

“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

Third National Multi Stakeholder Dialogue Meeting Minutes

(MSD 3)

Date: 7th April, 2010



By Jane Aggrey, James Parker Mckeown, Mercy Owusu Ansah & Emmanuel Fosu

Acronyms

CFC	Community Forestry Committee
CBUD	Community Biodiversity Utilisation and Development
CFW	Community Forestry Worker
CSM	Chainsaw Milling
DFE	District Forest Forum
EU	European Union
FAWAG	Furniture and Wood Workers Association of Ghana
FC	Forestry Commission
FSD	Forest Service Division
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
PMT	Project Management Team
GREDA	Ghana Real Estate Developers Association
GTA	Ghana Timber Association
GTMO	Ghana Timber Millers Association
KNUST	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
MSD	Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue
MSD-SC	Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue Steering Committee
MLNR	Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
NF/CFA	National Facilitator/Community Forestry Advisor
NFA	Community Forestry Advisor
WWAG	Wood-Workers Association of Ghana
NFF	National Forest Forum
NPC	National Project Coordinator
PD	Programme Director
RMSC	Resource Management Support Centre
SC	Steering Committee
TBI	Tropenbos International
VPA	Voluntary Partnership Agreement
WWF	World Wildlife Forum
DOLTA	Domestic Lumber Traders Association
TIDD	Timber Industry Development Division

MSD Members Present:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 1. Ekua Ansah-Eshon | MSD-SC Chairperson |
| 2. Nana Adu Ofori | CBAG, National President, Apapam |
| 3. Stephen A. Sarkodie | Farmer, Juaso District |
| 4. Isaac Kwao | NTPF collector, Akyem Oda |
| 5. Attah Attakey Louis | Lumber Broker, Ho |
| 6. Gabriel Tettevi | Lumber Broker, Ho |
| 7. Daniel C. Tecku | WAG, Kumasi |
| 8. Francis K.Asiedu | FDA, Begoro District |
| 9. E. Kofi Ametepe | MOFA, Kade |
| 10. O.B. Puplampu | NFF, Koforidua |
| 11. Peter Zormelo | TIDD, Takoradi |
| 12. Kwame Asamoah Dwomoh | NFF, Vice President(Rep. National President) |
| 13. Francis Amedzator | MOFA, Akyem Oda |
| 14. Prince C.Appah | BNI, Begoro |
| 15. Dr Emmanuel Acheampong | Academia, FRNR-KNUST |
| 16. Togbe Kasa III | NFF, Volta Region |
| 17. Osabarima Ofori Kwabi III | Traditional Authority, Akyem Oda |
| 18. Charles K. Kumi | NFF, Sunyani |
| 19. Solomon Bagaseh | NFF, Upper East Region |
| 20. Donkor Bossman | Chainsaw Operator, Atronie |
| 21. Nana Atakora Kodua | NFF, Ashanti Region |
| 22. Emmanuel Boafo | CFC, Akyem Oda |
| 23. Sampson Oduro | Sawmiller, Tekyiman |
| 24. Atta Yeboah | NFF, Brong Ahafo Region |
| 25. Kusi Appiah | Carpenter, Assin Foso |
| 26. A. A Nkrumah | NFF, Western Region |
| 27. Amoako Dankwa | Carrier, Juaso |
| 28. Emmanuel Torsu | Chainsaw Operator, Juaso |
| 29. Mary Q. Galle | NFF, Central Region |
| 30. Ignitious Amponsah | Lumber Broker, Oda |
| 31. Charles Mensah | Chainsaw Operator, Tekyiman |
| 32. Kwame Ofori Attah | Chainsaw Operator, Begoro |
| 33. Mensa Atobrah | DOLTA, Ashaiman |
| 34. John Arko Tettey | District Assembly, Juaso |
| 35. Daniel Y. Ansah | Lumber Broker, Assin Foso |
| 36. Stephen K. Boafo | Chainsaw Operator, Assin Foso |
| 37. Daniel C. Tecka | Wood Workers Association of Ghana, Kumasi |
| 38. Isaac Anobil | Chainsaw Operator, Akyem Kade |
| 39. Kofi Ampah | Lumber Broker, Nkawkaw |
| 40. Mike Puplampu | GREDA, Accra |
| 41. Bawah Seidu | NFF, Upper West Region |
| 42. R. Agyenim Boateng | Chainsaw Operators, Goaso |
| 43. J.K Tawiah | CFC, Brong Ahafo Region |
| 44. Prince Henneh Ofori | Farmer, Sunyani |
| 45. Alex Dadzie | GTA, Takoradi |
| 35. Francis Nana Akowuah | FAWAG, Kumasi |
| 46. John Amankwah-Okrah | Lumber Broker, Techiman |
| 47. Valerie Fumey Nassah (Mrs) | RMSC of FC, Kumasi |
| 48. Ben Bawa Karimu | NFF, Northern Region |

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 49. Anokye Prince | KNUST, Kumasi |
| 50. Alex Asare | RMSC/NFF, Kumasi |
| 51. K.E.Haizel | TIDD of FC, Takoradi |
| 52. Augustine Gyedu | FSD of FC, District Manager, Bekwae Ashanti |
| 53. Joseph Boakye | FSD of FC, Operations Manager, Accra |
| 54. Dickson Adjei Sakyi | FSD of FC, Sunyani |
| 55. Susana Karikari | Lumber Broker, Sokoban Wood Village, Kumasi |
| 56. Wale Adeleke | IUCN |

In Attendance

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 1. Prof. Alfred A.Oteng-Yebaoh | PAC Chairman |
| 2. Dr Emmanuel Marfo | PMT member |
| 4. Edward Obiaw | Director, RMSC of FC, Kumasi |
| 5. Samuel Nketiah | PD, TBI Ghana |
| 6. Douglas Asamany | Executive Director, TIDD of FC, Takoradi |
| 7. Wale Adeleke | Representative, IUCN |

Observers

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Ben Opoku Asare | CFW, Begoro |
| 2. Charles Nketiah | CFW, Akyem Oda |
| 3. Otuo Acheampong | CFW, Goaso |
| 4. Koranteng William | CFW, Kade |
| 5. Seth Duodu | CFW, Assin Foso |
| 6. Kow Quaison | CFW, Sunyani |
| 7. Owusu Boakye Isaac | CFW, Juaso |
| 8. Ernestina Osei | FORIG, Kumasi |
| 9. Daniel Forson | FORIG, Kumasi |
| 10. Evans Mensah Sampene | TBI Ghana, Kumasi |
| 11. Rebecca B. Oppan | District Manager, FSD of FC, Kumasi |
| 12. Yaa Konadu Pokuaa | RMSC of FC |

Project Secretariat

- | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. James Parker | NPC, EU Chainsaw Project |
| 2. Mercy Owusu Ansah | NF/CFA, EU Chainsaw Project |
| 3. Emmanuel Fosu | PA, EU Chainsaw Project (Recorder) |

Apology

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 1. Joseph Blay | Judicial Service, Assin Foso – Attending a seminar in Accra |
|----------------|---|

Absent:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| 1. Dr C.Antwi Boasiako | KNUST, Kumasi |
| 2. Nene Tei D. Korabor IV | Traditional Authority/NFF, Greater Accra Region |
| 3. Representative | Forest Watch |
| 4. George A. Mathias | Sawmiller, Begoro(Nkawkaw) |
| 5. Alhaji Haruna A. Salam | District Assembly, Goaso |
| 6. Dr Richard Gyimah | VPA |
| 7. Nana Kustamanko | Traditional Authority, Nkawie |
| 8. Mr. Joseph Osiakwan | MLNR |
| 9. Richard Kumake | Sawmiller, Juaso |
| 10. Anthony Haidamous | John Bittar Company, Takoradi |

Recorders

1. Paul Osei Tutu

TBI Ghana, Kumasi

Agenda:

The following were agreed for discussion at the meeting:

- Opening
- Introductions
- Welcome Address by steering committee chairperson
- Short Address by MSD 3 Chairman
- Reading of previous minutes and matters arising
- Purpose and objective of MSD 3
- Presentation of SWOT Analysis and discussions
- Break
- Development of strategies to address weakness and threats of the three options(Groups)
- Prioritizing of critical issues for action research(Groups)
- Group presentation
- Presentation and discussion of code of conduct for MSD meetings
- Date for next meeting
- Closure

Proceedings	Action
<p>1.0 Opening The meeting was called to order by the National Facilitator at 10:00 am. It was followed with a prayer by Nana Adu Ofori.</p> <p>1.1 Introduction of Stakeholders and Chairperson The NF/CFA introduced all stakeholder groups present. Prof. Alfred A. Oteng Yeboah, the chairman of the PAC, was introduced as the Chairman for the meeting.</p> <p>2.0 Addresses</p> <p>➤ Address by MSD Steering Committee Chairperson The chairperson on behalf of the MSD-Steering committee welcomed members to the meeting with the following highlights from her speech (main speech in annex 1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ The MSD is a platform for building consensus on the illegal CSM issues➤ Consensus building at the MSD is effective if stakeholders seek to address issues with the national interest at heart.➤ In the quest to ensuring consensus on sustainable management of the forest resources, MSD members should bear in mind and focus on the global trend of climate change.➤ The decisions from the MSD can go a long way to influence decisions for addressing unsustainable exploitation of Ghana forest resources.➤ If we are able to manage our forest sustainably and ensure equitable distribution of the forest resources, we will be also finding solution to addressing poverty. <p>MSD 3 Chairman’s Welcome Address The Chairman welcomed all members to g the meeting. He expressed his delight for being part of the third national MSD meeting which had gathered diverse stakeholder groups to pursue one course.</p>	

The following are highlights from his speech (full speech in annex 2):

- Members have a common purpose of ensuring that legal lumber are available to the citizenry.
- The entire world takes keen interest in issues of forest sustainability and it is important to take a serious look at the forest resources nature has bestowed unto Ghana.
- Under the millennium development goals, Ghana will have to give accounts of how she has been able to address hunger, poverty and issues related to environmental degradation.
- Indiscriminate destruction of the forest has an impact on the country's water sheds and water bodies which eventually impact on water supply in the country. Climate change may seem inevitable, however, if we are able to keep our forest and its usage in a sustainable manner, the effects of climate change will be minimised. As stakeholders who are informed of the impact of forest destruction on our lives, it is our responsibility to educate those who are only interested in felling trees, to think of replacing trees felled
- The third MSD gives us opportunity to discuss the result of the SWOT analysis of the three policy option and develop strategies and interventions to mitigate the weaknesses and threats associated with each policy option.
- MSD members should critically and without any pre-determined intention analyse issues in order to help the country come out with the best policy option.
- The PAC as the highest decision making body only listens to the issues from the MSD members and other stakeholders who are at the fore-front of the usage of the resources and gives advice to help in good policy direction. The project is using the bottom –up approach, instead of the top-bottom used elsewhere. We have an empirical evidence provided by the scientist to fall on to guide us come out with decision judicious enough to sustain our forest, which all stakeholders will be proud of.
- This year is an international year of biological diversity. The forest is the biggest natural estate which inhibits huge diversity of all sorts of organisms. All organisms in the forest contribute in diverse ways to help sustain our forest and help human beings to live a good life. Our role as human beings is to utilize the forest to the fullest and not to destroy it.

3.0 Reading of Previous Minutes and Matters Arising

The minutes of the previous meeting was taken as read. The MSD-SC Chairperson led the meeting to correct some errors and omissions. Mr Donkor Bossman, moved for the acceptance of the previous minutes and was seconded by Mr Nana Adu Ofori.

3.1 Matters Arising

3.1.1 Distribution of MSD Plan

The NPC indicated that the plan was ready and would be distributed to members present.

4.0 Purpose and Objective of the MSD 3

The NF/CFA stated that MSD 3 was a follow up to MSD 2 which did SWOT analysis of the three options. She outlined the purpose of MSD 3as follows:

- Present and discuss the results of the SWOT analysis of the three policy options
- Develop strategies to address the threats and weaknesses of the three policy options
- Identify areas that need further research
- Prioritise identified researchable areas
- Select a technical committee to further work on the SWOT analysis outcome and identify technical issues that needs attention

5.0 Presentation and discussion of Code of Conduct for MSD Meetings

The draft code of conduct for MSD meetings was distributed to members to study. Concerns raised were addressed, after which members accepted the code of conduct as a working document for the MSD (details in annex 3).

6.0 Presentation of SWOT Analysis

Dr Emmanuel Marfo presented the outcome of the SWOT analysis discussions.

7.0 Stakeholders preference for the three policy options

Prior to the group work, members were given the opportunity to stake their preference for the three policy options in the following order: most preferred, preferred and least preferred. Information on the preference were collected according to stakeholder groups (details in annex 4)

8.0 Group Work

8.1 Development of Strategies to Address Weakness and Threats of the Three Options

Members went into six groups (two groups discussing each option) to discuss the weaknesses and threats and suggested strategies of addressing them (annex 5). Because of time, the groups could not present the outcomes in plenary.

9.0 Nomination of Members to Study Outcome of SWOT Analysis

To further study and edit the outcome of the SWOT analysis of the three options and identify the technical issues that need attention, a nine member sub-MSD committee was formed. The committee was made up of the following persons:

- i. Dr. Emmanuel Marfo FORIG
- ii. Mr. Alex Asare RMSC
- iii. Dr. Emmanuel Acheampong KNUST
- iv. Mr. K. S. Nketiah TBI Ghana
- v. Mr. Atta Attackey Lumber Dealer
- vi. Mr. Alex Dadzie Industry (GTA)
- vii. Mr. K. E. Haizel TIDD
- viii. Mr. Joseph Osiakwan Ministry
- ix. Mr. James Parker EU Chainsaw Project

10.0 Closing

The NF/CFA thanked members for attending and closed the meeting with a short prayer at 4:15 p.m.

Signed:
Emmanuel Fosu(PA) – Recorder

Signed:
Ekuia Ansah-Eshon (MSD-SC Chairman)

Secretariat

Annexes

Annex 1:

Welcome Address by the MSD Steering Committee Chairperson

Distinguished guests, eminent facilitators, the vice chair, honourable MSD members, observers, nananom, the press, ladies and gentlemen. I am singularly honoured to welcome you to the third national MSD meeting.

The MSD is a platform to build consensus over a difficult but unavoidable situation which confronts us as a nation. These are the sustainable use and equitable distribution of the natural wealth or forest. This task can be achieved by a genuine desire to seek the common good of all citizens of the nation. This can only be achieved by honest, selfless, God fearing hearts which are deemed honourable hearts. The steering committee is happy to welcome you all as honourables to the meeting.

Our task of charting a path of sustainable usage and equitable distribution of forest wealth can only be attained if honourables will bear in mind and keep in focus the global trend of climate change and its effects on agriculture, water availability and its attendant stress on the human resources of the nation. The essence of a nation is to marshal plans for our survival of which the judicious use of the chainsaw is an essential factor. Honourables, at the MSD we have been literally entrusted with the role that operates the gulliton. The gulliton that can cut this nation to an irrevocable destruction or the gulliton that can be staged and made inactive by our responsible use of our natural resources including our responsible use of a tool called the chainsaw. Honourables, the irrevocable destruction of the forest will destroy our very selves. If we secure and turn around the use of our natural resources, we will be likened to Christ who gave all to save mankind and we will be called saviours.

The chainsaw project has for its objective, the use of the forest in a sustainable manner, finding solutions to rural poverty and ensuring equitable distribution of forest wealth. We are here gathered to find a way: what is your wish? What is your mandate? What is your desire? Do you desire to save or do you desire to add to the destruction? Make your choice. You are welcome.

Annex 2:

MSD 3 Chairman's Speech (PAC Chairman)

Distinguished ladies and gentlemen, I am very pleased to be with you this morning, especially with the array of different stakeholders present. This is the third national MSD, though, this happens to be the first one I am attending; I have had the opportunity of reading through the minutes of the previous meetings. The different stakeholders here have one common purpose of ensuring that lumber is made available. But one thing all stakeholders must know is how lumber will be made available depends on how we will ensure that lumber is available.

This is a decade the whole world is interested in issues of sustainability, because situations of the world's economy demands that we take a good look at the resources which God in his own infinite wisdom has given to mankind for free. The basic thing we often forget is that the natural resources are the hallmark of our very survival. If we look at the millennium development goals which in five years time Ghanaians will give assessment on how we have been able to address those elements that cause poverty and bring about hunger and all issues that relate to environmental degradation. The question as Ghanaians we will be asking ourselves is 'how we have fared'?

The fact is that a lot of our forest is empty because we have been indiscriminately removing trees. A time is coming when water availability is going to be a major problem in this country. Many people attribute this to climate change, but, are also of the view that if we are able to keep our forest and its usage in sustainable manner, our water resources will remain intact in spite of the changes in climate. A large number of people do not know what is happening around us, and it is the purpose for which the MSD have been established to help those who only interested in felling trees to also understand the necessity of replacing them for our common good..

This third MSD gives an opportunity for members to look at the SWOT analysis of the three options/policy direction on how to feed the domestic market with legal lumber. Each policy direction comes with its attendant implications – which could be good or bad. The duty of the members is to critically and without any pre-determined intention analyse the issues. Those of us at the PAC only listen to your voice because it is your voice, because you are those at the forefront of the use of the resource. At the same time it is our concern that you give proper direction to the government so that you are proud of the outcomes.

To this effect all concerns are welcome to enable us to do proper analysis of the situation and build consensus. The scientists have provided enough empirical evidence in a logical manner for us to understand and fall on in order to relate the present with the future. All we need to do is to act in a manner which will help this project deliver an outcome which all of us will be satisfied with as a measure to save our forest. This year is an international year of biological diversity. At the mention of natural estate, what comes to mind is the forest, because it is where we have huge diversity of all kinds of organisms. All organisms in the forest contribute in diverse ways to help sustain our forest and help human beings to live a good life. Whatever God has provided for us has a purpose.

Our role is to utilize the wood and other ecological resources, not to destroy them. We should therefore not destroy the forest and biological diversity as we do so at our own peril.

Annex 3: Code of Conduct for MSD-Draft

1.0 Introduction

The European Union (EU) chainsaw milling (CSM) project focuses on forest governance issues in Ghana and Guyana which are countries with high incidence of CSM. In many local and indigenous forest dependent communities in these countries, CSM is an important component of livelihoods, yet the conflict and illegality associated with it are high. The project seeks to use multi-stakeholder dialogue (MSD) as a mechanism to reduce conflict, adjust perceptions of the problems and create shared views of solutions among stakeholders. The MSD meetings will examine issues using structured dialogue that will mitigate existing levels of conflict between stakeholders. The platform will also provide a more effective pathway for information to contribute to the formation of shared perspective on issues and solution for CSM with the objective to facilitate and strengthen multi-stakeholder processes at the community, district and national levels.

2.0 Objectives of the code of conduct

The code of conduct is a concise statement of minimum standards with respect to stakeholder behavior at the MSD. It is meant to ensure that stakeholders operate at a level playing field on the platform. Stakeholders are expected to insist on compliance with the code by any MSD member and ensure that their stakeholder representatives would not fall under the scope of the code. The code sets forth standards for participation, time, methods, decision making and conditions for stakeholder engagement in the MSD platform. These standards are meant to apply throughout the MSD process.

The code is not meant to be used as a means to close the doors of the MSD to some stakeholders at the expense of others, but seeks to afford stakeholders equal opportunity to participate effectively in the MSD.

3.0 Scope of application

The code of conduct applies to members of stakeholder groups who are engaged in the MSD platform. It has been set out to define the principles under which the MSD should operate. Through the code stakeholder responsibility towards each other is specified. MSD members must be encouraged to observe the code and collaboration to reach agreements on alternatives for illegal chainsaw milling in Ghana.

The code establishes three principles:

- ✓ Stakeholder accepts responsibility for participation;
- ✓ Ensure that representatives send feedback from and to their groups;
- ✓ The stakeholders pledge to make observance of the code a condition of any agreements that it makes;

4.0 Code of Conduct

The code of conduct stipulates the manner in which members of the MSD are expected to conduct themselves to ensure that all platform meetings are conducted with the due respect for the rights of others and their stakeholder group. It ensures respect for all stakeholders groups irrespective of their stake, interest, influence/power and established positions. The MSD recognizes its responsibilities to stakeholders for the conditions under which discussions are held and that these responsibilities extend to stakeholder groups through their representatives:

A) Freedom of participation in the platform

All stakeholders of the MSD shall participate freely during discussion. The MSD (facilitator, MSD steering committee and members) will ensure that;

(i) There shall be no discrimination by;

1. Providing equal opportunity and treatment regardless of stake, interest, influence/power, political opinion, sex, social origin or other distinguishing characteristic

2. Preventing influential/powerful stakeholders making derogatory remarks/statement about less influential/weaker stakeholders
3. Providing all stakeholders access to all relevant information necessary to enable them participate in the MSD effectively
4. Building capacity of stakeholders to participate effectively in the MSD

(ii) Stakeholder views and opinions should be respected by;

1. Allowing stakeholders to express their opinions and views freely with due regards to Ai(2)
2. Showing consideration and respect of each other's perspectives, values, beliefs, interest, position and goals.
3. Separating personality from issues involved
4. Allowing stakeholders to form alliance or join any group for support during platform discussions and agreements.
5. promoting democratic and transparent dialogue

B) Decisions/agreements by the MSD

A number of decisions and agreement are expected to be made concerning issues and in developing alternatives for illegal chainsaw milling. The MSD (facilitator, MSD steering committee and members) will ensure that;

(i) Decision making process shall not be influenced by:

1. The facilitators/MSD steering committee, the project secretariat/project partners, few powerful/influential stakeholders or any other influential organization /agency

(ii) Decision/agreements shall be made by:

1. Ensuring that no stakeholder groups are sidelined in decision making
2. Encouraging different stakeholder to work together to develop generally acceptable solution
3. Ensuring that issues are well discussed to address differences among stakeholder groups
4. Ensuring that the facilitators/steering committee of the MSD are not being biased
5. Allowing stakeholders to consult their constituencies when necessary
6. Ensuring that consensuses are documented and endorsed by the steering committee

C) Conduct of meetings

To engender effective participation of stakeholders in the MSD meetings, the MSD (facilitator, MSD steering committee and members) shall ensure that:

(i) Invitation to MSD members for meetings shall be;

1. Clear and in simple language for easy understanding
2. Send at least 2 weeks prior to the meeting date
3. State agenda, time, meeting duration and venue of the meeting

(ii) Meeting day/time;

1. Shall be set in consultation with stakeholders
2. Shall be postponed by notifying all stakeholders
3. Hours of meeting shall comply with agenda and stakeholders shall be notified if meetings will last longer than planned in consultation with the steering committee

(iii) Meetings shall be;

1. Chaired by the chairperson of the steering committee.

2. Facilitated by a lead facilitator (National Facilitator/Community Forestry Advisor of European Union chainsaw project supported by other project staff)
3. Held using best participatory practices/approaches/methods depending on the agenda
4. Devoid of verbal/physical abuse, threat and intimidation by any MSD member. These behaviors are strictly prohibited.
5. Issues to be discussed shall be guided by the project objectives.

(iv) Records/reports;

1. Proper records/reports shall be prepared after each meeting
2. Minutes previous meeting shall be read and accepted by members
3. It is the responsibility of stakeholders to send feedback to their constituents
4. Minutes of previous meeting shall be sent to all stakeholders 2 weeks before the next meeting

(v) Conflict management;

1. The MSD steering committee shall authorise a procedure with fixed time limits to rectify conflicts and use appropriate measures to resolve such conflicts

5.0 Implementation of the code of conduct

The MSD steering committee should take a lead role in ensuring that the code of conduct is enforced/implemented.

They shall encourage MSD members, the facilitator and the project secretariat to adhere to the code for effective MSD meetings. The project together with the steering committee shall periodically monitor and review the operation of the code together with the MSD members.

Annex 4 – Stakeholders preference of the three policy options

ANALYSIS OF THE THREE POLICY DIRECTION

The three policy options (Sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market; Sawmills and artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market and artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market) were presented to the stakeholders to state their preferences as follows:

1. Least preferred policy direction
2. Preferred policy direction
3. Most preferred policy direction

Table 1: Preferred policy options by stakeholders.

POLICY DIRECTIONS	LEAST PREFERRED	PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market.	30 (59%)	14 (27%)	7 (14%)
Sawmills and Artisanal to supply limber to domestic market.	3 (6%)	19 (37%)	29 (57%)
Artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market.	18 (35%)	18 (35%)	15 (30%)

In all, fifty-one (51) MSD members stated their preferences. They were from the following stakeholder groups:

- Civil society (14)
- CSM related (12)
- NGOs (4)
- Farmers/community (6)
- Researchers/academia (3)
- Traditional authority (2)
- Law enforcement (1)
- District assembly (1)

From table:1, the least preferred policy option was, sawmills only to supply lumber to domestic market (59%), while the most preferred policy direction was sawmills and artisanal operators to supply lumber to domestic market (57%).

Table 2: Preferred policy option by Civil Society

POLICY DIRECTIONS	LEAST PREFERRED	PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market.	7 (50%)	4 (29%)	3 (21%)
Sawmills and Artisanal to supply limber to domestic market.	1 (7%)	5 (36%)	8 (57%)
Artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market.	6 (43%)	5 (36%)	3 (21%)

From table 2, the least preferred policy option was sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market (50%), while the most preferred policy option was sawmills and artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market, indicating (57%).

Table 3: Preferred policy option by Chainsaw Related

POLICY DIRECTIONS	LEAST PREFERRED	PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market.	10 (84%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)
Sawmills and Artisanal to supply limber to domestic market.	0 (0%)	7 (59%)	5 (41%)
Artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market.	2 (17%)	4 (33%)	6 (50%)

From table 3, the least preferred policy option was sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market (84%), while the most preferred policy option was artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market (50%).

Table 4: Preferred policy option by Forestry Commission

POLICY DIRECTIONS	LEAST PREFERRED	PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market.	4 (50%)	3 (37%)	1 (13%)
Sawmills and Artisanal to supply limber to domestic market.	0 (%)	1 (13%)	7 (87%)
Artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market.	4 (50%)	4 (50%)	0 (0%)

From table 4, the least preferred policy option was sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market and Artisanal to supply lumber to the domestic market (50%) , while the most preferred policy option was sawmills and artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market (87%)

Table 5: Preferred policy option by NGOs

POLICY DIRECTIONS	LEAST PREFERRED	PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market.	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
Sawmills and Artisanal to supply limber to domestic market.	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)
Artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market.	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)

From table 5, the least preferred policy option were sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market and Artisanal to supply lumber to the domestic market (50%), while the most preferred policy option was sawmills and artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market (75%)

Table 6: Preferred policy option by Farmers

POLICY DIRECTIONS	LEAST PREFERRED	PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market.	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)
Sawmills and Artisanal to supply limber to domestic market.	2 (33%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)
Artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market.	1 (17%)	2 (34%)	3 (50%)

From table 6, the least preferred policy option was sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market (50%), while the most preferred policy direction was artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market (50%).

Table 7: Preferred policy option by Traditional Authority

POLICY DIRECTIONS	LEAST PREFERRED	PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market.	1 (50%)	0(0%)	1 (50%)
Sawmills and Artisanal to supply limber to domestic market.	0(%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market.	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0(0%)

From table 7, the least preferred policy options were sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market and artisanal to supply lumber to the domestic market (50%), while the most preferred policy direction were sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market and sawmills and artisanal to supply lumber to the domestic market (50%).

Table 8: Preferred policy option by Researchers/academia

POLICY DIRECTIONS	LEAST PREFERRED	PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market.	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0(%)
Sawmills and Artisanal to supply limber to domestic market.	0(%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
Artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market.	1 (33%)	0(0%)	2 (67%)

From table 8, the least preferred policy option was sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market (67%), while the most preferred policy option was artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market (67%).

Table 9: Preferred policy option by District Assembly and Law Enforcement Agencies

POLICY DIRECTIONS	LEAST PREFERRED	PREFERRED	MOST PREFERRED
Sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market.	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Sawmills and Artisanal to supply limber to domestic market.	0(0%)	0(0%)	2 (100%)
Artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market.	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0(0%)

From table 9, the least preferred policy option were sawmills to supply lumber to domestic market and artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market (50%) while the most preferred policy direction is sawmills and artisanal to supply lumber to domestic market (100%).

Annex 5: Weakness and Threats with Strategies to address them

Option 1: Sawmills only to Supply Domestic Lumber

<i>Weakness & Threats</i>	<i>Strategy</i>
High operational cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government must increase taxes for inefficient mills Promote industrial retooling to ensure the use of efficient machinery Promote the use alternative energy sources and production waste Build capacities of staff to ensure good managerial practices to reduce cost. Employ qualified personnel to manage saw mills Establish sales outlet in nearby communities to reduce cost of transportation.
High prices for lumber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve wood processing efficiency to reduce waste. Reduce operational cost
Inadequate financial resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government should provide support in the form of subsidies. Reduce taxes on the timber industry Reduce high operational cost Sawmills should link up with financial institutions for assistance
High environmental impact and crop destruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote the massive afforestation Proper and effective monitoring of logging operations Review existing environmental laws/regulations concerning logging and create awareness CFCs should be empowered to check the extent of crop damage for the payment of realistic compensation to farmers. Provide skills and knowledge on environmentally friendly technologies on tree felling
Difficulties in supplying local communities with lumber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review existing laws/regulations of domestic lumber supply by the sawmills taking into consideration the demand Sawmills to establish sales outlets in rural communities and to supply a quoted amount of lumber to the domestic market as requirements for obtaining concessions.
Inability to remove trees in difficult terrain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employ modern technology of harvesting
Dwindling resource base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote massive afforestation Promote sustainable forest management Reduce log/lumber export Promote the use of lesser known species and wood substitutes.
Low pricing in the local market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create awareness on the need to pay the realistic price Encourage low production cost through the use of efficient machines to minimize waste Provide a standardized pricing list for various lumber sizes for all lumber dealers.
Influx of mushroom sawmills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set standards and guidelines for establishment and operation of sawmills
Illegal logging (chainsaw milling) in their concessions and unfriendly behavior of communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure total enforcement of the law There should be political will by government to eliminate chainsaw operations Involve and motivate communities to help in monitoring. Enhance capacity of FC especially frontline staff Ensure community access to lumber Ensure the fulfillment of SRAs Review benefit sharing of lumber revenue Develop viable alternative livelihoods for chainsaw operators
Temptation to supply the domestic market with low quality lumber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce or ban exportation of lumber A quality control board should be established to monitor lumber supply to the domestic market.

Option 2 – Sawmills and Artisanal Millers to Supply Domestic Lumber

<i>Weakness & Threats</i>	<i>Strategy</i>
-------------------------------	-----------------

Inadequate policy/legislation to support the option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use the current policy and legislative reform to address and provide support for the option (VPA and NREG) ▪ Use the different platforms to lobby and create awareness through education on the option
Inadequate capacity for monitoring the operations of the two parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop a monitoring framework and provide adequate resources to strengthen monitoring agencies ▪ Collaborate with community level stakeholders e.g. unit committees and traditional rulers in monitoring the activities of the two parties. ▪ CBOs should be empowered and well motivated to carry out their duties. ▪ Devolve off reserve tree management
Conflicts amongst artisanal and saw millers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy review and development must hinge on proper stakeholder consultation ▪ Support adequate communication and consultation as well as technical and financial capacities of the two parties in terms of negotiations ▪ Develop distinct guidelines to streamline the operations of the two practices (and accepted code of conduct) ▪ Ensure openness and transparency in the resource allocation ▪ Government should enact legislation to provide permits to artisanal millers to operate. ▪ There should be a standing mediation body to settle conflicts.
Dwindling resource base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promote massive afforestation ▪ Promote sustainable forest management ▪ Promote the use of lesser known species and wood substitutes ▪ Provide practical training for artisanal operators to enhance efficiency
Inability to pay for cost of improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop programmes/initiatives to support the up scaling of forest industries ▪ Government should assist artisanal millers in terms of reduced taxes and credit for importation of artisanal milling equipments. ▪ Individuals, millers and artisans should come together to form groups and associations to enable them procure machinery
Loss of jobs by some operators who cannot afford the improved technology.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop and promote viable alternative livelihoods. ▪ Train operators in the skills of identifying and managing small businesses.

Option 3: Artisanal Millers only to Supply Domestic Lumber

Weakness & Threats	Strategy
Poor managerial skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide practical training on proper managerial skills
Inadequate policy/legislation to support the option	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use the current policy and legislative reform to address and provide support for the option (VPA and NREG) ▪ Use the different platforms to lobby and create awareness through education on the option
Artisanal millers may face difficulties competing with saw millers for timber resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy review and development must hinge on proper stakeholder consultation ▪ Government should enact legislation to provide permits to artisanal millers to operate ▪ Establish transparent standards and guidelines for resource allocation ▪ Encourage the involvement of artisanal millers in plantation establishment
Possible abuse of permits issued under this arrangement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish transparent standards and mechanisms to guide artisanal operations ▪ Involve communities, CBOs in monitoring artisanal operations and encourage self monitoring
The generally weak law enforcement culture in Ghana could lead to abuse of the arrangement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish transparent standards and mechanisms to guide artisanal operations ▪ Strict enforcement of laws and provisions ▪ Build capacity and motivate communities and CBOs to assist in monitoring artisanal operations ▪ Encourage self monitoring by artisanal operators themselves
Dwindling forest resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide practical training for artisanal operators to enhance efficiency ▪ Establish transparent standards and mechanisms to guide artisanal operations ▪ Involve communities and CBOs in monitoring artisanal operations as well as self

	<p>monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure proper enforcement of laws banning chainsaw milling activities ▪ Encourage log importation to augment supply from our forests ▪ Encourage the use of lesser known species and wood substitutes ▪ Laws governing plantation establishment should be made favorable to individual. ▪ Promote massive afforestation ▪ Review policy on tree ownership/tenure
Increased cost of operation relative to the current free-hand chain sawing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government should support or subsidize/provide credit for acquisition of artisanal milling equipment and training ▪ Artisanal millers should form cooperatives/associations and seek for financial assistance from financial institutions

Some questions to think about

1. Who monitors to ensure that both sawmillers and artisanal millers are supplying their quota?
2. Who determines the price at which saw millers and artisanal millers sell their lumber?
3. Will equipments for artisanal milling e.g. logosol, woodmizer etc. be available?
4. Can sawmillers alone meet the high lumber demand on both local and international markets?
5. Is the government ready to release available timber concession to both saw millers and artisanal millers?
6. Will the government assist to provide proper training to the artisanal millers in the use of improved technologies?
7. Are there enough forests to sustain the timber industry?
8. Is the government willing to reduce taxes on the timber industry or the industry prepared to use efficient equipments in order to reduce production cost so as to make lumber affordable?
9. Is the public ready to pay realistic price for lumber produced?
10. Are sawmillers ready and willing to open outlets in the communities in order to make lumber readily accessible to all?
11. Will the lumber supplied by sawmillers for the domestic market be of same quality as those intended for export?
12. How readily is land available for afforestation?
13. What motivation is there for chainsaw operators who want to undertake afforestation?
14. What motivation is there for tenant farmers who nurture trees to maturity?
15. Do artisanal millers have the capacity to produce lumber for the whole country?
16. Does the government have the political will to enact and implement law(s) to regulate the activities of artisanal millers?