

REFORM OF FORESTRY ADVISORY SERVICES: LEARNING FROM PRACTICE IN UGANDA

Mike Harrison, Rebecca Ssabaganzi, Ian Goldman and James Carnegie

Finding sustainable and value-adding models for agricultural/NR services which reach poor communities has proved problematic. Privatisation appears more viable with commodities or enterprises that can easily be converted into cash, and more difficult where it is concerned with the broad range of benefits that are sought from natural resource (NR) management – which range from the commercial, through the risk- and vulnerability-reducing, to the environmental, and frequently have ‘public goods’ components. This paper captures these dilemmas by focusing on forestry extension for poor farmers, both on-farm and in forest areas. It describes the piloting of reforms in forest advisory services in Uganda, identifying livelihood opportunities and relevant service demands, exploring different kinds of services, and using community-based workers for delivering services. Early experience suggests lessons on the roles of and relations between individuals and institutions may have much wider relevance.

Policy conclusions

- Economic reform agendas frequently include pressure to privatise advisory services in agriculture, livestock and forestry, but few examples of successful practice are yet available.
- Uganda is experimenting with publicly-funded but privately delivered forestry and agricultural advisory services. Its experiences confirm that it can deliver services that are relevant, cost-effective and coherent, and can contribute to poverty reduction.
- The approach has used a sustainable livelihoods analysis as a basis for identifying and developing relevant opportunities for tackling poverty through forestry and delivering appropriate, efficient and sustainable services.
- These services include guidance on process and institutional development as well as technical services. The former includes the mobilisation and sensitisation of local council leadership, empowerment of local leaders to build wider awareness, confidence and trust among community members, and the development and organisation of robust local institutions that are able to negotiate relevant services and yet continue to include marginalised groups within the community. The latter includes the skills, technologies and knowledge required to develop particular forestry opportunities in agroforestry or natural forest management.
- In this way, services have been developed from micro to macro levels with important implications for forestry and models of support to poor people who depend on natural resources in Uganda. In particular, the approach radically redefines the roles and responsibilities of different actors amongst farmers, service providers, local governments and national bodies.
- The use of community-based extension workers has been piloted as an approach to delivering services more effectively, providing a link between micro and meso levels. First indications are that the model is working, is reaching poor people, and is able to provide extension for forestry in a cost-effective manner.
- This approach could equally be applied in other sectors (for example, in human and animal health, in agriculture and fisheries) to ensure that services are appropriate for poor people's livelihoods.

A. Introduction: policy context and livelihoods analysis

Background

Conventional service delivery models are facing often shrinking budgets amidst increasing poverty challenges. This is true for forestry in Uganda, and at the same time the policy environment is changing with an emphasis on decentralised funding flows, client-oriented service delivery and privatisation of extension. This implies an active and dispersed network of local service providers, whether community-based, private sector or government, around many frequently needed developmental services, including forestry. Experiments with service delivery in forestry, taking place over three years in a number of districts in Uganda, have attempted to identify new approaches, skills and practices, including the use of community-based services, and to examine the types of forestry services that would enhance livelihood opportunities through forestry. This is in preparation for including forestry extension into the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS).

In response to the need for major policy and institutional reforms in the forest sector, the Government of Uganda developed the *Forest Sector Umbrella Programme (FSUP)* to spearhead the changes. The programme began in 1999 and ran until late 2003, implemented by the Forest Sector Co-ordination Secretariat (now Forestry Inspection Division) under the Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment.

Government policy framework

The policy framework for forestry in Uganda comprises:

- *The Poverty Eradication Action Programme* (1997, currently under review): This apex policy has four pillars: economic growth, good governance, improving incomes and quality of life for the poor.
- *The Public Sector Reform Programme*: The Forestry Department has been replaced by a National Forestry Authority (launched in 2004), which will be self-financing and semi-autonomous, but will focus primarily on managing Uganda's state forest reserves.
- *The Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture* (2000): This includes a farmer-centred prioritisation of public spending on productive activities and the National Agricultural Advisory Service (NAADS) through which producers contract advisory services from private service providers. It also outlines development of research and technology, rural finance, processing and marketing, education and sustainable management of NR.
- *Local Government Reform*: Reforms include the decentralisation of budgets and most developmental services to local governments, an incentives framework for local development planning to reflect local priorities, accountability through improved financial systems, and transparency of allocation decisions.

Progress with the reforms in the forest sector includes the new *Uganda Forestry Policy* (2001), the *National Forest Plan* (2002) and the *National Forestry and Tree Planting Act*

(2003) which has enabled the creation of the National Forestry Authority, the decentralisation of district forestry functions and the rethinking of service delivery. These policy and legal reforms redefine roles and partnerships in governance including central government, local government, the private sector, local communities and NGOs/CBOs.

In the context of forestry services, this set of policies focuses on poverty-reducing and an environment-favouring decentralised service delivery, with key roles for local governments, and producers purchasing advisory services through NAADS. Within the 'commodity-focused' orientation of NAADS, forestry is concerned more with integrated NR management than with the exploitation of a single commodity. This may mean that users are unwilling to pay for extension.

Livelihoods analysis

In Uganda, as elsewhere, low funding and incentives, inadequate livelihoods perspectives, inappropriate skills, and over-centralisation have all reduced the effectiveness of the forest service. Re-thinking service delivery raised questions of how forestry contributes to rural livelihoods, what opportunities there are for forestry to contribute to poverty eradication and what services are needed to realise these opportunities.

To address these questions, the Forest Sector Co-ordination Secretariat¹ undertook livelihoods analysis in sample communities from nine districts, covering a range of social and ecological conditions. For different interest groups, the role of forestry in livelihoods was analysed, their preferred outcomes were assessed, and the opportunities and services that could help achieve these outcomes through forestry were identified. Roles, responsibilities and capacity were examined at five institutional levels: community, service provider, district, national and ministerial.

An innovative methodology was developed with forest department staff and partner NGOs for the livelihood and institutional analysis in sample parishes, using a client-focused service design. A synthesis of opportunities was prepared and the potential services identified which could address these, and the findings were validated and communicated at two national workshops. The results were reflected in the National Forest Plan, and a follow-up programme of piloting service contracts using community-based forestry worker extension models has helped to inform NAADS.²

Forestry in rural livelihoods

A wide range of social groups and corresponding preferences was identified during the initial analysis, e.g. married women in Luwero District wanted increased food security from better agricultural production, and the youth in Nakasongola District aimed to raise income from charcoal production.

The importance of forestry in livelihood strategies was clear: for example, as *firewood* (for domestic use, lime and brick-making, tea and tobacco curing, fish smoking, brewing), as *timber* and poles (creating employment in pit sawing and income from sales, construction, carpentry, boat-building), or as *non-timber products* (charcoal, honey, craft materials, fruit, mushrooms, bark cloth). *Environmental benefits* of forests were strongly felt (soil fertility, shade, windbreaks, micro-climate and rain). Women relied heavily on natural forests for meeting *seasonal food gaps* and feeding small livestock. Others identified the need to improve forestry resources *on-farm*.

Opportunities and services

Livelihood opportunities associated with forestry included: tree production, collaborative forest management, establishment of tree nurseries, agroforestry (fruit, coffee, soil fertility, improved crop production), non-wood products (honey, crafts, shea nut oil, medicine, hunting), improved

marketing and trading in forest products, improving technology (charcoal, honey, stoves), alternative income sources (crops, cotton), and forest ecotourism.

The services that people saw as necessary to realise these opportunities included: public information, communication and advocacy; inclusion of forestry in local government processes (planning, by-laws); advisory services (organisational, technical, small business development); specialist advice (pathology, securing land tenure, ecotourism); development of new technologies; support on contractual issues (collaborative forest management – CFM – arrangements); input supply, including quality tree seeds; accessing rural finance; and marketing support (development of new opportunities, market information, business and marketing support, quality standards). Table 1 shows an example for one opportunity, tree nurseries.

A suite of services to support forestry

From this longer list, a consolidated set of services was identified at different levels to meet the range of demands emerging:

Local extension support: the preference was for very local provision using a model already in use in public health and reproductive and animal health, in which community-based extension workers with specific skills are contracted by communities.

Small business support: services are needed to assist with setting up businesses and developing business plans, accessing market information, tendering, providing marketing advice, obtaining finance and providing aftercare. Such services should be contracted at district level, could include 'community business workers', and in some cases be provided by existing programmes. Other necessary services include access to rural finance and quality certification systems, e.g. for tree seeds.

Specialist advice and new technology: these could be contracted from consultants in the district (or beyond, for rarely needed skills), e.g. advice on pathogens, land tenure issues, legal agreements on CFM, ecotourism development, conflict resolution. The same could apply in relation to technology, e.g. adapting agroforestry technologies to local conditions.

District role: a district forester needs to be responsible for mobilisation and co-ordination of services and funding, e.g. securing allocations for forestry in the District Development Plans, monitoring the quality of service providers, and promoting appropriate district or sub-county by-laws and ordinances. The district forester also needs to mobilise other relevant district staff.

Central information services: this would involve a menu of opportunities to identify possible markets, basic production technologies, support grants, investments and returns for each opportunity. An out-sourced market information service could back up business support services.

National co-ordination and advocacy: public information and sensitisation, co-ordination of extension service reforms, promotion of investment in forestry-related activities and

Table 1 Example of services for developing tree nurseries

Service types	Support services required
<i>Local extension</i>	
• <i>Organisational</i>	Organisation of group nurseries
• <i>Technical</i>	Skills in nursery production
• <i>Business</i>	Small business skills for trading in seedlings
<i>Specialist skills</i>	Propagation methods for particular species
<i>Land tenure</i>	Advice on tenure and land registration
<i>Input supply</i>	Sourcing and handling quality tree seeds
<i>Marketing</i>	Information on markets beyond the local area
<i>Finance</i>	Longer term finance, need MFIs to cover forestry

promotion of sustainable use of forestry resources are needed and could be contracted from a central organisation such as the National Forestry Authority (NFA). Better co-ordination of other national agencies relevant to forestry is also required, such as the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) and the Department of Lands.

B. Service delivery reforms in practice: the pilot programme

Learning framework for a pilot programme

The findings of the livelihoods analysis and the processes launched in the sample parishes helped in developing a pilot programme to test the approaches, develop the opportunities, and explore the challenges identified. This was done via a learning framework with 'district learning teams' comprising local government officials, farmers and forest-users, and NGO partners as service providers.

These teams undertook a process of orientation towards the NAADS principles and pilot programme planning. They followed up with a series of events to mobilise and sensitise key stakeholders in target sub-counties, local government officials, service providers and farmer groups. Local political support was critical to the roll-out of the programme. During this process a set of critical questions formed a learning framework (Box 1).

Exploring models of service delivery – using community-based workers

Once the start-up activities were completed by the district learning teams, service providers were contracted to deliver the priority services demanded, particularly via community-based service delivery (CBSD). CBSD refers to services where the client (the 'community') is directly involved in developing the extension messages, in delivering the services and in the management of the delivery system in general. Carnegie et al. (2002), who were commissioned to review relevant international and national experience, define elements of CBSD as follows:

Box 1 Learning framework for action-research on reforming forestry advisory service delivery

- **Questions within the community:** about group formation, poverty and gender, selection of community workers, inclusion of non-farming stakeholders and marginal groups, links to other processes for community-based planning;
- **Questions among service providers:** about their capacity, willingness to respond to new demands, ability to work with community-workers;
- **Questions for local government:** about their new roles, needs for specialist forestry staff, transition from FD to NFA, need for special incentives to attract interest in common property resources, links to the NAADS programme; and
- **Questions for national institutions:** about the need for creating demand for forestry services, capacity of the parent Ministry to oversee, the need for national information services - such as market information or new innovations.

Box 2 Role of the community worker

- Being a conduit for information and technologies (and sometimes, inputs);
- Being a bridge/link person between the community and facilitating agent;
- Organising people into groups and mobilising the community for learning activities
- Engaging in training activities with the facilitating agent, and training community members;
- Using their own activities for demonstration purposes;
- Animating the community by providing energy and enthusiasm for development activities

The *community* refers to the direct and indirect beneficiaries or clients of the system. The *community-based worker (CBW)* is a community member, selected by and accountable to the community. CBWs are able to motivate and organise, demonstrate by practical example, and share the results of their experimentation at little cost (Box 2).

The *facilitating agent (FA)* is the contracted organisation (NGO, government or private sector) that supports CBWs through the provision of resources, training, and management. These also facilitate linkages among specific *service providers (SPs)* (see Figure 1).

A number of variables in the CBW system were identified that the pilots would test (see Box 3).

Integrating forestry into NAADS

The National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) is a Ministry of Agriculture initiative to increase farmer access to information, knowledge and technology for profitable agricultural production. So far, it has paid little attention to forestry, but recognises the need to enhance broader NR productivity in sustainable ways.


The NAADS Act was passed in mid-2001 and so NAADS started its operations shortly after these pilots began. In pilot districts where NAADS also started to operate, the new forms of forestry service delivery were *not* piloted, to avoid potential confusion. Instead, the district learning teams in these districts focused on sensitisation of local governments, service providers and farmers to the livelihood opportunities offered through forestry and natural resources, in order to stimulate demand for forestry-related services in NAADS as it rolled out (Box 4).

C. Experiences from the pilot programme

NR sensitisation before service planning

The outcomes of the sensitisation work in pilot districts were instructive. The sensitisation about forestry and NR provided a basis for farmers to make informed choices in their selection of enterprises for NAADS service support. In general, there was low awareness amongst government officials, service providers and some farmers of the importance of forestry and the opportunities it presents for improving incomes, farm productivity and quality of life.

Understanding and support at all levels grew substantially following the sensitisation. Firstly, the multi-stakeholder process was important for increasing participation and the sense of ownership by marginalised groups, and in generating



Box 3 Learning framework for testing community-based service delivery

- **Sector:** what types of services are appropriate for a CBW?
- **Roles:** is it better for CBWs to be generalists or have specific skills, and should these be technical or organisational skills?
- **Selection:** what type of person is appropriate for a CBW? should they be full- or part-time? who should select them – the community or the facilitating agent?
- **Payments/incentives:** should CBWs be paid? If so, by whom?
- **Accountability and management:** to whom should the CBW be accountable and what community management is required?
- **Support and training:** what support and training is required for the CBWs?
- **Linkages:** what links exist or are required between CBWs and government or other structures?

political goodwill and support. Secondly, farmers were keen to take up forestry-related enterprises as long as they could identify the chain of benefits, including income, environmental values and increases in the productivity of other crops. Both market and technical information were critical to their decision-making.

In sub-counties where there was active sensitisation before planning for agricultural service delivery, there was increased demand by farmers for forestry services as part of the package of agricultural support. This included specifically demands for agroforestry technologies and support, for assistance with timber and pole plantations, and for support in managing customary and reserved natural forests and associated products (such as honey and non-timber forest products (NTFPs)), and their trade.

However, despite this increased demand, there was inconsistent uptake of forestry services through the NAADS selection and prioritisation process. There are a number of reasons for this. The demand often came from poorer, more marginalised groups with more limited voice. Their access to NTFPs is uncertain, given the prevailing 'free-for-all'. The current poorly developed state of forestry markets and long time-scale for many products means that forest products cannot compete with other higher value commodities. And finally, the NAADS focus on enterprises based on single agricultural commodity crops sends negative signals to farmers' groups who are showing interest in more integrated farming systems, which include trees on farm to provide product diversity and soil improvement.

Service delivery pilots – evidence of new approaches, skills and practices

Experiences from the longer-engaged (non-NAADS) districts include the following:

In *Luwero District*⁸ the pilot sub-county forum selected three priority opportunities: *agroforestry on farm* – particularly establishment of *fruit tree orchards*, *beekeeping*,

Box 4 Key messages in the forestry sensitisation 'training module'

- NAADS is about forestry and NR as well as agricultural crops.
- New policies, laws and guidelines are now in place that are important for poor people and communities who depend on forest resources.
- Forestry and NR relate to farmers' lives in important ways, for energy, food, employment, incomes, food security, quality of life and reduced vulnerability to shocks and stresses. These benefits are especially important to women and marginalised groups.
- There are many opportunities to improve livelihoods through forestry, both small-scale on- and off-farm opportunities, as well as large-scale commercial opportunities.
- There will be different opportunities and solutions in different agro-ecological zones across the country, each needing particular kinds of forestry technologies and practices.

and *collaborative forest management* in the nearby forest reserve. The Facilitating Agent (FA) which was contracted to provide services is a national NGO called Environmental Alert. The community workers (called 'Community Forestry Advisers'; CFAs) were selected jointly between the FA and the farmer groups. They are working in one sub-county, with some 21 farmer- or forest-user groups. The groups are of 10–20 people, some from the same household, amounting to a total of some 200 households.

In *Masindi District*, the preferences were for *collaborative forest management (CFM)* and *agroforestry*.

The 21 CBWs operating in Luwero undertook their mandated functions adequately, and have now also become the centre for outreach by other institutions (both government and NGO). They work on average 15 hours per week during peak times, and are seen by client-farmers as an accessible source of appropriate information and advice. There are farmer groups created around each of the three forestry enterprise opportunities, and a committee comprising farmers and local council leaders to oversee the service contract.

A cross-learning review was conducted in April 2003.⁴ The findings were:

- *Sensitisation* events, led by the FA, were critical to create entry to community groups and engage local leaders.
- *CBW selection* was made by farmer groups using criteria they defined, including secondary education, appearance, commitment and local residency. The criteria disfavoured women and only one CBW is a woman in Luwero.
- The FA trained the CBWs in two one-week training events outside the district. This discouraged female participation as CBWs.
- The CBWs have gained *incentives* from a variety of sources, including a bicycle allowance. They also felt that gaining new knowledge and skills, becoming known in the community, and learning to speak in front of people were good incentives. According to the FA, the motivation of the CBWs after one year remains good.
- *Accountability* of the CBWs is strongest to the FA and also to the management committee, but, as yet, less so to the farmers' groups who selected them.
- *Farmer-clients*, however, currently feel a strong ownership of the CBWs and provide contact at village level.
- By contrast, relations with *forestry staff* are more problematic: since they currently operate only at district level and above. Problems of coordination (e.g. with local government) and of responsiveness may be eased with the forthcoming decentralisation of the Forest Department.

D. Impacts and lessons

Evidence of impacts on livelihoods

Although it is still early in the pilot experience, some impacts are already being seen in Luwero District (see also Table 2):

New community organisation around forestry: the new structures that emerged as a result of the pilot are the farmer groups and the Management Committee. The MC is similar to a NAADS farmers' forum, and seems to be playing a significant role.

Involvement of marginalised households and gender issues: incorporation of the marginalised such as women and youth has been piecemeal and no specific opportunities have been identified for them. For instance, although land belongs to both husband and wife, the perceptions are still that men control land.

Impact on attitudes: there has been a positive change in attitude according to the MC, one indicator of which is that people are now prepared to pay for seedlings. The message: 'cut one, plant five' seems to have been well-received. People

Table 2 Impacts observed

Impact on	Impacts observed
<i>New community organisation</i>	Management committee and farmers groups are operating
<i>Involvement of the marginalised</i>	They are involved in the farmers groups
<i>Attitudes</i>	There are more positive attitudes to forestry, and a strong sense of empowerment over service delivery
<i>Behaviour</i>	People are cutting less and planting more
<i>New forestry skills and practices</i>	Tree planting, nursery establishment and apirary are now practiced
<i>Other impacts on households</i>	Fuel, fruits, soil nutrients, herbs, firewood are starting to improve
<i>Incomes</i>	Too early to tell

Source: Goldman et al (2003)

are also now planting trees for food and income. After five months 45% of people have taken up the training and are planting trees to help with future school fees.

New forestry skills and practices adopted: tree planting and nursery bed establishment are the practices which are most advanced. Five tree nurseries have been established in each village, some belonging to individuals, some to groups, and are operating commercially. Farmers and CFAs have learned new skills in tree nursery management and planting, as well as on the use of different tree species and their benefits.

The complexities of collaborative forest management remain to be tackled.

Impact on income: Whilst impacts are too early to assess, farmers plan to sell seedlings commercially and other future benefits will include fruits for food, improvement of soil nutrients to boost farm incomes, and products from new species such as herbal medicine from moringa and neem.

Similar lessons are emerging in Masindi. There are strong groups being organised around planned opportunities: a shift from problem- to opportunity-based planning has brought new prospects. Farmers feel that services are more appropriate to their specific needs and aspirations. Community-based workers are becoming effective leaders and delivery agents for priority services.

In Masindi District, concerted efforts to challenge and coordinate the local councils, the District Land Board, and the central department of lands and of forestry means that community groups are now nearer to acquiring land titles for customary forests under Communal Land Associations (CLAs). These are the first examples of the CLA being put into practice in Uganda, promoted effectively by this new approach to demand-driven service delivery.

Lessons for agricultural services

On applying the SL approach: The strength of using the Sustainable Livelihoods approach is that it helps provide farmers, forest users and service providers with a comprehensive understanding of livelihood assets and preferred outcomes, of how forestry could relate to these and to policy and institutional constraints. This then helps in identifying services to support these opportunities.

Basing service delivery plans, and the institutional reforms required to make these more effective, on assets and opportunities provides positive and achievable ways forward. By contrast, plans can be paralysed if based only on problems. Opportunity-based planning is proving to be effective in creating ownership and self-reliance amongst target communities, and more client-focused service provision.

On demand-driven service delivery: new roles for the community, SPs, LGs, national bodies: The pilot approach appears to be working and FAs are valued. There are clear

tasks and roles for CBWs, and they need to be trained locally to permit women to attend, although exposure visits to other areas are important. On incentives, a US\$ 10,000 allowance plus bicycle is adequate, and payment of a fee may not be necessary for those CBWs working under ten hours a week. The entry process is important, to sensitise and involve the villages and parishes.

The roles of the FA are clear, but it was suggested that their advocacy role needs strengthening. The FA should ideally be a local organisation with community development skills. Local government must be actively involved, and forestry should be planned and budgeted for in local development plans. The FA should be accountable to the farmers forum while the CBWs need to be accountable to the farmers' groups.

On community-based service delivery: This appears to be an effective form of service delivery, in terms of reach, cost, relevance and sustainability. The pilots have indicated that the poorest tend to benefit more under this system, compared to service delivery by outsiders. It is applicable to a variety of types of services, including both technical and organisational services. Hitherto few women have been selected as community workers. This can be addressed partly through the criteria for selection that do not take women away from the home, thus there would be greater emphasis on qualities such as communication skills, gender balance, trustworthiness and willingness to volunteer. Lessons on the need for incentives for CBWs are mixed, some suggesting that small payments or a bicycle allowance are important, others suggesting that exchange visits, inputs such as seeds and community status are as important.

Certainly, training of CBWs needs to be improved and standardised, with an emphasis on new practical skills. Close monitoring and mentoring of CBWs is required by the FAs, in order to sustain effective support for community-based service delivery. In the longer-term, the question of accountability of the CBWs may become critical. Currently they appear more accountable to the FAs than to the farmers who selected them. This may not be sustainable in the long run, and mechanisms to improve accountability to the farmer-clients will need to be developed.

On transition from Forestry Department to NFA: The transition from the old Forestry Department involves introduction of more diverse delivery systems, the strengthening of civil society, and new contractual relationships.

National roles that need to be fulfilled more effectively include identification of a menu of opportunities for investments in forestry, which identify markets, investment costs and returns, technologies and service requirements. Other important roles include quality certification, arrangements for rural finance, development of improved technologies and co-ordination of support nationally.

On integrating natural resources into NAADS: The main challenge is to ensure that NR-based activities such as forestry receive adequate consideration in enterprise prioritisation undertaken by NAADS. Thus there is a need:

- to address the *criteria for enterprise selection* so that they enable rather than disable NR enterprise selection, broadening definitions of enterprises to move away from single commodities.
- for more effective promotion and *sensitisation about NR opportunities*, at all levels including farmers, service providers and local governments. This must start to include analysis of investment costs and returns.
- for greater *cross-linkages between enterprises*, so that the support role of forestry to a range of other agricultural enterprises (e.g. livestock feed, soil improvement, wind protection, product diversification) can be better appreciated.

The use by NAADS of an enterprise-based system does not appear to include sufficient understanding of livelihood strategies. Forestry, though offering good income opportunities, may not be appreciated in the given criteria for a single enterprise. Forestry can be approached in four ways:

- (i) forestry within agricultural enterprises (e.g. for soil improvements, windbreaks, fodder);
- (ii) forestry as an enterprise on its own on-farm (e.g. woodlots, fruit trees);
- (iii) sustainable harvesting from common property resources primarily for sale (e.g. craft materials, NTFPs, medicines);
- (iv) livelihood support from common property resources, mainly for subsistence.

The recommendation is that agroforestry should be integrated in all the priority enterprises of NAADS. Farmers need to be sensitised to the commercial and environmental values of NR (with a list of possible opportunities) before the selection of priority enterprises. Selection of the NAADS core team at district level should include NR technical personnel who should be familiar with these issues.

Finally, an Innovation Fund may be needed in some cases to encourage producers to select the development of NR in their demands for support services. The longer-term nature of NR management and the greater complexity of managing common property resources may not compete well with short-term commodity crops or in poorly developed forestry markets, and some additional incentives may be needed to enable longer-term horizons to be targeted.

Footnotes

¹ with support from *Khanya – managing rural change*

² The Forestry Inspection Division is continuing to promote these pilots, and is participating with NAADS in a four-country project (along with Kenya, Lesotho and South Africa), which is exploring how to implement community-based worker systems most effectively. For further details, contact Patrick Mbullu at patrick@khanya-mrc.co.za

³ Luwero is now a NAADS district, but was not at the time of the study.

⁴ see Goldman et al. (2003)

References

- Carnegie, J., Kafeero, F. and Kivumbi, P. (2002) *Community-based Service Delivery: a Review to Develop Guidelines for the Forest Sector in Uganda*. Kampala: Commissioned by the Forestry Secretariat.
- Goldman, I., Harrison, M., Carnegie, J. and Ddungu, B. (2001) 'Exploring Livelihoods and Identifying Opportunities and Services for Livelihood Enhancement through Forestry', *Synthesis Report from Nine District Livelihood Studies*, Kampala: Forestry Secretariat.
- Goldman, I., Ssabaganzi, R. and Harrison, M. (2003) *Review of Progress with Forestry Extension Reforms in Uganda*, Kampala: Forestry Secretariat.
- Government of Uganda (2004) *National Forestry and Tree Planting Act*, Kampala: Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment.
- Government of Uganda (2002) *National Forest Plan*, Kampala: Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment.
- Government of Uganda (2001) *Uganda Forestry Policy*, Kampala: Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment.
- Harrison, M. and Goldman, I. (2002) *A Livelihoods Approach to Redesign of Forestry Services in Uganda*, London: Livelihoods Connect, DFID.
- Harrison, M. and Ssabaganzi, R. (2002) *Environment and Natural Resources in NAADS – Perspectives from the Forest Sector*, NAADS workshop report, 14th June 2002, Kampala.
- Harrison, M. and Ssabaganzi, R. (2001) 'Learning Framework

for the Forestry Advisory Services Pilot Programme', Memo 05 to District Learning Teams, Kampala: Forestry Secretariat.

Recent titles in the NRP series

92. People on the Move: New Policy Challenges for Increasingly Mobile Populations – *Priya Deshingkar and Edward Anderson*
91. Social Protection and Pro-poor Agricultural Growth: What Scope for Synergies? *John Farrington, Rachel Slater and Rebecca Holmes*
90. Policy Research and African Agriculture: Time for a Dose of Reality? *Steven Were Omano and John Farrington*
89. Livelihoods, Chronic Conflict and Humanitarian Response: A Review of Current Approaches – *Catherine Longley and Daniel Maxwell*
88. Making the Link between Micro and Meso: Learning from Experience of Community-based Planning (CBP) – *CBP partners in Ghana, Uganda, South Africa and Zimbabwe*
87. Post Offices, Pension and Computers: New Opportunities for Combining Growth and Social Protection in Weakly-integrated Rural Areas? – *John Farrington, N.C. Saxena, Tamsyn Barton and Radhika Nayak*
86. Decentralising Natural Resource Management: Lessons from Local Government Reform in India – *Pari Baumann and John Farrington*
85. 'Just Wildlife' or a Source of Local Development? – *Caroline Ashley and Joanna Elliott*
84. The Enabling Environment for Agricultural Technology in Sub-Saharan Africa and the Potential Role of Donors – *Robert Tripp*
83. Poverty Reduction, Equity and Climate Change: Challenges for Global Governance – *Michael Richards*
82. Do Area Development Projects have a Future? – *John Farrington, Roger Blench, Ian Christophos, Karin Ralsgard and Anders Rudqvist*
81. Supermarkets and Farming in Latin America: Pointing Directions for Elsewhere? – *Thomas Reardon, Julio A. Berdegué and John Farrington*

Acknowledgements and Contacts

Mike Harrison, previously with Uganda Forest Sector Co-ordination Secretariat, now with DFID, can be contacted at mike-harrison@dfid.gov.uk. Rebecca Ssabaganzi, previously with Forest Sector Co-ordination Secretariat, now with National Forestry Authority, can be contacted at rebeccas@nfa.org.ug. Ian Goldman and James Carnegie, both of *Khanya-managing rural change*, can be contacted at goldman@khanya-mrc.co.za and james@khanya-mrc.co.za.

The authors are grateful to DFID for funding this work, but wish to emphasise that the interpretations here are theirs alone and do not necessarily reflect the views of DFID.

The authors would like to thank Madira Davidson and staff of BUCODO (bucodo@utlonline.co.ug), Fred Kafeero and staff of Environmental Alert (fkafeero@envalert.org), Francis Byekwaso and staff of NAADS (naads@utlonline.co.ug), and the District Learning Teams in the pilot districts, for their enthusiastic development of the learning process, and John Farrington for extensive editorial advice.

ISSN: 1356-9228

© Overseas Development Institute 2004

See www.odi.org.uk/nrp/ for papers in this series.

Natural Resource Perspectives present accessible information on current development issues. Readers are encouraged to quote from them or duplicate them, but as copyright holder, ODI requests due acknowledgement. The Editor welcomes manuscripts for this series.

Series Editor: John Farrington Administrative Editor: Leah Goldberg