

## NFPS: AGENT OR PRODUCT OF INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE?

Kirsti Thornber, Julian Gayfer, Ben Voysey\*.

**LTS International**<sup>\*</sup>, Pentlands Science Park, Bush Loan, Penicuik, Edinburgh, EH26 0PH,  
UK. Tel +44 131 440 5500, email: name-surname@ltsi.co.uk

(Paper presented to the Commonwealth Forestry Conference in Freemantle Australia, April 2001)

### ABSTRACT

This paper will compare and contrast different experiences and approaches used in working towards developing nfps (national forest programmes). Lessons from experience of the practicalities of doing it will be shared. Experience from different countries will compare approaches. Some have focused on fundamentally reshaping institutional arrangements before setting off on the road to nfp development. Others have put development of the nfp first and within it have (sometimes implicitly rather than explicitly) acknowledged needs for change within the institutional frameworks, and, within this, transformation of organisations responsible for public sector forestry. The paper will also discuss the role of nfp processes in the wider picture of change in approach to forestry and institutional issues and will give comments on the implications of this change for the role of donor technical assistance.

### INTRODUCTION

As will have been noted in other papers in this volume, nfp processes involve policy review and refinement along with a strategy to put in place the enabling conditions to support policy implementation and to manage the impact. Whilst they come under many different names and guises (Savenije 2000 gives some useful background), typically nfp processes are about *change*. Consequently, working through nfp processes usually involves the instigation and management of change processes, usually in hierarchical government organisations. Such institutional transformations include some key elements:

- Redefining the roles and responsibilities of different institutional actors, given a changing vision of how the forest sector can best contribute to sustainable development and poverty elimination;
- Re-organising relationships between the stakeholders (forest users and policy 'clients') and the service providers (including those delivering the enabling policy);
- Organisational transformation within the public sector forestry institutions to allow them to best carry out the newly defined roles and responsibilities, and provide the services expected of them.

LTS has recent and ongoing experience and involvement in several such nfp development processes. This includes direct and indirect involvement with efforts in: Uganda, Malawi, and India. Based on a number of personal observations, this paper seeks to share experiences and provoke thought about how nfp processes can and do work. In particular, it considers how nfps link with the agenda of change within public sector organisations, and the need for nfp processes to explicitly address organisational transformation. This reflects the importance of the

---

<sup>\*</sup> LTS International is a well established and independent consultancy company, based in Scotland. We work with clients from the public and private sectors, to enable them to achieve their development and commercial goals. We specialise in policy formulation and organisational change.

third key element of change, noted above – the nature and pace of organisational transformation will have a critical impact on achieving policy outcomes in the long-term.

### *Uganda*

The late 1990's in Uganda saw a recognised need for a revised and detailed Forest Policy to replace the outdated and brief one of 1988. With strong political support for change in the forest sector, the time has become ripe to initiate a formal, sector-wide reform process, including policy and institutional reforms. The emergent action plans and nfp development are a part of this.

Under the Government of Uganda's (GoU) Forest Sector Umbrella Programme\* (FSUP), the Uganda Forest Sector Co-ordination Secretariat was established to coordinate institutions, donors and different elements of the GoU, to ensure integrated cross-sectoral planning and promote institutional reforms. The emergent nfp will probably take over the role that the FSUP\*\* currently plays, once reforms have been implemented.

One part of the FSUP is the DFID-funded Forest Sector Policy and Strategy Project (FSPSP). A major element of the FSPSP is the development of the nfp. A Forest Sector Review and information system has been completed, a new Forest Policy has been submitted to the Cabinet, draft new forestry legislation is under discussion to prepare it for submission for Parliamentary approval. Legislation will create the new National Forestry Authority (NFA) to replace the current Forest Department. The NFA will be a key new institution for driving progress with the nfp. Through the FSPSP since 1999 LTS advisers have been working closely with the Secretariat's staff to achieve their aims.

### *Malawi*

Other papers describe more fully the history and process of Malawi's nfp (Ngalande, this volume; Mayers *et al*, in prep.). The nfp aims to operationalise the new Forest Policy and Act, approved in 1996 and 1997 respectively. A key observation is that, whilst the process of developing the nfp began gradually in the early 1990s, when the Forest Policy and Forest Act were reviewed it became more widely recognised that good policies and legislation require a strategy for implementation. However, a concerted development phase\*\*\* for the nfp did not get underway until 1999, with a new driving force formed by a recently appointed Director of Forestry and the NFP Co-ordinator, and the reactivation of donor interest.

The nfp's framework document was formally launched early in 2001 by the Malawian President. Malawi's nfp recognises that existing forestry institutions are poorly fitted to the changed roles that stakeholder pressures and new policies demand. Priority actions identified by the nfp process are focused on tackling the challenges in managing a process of institutional change that will sort out institutional responsibilities, build capacity, and allow the State and others to play more appropriate and effective roles in the forest sector.

LTS has been involved in the nfp's Working Group on Co-management, and is responsible for the EU funded Social Forestry Training and Extension Project, which is developing the capacity of the Forestry Department to interpret and implement National Forest Policy, with an emphasis on participatory social forestry.

---

\* FSUP is a sector-wide, multi-donor, multi-agency reform support programme, driven by the GoU.

\*\* Within a broad interpretation the FSUP itself is the nfp, insofar as it is a sector-wide programme for co-ordination and development of the forest sector.

\*\*\* Donor support during this period helped to facilitate the process.

## *India*

The process of developing India's NFAP began in 1993 with a series of reports by international consultants, including an institutional development specialist. Subsequent work at national level looked at different technical areas of operation and issues within the forest sector. At the same time a series of state level forest sector reviews were carried out using government staff and external consultants. These reviews provided the basis of State Forestry Action Plans (SFAPs), submitted to the central government in 1996.

In turn the SFAPs provided the basis for preparation of the NFAP, supplemented with further work at national and international level on situation analysis, policy and institutional reform, and investment proposals. The NFAP was finally presented in 1999. Whilst many of the SFAPs identify policy and institutional sub-programmes, there is little strategic information on what aspects of the State Forestry Departments might need to change and how changes should be driven and managed. This has implications for the change implementation strategies included in the NFAP.

LTS has provided consultancy support to DFID projects in India and one of the authors has previous experience in India and is familiar with recent developments in the forest sector there.

## PRACTICALITIES: LESSONS FROM EXPERIENCE IN UGANDA

Increasingly, nfps are being seen as a useful tool for promoting coordinated and consensus-based forest sector reforms. Whilst guidelines such as those of the FAO's (1996) provide a step-by-step guideline to how to work through the nfp process, the realities of actually *doing* it can be more complicated. The case study of Uganda will be used here for discussion. Whilst an in-depth analysis of lessons has not been carried out and is not possible in this short paper, this description provides a perspective on some of the key issues facing those involved in the day-to-day process of developing nfps.

### ***Towards the reform process - political background***

Prior to the 1970's, Uganda was renowned in Africa for the quality of its forest management and the strength of its Forest Department (FD), which was nearly 100 years old and effective. The Amin era brought political turmoil and civil unrest, which eroded both forest cover and quality and morale and standards in the FD. Post-Amin, the early 1990's saw an extensive multi-donor forestry project focusing on rehabilitation of the forest estate. Its failure to address the central institutional problems meant that whilst it at least partly re-established the integrity of the forest reserves, it contributed little to sustainable change and improvement in the sector.

1997 saw developing political interest within Uganda in using an nfp process as a vehicle to bring about sector reform, stimulated by the IPF/IFF process that came out of UNCED's 1992 Rio conference. An early political priority was made apparent when the Government announced its intention to abolish the FD in favour of a new National Forestry Authority. The FSUP was subsequently developed as a multi-donor GoU programme with the objective of facilitating a range of forest sector reform initiatives, including the development of an nfp. Funding for the FSUP finally began in 1999, and plans for facilitating a forest sector review and the development of the nfp were put in place.

### ***Ambitions vs realities***

The formal nfp process began proper in 2000 and is continuing towards its objectives in 2001. Progress towards them has been varyingly successful, as noted below/in table 1.

Table 1. Working towards an nfp in Uganda - ambitions vs realities

<i>Some of the original ambitions</i>	<i>Actual achievements to date, at Feb 2001</i>
Early formation of nfp working groups (WGs).	Successfully achieved: NFA WG in place and working by April 1999; WGs for policy and legislation up and running by January 2000.
Launch of communications programme...	Ongoing: Preliminary programme effected in 1999 and 2000.
Capacity building in nfp formulation...	Ongoing: including external support from European union supported programme by African Academy of Sciences.
New forest policy and associated acts approved by cabinet by January 2000	Not yet achieved - see 'challenges' below.
Completion and distribution of Forest Sector Review by February 2000	Completed but not yet formally launched or distributed.
National Forest Authority launched in July 2000	Not yet achieved, awaiting new forest policy and associated Acts (see above).
Launch of nfp December 2000	Not achieved yet - requires new National Forest Authority to be operational.

(taken from FSPSP Inception Report 'Milestones', 1999)

However, despite high-level government support, difficulties remain for those driving the change and nfp efforts. Some of the key challenges have arisen because of internal perspectives and interests at sector-level. The key factors delaying progress are highlighted below:

- *Entrenched forestry sector:* The forest sector had been weakened and demoralised over decades by under-funding, low pay and a history of donor projects operating outside the structures of the Forest Department (FD), but providing rewards to those in positions of control. The outcome was an increasingly inert institution, with staff unable to move with the times, unused to inter-institutional co-operation, and resistant to changes in the organisational structures. With limited motivation and will to change inside the organisation, changing attitudes to implement reform procedures has been a slow process. In reality, the FD in its current form has been unable to be a real partner in the nfp process - the forthcoming NFA is expected to be more suited to be involved in the wider change process.
- *Upheaval in the government forestry institutions:* During the initial period of efforts to develop the nfp, a parliamentary investigation into allegations of corruption in the Forest Department created enormous personnel instability in the efforts to seek out desirable leadership and turn around the weaknesses of the parent ministry. There were four different FD directors in the space of 12 months, and four different managers assigned to the FSUP. The planned complement of FSUP staff was not assigned until over a year and a half into its schedule. The whole change process was reduced almost to a halt during key investigations in the institutions. These factors have clearly contributed to delays in the reform process and achieving original ambitions.
- *Donor views:* Views amongst the various donors and the Government of Uganda differed initially about the 'shape' and approach of the change process, slowing initial funding agreements. The administrative burden of processing funding has also caused some delays. When momentum and interest in change is already challenging to maintain, hold-ups are a major problem. Relationships within and between donor organisations, and changing donor

perspectives, have also influenced progress. Donor approaches differ in terms of funding flexibility and procedures\*, policies and priorities, and with different personalities, making the shift to co-ordination and 'pooled' funding difficult.

- *Extra-sectoral politics*: National government decisions have had enormous impacts on the forest sector change process in Uganda. For example, the decision to introduce a National Forestry Authority in place of the Forest Department contributed to FD instability and staff insecurity, creating rather rocky foundations to the change process, but providing the push that was not possible from within the FD. More recently, Government election schedules have placed pressure on issues to be resolved in a different sequence to that originally planned. For example, forthcoming elections in June mean that any Acts not put through before it will not be dealt with for several months afterwards. Congested Cabinet and Parliamentary timetables have already delayed consideration of a new Forest Act, which needs to be in place before the NFA is established. This means there is prioritised pressure to get the new Forestry Act in place before the election, so that the nfp can fit into an institutional framework and progress, which takes much effort and time of FSUP management in lobbying.

Whilst some of these issues are inevitably country-specific, some will strike a chord in many countries. Key lessons from Uganda are that high-level support has been essential, especially in a process of fairly radical reform that takes time and political sensitivity, and can be prickly for many stakeholders who would do better from keeping the status quo. A lack of clarity of approach and flexibility, to respond to changing situations, amongst promoters of change can undermine the process.

## NFPS AND TRANSFORMATION PROCESSES

### *The Kotter model of transformation processes*

As noted, nfps are typically part of a wider change process within the sector. Kotter (1995) noted that transformation processes typically go through a series of phases that, in total, usually require considerable time. Missing, rushing or making mistakes in any of the steps can result in a failure of the whole process. This model emerged out of a corporate setting, but the key issues extend across all sectors. Applying it to organisational transformation in relation to nfp processes could be a way of analysing success or likelihood of success of sectoral change and thereby achieving policy outcomes. Table 2 outlines Kotter's eight key phases and comments on their relevance in nfp processes. Hopley and Shields (2000) used the Kotter model as a means of assessing progress with process level "software"\* changes within an operational unit of a State forestry department in India.

Nfps are typically about planning activities – involving prioritising, mobilising and focusing usually limited resources - to address the needs to achieve forest sector reforms. Institutional issues are about transformation, usually within government organisations, of roles and responsibilities to respond to changing needs and effectively implement the nfp. But do/can nfps include statements on strategies by which institutions will be transformed to meet the requirement of their new role within a growing and changing sector?

---

\* For example, some donors can only put money through government organisations, others cannot put money directly into government organisations.

\* "Software" refers to approaches to management, attitudes and relationships, in contrast to the "hardware" of written policy etc..

### ***Comparing approaches to developing nfps***

How do approaches to nfp formulation processes and products in different countries match this kind of change model? In LTS' experience, approaches taken in different countries may vary in terms of which elements in this model are prioritised. Table 3 summarises these, and highlights where the nfp process can be seen to fit into the model.

There is a commonly recognised need for institutional transformation within nfps. The processes involved in developing an nfp can be either stimulated by or result in institutional change. However, few nfps explicitly include a clear action strategy towards institutional issues. In most cases, a strategy is critical if objectives of the nfp are to be met.

Table 2. Nfps and Kotter's model - a framework for change

<b>Kotter's transformation phases</b>	<b>Relevance in developing successful/sustainable nfps</b>
<p>1. <i>Creating a sense of urgency to change.</i> Without a 'critical mass' of recognition of need to change, <i>motivation</i> to drive, accept and implement changes will be limited.</p>	Has the nfp process grown out of internally (i.e. within a government forestry institution) recognised real needs and crisis, or responded to external pressures and suggestions?
<p>2. <i>Creation or existence of a powerful change team.</i> Change needs to be driven by an adequately high ranking group of people, working together as a team.</p>	Is there a set of key players with a common view within the government forest institution to drive the process, rather than individuals with conflicting views? Is the team outside the normal hierarchy of management ?
<p>3. <i>Developing a clear vision.</i> This needs to clarify the objectives to all involved, to capture imagination, inspire and motivate. Thick documents should be avoided.</p>	Is the shared vision of the forest institution for the sector consistent with that of other stakeholders (i.e. is there a working consensus)? Has the forest institution been able to derive from that a clear sense of the implications for their organisation, about the changes required and the strategy by which the change can be managed?
<p>4. <i>Communication of the vision.</i> This should widely promote the belief that change is possible, useful and positive in the long-term.</p>	How wide and deep is the understanding of the vision and strategy within the organisation? Has the nfp process touched everyone?
<p>5. <i>Empower people to act on the vision.</i> Obstacles can be due to: organisational structures; individual resistances to change; effort and reward factors.</p>	Is the common view realistic and achievable? Is there political, economic and social will to change? Have obstacles been identified and can they be removed?
<p>6. <i>Plan in short-term successes.</i> Without evidence of 'wins' in the short- and medium-term people will lose interest. These should be planned into the process.</p>	Is this factored in - does the nfp recognise where the 'easy wins' might be and make the most of them to improve and build commitment and support for change?
<p>7. <i>Consolidating and continuing change.</i> Change systems, structures and policies to meet the vision; reinvigorate the process with emergent themes and goals; involve dynamic change leaders.</p>	The first success does not mean the change process is complete. Perceptions that it does can remove momentum for further reflection and changes.
<p>8. <i>Institutionalise new approaches</i> Ensure people see the links between change and improvements (outcomes); maintain the right kind of leadership.</p>	Does the nfp recognise that change will bring about the need for new systems, approaches and institutions? Can new approaches become 'the norm'?

(Adapted from Kotter 1995)

## THE ROLE OF NFPS IN WIDER CHANGE PROCESSES

### ***Planning for change***

In reality, nfps appear to usually be the first step towards a much longer change processes - they are (directly or indirectly) a strategy for managing the change process. As such, nfp's may constitute only the first 3 or 4 steps of Kotter's model, rarely taking the process beyond vision creation and perhaps communication. This may not be a problem - it could be argued that change management can be tackled through nfp implementation. In Malawi, whilst there has been no clear organised transformation dimension to the nfp, some elements have been put in place without explicit planning. But in the long-term can nfp implementation be successful without at least some consideration of all 8 steps within the nfp?

Removal of barriers to implementation of the vision can be seen as a key point to be addressed in the nfp. One common major barrier to change is institutional resistance to change. Reform aims to bring positive benefits, but change also inevitably brings losses to some. This fear builds an inertia and grasping to status quo. Another typical barrier is the influence of 'political realities', which the Uganda case study highlighted and can be difficult to remove.

Given that institutional change is clearly a long-term process, then management of transformation needs to be (wherever possible) an integral part of nfp formulation and clearly addressed within it to at least begin to remove obstacles. The political sensitivities surrounding institutional change in some places may be too strong to allow a head on approach, making it better for recognition of the need for transformation to emerge in a more subtle way from the nfp process. However, without addressing change issues in some way at an early stage, in the nfp, the issues are likely to impact negatively on implementation, causing delays and possibly deadlocks.

### ***Generating future vision***

Success of nfps may depend on what is in them but also on what energy and shared vision is generated through the process. Some have done this more effectively than others. Without real and widespread commitment to change, the transformation is unlikely to succeed and an nfp could fall into the trap of simply reinforcing the status quo. Stakeholders who see the nfp as a way to reshape their future will produce and gain more from the process than those who see it as another fad which can generate projects and donor income.

### ***Fundamental or academic fad?***

A 'national forest programme' can be any kind of national forest sector planning process. In different countries they might have very different history, instigation, form, context, content, support, timeframes, etc.:. They are probably not defined enough to be seen as a fad - the concept does not promote a stringent route through a process, but rather encourages its drivers to find an appropriate path. The common factor is that they are a conceptual *approach to change* that includes participation and learning between local stakeholders, and they assist recognition of needs for the approach to be successful, acceptable and sustainable.

Nfps are a potentially fundamental way to approach institutional change, providing a framework for effective action planning based in reality, whether they are an instigation or a vehicle for change. Considering a transformation model such as Kotter's may help those driving nfps to think through the full length of the change process.

What is important to realise is that the nfp is a new concept, and, by its very nature, it will evolve. Learning from emerging experience is important, but it is also important to avoid drawing strong conclusions from the early outcomes of just a few. However, the role of nfps in

providing lessons for institutional change needs were highlighted in FAO's survey even in 1996 (FAO 1996). Watching and shaping these trends may be useful in monitoring nfp processes.

Table 3. Comparing approaches

Kotter's transformation phases	Uganda's nfp (through the FSUP)	Malawi's nfp	India's NFAP
1. Creating a sense of urgency to change.	Grew out of national level political will for sector reform to reflect changing GoU priorities, including a stronger poverty focus, decentralisation, and increased participation indecision making.	Major push for the nfp came from changes in the wider political foci and a need to operationalise the new Forest Policy and Act. Early efforts to create a sense of urgency for institutional change were limited to a small number of FD and NGO personnel and a couple of donor supporters - the more broadly recognised need for organisational reform emerged from the nfp process.	Process has had limited impact on creating urgency for institutional change, in part due to the protracted nature of the process and emphasis on investment needs rather than changes in institutional arrangements.
2. Creation or existence of a powerful change team.	Change team created through the head of the Secretariat, with staff recruited on the open market to bring in the necessary motivation and forward-thinking, unavailable in the entrenched FD	A change team has emerged from the nfp process, with a reasonably cohesive vision amongst the key thinkers.	Little evidence of change teams at central or state levels has emerged as a result of the SAFAP/NFAP process. Limited multi-stakeholder consultations on either SFAP or NFAP has not catalysed any external forum to support or drive change within government.
3. Developing a clear vision. (including implementation and change strategy)	This has been created through the team, supported by strong levels of co-ordination and external support.	A vision of the future of the forest sector in general has been developed amongst key role players, and there is an emerging strategy for the institutional change required to make the nfp happen. However, there is no output level statement on change - for example, what type of organisation the FD is aspiring to be, and by when - in order for it to play its role in nfp implementation.	Numerous statements on the desired future state, but no direct related statement on what institutional change might be required to support that future state. Institutional issues concerning re-structuring and transformation are 'hidden' within the NFAP, which lacks a clear and coherent statement of goals, purpose and outputs.
4. Communication of the vision.	The vision has been successfully communicated to players outside the Forestry Department, but there is still some weakening resistance to change with the FD - the benefits of change are only gradually being understood well enough to outweigh the <i>status quo</i> , as more come on board.	Whilst the nfp has created a vision, there is a need for wider sharing of this within the State forestry institutions, NGOs, CBOs and the private sector, which need to accept and develop the changes that the nfp processes has identified as necessary.	Not everyone within the FD are fully aware of the recognised needs for institutional change.. SFAPs 'finalised' in 1996 are now somewhat outdated and redundant, NFAP calls for reviewing and updating

Kotter's transformation phases	Uganda's nfp (through the FSUP)	Malawi's nfp	India's NFAP
5. Empower people to act on the vision.	<p>Obstacles removed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGOs and private sector are included in decision-making and on-board the vision, for the first time in forestry.</li> <li>• Capacities to manage change being developed through FSUP with external inputs.</li> </ul> <p>Obstacles remaining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political will for change not shared within the FD</li> <li>• Forestry civil service staff continue to feel threatened.</li> </ul>	<p>Obstacles removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political support for change engendered by the nfp process.</li> <li>• Participation has increased the likelihood that smallholders, the private sector and CBOs will get involved and take action in the future of process.</li> </ul> <p>Obstacles remaining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the FD is still embedded in an institutional culture and set of procedures that constrain the pace of change.</li> <li>• Rapid pace of change encouraged by nfp is demanding – momentum will be difficult to maintain.</li> </ul>	<p>Obstacles removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NFAP recognises need for getting policy consistency, support and strong linkages with other parts of the government; but</li> </ul> <p>Obstacles remaining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of strategies for the desired 'attitudinal change' to make this happen.</li> <li>• no widespread efforts to take the NFAP to State levels and further develop SFAPs.</li> </ul>
6. Plan in short-term successes.	In process.	Immediate, short-term and longer-term priorities are identified in the nfp framework document. Success will depend on maintaining momentum and political support, and on more supporters continuing to come on board.	No clear strategy for change (see above) or obvious sense of the extent to which institutional change may need to precede large-scale investments.
7. Consolidating and continuing change.	<p>In process.</p> <p>New change teams and vision extension is slowly creating attitudinal shifts.</p> <p>Key challenge will be to ensure maintenance of wider perspective currently promoted by the co-ordination Secretariat, which includes public sector, civil society and private sector members..</p>	<p>The nfp is breaking down FD hierarchies and the 'process' element has been emphasised - the launched nfp document is not the end point, but a first step towards a dynamic strategy for change.</p> <p>The nfp process has <i>begun</i> the process of institutional change - promoting decentralisation and privatisation - this will reshape the future institutional framework.</p> <p>The nfp has recognised the need for institutional review.</p>	NFAP has not explicitly picked up on areas of ongoing change (e.g. developing shared vision, systems, and skills) within Indian forestry and considered how such positive developments can be consolidated, disseminated and taken to the next stage.
8. Institutionalise new approaches	In process.	Institutional change is not an explicit output of the nfp, but something that is planned for and pursued through many of its actions.	Currently there are weak linkages between innovation at 'local' levels and mainstreaming structures at central level.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR DONORS

### *New roles in 'technical assistance'*

The nature of assistance needed to support nfp processes is significantly different to past trends. A key issues is in recognising the timeframes necessary for change. Even where national political support is strong, developing and implementation of the first iteration of an nfp may take 10 years, especially where significant reform is required and part of the nfp. This has implications for donors in terms of consistency of staffing. Frequent changes of nfp support programme staff are undesirable when a consistency of perspective and support is required over time, from and within donors.

Donors must also recognise that change management and governmental reform is not always comfortable territory, and change can bring far-reaching ripple effects. Addressing this through facilitating and improving equitable access to transparent information for all stakeholders is increasingly recognised (see Ljungman and Nair 2001). Forestry is often influenced or dominated by what happens outside the sector and a comprehensive and holistic approach is required.

### *Building opportunities for catalysis*

Bearing this in mind, donor support does have the potential to catalyse an effective nfp process, if placed at the right place and the right time. A relatively short period of concentrated effort and confrontation of difficult (often institutional) issues can help to break through resistances and build enough internal momentum to carry the process on without too much external support. The challenge is in providing support at the right 'window of opportunity' for optimum impact, which might depend on low level support in the preparation phase, working towards attitudinal shift within government departments often strangled by inertia and resistance to real change.

Commitments to support should not be taken on without understanding of these issues and long-term vision. The current trend away from project to programme approaches reflects growing recognition of this.

*"You can change structure, you can change policies, but to change behaviour means changing vision and institutional culture - that takes much longer."*

Mamphela Ramphela, Managing Director, World Bank (Courier 2001)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express their thanks to all those who have contributed their thoughts for this paper, including: John Cantrill (LTS International); the Uganda FSPSP team and FSUP Co-ordination secretariat, including Mike Harrison, Bill Farmer and Justin Lokwiya; James Mayers (International Institute for Environment and Development, London).

## REFERENCES

- Courier (2001). *Meeting Point - There has to be life after poverty*. The Courier: the magazine of ACP-EU development co-operation, No. 184, January-February 2001, p3-5. European Commission, Brussels.
- FAO (1996) *Formulation, execution and revision of national forest programmes: Basic principles and operational guidelines*. UN Food and Agriculture Organisation, Rome. [www.fao.org/forestry/FODA/NFP](http://www.fao.org/forestry/FODA/NFP)

- Government of India. (1999) *National Forestry Action Programme - India*: Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, New Delhi, June 1999.
- Government of Malawi. (2001) *Malawi's National Forestry Programme: priorities for improving forestry and livelihoods*. Government of Malawi Department of Forestry, NFP Co-ordinating Unit, Lilongwe.
- Government of Uganda and DFID (1999) *Inception report*. Uganda Forest Sector policy and Strategy Project. 29 June 1999.
- Hobley, M. and Shields, D. (2000) *The Reality of Trying to Transform Structures and Processes: forestry in rural livelihoods*. Working paper 132, Sustainable Livelihoods Working Paper Series, Overseas Development Institute, London.
- Kotter, J.P. (1995) *Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail*. Harvard Business Review, March-April 1995, p59-67.
- Ljungman, L and Nair, C.S. (2001) *Changing perceptions on technical assistance in support of sustainable forest management*. Paper presented at the workshop on Financing Sustainable Forest Management, 22-25 January 2001, Oslo, Norway.  
[www.cifor.cgiar.org/fsfm/documents/papers](http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/fsfm/documents/papers)
- LTS International (2000) *Report of project management mission*. Uganda Forest Sector Policy and Strategy Project. Internal report.
- Mayers, J., Ngalande, J., Bird, P. and Sibale, B. (in prep) *Forestry Tactics: Lessons from Malawi's National Forestry Programme*. Policy That Works for Forests and People series, No.11. IIED, London.
- Savenije, H. (2000) *National Forest Programmes: From political concept to practical instrument in developing countries*. Theme studies Series 3, Forests, Forestry and Biological Diversity Support Group, National Reference Centre for Nature management (EC LNV), Wageningen, Netherlands.
- Uganda Forest Sector Policy and Strategy Project (UFSPSP) (Various) Quarterly monitoring reports to DFID. Unpublished reports.