domestic market	1	High priority
8	Assessment of failure/success of policy/law banning chainsaw milling	1	High priority
9	Tree ownership and tenure	1	High priority
10	Sharing of benefits from tree resources	1	High priority
11	Access to timber resources by local people	1	priority
12	Capacity of FC to manage chainsaw milling	1	High priority
13	Annual allowable cuts exceeds current resource base	1	Priority
14	Dwindling forest resource base	1	High priority
15	Forest plantation/afforestation	1	High priority
16	Developing alternatives like bamboo and rattan plantation	1	High priority
17	Developing lesser known species	1	High priority
18	Analysis of implications of recommended options	1	Priority
19	Economic cost benefit analysis of recommended options	1	Priority