

# **BASIS CRSP External Evaluation Panel Report, 1999**



**B A S I S**



**Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems**

May 2000

# **BASIS CRSP External Evaluation Panel Report, 1999**

## **Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems**

Provided by the BASIS Management Entity  
The Land Tenure Center  
1357 University Ave.  
Madison, WI 53715  
Tel: (608) 262-3657  
Fax: (608) 262-2141  
Email: [basis-me@facstaff.wisc.edu](mailto:basis-me@facstaff.wisc.edu)  
<http://www.wisc.edu/ltc/basis.html>

**May 2000**

This publication was made possible through support provided by the US Agency for International Development (USAID), under the terms of Grant No. LAG-A-00-96-90016-00.

All views, interpretations, recommendations, and conclusions expressed in this report are those of the external evaluators and not necessarily those of the supporting or cooperating institutions. This report has been formatted to conform with the *BASIS Reports* series but the contents have not been edited.

Produced on behalf of the Consortium for Applied Research on Market Access (CARMA) by the BASIS Management Entity, the Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin–Madison.

**CARMA members.** Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Wisconsin–Madison; Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID); Institute for Development Anthropology (IDA); Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS), University of Maryland; International Center for Research on Women (ICRW); International Resource Group (IRG); Land Tenure Center (LTC), University of Wisconsin–Madison; Land Tenure Service, Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO); Lincoln Institute of Land Policy; Michigan State University (MSU); Rural Development Institute (RDI); Rural Finance Program, the Ohio State University (OSU); Tuskegee University; Winrock Associates; Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University (IU); World Council of Credit Unions (WOCCU).

**Host-country institutions collaborating with CARMA.** *Central America:* Fundación Dr. Guillermo Manuel Ungo (FUNDAUNGO); Fundación para el Desarrollo Económico (FUNDE); Fundación Salvadoreña para el Desarrollo Económico y Social (FUSADES); Universidad Centro Americana (UCA). *Central Asia:* Cabinet of Ministers of the Uzbek Republic; Ministry of Agriculture and Management (Uzbekistan); Scriabin Agricultural Academy (Kyrgyzstan); Tashkent Institute of Irrigation and Agricultural Mechanization Engineers (TIAME); Uzbek Research Institute for Market Reform (URIRM); Uzbek Scientific-Production Center of Agriculture. *Greater Horn of Africa:* African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS); Institute of Development Research (IDR), Addis Ababa University; Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA); Tegemeo Institute of Agricultural Policy and Development of Egerton University. *Southern Africa:* Centre for Applied Social Science, University of Zimbabwe; Centre for Social Research, University of Malawi; Institute of Natural Resources (INR), University of Natal; Núcleo de Estudos da Terra (NET), Eduardo Mondlane University; Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAS), University of Western Cape.

# Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<b>FOREWORD</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>I. ROLE OF EXTERNAL EVALUATION PANEL</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Purpose	1
B. Previous Evaluation	1
C. Current Evaluation Process	1
D. Regional Site Visit Schedule	1
<b>II. MISSION AND PURPOSE OF THE BASIS CRSP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. 1998 BASIS CRSP EVALUATION UPDATE</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>IV. SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS</b>	<b>7</b>
A. El Salvador	7
B. Nicaragua	8
C. Horn of Africa	8
D. Southern Africa—Zimbabwe, Malawi, Mozambique (Water Program)	10
E. Southern Africa—Zimbabwe, South Africa, Namibia (Land Program)	11
<b>V. OVERALL EVALUATIONS AND FINDINGS</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>VI. RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>ANNEXES: BASIS CRSP FIELD EVALUATION REPORTS</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>ANNEX I: EL SALVADOR PROJECT</b>	<b>19</b>
A. Overview	19
B. Research Progress	19
C. Status	22
D. Specific Recommendations and Suggested Timeline	26
E. Appendix: Evaluation Process and Listing of Interviews	28
<b>ANNEX II: NICARAGUA PROJECT</b>	<b>31</b>
A. Overview	31
B. Research Progress	32
C. Status	33
D. List of Interviews, Description of Evaluation Process	36
<b>ANNEX III: GREATER HORN OF AFRICA REGIONAL PROGRAM</b>	<b>37</b>
A. Overview	37
B. Research Progress	38
C. Status	43
D. Recommendations and Issues to Consider	47
E. Appendix	50
<b>ANNEX IV: BROADENING ACCESS TO WATER RESOURCES IN SOUTHERN AFRICA</b>	<b>51</b>
A. Overview	51
B. Research Progress	52

C. Approaches or Methodologies	54
D. Impact Indicators	56
E. Status	57
F. Specific Recommendations	60
G. Appendix	63
H. Listing of interviews, description of the evaluation process	64
<b>ANNEX V: BROADENING ACCESS TO LAND MARKETS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA</b>	<b>65</b>
A. Overview	65
B. Research Progress	66
C. Progress Relative to Workplans— <i>Namibia</i>	66
D. Progress Relative to Workplans— <i>South Africa</i>	68
E. Status	70
F. Specific Recommendations	72
G. List of Interviews, Description of the Evaluation Process	73

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Comparing progress relative to workplans—Nicaragua	32
Table 2: Comparing progress relative to workplans—Horn of Africa	38
Table 3: Comparing progress relative to workplans—Southern Africa	52
Table 4: Comparing progress relative to workplans—Namibia	66
Table 5: Comparing progress relative to workplans—South Africa	68

## FOREWORD

In the final analysis, people are what matter. The underlying objective of the BASIS CRSP is to improve lives via research activities which relate to issues that impact the basic quality of life. It is for this reason that the members of the External Evaluation Panel committed to undertake this evaluation process.

The Members of the External Evaluation Panel are as follows:

- David Abler, Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, Pennsylvania State University
- Elizabeth Dunn, Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Missouri-Columbia
- Allen Featherstone, Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, Kansas State University
- Angelique Haugerud, Associate Professor, Department of Anthropology, Rutgers University
- Chair, B. Jean Ruley Kearns, Professor, University of Arizona, and Executive Director Consortium for International Development

The efforts which were expanded in order to prepare this evaluation report were objective, honest, and performed in order to provide assistance to the BASIS CRSP and to USAID. In a work of this size and magnitude, there must be mistakes, typos, misspeaks, but such mistakes should be viewed as inadvertent and, we hope, do not impact the value of the document.

The conclusion, findings, and recommendations in this evaluation are based on data current at the time that each field visit was performed. Progress or changes may have taken place after the field visits and that possibility should be taken into consideration when reviewing this evaluation.

It is important to note that one regional program did not receive a field visit. Namely, the Southern Africa Water Program (Zimbabwe/Malawi/Mozambique) was evaluated without a site visit due to an emergency medical problem by the EEP Member (Kearns) scheduled to make the visit. Due to timing constraints it was agreed that the Southern Africa Water Program would be evaluated based on a desk review relying basically on document/report reviews and input from the Principal Investigator for the program. It was further agreed that in order to present a complete evaluation of the Southern Africa Water Program that an EEP member will conduct a site visit to the area later in the year. After the site visit the present Evaluation Report will be revised to reflect the information acquired through the site visit.

Finally, the Panel thanks the Principal Investigators:

- Michael Carter, Principal Investigator, Land Market Liberalization Project in Central America
- Claudio Gonzalez-Vega, Principal Investigator, El Salvador
- Peter Little, Research Program Leader, Greater Horn of Africa Region
- Pauline Peters, Research Program Leader, Southern Africa Region

Their input and assistance with the data analysis is greatly appreciated. The staff of the Management Entity led by Dr. Mike Roth and including Danielle Hartmann, Kurt Brown,

Marsha Cannon, Patty Grubb, Carole Karsten, and Tara Roffler are thanked and sincere appreciation is hereby expressed for their hard work. Frankly, without their good-natured support the field trips could not have been planned or implemented. Even more important relative to this evaluation process, the ME staff and Sara Herpolsheimer are thanked for generating and distributing project documents and for typing, formatting, and preparing this report.

B. Jean Ruley Kearns

BASIS CRSP EEP Chair

# **I. ROLE OF EXTERNAL EVALUATION PANEL**

## **A. PURPOSE**

According to the USAID CRSP guidelines, an External Evaluation Panel (EEP) is to be part of each CRSP. The responsibility of the EEP is to evaluate the status, funding, progress, plans, and prospects of the CRSP research program, and to make recommendations about that program. The EEP is to play a strong role in judging the balance of a CRSP and relevance of each project activity to the overall program goals. The Panel should evaluate the performance and productivity of each institution involved on each project annually and assess the appropriateness of planned resource allocation.

The objective views and expertise of the EEP is a critical part of the balance which must exist between possible conflicting but natural institutional biases which may be part of the CRSP. It is important for the EEP members to learn as much about the work of the CRSP as possible.

## **B. PREVIOUS EVALUATION**

The first EEP evaluation of the BASIS CRSP was conducted in August 1998 by Panel members Dr. Sara Berry and Dr. Jean Ruley Kearns. The 1998 evaluation reviewed activities of the CRSP for the period of 1996-1998. Reference is made to the 1998 report in Section III.

## **C. CURRENT EVALUATION PROCESS**

The present evaluation had as its primary goal to assess the CRSP activity based on a multi-year perspective. In addition to reviewing documents and reports, the EEP members interviewed relevant personnel. However, the backbone of the present evaluation was the series of regional site visits. The purpose of the site visits was to observe the BASIS research work firsthand and to interview the researchers, donors, and local officials at each research site.

The Panel met in early January 2000 to discuss the evaluation process and to determine scheduling and the reporting timetable. Details relative to the overall CRSP program were discussed and documents were reviewed. Following the January meeting, Panel members implemented the site visits and completed the reporting process.

## **D. REGIONAL SITE VISIT SCHEDULE**

The Panel members conducted the following site visits (see the Annexes for site visit reports).

### **Central America:**

- David Abler, Nicaragua, February 1-4, 2000
- Elizabeth Dunn, El Salvador, March 20-24, 2000

### **Southern Africa:**

- Allen Featherstone, South Africa/Namibia, March 4-12, 2000



- Jean Kearns, Zimbabwe/Malawi/Mozambique. (This site visit did not take place. A desk evaluation was conducted by Jean Kearns and Angelique Haugerud. A site visit to the area is planned for later in 2000)

**Horn of Africa:**

- Jean Kearns, Ethiopia, November 1-6, 1999, in conjunction with the Horn of Africa Regional Workshop: Agricultural Policy, Resource Access and Human Nutrition

## **II. MISSION AND PURPOSE OF THE BASIS CRSP**

In September 1996, USAID awarded the Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems (BASIS) Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP) to the University of Wisconsin–Madison’s Land Tenure Center, of the Consortium for Applied Research on Market Access (CARMA).

The BASIS CRSP was designed to conduct collaborative research and training on ways to improve access to and efficiency of land, water, labor, and financial markets in Africa, Eastern Europe and Eurasia, and Latin America. In support of USAID’s Center for Economic Growth and Agricultural Development, Office of Agriculture and Food Security, the BASIS CRSP seeks to:

- improve access to and allocation of land, water, labor and financial resources to enhance food security, economic growth and sustainable resource management
- strengthen partnership through collaborative research, training and capacity building
- enable or promote policy and program interventions through effective synthesis, training, communication, and research dissemination

Through its regional study of market access and through the application of global lessons, BASIS research aims to stimulate economic and agrarian growth in developing countries leading to more effective access and use of resources, particularly for the poor.

BASIS is organized around certain policy problems: market liberalization without growth and/or with widening income disparity; economic growth that is biased by gender, ethnic, racial, or other social difference; constraints of management and institutional innovation.

Priorities for research are achieved through collaboration with professionals in the regions where BASIS research and training take place. BASIS emphasizes collaborative research, training and capacity building.

BASIS focuses on applied, policy-relevant research. It implements its programs through collaborative and jointly-designed programs of research between U.S. and host country counterparts, including researchers, policymakers and community-based organizations.



### III. 1998 BASIS CRSP EVALUATION UPDATE

EEP Recommendation	Status (as of April 2000)
<b>Research Framework:</b>	
Clarify research objectives, especially in the areas of:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• institutional change</li> </ul>	In progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• research capacity building</li> </ul>	In progress
Specify themes for comparison across regional programs (star diagram)	Approach to Rural Development created
Determine if and when to drop a program	Policy established
The results as currently stated in the proposals are weak. Specify long-term (5-year) results anticipated and shorter-term (1- year) intermediate results.	Approach to Rural Development created. Efforts are being made to encourage more results oriented reporting, specifically in the Activities Report, summarizing worked accomplished.
Make link between BASIS objectives and USAID objectives more clear and explicit.	Approach to Rural Development created
Demonstrate CRSP contributions to country/regional mission objectives in agriculture and non-agriculture related areas.	In progress
RPLs should provide information regarding institutionalization in their Annual Activity reports.	See Third Annual Report
Make explicit the institutional constraints on and contributions to factor market access and document changes in volume and distribution of factor market transactions in estimating their effects on output, productivity, and income. State what type of information will be collected	Indicators identified in Approach to Rural Development
<b>Research Management:</b>	
Determine TC leadership, role and responsibilities of TC	Policy formalized
Determine role and responsibilities of RPLs v. PIs.	Role drafted

<b>IQCs:</b>	
Establish guidelines for decision making for CRSP and IQC relationship	Attempted, <i>CRSP and IQC Liaison Guidelines</i> drafted
Develop management structure to work with IQC/CRSP relationship	Attempted, <i>CRSP and IQC Liaison Guidelines</i> drafted
<b>Financial:</b>	
Review other donor possibilities with BOD and prioritize funding possibilities for RPLs. Approach?	Targeted possible donors in regions where BASIS is active.
Consider preparing high and low budget proposals for USAID review	Program director has resisted further complicating the budget process by instituting high-low ranking system. Instead, implemented ranking of activities and clearly identifying which sub-activities correspond with which budget line items so that changes can address budget fluctuations more accurately.
<b>Communication/Publication:</b>	
Increase collaboration/cooperation among CARMA members, especially through communication. Suggestions?	The ME has maintained its support of a full-time Program Coordinator to assist in addressing this issue. In addition, the ME has increased resource, where possible to outreach activities. Specific changes have been implemented including: web-first outputs policy and monthly digest
Establish guidelines for communication with USAID country and regional missions: publications, email, face-to-face meetings, visits to DC, outreach, results framework.	In progress. All Missions in countries where BASIS is active receive the Annual Report. When BASIS researchers are travelling in country, the Mission is contacted and a briefing is offered regarding the status of the project.
Develop procedure/guidelines for communication with USAID Program Officer	No formal guidelines have been established, but the ME is in frequent communication with the Program Officer and more frequent trips have been made to Washington, DC for face-to-face meetings.
Evaluate publications: to whom? How should be published? Web or hard copy?	In progress

## **IV. SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS**

This section provides a summary of the site visits conducted by EEP members and the resulting recommendations of the EEP. Complete Field Evaluation Reports are included as Annexes to this report. Please refer to these Field Reports for further explanation and detail of the research projects and recommendations.

### **A. EL SALVADOR**

#### **1. Status**

The BASIS CRSP program in El Salvador, established in 1997, focuses on the interaction of land, labor, and financial markets and their impact on poverty and resource conservation. The research analyzes the performance of these markets in an effort to increase access of the poor to factor markets and sustainable livelihoods. In addition, the research agenda seeks to explain the dynamics of poverty and causes of resource degradation on hillsides. Work on innovation in rural lending strategies seeks to broaden access to financial services by the rural poor.

The program in El Salvador has been a model of collaborative relationships, information and capacity building, and policy influence. It has improved the skills of local researchers, created a unique and valuable data set, and has the potential to generate results that are regionally relevant and can contribute strongly to global synthesis of the BASIS findings. The BASIS El Salvador program has also enjoyed strong support from the USAID/El Salvador mission and the government of El Salvador, and has catalyzed a national focus on rural poverty.

There are several important features of this project. The bi-annual rural household data set is the first of its kind in El Salvador. The collaborators come from a broad range of ideological backgrounds, with the BASIS CRSP project being the first time that they have ever worked together. The research is helping to focus national public attention on the issue of poverty.

As a great deal of data is being collected, greater attention is needed on disseminating the information so that others can benefit from its availability. This will be an on-going process, but to ensure that momentum is continued and that the current policy focus is maintained, innovative tools for disseminating research findings are necessary.

#### **2. Recommendations**

- Provide contractual incentives for timely reporting.
- Post the Salvadoran studies on the BASIS website.
- Clarify and strengthen linkages between the CRSP and the IQC.
- Make panel data and documentation publicly accessible.
- Strengthen role of non-FUSADES local collaborators.
- Increase opportunities for technical advising.
- Formalize knowledge transfer.

- Find innovative tools for disseminating research findings.
- Build smooth transition at USAID/El Salvador.
- Continue collection and refinement of the panel data.
- Maintain the current policy focus.

## **B. NICARAGUA**

### **1. Status**

During the past 10 years Latin American countries have implemented sweeping policy reforms that have led to the emergence of economic systems based on market orientation, openness, and competitiveness. A remarkable feature of these historically significant events is that they have taken place under democratic rule in virtually every country in the region. Honduras, Mexico, and Nicaragua have all undergone major reforms that have markedly reshaped the system of property rights regulating use, ownership, and transferability of rural land.

This research project supported by both the World Bank and the BASIS CRSP investigates how recent market-friendly reforms in these three countries have affected the lives of the rural poor. The research will determine if liberalized rural property rights and factor markets enhance income, land access and accumulation potential of the poor while promoting more efficient resource allocation.

The Nicaragua component of the project is the first to be implemented in January 2000. In Nicaragua, BASIS is collaborating with the Fundación Internacional para El Desafío Económico Global (FIDEG), the Nicaraguan Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAG), and the World Bank on a nationwide farm household survey. The purpose of the survey is to shed light on the impacts of land titling in Nicaragua, on access to credit by members of farm households, particularly women, and on the degree to which farm households require access to credit in order to be able to take advantage of the benefits of land titling.

As the project has so recently been implemented, the EEP evaluation is timely to help ensure that plans are set for future results to be useful.

### **2. Recommendations**

- Make plans now for seminars to disseminate the survey findings.
- Make plans now for a report on the survey findings.
- Bear in mind certain caveats as the survey data are analyzed.

## **C. HORN OF AFRICA**

### **1. Status**

The Greater Horn of Africa—Ethiopia in particular—is one of the most food-deprived regions of the world. The BASIS Horn of Africa program, the largest program of the CRSP, seeks to identify ways to improve food availability and nutrition in the region and broaden access by the

poor and socially disadvantaged to factor markets and sustainable resources through multiple projects.

The core activity, “From Household to Region: Factor Market Constraints to Income and Food Security in a Highly Diverse Environment–South Wollo, Ethiopia” is a five-year, integrated study of the social and economic causes of food insecurity at intrahousehold, household, community, and regional levels in South Wollo, Ethiopia. The activity addresses critical questions of rural output and factor markets, on the one hand, and the dynamics of household access to farm and non-farm incomes (“entitlement”), on the other.

The Cross-Border Trade study is a two-year study of regional cross-border trade (livestock and grain) and food security. It is the first systematic study of the topic in the region. BASIS research aims to inform policymakers about the importance of cross-border trade for regional economic development and food security, and to reduce constraints on cross-border trade in one key commodity–livestock–in the region.

BASIS undertook the case study research in “Linking Agriculture to Human Nutrition: A Gender-Based Analysis of Institutional Initiatives and Experiences,” to shed light on *how* institutions use integrated approaches to improve household food security. Researchers study 13 projects in Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda to determine factors that make their respective approaches work and why.

Through support from USAID/REDSO, a 3-day regional workshop, “Agricultural Policy, Resource Access and Human Nutrition” was scheduled for November 3-5, 1999 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The purpose of the workshop was to begin a productive dialogue, to provide a forum to share ideas and experiences on linkages between agricultural policy, resource access and the nutritional status of poor and vulnerable groups in the Horn of Africa region. The workshop also was an ideal time for the EEP member to travel to the region to meet many of the researchers who came together in one location.

With the exception of a couple of activities, all of the activities appear to be on schedule. The delays are due to border conflicts and the war. Recent famine will impact the work of the project but the information on which this assessment was based occurred prior to the 2000 famine.

## **2. Recommendations**

- The need for publication of results and/or methodologies is urgent. Research needs to be published in a timely basis.
- Multi-year workplans should be prepared for multi-year programs. Updates on an annual basis should be required but full annual workplans for multi-year programs utilizes time which may be better used elsewhere.

Thematic conferences relative to cross regional work should be proposed to focus on “lessons learned” as well as broader research topics.

- It is important to encourage the involvement of non-CRSP groups in joint funding situations whenever possible.
- It is important that the African and U.S. researchers operate in a full partnership. It is recommended that the Program Leader continue his open and cooperative work which is the basis for the researchers’ relationship.



- BASIS publications should be distributed to the African researchers with enough copies so that at least one could be filed in a relevant library.
- Non-gender-specific research activities should be examined in the planning stage and gender (BASIS crosscutting theme) issues should be incorporated as relevant.
- BASIS research related to the pastoralists should be synthesized so as to develop a series of recommendations for policy development.
- BASIS standing groups (Technical Committee, Board, etc.) should be scheduled a year in advance in order to foster planning and linkages with other groups.
- Consideration should be given to restructuring Technical Committee meetings.

It is important to assure that information about BASIS be made available to USAID officers and missions on a timely basis which meets the needs of their schedules.

## **D. SOUTHERN AFRICA—ZIMBABWE, MALAWI, MOZAMBIQUE (WATER PROGRAM)**

### **1. Status**

Involving Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and Malawi, the water resources project is designed to inform policy on water resource management—particularly decentralized management systems—in the context of ongoing water sector reform in all three countries and in the region as a whole. The research examines current patterns of water management in contexts where water is an exceedingly scarce resource and where there is increasing competition over its use and control.

Each country participating in the Southern Africa water project is involved in national level reforms to establish new policies, procedures, and decentralized management structures for water resources. Access to water is highly constrained in the region and projected to become even more so in the coming decades. An important element in the BASIS research on water resources is to identify and consult with key groups or categories of water users and rights holders who have an interest in and/or will be affected by policy change.

The work proposed by the project for FY2000 includes the following:

The **Malawi water project** FY2000 workplan proposes to finalize agency agreements in Chilwa basin, survey users, assess quantity and quality of water used, and analyze cases of competitive use and conflict over water.

The **Mozambique water project** FY2000 workplan proposes to select a sample of various categories of users, train assistants, survey users, evaluate conflicts and conflict resolution, and analyze policies.

The **Zimbabwe water program** FY2000 workplan proposes to interview policy-makers and implementers of reform; review policy documents; train assistants in database management; and conduct studies of use and impacts of reform to identify access by the disadvantaged to resources, factor markets, food security, and livelihoods.

The project has managed to continue through the crisis situation in Southern Africa. Continued progress in Zimbabwe may be questionable at least during the upcoming few months due to travel advisories by the British Government and travel warnings by the government of the U.S.A.

As the conflict in the area becomes more widespread and since some of the basic reasons for the conflict (land and water) relate directly to the project, research progress may be very difficult.

## **2. Recommendations**

- A U.S. PI has not yet been designated to work with the Mozambican team and the adequacy of this situation needs to be examined during the upcoming site visit.
- Disbursing funds in the area has been a problem. If possible, this issue should be addressed.
- Communication problems of a hardware nature is a problem in the area.
- The lack of trained personnel at all levels is a common problem in most of the area. Training needs to happen but BASIS does not have the necessary funding to complete the training needed.
- It is important to encourage and support collaborative research, exchange and information sharing across country borders.
- It would be beneficial to both Southern African students and to U.S. students to increase their involvement in the research program.
- Strategy relative to the restraining funding issue must be addressed soon.

## **E. SOUTHERN AFRICA—ZIMBABWE, SOUTH AFRICA, NAMIBIA (LAND PROGRAM)**

### **1. Status**

The goal of the Southern Africa land project is to inform policy recommendations aimed at broadening access to land markets and encouraging sustainable use of farmland acquired by disadvantaged people in South Africa, Namibia, and Zimbabwe. The ultimate aim is to evaluate the various means by which farmland is transferred and ultimately used with a specific focus on the well being of disadvantaged people. Specifically, the rate at which farmland is redistributed—both as a result of private transactions and public land reform programs—in selected regions of each country is being examined. In addition, the relationships between land tenure, managerial arrangements, farm and household characteristics, access to credit, investment in agriculture, land use and rural livelihoods on redistributed farmland are important components of the data collection and analysis.

Another objective was to develop local research capacity in the process of the completion of the BASIS research. The proposed research is to span a period of five years with annual census surveys of farmland transactions, sample surveys of households using redistributed farmland, and a series of workshops and reports to refine methodology and reports to refine methodology and disseminate findings. The long-term approach should allow local researchers to become more proficient in research collection and analysis.

In South Africa, several schemes for land reform ranging from those that are heavily government-driven to those which are heavily private sector-driven are in close proximity providing an ideal climate for comparative analysis. In Namibia and Zimbabwe, the issues are no less acute but are more difficult in that basic data on exact ownership patterns and how those ownership patterns are changing are unavailable. Thus, BASIS researchers in Namibia and

Zimbabwe needed to do much more preliminary work before the ultimate goals of the research stated above could be achieved.

## **2. Recommendations**

- More research opportunity exists than researcher effort available. Therefore it is suggested that creative mechanisms be developed for linking potential researchers (U.S. or non-U.S. students) with available projects.
- In general, the use of common methods across countries is to be encouraged to increase comparability. However, the partners were not on an equal footing going into the project, thus, progress was not made at the same rate. Therefore, the common methodology is probably a little too rigid to work well. In addition, funds were not available to allow common methodology to develop given the status of electronic communications.
- There needs to be a distinction between deductive versus inductive collaboration. A more inductive type of approach probably needs to be followed at this point for Southern Africa given the funding base.
- It is also imperative to provide more lead-time to adjust to structural changes in renewals.

## V. OVERALL EVALUATIONS AND FINDINGS

A number of strengths and accomplishments can be gleaned from the evaluations of individual activities currently supported by BASIS:

1. The BASIS CRSP by its 4<sup>th</sup> year of operations has implemented research programs in four regions, is managing add-ons totaling +/- \$650,000 in year four, has cumulatively to date incorporated more than 50 organizations in BASIS funded research programs, and has engaged researchers in a broad network of collaboration and partnership.
2. BASIS programs are employing innovative methodologies. In El Salvador, Nicaragua and the Horn of Africa, longitudinal surveys are tracking paths that individual households follow in and out of poverty. Research in all sites spans a wide range of ideological backgrounds and disciplines. Research in El Salvador, the Horn of Africa and Namibia is linking data collection with GPS coordinates that are utilizing state of the art spatial analysis.
3. BASIS programs have been successful in connecting with USAID mission and regional bureaus, particularly for work on poverty in El Salvador, land reform in Zimbabwe, and food security in Ethiopia and the Horn of Africa. The number of add-ons obtained to date validates evidence that BASIS research is demand driven. However, USAID missions have also indicated vocal support for the BASIS CRSP (for example, Mary Ott's presentation on Poverty in El Salvador to the USAID Administrator based on BASIS data).
4. BASIS programs are contributing to policymaking. In El Salvador, FUSADES has given presentations of BASIS results to economics and social cabinet ministers in El Salvador and the Central Bank. Water research in Southern Africa is linking with the National Water Authority and the Water Resources Management Group in Zimbabwe, and the Lake Chilwa Project in Malawi.

BASIS programs have been successful in enabling collaboration and strengthening capacity of host country researchers and their counterpart organizations including *inter alia* FIDEG in Nicaragua, FUSADES in El Salvador, CSR in Malawi, NET in Mozambique, CASS in Zimbabwe, the IDR in Ethiopia, and OSSREA for the Horn of Africa region.

Nevertheless, there are also a number of problems and constraints that are affecting the technical mission of the CRSP:

1. Capacity constraints. Both the Horn of Africa and Southern Africa report serious capacity constraints including problems reporting finances and disbursing funds in Ethiopia, turnover of key personnel in Southern Africa, lack of a US principal investigator in the Mozambique program, and time lost when researchers are hired as consultants on other projects.
2. Training. Although BASIS has done good job strengthening capacity through support of host country researchers in hands-on-training, workshops, conferences, and visiting scholarships to the US, the level of formal training is relatively low due principally to funding constraints. There are notable exceptions—the training of one graduate student from El Salvador at OSU and the training of young students in the water program in Mozambique, but such efforts are not sufficient to address the capacity constraints affecting the region.

3. Impacts. While most site visits report good progress in identifying and reporting results, the articulation, measurement and monitoring of impact indicators across program activities remains underdeveloped.
4. Overall benefits to the US. The site evaluations note how the US has economic, political and humanitarian interests in enhancing growth and reducing poverty in Nicaragua and Southern Africa. The site evaluations also underscore the global importance of land reform in Southern Africa, land titling in Nicaragua, and the applicability of the water research in Southern Africa for the arid areas of the US west. However, research has not reached the point of documenting or measuring these impacts. Overall, the factor market focus of the BASIS CRSP makes it more difficult to identify US benefits as directly as under the commodity CRSPs.

Cross Cutting themes. The crosscutting themes of gender, market integration and risk are being addressed to varying degrees in most sites, but work is not being carried out on synthesis, and crosscutting work in certain programs (the Horn of Africa) is weak.

Generally, the BASIS CRSP is progressing well. The research is moving forward in spite of limited resources, host country disasters, limited support staff in the host countries, and a slower than planned implementation. The strengths of the BASIS work lies in the involvement of excellent researchers, assistance of supporting institutions, meaningful linkages with non-U.S. institutions/researchers, and responsive management procedures.

The first five years of BASIS have contained many lessons which will be extremely useful as the program goes into the second phase.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

**Synthesis:** At this stage in the CRSP the synthesis work should be well underway. Currently the basic problems relative to preparing a synthesis series are (1) lack of leadership (two synthesis directors have resigned), and (2) there is still a lack of agreement between the BASIS CRSP and USAID on the scope and meaning of synthesis. The result is that a synthesis plan has not been fully formulated. The need to finalize a synthesis plan of work is immediate and the principals relative to this process are urged to reach agreement on this important issue.

Efforts have been made to synthesize the data (Labor Markets and Employment Strategies by Peter Little; Financial Markets and the Peri-Urban Economy in Maputo, Banjul and Accra by Douglas Graham; From Administrative Allocations to Commercial Land Transactions: Factor Market Constraints to Economic Growth in Three Peri-Urban Household Economies, by Michael Roth), but more is needed. In addition, the synthesis process must be overarching and should incorporate all aspects of the CRSP.

**Reporting:** A very useful procedural document prepared by the Management Entity and distributed to the researchers is the *BASIS Reporting Calendar with Due Dates* (undated). This document contains Reporting Guidelines, Workplan Guidelines, Annual Budget Guidelines, Reporting Guidelines and Proposal Guidelines. These procedures are detailed, well developed with due dates and relevant information.

The only recommendation about this document is one related to enhancement as the basic document is well done and should be continued. The recommendations are (1) add date (month and year) of distribution to the document, and (2) include wording which relates to crosscutting themes and directions for policymakers in sections related to workplans and reporting.

**Cross-cutting themes:** The value of crosscutting themes has been articulated in various BASIS reports and meetings. However, the adaptation of such themes is not readily apparent in the workplans presented by the regional plans. In some of the workplans certain topics are clearly identified as crosscutting themes (see Southern Africa) while in others, only the central research themes are listed (see Central America). In order for attention to be given to the crosscutting themes, then, there should be agreement and understanding among the researchers on the content of these themes, identification and agreement relative to a work approach and standardized reporting on the research accomplished in areas related to the themes.

One BASIS report which related to crosscutting themes was entitled *Improving Household Food Security*, by Charlotte Johnson-Welch et al., March 2000. While the information presented in the report was valuable, the conclusions and recommendations were framed too broadly to be of specific value to policymakers. A recommended subsequent follow-on needed relative to this report is a concise paper with specific recommended actions including phases, timing, and responsibilities with special emphasis on cross-sectoral actions.

In addition to developing research themes, the overall purpose of BASIS is to develop crosscutting issues. In order to assure that the work performed on these themes and issues are meaningful, a planned process of synthesis must be implemented. Specifically, the lessons learned and research findings which can be transferable must be distilled and presented in a synthesis document. Suggestions as to the theme presentations should be explored. Such a report would be most useful to USAID as well as other donors and government units. The importance

of such a report or reports to countries in emergency status (or recovering from an emergency) would be invaluable. As an example, the situations created by the recent famine in Ethiopia, flooding in Mozambique and land seizures in Zimbabwe provide unique opportunities to provide recommendations for action and policy development based on BASIS research. In order for the BASIS research to be utilized by policy developers and donors, the research has to be presented in a concise, usable form specifically developed for an audience of non-researchers who need the “bottom line” in order to develop policy with the assurance that sound research supports the recommendations.

**Publications:** The BASIS publications are well done. The need for research to be published is urgent. It is really important that research processes and results be recorded and published as soon as possible after the research is complete. In fact, it is equally important in some situations depending on the nature of the research, that publications be periodically produced which document the process of the research.

The value of research publications has been amply supported. However, the cost of review, production and distribution is relatively high. The amount of BASIS funds devoted to publications will rise significantly in the next several months. This will be due to the finalization of research activities and the need to extract information for documents usable by policymakers. In addition, the need for synthesis studies will require additional publications. A larger funding allocation will be required for the upcoming project phase. In order to realize the “pay off” of the BASIS work thus far, it will be necessary to get more funding for the preparation of publications.

**Impact Indicators:** More consideration and progress should be encouraged relative to developing a cohesive set of meaningful impact indicators. Assuming that this is a priority for USAID (and it should be), one recommendation that would be for the next phase of BASIS to explicitly require that a set of globally applicable impact indicators be created within the first period of the renewal. The set of indicators should be developed by a relatively small (3-4 people) subset of the BASIS CRSP technical committee, in collaboration with the USAID technical representative, then vetted with the TC. Once the list is honed and the indicators are well-defined, they could be circulated to the broader group of BASIS collaborators for comment. It might be advisable to pull in a consultant to this process, since there is both an art and a science to developing robust, valid, measurable, and cost-effective impact indicators. A common problem when a large group of inexperienced people try to develop a set of indicators is that they end up with an excessively long list, and they do not connect the conceptual indicators to specific empirical approaches.

## **ANNEXES: BASIS CRSP FIELD EVALUATION REPORTS**





# **ANNEX I: EL SALVADOR PROJECT**

**Prepared by: Elizabeth Dunn, EEP Member**

**Dates of Visit: March 20-24, 2000**

## **A. OVERVIEW**

The BASIS CRSP program in El Salvador, established in 1997, focuses on the interaction of land, labor, and financial markets and their impact on poverty and resource conservation. The research analyzes the performance of these markets in an effort to increase access of the poor to factor markets and sustainable livelihoods. In addition, the research agenda seeks to explain the dynamics of poverty and causes of resource degradation on hillsides. Work on innovation in rural lending strategies seeks to broaden access to financial services by the rural poor.

The program in El Salvador has been a model of collaborative relationships, information and capacity building, and policy influence. It has improved the skills of local researchers, created a unique and valuable data set, and has the potential to generate results that are regionally relevant and can contribute strongly to global synthesis of the BASIS findings. The BASIS El Salvador program has also enjoyed strong support from the USAID/El Salvador mission and the government of El Salvador, and has catalyzed a national focus on rural poverty.

## **B. RESEARCH PROGRESS**

### **1. Progress Relative to Workplans**

The research program appears to be following the research agenda described in the 1998 *Research Planning Framework: Central America Regional Program*. The research is also largely on target relative to the more recent *1999-2000 Work Plan*. More specifically, the panel data collection is proceeding according to schedule.

### **2. Approaches or Methodologies**

The approach for the research in El Salvador is for several diverse local and U.S. research groups to engage in long-term collaboration to conduct a panel survey, while assigning distinct areas of analysis to each group and/or to the individual researchers. The collaborating researchers meet periodically to revise the questionnaire, discuss research results, and to publicize and disseminate their findings to the broader community.

There are several innovative features of this project, including the following:

- The longitudinal data set being collected under the CRSP is the only panel data set of its kind in El Salvador, and allows the tracking of the paths that individual households follow in and out of poverty. As the only data set of its kind, it has attracted considerable attention from government ministries, USAID/El Salvador, the press, and local researchers.

- The local collaborators come from a broad range of ideological backgrounds. It is the first time since El Salvador's long and divisive civil war that such an ideologically diverse group of research organizations have worked together to share a significant, long-term stake in a common research program.
- The BASIS El Salvador research collaboration has placed rural poverty at the forefront of public attention and has provided a unique opportunity for ideologically conservative research groups to focus on rural poverty. The poverty theme of the BASIS research is critical, as it was a root cause of the civil war. Because the research findings on poverty are being reported by a coalition of ideologically diverse organizations, the findings are more credible to government policymakers as well as to a wider range of the general public.
- The current round of the longitudinal survey includes the collection and testing of drinking water samples and recording of GPS location information. This will allow analysis of the household data using GIS systems and the linking of water quality to economic and health variables.

### **3. Impact Indicators**

While the ultimate desired impacts of the BASIS CRSP in El Salvador include poverty alleviation, democratization, increased national productivity, the equalization of economic opportunity, and economic growth and development in general, it is not feasible to statistically link these impacts to the program. Instead, the potential impacts of the BASIS El Salvador research program must be inferred from measurable, effective program inputs.

The potential for creating impacts can be evaluated in four distinct areas: policy change, collaboration, capacity building, and scientific contribution. In each of these four areas, several impact indicators can be identified.

#### **Impacts on Policy Change**

- Number of public seminars and fora
- Number of newspaper articles, radio interviews, and television programs on BASIS findings
- Number of BASIS briefings to the Government of El Salvador (GOES), NGO, and commercial leaders
- Number of BASIS workshops for GOES, NGO, and commercial leaders
- Number of BASIS researchers appointed to work in government ministries
- Number of policies, programs, and reforms in the public and private sectors relying on BASIS-provided background information

#### **Impacts on Collaboration**

- Number of group or sub-group meetings of researchers from different local organizations
- Number of jointly sponsored seminars or workshops
- Number of papers co-authored by researchers from different collaborating organizations

### **Impacts on Capacity Building**

- Number of Salvadoran researchers employed through BASIS
- Number of technical meetings between U.S. researchers and local researchers
- Number of BASIS papers with significant authorship by Salvadoran researchers
- Number of U.S. and Salvadoran researchers earning advanced degrees while collaborating on BASIS research
- Number of Salvadoran researchers sponsored to attend international conferences

### **Scientific Contribution**

- Number of M.S. theses and Ph.D. dissertations based on BASIS research
- Number of presentations at national and/or international professional meetings
- Number of BASIS publications, monographs, and non-reviewed book chapters
- Number of journal articles published in national and/or international scientific journals
- Number of citations of BASIS-related journal articles
- Number of non-BASIS organizations and scientists using the panel data set

## **4. Prospects for Global Applicability**

The research findings are revealing important information on the factors affecting rural income growth and poverty alleviation. In particular, the findings highlight the importance of electricity, roads, and education in spurring income growth. These findings are directly applicable in many developing countries in Latin America and around the world.

A valuable feature of the longitudinal data set is that it allows tracking of households' movements in and out of poverty and analysis of the factors affecting those movements. Among the poverty-related factors being investigated are access to factor markets, migration, asset accumulation, and risk management strategies. These factors are relevant in many developing countries, as well as in poverty pockets in developed countries. The research findings may inform the development of program ideas for poverty alleviation in several countries.

The information on client profiles (characteristics) for different microfinance organizations is relevant to the current global research agenda on market segmentation in microfinance and the development of new products and services for microenterprise owners. In addition, the BASIS research may potentially contribute to advances in the development of effective rural finance strategies, which is another current topic in microfinance research.

## **5. Significance of Research Discoveries**

See section 4 immediately above.

## **C. STATUS**

### **1. Collaboration/Cooperation/Linkage Relations and Activities**

In general, the BASIS research in El Salvador benefits from excellent linkages between and among the lead U.S. research organization, USAID/El Salvador, the host country research partners, various government officials in El Salvador, and several NGO stakeholders.

#### **USAID/El Salvador and USAID/G**

Mary Ott, Chief of the Economic Growth Office at USAID/El Salvador, is extremely supportive of the BASIS project in El Salvador. Because the BASIS research focus matches the mission's strategic objective on economic opportunity,<sup>1</sup> the mission research money available for this strategic objective has been channeled into BASIS. Since the focus of BASIS is so well aligned with mission objectives, Ott prefers not to earmark the money, but rather to let the researchers choose the direction of the research. For example, the recent \$100,000 contribution by the mission was not earmarked.

On the other hand, Ott considers the biennial panel data to be a critical and non-negotiable component of BASIS. (Her exact words were "No biennial survey, no BASIS in El Salvador.") Earlier, when it appeared that the BASIS Technical Committee would not support a third round of the panel study, the mission decided to contract directly through FUSADES in order to support the survey. The mission would like to see BASIS and the panel study extended at least through 2002 (a fourth round of the survey), when the new USAID/El Salvador five-year plan will be written.

USAID/El Salvador communicates with the BASIS project solely through Claudio Gonzalez-Vega, an arrangement which is satisfactory for Ott. When she wants specific analysis or data tables from the panel study, she contacts FUSADES to request the information.

It should be noted that Mary Ott will be leaving El Salvador this summer.

The BASIS activities in El Salvador have had links to other USAID programs, including CRECER and FORMIR/DAI. There has also been recent collaboration between Jonathan Conning and Jolyne Sanjak of USAID/LAC's LACTEC II Project on land tenure issues in El Salvador.

#### **Host country organizations**

The local research collaborators (FUSADES, FUNDE, FUNDAUNGO, UCA, FLACSO) are generally very positive about both their participation in and the results of the BASIS research. As stated above, this is the first time that there has been collaboration across this ideologically diverse group of organizations. The organizations report that they were initially reticent to work together, but now feel that the collaboration has been successful. The local collaborators typically meet together each time the program leader visits El Salvador.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 1997-2002 strategic objective of "expanded access and economic opportunity for rural families in poverty" seeks five key results: 1) better educated rural residents; 2) improved use of land; 3) expanded, equitable access to financial, technological, and marketing services by the rural poor; 4) better rural productive infrastructure; and 5) economic policy environment supporting greater equity.

Local researchers have a sense of ownership of the research and partnership with the U.S. researchers. They attribute the U.S. researchers with contributing academic background and knowledge of current literature and methods, while the local researchers have more knowledge about local conditions. The local researchers consider their contact with the U.S. researchers on technical issues to be a very valuable part of the collaboration, and they would like additional contact.

FUSADES is the lead organization among the local BASIS collaborators in the sense that 1) it is the administrative coordinator for subcontracts, billing, and payments from the management entity; 2) it is the organization conducting the panel survey; 3) it holds the data and provides tables and analysis to the other researchers on request; and 4) it convenes the group meetings and its building is the site of most of the group meetings and public events. The selection of FUSADES for these functions was a logical choice, given its administrative and logistical capacity. However, the other collaborating organizations (FUNDE, UCA, FUNDAUNGO, FLACSO) consider themselves to be connected to BASIS only through FUSADES. In general, they were unaware of the structure and nature of the global BASIS project. Several researchers at these organizations would like to have more open access to the panel data.

The BASIS researchers have maintained close, on-going contact with officials of the GOES.<sup>2</sup> Officials of the GOES participated in the formulation of the *Research Planning Framework* for the BASIS work in El Salvador. Several local BASIS researchers participated in writing the *National Plan*. During the interviews conducted as part of this evaluation, a representative of the Minister of Economics, GOES, requested the opportunity to comment on the formation of a second phase of BASIS in El Salvador.

Important local stakeholders also include three microfinance organizations whose clients have been interviewed in the recent round of the panel survey: Financiera Calpiá, BFA (governmental), and CAM-FINCA. Of these three organizations, Financiera Calpiá has had the longest and most extensive collaboration with BASIS.

### **Relationships with other projects and organizations**

Linkages with outside organizations include collaboration on analysis with the InterAmerican Development Bank and with GTZ, a German development agency.

## **2. Program/Research Benefits/Contributions**

### **USAID goals**

Because the BASIS research agenda fits so well within the mission's strategic objective, USAID/El Salvador has been able to channel the research money for this strategic objective through BASIS and avoid having to contract for and directly manage the research.

The panel data provides a unique and revealing window on the poor in El Salvador, a window that can influence policy because it can be communicated succinctly. According to Mary Ott, the data base has been exceptional in revealing the true nature of rural poverty: "The data are the

---

<sup>2</sup> See section D (below) for a list of briefings provided by BASIS researchers to GOES officials.

opportunity for the 600 families to express their concerns and needs. The information can be distilled for busy policymakers to understand.”

The mission plans to use the BASIS data for programmatic decisions and will encourage the GOES to do so as well. The results have confirmed some existing assumptions about rural poverty, called some assumptions into question, and led to some surprises. Information from BASIS has influenced at least the following USAID/El Salvador policy and program decisions:

- the selection of microfinance as a growth area,
- the finding that agricultural income is not associated with higher income levels has led to a reduced emphasis on agriculture, and
- findings on the importance of infrastructure led to the use of the Hurricane Mitch money for road building.

In February, Ott gave a presentation on “Poverty in El Salvador” to the USAID administrator (Brady Anderson). For this presentation, she requested and received BASIS data from FUSADES.

USAID/El Salvador would like to see the data, data documentation, and research papers publicly available. The papers related to the El Salvador research should be on the BASIS website. The data should be available for anyone to analyze, particularly for dissertation research.

### **Host countries/non-US partners**

The local research partners feel that BASIS has been successful and that this success has been due to the fact that all of the collaborators share a common focus on the topics of rural poverty and rural development. They note several benefits from their participation in BASIS:

- All of the local researchers report that they would never have collaborated with each other if it were not for their participation in BASIS. While they were mutually respectful of each other’s work, the ideological boundaries between them had precluded collaboration. They all report that they have gained new respect for each other and have been pleasantly surprised to find that each group reaches similar conclusions despite beginning from different perspectives. At least two of the organizations are now considering collaboration outside of BASIS.
- The local researchers value the opportunity to have contact with scientists from outside of El Salvador, especially since it is a small country with a limited number of scientists. They place a high value on the training and support that they have received from the U.S. collaborators.
- The strategically selected coalition of local collaborators, along with the attention paid to public dissemination, has led the researchers to have a stronger influence on policy formation than they had in the past.

The BASIS program in El Salvador has had a major impact in that it has helped to focus public attention on poverty. BASIS research and its public dissemination has put poverty on the national policy agenda. The BASIS research findings are widely accepted as credible due to the coalition of diverse organizations participating in the research. There has been major press coverage of BASIS-sponsored public seminars and events held in August 1999 (over 300 people) and March 2000 (over 175 people).

The BASIS research is having an impact on public policy formation in El Salvador. In recent months, FUSADES has given presentations on the BASIS results to 1) the economics and social cabinet ministers of the government of El Salvador; 2) executives of El Salvador's Central Bank; and 3) personnel of Banco Multisectorial de Inversiones (BMI-2 sessions). For information on additional briefings with policymakers, organizational leaders, and the press, see the 1998-99 annual report on the El Salvador program (in a box entitled "BASIS Research Aids Policymaking in Central America").

The BASIS research has provided useful information to BMI's financial development thrust area, which seeks to encourage the formal banking sector to provide microfinancial services, including rural credit. The BASIS studies have helped BMI to better understand where poverty is located and how, through credit, BMI can help the poor to develop their businesses. The specific finding on the mobility of households in and out of poverty has helped BMI to better understand the needs of microenterprise households.

Managers of Financiera Calpiá report that the BASIS research has benefited their organization in several ways. It has provided valuable information on their clients' needs and how their clients perceive their organization and its products and services. The research has allowed Calpiá to measure the depth of its outreach for the first time. The analysis of the Calpiá credit process has been useful both in improving training and incentives for staff as well as in educating outside groups about the nature of microenterprises and what is involved in providing microfinance services, thus helping Calpiá to legitimize its costs to outsiders.

### **U.S. universities/institutions**

The Rural Finance Program at Ohio State University has been able to provide research experience to several graduate students through the BASIS CRSP. OSU has also been able to add depth to its existing research program in microfinance and rural finance. Jonathan Conning of Williams College has benefited from a BASIS competitive grant. Other U.S. collaborators include Mark Schreiner of Washington University (St. Louis).

There would be a large potential benefit to U.S. researchers from public access to the panel data set.

### **Training**

The BASIS CRSP in El Salvador is improving the research skills for a cadre of young Salvadoran professionals. The local collaborators place a very high value on the technical advice and guidance that they receive from the U.S. researchers. Through this advice and guidance, they have been able to improve their research and analytical skills for use in BASIS and future projects. The local research collaborators feel very fortunate to have the opportunity to work with Claudio Gonzalez-Vega, who provides guidance while respecting their intellectual and creative independence. There is also an appreciation of the ability to work with other U.S. researchers who have come to El Salvador under BASIS (e.g. Southgate, Schreiner, Navajas, Conning). The local researchers would like more contact opportunities.

One local researcher (Rafael Pleitez of UCA) has begun doctoral studies at OSU. Several local researchers received BASIS support to attend the Annual Seminar on New Development Finance in Frankfurt, Germany.



### **Cross-cutting themes: gender, market integration, risk**

The BASIS research agenda in El Salvador places a heavy emphasis on risk management strategies and market integration of rural households. The panel data will provide considerable information on these topics that would be useful for global synthesis. Various types of gender-relevant information are also available from the panel data, but gender analysis does not appear to be a specific research theme at this time.

### **3. Evaluation of CRSP Fiscal/Administrative Management from Program Viewpoint**

FUSADES reports that they have efficient communication with the management entity and that the reporting requirements are not overly burdensome. There have been some payment delays experienced by FUSADES and, subsequently by the other local partners. FUSADES and the other local partners attribute these payment delays to the ME.

The non-FUSADES local collaborators appear to be connected to BASIS only through FUSADES or through direct contact with the program leader. They appear to have only indirect knowledge of and contact with the ME.

## **D. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTED TIMELINE**

**Make panel data and documentation publicly accessible.** The panel data set and full documentation should be posted to several websites immediately. While there is always a danger that the data will be used incorrectly, it is more than outweighed by the potential value of providing these data for analysis by a wide range of serious researchers in El Salvador, the U.S., and elsewhere. Currently, only FUSADES, OSU, and the Conning-Trigueros research team have direct access to the data. The other local BASIS partners must make their requests for data analysis through FUSADES.

**Post the Salvadoran studies on the BASIS website.** Too few documents from the BASIS El Salvador research program are available on the BASIS website. In part, this is because of long delays between drafting documents and finalizing them. Any second-round BASIS agreement should clarify the time lines for finalizing and posting BASIS research papers. Future BASIS agreements should formalize the process for developing, finalizing, and disseminating written products (relates to later recommendation regarding contractual incentives).

**Continue collection and refinement of the panel data.** The panel data are considered immensely valuable by personnel at USAID/El Salvador, numerous government ministries, NGOs, and local research groups. This panel should be continued at least through 2002, when USAID/El Salvador will have its next round of planning. The questionnaire is of generally good quality, although a few sections need to be refined.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, according to generally

---

3 In particular, the following criticisms could be noted (1) the section on migration and remittances (section 17) does not have a clear unit of analysis and appears to be overly long given the focus of BASIS; (2) a series of hypothetical questions on credit (questions #341-#343) were too difficult to convey to the respondent; (3) there appear to be repetitive questions on land size, characteristics, and use which could be pared down; (4) in general, redundancies should be identified and eliminated (e.g. see section 5.2, #36, and 14.2, #256-258); (5) section 13.1 is too lengthy (burdensome) when applied to every crop;

accepted standards, the survey interview is currently too long. Tough (but collaborative) decisions need to be made so that the interview length can be cut at least in half for future rounds of the survey. One way to do this would be to determine which parts of the data were not analyzed or reported following the third round of the panel and eliminate the corresponding questions from subsequent rounds.

**Maintain the current policy focus.** Future versions of BASIS in El Salvador should not turn away from the heavy policy emphasis of the current project. BASIS is having an impact on policy formation in El Salvador. This beneficial influence can be significantly strengthened by continuing for several more years along the same path.

**Find innovative tools for local dissemination of research findings.** The personnel in USAID/El Salvador, GOES, and many NGOs are too busy to read full research reports. Among the possible dissemination alternatives are the following:

- research briefs (front and back of one page),
- short, bulleted reports,
- PowerPoint slide programs (could be placed on a web page or sent electronically),
- an internet newsletter with brief statements of findings sent to all stakeholders, and
- oral presentations with handouts.

**Formalize knowledge transfer.** The host country government officials, as well as individuals from certain NGOs, are very eager to receive individualized briefings on the BASIS findings. They would like the briefings to be held with subgroups of people who have similar objectives and interests (e.g. microfinance organizations; specific government ministries), so that questions and discussions can be tightly focused. In addition, government and NGO groups would like for briefings to be followed by workshops in which the BASIS researchers help them to think of ways to formulate action plans based on the research findings. Any second round of BASIS in El Salvador should include an explicit plan and budget for knowledge transfer.

**Clarify and strengthen linkages between the CRSP and the IQC.** The GOES policymakers and local NGO leaders would like for BASIS to provide them with training, technical assistance, and policy recommendations based on the research findings. However, that is currently seen as the role of the IQC (rather than the CRSP). In order to maximize the impact of the BASIS CRSP, the linkage with the IQC must be clarified immediately. Currently, CRSP personnel can not respond to requests for training and technical assistance, while personnel associated with the IQC are (as far as this evaluator knows) uninformed about the strong foundation of data, research findings, and collaborative relationships that have been built by the CRSP.

**Strengthen role of non-FUSADES local collaborators.** Currently, FUSADES sets the local collaboration agenda in terms of deciding when and where to hold meetings and public events. In part, this is because FUSADES has the physical and logistical capacity to host meetings and events. In addition, FUSADES is the prime contractor and it subcontracts to the other groups. However, the local non-FUSADES partners should feel “empowered” to call for meetings and

---

(6) the answer format for #223-#233 does not easily accommodate data from more than one laborer; and  
(7) “chicks and chickens” (enough said!).

contribute to setting the agenda. For example, while this field evaluation was taking place, the ME call for letters of intention were being considered by the local organizations. Several of them were waiting to receive direction from FUSADES about how to proceed. As mentioned above, the non-FUSADES partners do not have direct access to the data. Many of them also indicated that they were unaware of the global BASIS CRSP and that they receive information from the ME only through FUSADES. The ME should disseminate information directly to all local partners.

**Increase opportunities for technical advising.** The local researchers place a high value on the opportunity to meet with the U.S. researchers and receive specific advice and suggestions on their BASIS-related research. When the U.S. researchers visit El Salvador, they spend significant time discussing the technical approach to the research. This has had a high payoff in terms of the quality of the research and local capacity building. Means for increasing these opportunities should be explored, such as by increasing the number of U.S. researchers who come to El Salvador or by increasing the length and/or frequency of the visits.

**Provide contractual incentives for timely reporting.** Despite the significant achievements of the BASIS research program in El Salvador, there has been a major point of contention between the ME and the program leader in terms of the timeliness and thoroughness of workplans, budgets, and annual reports. The second-round BASIS activity should clearly specify the minimal reporting requirements and build in contractual incentives for complying with requirements and deadlines.

**Build smooth transition at USAID/El Salvador.** As soon as the new Chief of USAID/El Salvador's Economic Growth Office (Don Harrison) arrives, he should receive a series of briefings on the BASIS work in El Salvador. He should be provided with the full set of project documents, along with easy-to-use summaries of key findings (see above). Harrison will be replacing Mary Ott, who has been the primary advocate for BASIS within USAID/El Salvador.

## **E. APPENDIX: EVALUATION PROCESS AND LISTING OF INTERVIEWS**

The information for this report was gathered in El Salvador between March 20 and 24, 2000, through formal interviews, informal discussions, observation of survey implementation in the field, and attendance at a public presentation of BASIS documents. Additional information was obtained from BASIS Program reports and workplans.

The following persons were interviewed as part of the evaluation:

- Claudio Gonzalez-Vega, BASIS El Salvador Program Leader, Ohio State University
- Jonathan Conning, BASIS Competitive Grants Researcher, Williams College
- Mary C. Ott, Chief of Economic Growth Office, USAID/El Salvador
- Roxana Blanco, Coordinator of Microfinance Team, Economic Growth Office, USAID/El Salvador
- Sandra Lorena Duarte, Microenterprise Officer, Economic Growth Office, USAID/El Salvador
- Yolanda Mayora de Gavidia, Technical Advisor to Economic Minister, GOES

- Roberto Rivera Campos, Director of Department of Economic and Social Studies (ESS), FUSADES
- Anabella Larde de Palomo, Chief of Social Studies Section, ESS, FUSADES
- Margarita de Sanfeliu, Chief of Research and Information Center, ESS, FUSADES
- Mauricio A. Shi, Research and Information Center, ESS, FUSADES
- Enrique Merlos, Economics Researcher, FUNDE
- Ricardo Cordova M., Executive Director, FUNDAUNGO
- Julia Evelin Martinez, Researcher, FundaUngo
- Alvaro Trigueros, Chair of Economics Department, Universidad Centroamericana
- Rafael Pleitez, Universidad Centroamericana and Ohio State University
- Carlos Briones, Technical Advisor to Education Minister, GOES, formerly of FLACSO
- Katherine Andrade-Eekhoff, Researcher, FLACSO
- Roberto William Bonilla Garcia, Financial Manager, Financiera Calpia
- Enriqueta Claramunt de Rodriguez, Administrative Manager, Financiera Calpia
- Jose Jorge Siman J., Board Member of FUSADES and Financiera Calpia
- Sigfrido Aristoteles Esperanza, General Manager, FUNDAMICRO (formerly of Calpia)
- Roger Alfaro Araujo, Manager of Financial Development, BMI
- Guillermo Funes Araujo, President, BFA
- Carlos Rafael Huevoz, Credit Specialist, CARE/El Salvador
- Sergio Navajas, BASIS Researcher (Ohio State University)
- Rodolfo Quiros, BASIS Researcher (Academia of Central America in Costa Rica)
- Michael Roth, BASIS Director, University of Wisconsin-Madison



## **ANNEX II: NICARAGUA PROJECT**

**Prepared by: David Abler, EEP Member**

**Date of visit: February 1-4, 2000**

### **A. OVERVIEW**

In Nicaragua, BASIS is collaborating with the Fundación Internacional para El Desafío Económico Global (FIDEG), the Nicaraguan Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAG), and the World Bank on a nationwide farm household survey. The purpose of the survey is to shed light on the impacts of land titling in Nicaragua, on access to credit by members of farm households, particularly women, and on the degree to which farm households require access to credit in order to be able to take advantage of the benefits of land titling.

The survey sample includes approximately 2,000 rural households interviewed in previous surveys: 1,450 farms from a 1996 survey conducted by MAG, 250 landless households in a previous survey by FIDEG, and 500 other households from other previous surveys. In cases where a farm has changed hands between a previous survey and the current survey, both the new household cultivating the land and the original household are to be included. In such cases, the goal is to track down and interview the original household even if it has moved out of the area. In this way, information on land market transactions will be obtained from both buyers and sellers.

The survey contains twelve major sections as follows:

1. Household roster and basic demographic characteristics.
2. Nonagricultural income for each household member.
3. Landownership, rental, and use; land market transactions; participation in land titling programs.
4. Crop production and sales; crop input use and input expenditures.
5. Livestock ownership and transactions; milk production and sales; livestock input use and expenditures; hired labor use and expenditures.
6. Agricultural machinery ownership and purchases.
7. Loans received during the previous year; the terms of each loan; whether the household had wanted a larger loan in each case and, if so, how much; transaction costs associated with each loan; whether the household had been turned down for a loan; why households not applying for a loan had not done so; household debts.
8. Effects of Hurricane Mitch and other unforeseen events on the household.
9. Participation in economic, political, religious, social, and other groups.
10. The household's agricultural history in certain key years (e.g., 1979, the year of the Sandinista revolution).
11. The household's physical and social environment.
12. Food expenditures.

Interviews began on January 31, 2000, and are expected to take approximately six weeks to complete. The interviews are being administered by a corps of surveyors who have worked with MAG on previous surveys. Data entry and cleaning are proceeding at FIDEG concurrently with the survey, and are expected to be finished by some time in May.

Financially speaking, BASIS is a relatively small part of the survey administration process. Most funding for administering the survey is coming from the World Bank and MAG. However, BASIS personnel at the University of Wisconsin-Madison have played key roles in the design and management of the survey, and are expected to play important roles in data analysis and in dissemination of survey results. FIDEG appears to view the University of Wisconsin-Madison as its key partner on this survey.

## **B. RESEARCH PROGRESS**

**Table 1: Comparing progress relative to workplans—Nicaragua**

[Note: The BASIS program leader for Central America was asked to prepare this table. To my knowledge, it has not yet been prepared. — <i>David Abler</i> ]
--

### **1. Approaches/Methodologies**

Broadly speaking, the approach being used in the case of Nicaragua is that survey research can contribute to sound policy-making. The project investigators believe that the survey results will provide insights into how land titling programs should be implemented, whether efforts should be made to ensure that farm households have access to credit in order to be able to take advantage of the benefits of land titling, and whether efforts should be made to enhance access to credit on the part of women.

### **2. Impact Indicators**

This project is in its early stages, with the survey having just begun, so that it is premature to talk about impacts. However, it is not too soon to firm up plans to ensure that the project does have an impact. This is discussed below.

### **3. Prospects for Global Applicability**

Assuming that the survey provides useful information, particularly the “conjectural” questions on the survey (see below), the prospects for global applicability should be good. The survey could provide a model for surveys in other countries that are implementing, or considering implementing, land titling programs. The survey results could potentially yield important insights and hypotheses that researchers in other countries could use as a starting point for their own work.

## **4. Significance of Research Discoveries**

Because the project is in its early stages, no research discoveries have yet been made. However, the survey could potentially yield important research findings about land titling and access to credit, particularly access to credit among women.

## **C. STATUS**

### **1. Collaboration and Linkages with Other Organizations**

#### **USAID**

The Nicaragua BASIS program is not collaborating directly with the USAID mission in Nicaragua, but personnel at the Mission expressed a strong interest in the survey findings when they become available. They felt that the survey findings could provide input into their five-year strategy for Nicaragua that they will be developing later this year.

#### **Host Country Organizations**

The Nicaragua BASIS program is collaborating with the Fundación Internacional para El Desafío Económico Global (FIDEG) and the Nicaraguan Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAG). FIDEG is administering the survey and will be entering and cleaning the data. FIDEG also supplied the sampling frame from a previous survey of landless agricultural households. The head of the Women's Studies Unit at FIDEG, Sonia Agurto, is planning to spend three weeks at the University of Wisconsin-Madison this summer working on analysis of data from the survey. MAG is providing funding for the survey and also supplied the sampling frame from a 1996 survey that it conducted.

#### **Donor Organizations**

The Nicaragua BASIS program is collaborating with researchers at the World Bank, which is providing a large part of the funding for the survey.

#### **Other BASIS Programs and Other CRSPs**

The degree to which the program is collaborating with other BASIS programs is unclear, although there is overlap in personnel between the Nicaragua program and other BASIS programs in Central America. There does not appear to be any collaboration with other (non-social science) CRSPs, although such collaboration may not be warranted given the nature of the research in Nicaragua.

### **2. Research Benefits and Contributions**

#### **USAID Goals**

The Nicaragua BASIS program should contribute to achieving USAID goals insofar as (1) its research findings have important policy implications in Nicaragua or elsewhere and (2) those findings are used by policymakers. One USAID goal in its Strategic Plan is to encourage broad-based economic growth and agricultural development. Objectives underneath this goal that the



Nicaragua BASIS program could potentially help to achieve include strengthening critical private markets (e.g., land, credit), enhancing agricultural development, and increasing access to economic opportunity for the rural poor. Other USAID goals and objectives in its Strategic Plan speak in terms of improving opportunities for women, and the Nicaragua BASIS program could potentially help in that regard as well.

### **Host Country and Non-US Partners**

The Nicaragua BASIS program should strengthen research capacity at FIDEG. FIDEG is responsible for data entry and cleaning, and FIDEG personnel will be involved in data analysis. Three personal computers have been, or will be, purchased for data entry, cleaning, and analysis. Personnel at FIDEG emphasized the importance of projects that partner with host country institutions and create research capacity in the host country.

### **US Universities and Training**

The Nicaragua BASIS program should also strengthen research and training capacity at US universities. The data should be an important source for analysis by US faculty and graduate students. The survey data should permit analysis of the “latent” demand for credit by those who have been turned down for credit or have never applied for credit, something that previous surveys in Nicaragua and many other countries have not covered.

### **Overall Benefits to the US**

This project has the potential to yield research findings that could improve policy-making in the areas of land titling and access to credit, particularly access to credit among women. Sound policy in these areas could potentially enhance economic growth and reduce rural poverty. Nicaragua is one of the poorest countries in the Western Hemisphere and has suffered much economic and political upheaval in the last two decades. The US has economic, political, and humanitarian interests in enhancing growth and reducing poverty in Nicaragua.

### **Gender, Market Integration, and Risk**

An important feature of the Nicaragua BASIS program is its focus on women. Previous surveys in Nicaragua and many other countries have not given adequate coverage to women’s activities. The Nicaragua BASIS program also addresses the integration of farm households into credit and land markets. In addition, with a section in the survey on the effects of Hurricane Mitch and other unforeseen events, the survey data could be used to analyze household impacts and responses to such risks.

## **3. Specific Recommendations**

The Nicaragua BASIS program appears to be on its way toward successful implementation of a nationwide farm household survey. Three main recommendations emerged from my visit to Nicaragua earlier this month regarding steps to take next:

**Make Plans Now for Seminars to Disseminate the Survey Findings.** In order to have an impact on policy, it will be essential to have seminars on the survey findings targeted toward policymakers, international donors, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), agribusinesses, and others interested in land titling, agricultural credit, and gender equity. Well-planned seminars

can require months of lead time to identify suitable locations, draw up lists of people and organizations to invite, send out invitations, handle other logistics, and ensure that people put the seminars on their calendars before other commitments arise.

The seminars should not be one-way (speakers to audience) but should instead engage the audience in a dialogue that could continue after the seminars are over. People and organizations of all political persuasions should be invited to these seminars to ensure that the research is not tarnished by associating it with a particular political viewpoint.

I was told that there are funds in the project budget for seminars on the survey findings. However, it is not clear what actions have been taken so far to make these seminars a reality. Personnel at FIDEG, which would be a logical partner for BASIS in organizing these seminars, were not aware of anything that had been done.

It is important for BASIS to take the lead on these seminars in order to ensure that they happen and that they are done properly. The Nicaraguan Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAG), another partner in the survey, has historically done a very good job of collecting information but has apparently been weak on disseminating information to the public.

**Make Plans Now for a Report on the Survey Findings.** In order to have an impact on policy, it will also be essential to have a report on the survey findings. The report should ideally be ready in time for distribution and discussion at the seminars mentioned above.

The report should be written for an educated yet general audience, and should emphasize the policy implications of the survey findings, particularly implications that run counter to “conventional wisdom.” The report should minimize the use of economic and statistical jargon. It should be visually appealing, with charts and diagrams as appropriate. There should be two versions of the report, one in Spanish and the other in English. The report should also be reasonably brief so that people will read it.

**Bear in Mind Certain Caveats as the Survey Data are Analyzed.** The survey appears to be comprehensive and has the potential to yield important findings. However, three caveats should be borne in mind as the survey data are analyzed. First, the survey is very long. I was told during my field visit that the survey was taking up to four hours to complete in some cases. With a long survey, the quality of a respondent’s answers can decline as the interview proceeds and the respondent grows tired or restless. This should be borne in mind as data from the latter sections of the survey are analyzed.

Second, considerable recall is required to answer some of the questions, particularly questions about years prior to last year (1999). The sample consists mostly of poor farmers and landless agricultural households who probably do not keep written records. Recalling from memory can give rise to the usual problems of omission and telescoping. These problems can be compounded if respondents feel pressured to answer a question quickly so that the rest of the survey can be completed.

Third, while the enumerators are professionals and underwent training on the survey prior to being sent out into the field, their experience lies in agricultural production censuses where the questions are factual in nature. The “conjectural” questions on the current survey (e.g., whether a household had wanted a larger loan than it received, and why households not applying for a loan had not done so) may not be familiar to many of them. In statistical analyses of responses to these questions it may be advisable to control for interviewer effects and for when a household

was interviewed (early, when an enumerator had little experience asking these questions, or later, when more experience had been acquired).

## **D. LIST OF INTERVIEWS, DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION PROCESS**

My evaluation was based on the interviews listed below and on a review of the BASIS CRSP Central America Regional Workplans for 1998-1999 and 1999-2000. I also reviewed the 1998 BASIS Research Planning Framework for Central America, as well as the research proposal submitted to the World Bank in 1998 to partially fund the Nicaragua survey (along with research in other Central American countries). In addition, I went on a field visit on February 2, 2000, and sat in on a survey interview. I also attended a meeting on February 3, 2000 on rural credit at the USAID mission in Managua. Participants at this meeting included seven officials from the USAID/Nicaragua Mission and two officials from USAID headquarters in Washington, DC.

### **1. List of Interviews**

#### **January 26, 2000**

Michael Carter (Professor, Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin-Madison and coordinator for BASIS of the Nicaragua project), by phone

#### **February 1, 2000**

Stephen Boucher (Ph.D. Candidate, Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin-Madison)

#### **February 2, 2000**

Sonia Agurto (Head, Women's Studies Unit, FIDEG)

Stephen Boucher (Ph.D. Candidate, Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Alejandro Martínez Cuenca (President, FIDEG)

#### **February 3, 2000**

Ray Baum (Supervisor, Agricultural Development Office, USAID/Nicaragua Mission)

John Strasma (Professor Emeritus, Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin-Madison and Consultant, Boston Institute for Developing Economies).

## **ANNEX III: GREATER HORN OF AFRICA REGIONAL PROGRAM**

**Prepared by: Jean Kearns, EEP Chair**

**Date of visit: November 1-6, 1999**

### **A. OVERVIEW**

The BASIS Horn of Africa Program was launched in 1997 with a series of visits to the region to explore potential research sites and institutional collaboration, and with a research planning workshop held in Dese, Ethiopia. The July 1997 research meeting was comprised of national, regional, and U.S. researchers, government officials, and policymakers and helped to identify both a national research program for Ethiopia and a regional program for the Horn. The former was to highlight a study of factor market constraints to rural food security and incomes, while the latter was to address cross-border trade and food security and institutional collaboration in the region.

The Ethiopian Program, in collaboration with IDR, Addis Ababa University, is located in the South Wollo area of Ethiopia, a region that has assumed an important—if not infamous—role in many of the policy and theoretical debates about the causes of food insecurity and famine. The BASIS program is engaged there in an integrated study of the social and economic causes of food insecurity at intrahousehold, household, community, and regional levels, that examines both questions of commodity and input market linkages, and agricultural productivity (the ‘supply’ side), on the one hand, and the dynamics of household (intrahousehold) access to farm and non-farm incomes (‘entitlement’), on the other. It utilizes a multi-level (region, community, and household) approach to factor market research and food security, as well as a series of case studies on key policy and research themes. To date, this program has received support from the BASIS CRSP, REDSO/Nairobi, and USAID/Ethiopia, and has involved eight Ethiopian and nine US/BASIS researchers. It is anticipated to be completed by September 30, 2001.

The regional program in the Horn is carried out in collaboration with OSSREA but also has engaged researchers from Egerton University, Kenya, and the African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS), Nairobi. The core of the effort is focused on a two-year study of regional cross-border trade (livestock and grain) and food security that is the first systematic study of the topic in the region. An understanding of the informal financial/credit arrangements and capital generation associated with cross-border trade; and of the links between cross-border trade and food security in the three border sites (all of which are grain-deficit zones) shape the research questions for the study. Specific methodological issues are apparent since most of the key cross-border markets are located in dry regions, far from major urban centers, dominated by mobile pastoral production systems, and, in most cases, poorly served by transport and other infrastructure. These all add to the costs of standard survey approaches and have required considerable methodological innovations, such as key actor interviews, ethnography, and rapid appraisal techniques. On-going conflicts and random border closures in the region also increase risks and uncertainties for merchants, producers, and researchers alike and have required methodological adjustments. This interdisciplinary program promises to yield important scholarly and policy-relevant findings and has been predominantly funded by REDSO/Nairobi.

As of December 1999, this program has involved five regional and four US/BASIS researches and will be completed by September 30, 2000.

Management of the Horn Program: For a number of reasons, the management/leadership of the Horn of Africa program is not obvious, nor does it follow a clear organizational/responsibility sequence. Specifically, leadership and management are directly related to function. For example, Dr. Peter Little is the identified research program leader for the Horn of Africa program and is responsible for the overall coordination of activities in that program. However, this role is in addition to his role as principal investigator for certain activities. Principal investigators in the Horn program include approximately 11 researchers, all of whom are responsible for the research assigned to them as a result of a review of proposals which were generated by them. The researchers include both U.S. and African personnel and the names are included in the BASIS CRDP Program Update document.

The resulting situation means that management responsibilities are sometimes not absolutely clear. The management responsibility and functions are shared by Michael Roth and Peter Little. In the case of the ICRW activity, Michael Roth provides general leadership. Depending on the activities, the role of manager and the principal researcher seems to be shared and/or alternated between Drs. Roth and Little. The end result is that the administration and leadership of the Horn of Africa program appears to rest with individual activities rather than with the entire program.

The management/leadership arrangement appears to work well for the most part, but this success is due to the personalities involved and should be reviewed periodically for possible conflict of interest and efficiency.

## B. RESEARCH PROGRESS

**Table 2: Comparing progress relative to workplans—Horn of Africa**

(prepared by Peter Little, December 1999)

Schedule of Activities and Status.

Activity	Year I	Year II	Year III	Year IV	Year V
Reconnaissance and Planning Activities (completed 12/97)	XXXX				
Planning Workshop (Dese) (completed 7/97)	X				
National Policy Seminar (Addis) (completed 10/97)		XX			
MOU's with National and Regional Institutes. (completed 4/98)		XXXX			
ETHIOPIA PROGRAM (WITH IDR, DELAYED 5 MO. DUE TO WAR)					

Secondary Data Analysis Inventories, and Maps (completed 10/98)	XXXX			
Regional Markets . . . (completed 11/99)	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		XXX	
GIS Activity (Phase I completed 9/99)	XX	XX		
Community Assessments (completed 11/99)	XXXXXXXXXXXX			
Rural Household Study (to begin 1/200)			XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	
Intrahousehold Study of Consumption and Nutrition (dependent on funding)			XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	
Case Studies Research (in progress)				
Workshops/Seminars (1 <sup>st</sup> completed 10/99)		XX	XX	XX
Data Analysis, Modeling, and Final Write-up	XXXXXXX			
REGIONAL PROGRAMME (W/OSSREA, DELAYED 6 MO. DUE TO BORDER CONFLICTS) CROSS BORDER STUDY				
Seminar/Meetings (1 <sup>st</sup> completed 7/98)	XX			
Research Design/Questionnaire (completed 11/98)	XX			
Ethiopia/Kenya Site (completed 10/99)		XXXXXXXXXX		
Somalia/Kenya Site (research completed; report 1/2000)	XXX	XXXXXX		
Djibouti/Ethiopia Site		XXXXXXX		
Final Report (in progress)			XXXXXX	

## 1. Overall objectives of Horn Regional Program

1. Establish strong collaboration with national and regional institutions and researchers:  
(Collaboration has been established through MOUs with IDR, Addis Ababa U and

OSSREA and research collaboration is continuing with Tegemeo Institute of Egerton U and ACTS, Nairobi; and through collaboration with more than 10 researchers in the region).

2. Establish a national research program in Ethiopia focused on the relationship between factor market access and food security (this has been accomplished so with IDR in S. Wollo project); and a regional program dealing with a major cross-border/regional issue (OSSREA cooperation in cross-border study).
3. Develop innovative research methods and techniques (in progress in interdisciplinary programs both in Ethiopia and in the region, integrating social and economic sciences, GIS and social sciences, rapid appraisal techniques with survey methods, and approaches that integrate regional, community, and household levels of data collection).
4. Establish strong policy linkages with national policymakers (apparent in S. Wollo and Ethiopia through three workshops; collaborative community and regional research with zonal and regional officials)
5. Disseminate research findings through national, regional, and international forums and publications (this was started in 1999 and 2000 through publications, conference presentations [including at international meetings in USA], and national and regional publications [especially IDR and OSSREA series]). This only began in late 1999 since data analysis and findings are only just now becoming available from first set of studies, but will be major focus in 2000-2001.

## **2. List of Research projects and Researchers**

### **From Household to Region: Factor Market Constraints to Income and Food Security in a Highly Diverse Environment, South Wollo, Ethiopia**

US Researchers:

Dr. Gary Gaile, Co-PI for Regional Market Study and Professor of Geography, University of Colorado, and IDA

Dr. Peter Little, Co-PI for BASIS and Professor of Anthropology, U. Of Kentucky and IDA

Dr. Peter Castro, Co-PI for Community Study and Associate Professor of Anthropology, Syracuse University and IDA

Dr. Michael Shin, GIS specialist and Assistant Professor, University of Miami, and IDA

Dr. Michael Horowitz, Senior Researcher and Director, IDA

Dr. Michael Roth, Co-PI for Household Study and BASIS Program Director

Dr. Charlotte Johnson-Welch, Gender Specialist, ICRW

Ms. Lauren Montgomery-Rinehart, Research Assistant and graduate student, IDA

Mr. Scott McDonald, Research Assistant and graduate student, IDA

Ethiopian:

Dr. Tegegne Gebre-Egziabher, Co-PI and Director, IDR

Dr. Johannes Kinfu, Chair and Organizer of First Dese Workshop and Director of IDR (until 12/97)

Dr. Yared Amare, Co-PI for Community Study and Senior Researcher, IDR (and Lecturer, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, Addis Ababa University)

Dr. Workineh Negatu, Co-PI for Household Study and Senior Researcher, IDR (and Faculty Member, Department of Economics, Addis Ababa University)

Mr. Yigremew Adal, Researcher on Community Study and Researcher, IDR

Mr. Degafa Tolossa, Researcher on Community Study and Researcher, IDR

Mr. Melaku Eshetu, Researcher and Coordinator on South Wollo Program and Researcher, IDR

Dr. Mulat, Faculty Member, Department of Economics, Addis Ababa University

### **Cross Border Trade and Food Security in the Horn of Africa**

US Researchers:

Dr. Peter Little, Co-Principal Investigator, BASIS Program, and Professor of Anthropology, U. of Kentucky and IDA

Dr. Barbara Cellarius, Post-Doctoral Researcher, University of Kentucky and IDA

Dr. Michael Horowitz, Senior Researcher and Director, IDA

Mr. Scott McDonald, Research Assistant and Graduate Student, IDA

Regional Researchers:

Dr. Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed, Executive Secretary and Senior Researcher, OSSREA

Dr. Tegegne Teka, Co-Principal Investigator and Regional Programme Coordinator, OSSREA

Mr. Alemayehu Azeze, Researcher, OSSREA

Mr. Ayele Gebremariam, Consultant Researcher, OSSREA

Mr. Hussein A. Mahmoud, Egerton University and University of Kentucky (graduate student)

### **3. Approaches or methodologies**

While these may be multiple innovative approaches in process within the program, the following appear to be recognizable at this time:

- The program proposal as related to household surveys advances multi-level methodology as it includes geographic aspects, GIS, regional market methods, community assessments, and gender, as well as other data. The emphasis in the Horn of Africa work has been very focused on the development of a strong methodology.
- It was the opinion of OSSREA leadership that relative to the Cross Border Trade project, the methodology, which combined economics and social sciences, utilized techniques different (and more effective) from those used in the past in order to acquire in depth information.



#### **4. Impact indicators**

Impact indicators should be assessed from a variety of bases. For this program, they appear to be the following:

- Research studies such as the South Wollo work will provide information about the land tenure impact on food security. The related labor issues and amount of land usage information will be transferable to policy development. The ultimate indicator related to the research program is whether or not policymakers utilize the data in the development of policies. Based on the research discussions in the November 1999 workshop, the researchers appear to be very aware of the need to make the research understandable and applicable for use in broader policy areas. To date, two workshops have been held for policymakers from South Wollo and the Amhara Region.
- Impact indicators relative to the host country organizations include the level of involvement, planning for future activities dealing with the targeted topics of BASIS but taking place beyond the life of the CRSP, joint publications and changes/modifications to the organization due to its involvement in BASIS. These indicators are evident to a lesser or greater extent in all of the cooperating host country organizations.
- Increased interest in international development work is evident at the U.S. universities which are involved in the BASIS work. This is indicated by the number of researchers involved, the number of RAs devoted to CRSP work, and the planning for joint (U.S. and African researchers) research publications.

#### **5. Prospects for global applicability**

Some data have been developed and these data are being prepared for publication at this time. However, there are various areas that are being examined which will be relevant for other areas in the world, and therefore these data should be published on a timely basis. These areas include factor markets and the way that they are researched, trader margins and relationship to markets, irregularities in the labor market, relationships between share croppers and land usage, rural poverty dynamics, economy operations in the absence of government, factors which most directly relate to conflicts in border areas, and resource conflict issues/practices in dry areas.

One basic question which is being investigated in the BASIS research is, "How do institutions work together?" A search of the literature revealed that there has been a very limited amount of research done on this question. However, research relative to this question will be valid as cross border issues are addressed.

#### **6. Significance of research discoveries**

Several research findings are important to the development of a knowledge base of BASIS. Some of these are as follows:

- the impact of cross border livestock trade on the livelihood of pastoralists; and
- the market center studies and the community assessment research developed a clear picture of the functions of market centers and enabled the development of recommendations in an area lacking in research.

## **C. STATUS**

### **1. Collaborative/cooperation/linkages/relations and activities**

#### **USAID mission and USAID/G**

The USAID/Regional Economic Development Service Office in Kenya funded the cross border livestock study, the regional workshop (November 3-5, 1999) and part of the South Wollo research work. Thus far, USAID/Ethiopia has not been heavily involved in the program since they did not have agriculture activities in 1997 when the BASIS personnel first visited the country. Mission personnel attended the 1997 workshop and since that time they have become more interested in the Program. Currently, the Mission is funding case studies and is knowledgeable about the CRSP work. CRSP program leaders view the Mission involvement as positive.

The USAID officer from REDSO most closely involved in the funding decisions noted that the CRSP was doing good work but that more frequent information/interaction would be desirable. BASIS personnel view the REDSO officer as supportive of the CRSP program and notes that he understands that CRSP is not like other projects and works within those boundaries.

USAID/Africa Bureau has provided add-on funding (\$300,000 and \$500,000) to support several activities. The BASIS *CRSP Program Update* should be referenced for specific details.

#### **Host country organizations**

Relative to this topic it appears that the Program is doing very well. A number of host country organizations are active in various degrees in the BASIS research. The Program Leader noted in interviews that the country organizations were closely involved in all phases of the work.

In Ethiopia one organization which participates in the program is OSSREA, an NGO which has as its goal the networking of social research scientists. OSSREA is funded by various donors and was part of the original Horn of Africa BASIS proposal. OSSREA is involved in the research program and was the organization which provided logistical and organizational (non-technical) support for the Horn of Africa Regional Workshop (Nov. 3-5, 1999). It was on the basis of the amount of involvement OSSREA has with BASIS that they made the decision to hire another staff person to help with the research. The Director of OSSREA is a member of the BASIS CRSP Board of Directors.

Another organization which cooperates with BASIS in Ethiopia is the Institute of Development Research (IDR). This Institute is part of the University of Addis Ababa and all of the staff members are faculty of the University. Funding is provided by a variety of donors and this Institute was part of the original Horn of Africa BASIS proposal. IDR's work with the CRSP has provided the organization with the need to hire a professional to do some of the required research. IDR has taken the leadership role in policy work which is most sensitive and critical in Ethiopia. The Director of IDR is a member of the BASIS CRSP Technical Committee. This involvement is most important as it keeps the organization in the information loop. However, one area that still seems to be somewhat confusing to the organization is the concept of add-ons in funding.

Workplans with both OSSREA and IDR are prepared with the initial work being done by the Principal Investigator and frequent exchanges among the researchers relative to content, wording, timing etc. The current workplan with OSSREA is for a 2.5-year period and it deals with cross border research. The workplan with IDR is prepared on an annual basis.

Discussions with OSSREA and IDR recently have started to focus on the future and where these organizations will go in terms of research after BASIS is no longer active. OSSREA is particularly proactive in their planning for 'life after BASIS'. IDR has also started to discuss the need to continue research related to the goals of BASIS after the CRSP is no longer active. However, it is important to note that both of these organizations have on-going separate programs which predated BASIS and which are not related or dependent upon the work of the BASIS CRSP.

Interviews with the Administrators and selected staff of OSSREA and IDR indicated that they consider that the work is going well and is of a cooperative nature. OSSREA noted that there were some concerns on their part in the initial phase of the CRSP relative to a misunderstanding about this role and contractual matters. However, these concerns are no longer apparent as OSSREA leadership feels they are functioning as a full partner. IDR is currently working out the financial procedures by which they can bill the CRSP for use of vehicles, etc. CRSP personnel has made suggestions as to how the billing process can be implemented in a more timely manner.

Egerton University of Kenya and TEGEMEO of that country are participating in BASIS. TEGEMEO has not yet received funding from the BASIS competitive grants program but an initial pre-proposal writing activity was funded by BASIS for that organization. Approximately three persons were involved in the writing. The proposal focus is to look at water and land rights in an irrigation scheme. TEGEMEO assumes that they will hear about the funding by January 2000. The work would be accomplished in one year. TEGEMEO noted that communications with BASIS have been adequate and when inquiries are made then the response is made in a timely way. The proposal writers feel strongly that the subject of the research is very relevant due to the cash crop possibility which may be realized as a result of this research. The results would be used to prepare policy briefs for distribution to government Ministries.

#### **Donor (non-USAID) organizations**

Representatives of BASIS have had meetings with World Bank officials but have not as yet received funding from that organization. World Bank/Ethiopia has essentially put their program on hold until the dispute with Eritrea is settled.

The Ford Foundation is supporting land tenure work in the area and the CRSP utilizes the information developed in the Ford program.

IDR has had some funding from SIDA and through this connection the CRSP has benefited from use of a shared database.

#### **4. Other BASIS programs, other CRSPs and external groups**

Most collaboration with other BASIS programs has been with the Southern Africa program. This collaboration has been at a minimum level. The need to collaborate has been discussed in the Technical Committee but nothing has actually been done, as a mechanism incentive is not in place. It is important to note here that the Program Leaders all appear to be 'stretched' in terms of the amount of time they have for the necessary CRSP work. The lack of time to do other

activities and the limited funding within the CRSP combine to limit the Program Leader's work to one region.

Collaboration with the Livestock CRSP has involved sharing data and reports, and participation in workshops. For example, part of the Livestock CRSP research was presented in the November 1999 BASIS workshop. In addition, data relative to cross border trade has been shared between the Livestock CRSP and the BASIS CRSP.

## **2. Program/Research benefits and contributions**

### **USAID goals**

According to the Program Leader the work in the Horn does not fit totally under any one USAID strategic objective. However it is his opinion that food security and nutrition does fit within more than one of the strategic objectives.

The food security research carried out by the Horn program links with USAID goals according to the CRSP Director. There have been some discussions between the Technical Committee and the Horn program as to whether the research has had a sufficient factor market focus, especially in the first phase of the program. Most of the researchers appear to recognize a need to focus, but the actual prioritization (land, water, employment, finance, food security, nutrition) is not clear cut and has not been finalized.

### **Host countries**

Participants in the November 1999 Workshop were researchers or representatives of organizations in Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. These persons were very articulate in their support for research which would provide data support for policy recommendations. It was clear that they felt that modifications are urgently needed in the represented countries but that the key to change would be policy adjustments. The need to have solid research together with recommendations related to better methods or policies is recognized by government as well as research leaders in the various countries.

It is interesting to note that the research activity entitled, "Improving Household Food Security: Documenting Institutions' Efforts to Apply Gender-Sensitive, Participatory Processes in Developing Integrated Solutions" included researchers from Tanzania, Ethiopia, Uganda and Kenya as well as the U.S. The African researchers are professionals well placed in the systems of their countries to make gender sensitive changes within the government or university structure. Such an approach will be beneficial to the institutions as well as to personnel located in cooperating groups.

### **U.S. universities/institutions**

The CRSP activities have benefited the U.S. universities involved in the research in various ways including the following:

- Increased international research has been made possible because of CRSP leadership and has helped the universities to focus on the need to hire RAs to undertake the research;
- The involvement of researchers from different universities has encouraged institutional ties which did not exist between those academic units in the past;

- The CRSP has provided sabbatical possibilities for U.S. University faculty; and
- Diversification techniques, risk management and related information from research activities in Ethiopia has provided ‘lessons learned’ data for U.S. areas where crops such as tobacco are being phased out and the need for assistance is evident.

### **Training**

Formal training was not included as part of the activities of the Horn program. Specifically, training activities are not reported by the Horn researchers since the activity is not a goal of the program. One could surmise that the training which has occurred has been of an informal basis which occurs when researchers work together and learn from each other in areas such as methodology, cultural mores, writing techniques, etc.

### **Overall benefits**

The Horn program addresses BASIS CRSP objectives and USAID objectives of identifying ways to improve food availability and nutrition in the region, and broadening access of the poor and socially disadvantaged to factor markets and sustainable livelihoods.

The overall benefits will relate to understanding market factors and translating that understanding to knowledge/action plans to impact policy/action, which in turn will increase food security in one of the most food-deprived regions of the world.

### **Cross cutting themes**

The BASIS/CRSP Annual Report, Greater Horn of Africa Program does not address cross cutting themes. One can assume that attention is being given to gender, market integration, and risk in a cross cutting approach, but the project reports are relatively silent on this point.

## **3. Evaluation of overall BASIS CRSP management and administration**

The following evaluative assessments were provided in response to questions by the evaluator:

- When inquiries are sent to the ME, responses are quickly provided.
- The ME staff is very responsive to the needs as expressed in the field. The attitude of the ME as illustrated by Danielle Hartmann is not to say no but to ascertain how a task can be done. This positive approach is a key to the development of good working relationships between the field and the ME.
- The Project Director is solid in the technical field and working relationships with him are sound.
- Each activity has special needs and requirements and the flexibility on the part of the ME assists these programs to operate well.
- The ME communicates well with the Program Leader and keeps him informed of relevant information.
- Communications are generally positive within the CRSP. E-mail has been most helpful and that is funded for some African researchers by BASIS. The ME is very helpful with

communications as messages are copied to relevant personnel so that everyone knows what is going on in their areas of responsibility.

- The Land Tenure Center at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, has long experience with AID and their experience is very helpful to ME in terms of working with AID in a non-confrontational atmosphere.

## **D. RECOMMENDATIONS AND ISSUES TO CONSIDER**

The following comments are based on interviews and observations and are presented for consideration by those involved in the Program. Consideration was not given to possible barriers to activating these comments and that process is left to the appropriate personnel. The comments are as follows:

- Basically this program is a research project with emphasis upon policy influence. For various reasons, the need for publication of results and/or methodologies is urgent. Research needs to be published on a timely basis. The ME takes leadership in this area and it is urgent that they push the researchers to get the data prepared for publication in a timely manner. At the same time it is important for the ME to move the research publications along as quickly as possible. The final editing of the papers appears to be done within the ME but some researchers seemed confused about the process of the final editing.

It is recommended that the data need to be prepared for publication and submitted to referred journals as soon as possible. Researchers should take responsibility in this activity, and should submit to journals while keeping the ME in the information loop.

It is recommended that the program continue to assure that publications are jointly (U.S. and African) prepared and published and that this process take place quickly.

- Annual workplans for multi-year programs appear to be a bit redundant and appears to require time that is better utilized elsewhere. However, it is important that workplans be specifically detailed so that designated activities are matched with expenditures, institutional matching, core funding, and add-on funding.

It is recommended that multi-year workplans and programs be required to submit updates but will not be required to submit full annual workplans.

- The BASIS CRSP has been in the implementation phase long enough that cross regional work should be taking place.

It is recommended that thematic conferences be proposed in order to provide a venue to address specific topics across regions and focus on 'lessons learned' as well as broader research topics. For example, the value of investigating factor market constraints findings in various geographic areas could result in global indicators and could foster data synthesis/integration.

- The Horn program has involved a variety of non-CRSP groups and this should be continued and encouraged. However, it is important to note that all of the non-CRSP group involvement is funded with BASIS CRSP funds. It is important to encourage involvement of non-CRSP groups in joint funding situations whenever possible.

- The relationship between the Horn Program Leader and the field researchers appears to be one which consists of frequent communication. The fine line between taking over an activity and supporting that activity is sometimes difficult to maintain but the Program Leader appears to have mastered the technique. It is important that the African researchers feel a partnership role and it is recommended that the Program Leader continue his open and cooperative work. Since some of the Africans interpreted early behavior in the project as one which tried to dominate the situation it is very important to assure that the situation is one of equality in all aspects.

One area that is a cause of concern to the African researchers is the selection of counterparts. Specifically, when U.S. counterparts are proposed, the African researchers would like to be involved and receive a copy of the proposed counterpart's resume. This situation could be set up in such a way that the African researchers are part of the information loop and feel that they have an opportunity to voice considerations.

Program Leaders makes the allocation of funds and the researchers learn about the action after it is accomplished. More collaboration is needed in this area and input is encouraged. The positive aspect about collaboration is that everyone feels involved and has ownership. However the negative aspect may be that involvement may indicate that decisions can then be made as a group. When dealing with a limited budget and without knowledge of the entire program on the part of the researchers then the allocation responsibility remaining in the hands of the Program Leader may be the best and most efficient method of operation. Consideration should be given to possible actions in this area which would invite input.

- BASIS publications should be distributed to the African researchers with enough copies so that at least one could be filed in a relevant library. The BASIS Newsletter is an important communication item and that should be distributed on a regular basis.
- Gender issues have been addressed in various studies and that should be continued. In addition, other non-gender specific research should be examined in the planning stage and gender issues should be incorporated as relevant. It is not enough to state that gender does not impact, but it is important to include gender in research topics that relate to policy.

Since gender issues have been identified by the CRSP leadership as one cross cutting issue then all proposed research proposals should be reviewed for possibilities of including gender related information. There are several African researchers who are specialists in the field of gender research and they should be utilized to review interview schedules, questionnaires and research proposals relative to gender issues.

It is important to recognize that the time to review research with attention to gender issues is not after the research is completed but rather when it is in the design phase.

- The research related to the livelihood and quality of life of the pastoralists is important to every country in the Horn of Africa. The whole topic of pastoralists is urgent and the need for policy recommendations is immediate. It is recommended that the BASIS research related to the pastoralists be synthesized so as to develop a series of recommendations for policy development. Unique ways to bring policymakers together to discuss and understand the research in this subject matter area should be examined and attempts should be made to bring the data into a policy mode and prepared for policymakers use. The pastoralists network

proposed by OSSREA should be part of the interactive research methodology utilized by BASIS.

Guidelines should be given (probably were) to writers of reports to be presented in conferences. For example, relative to the required workshop in November 1999, every writer should be identified as in the “Agricultural Policy, Employment and Resource Access: Micro Foundations for Sustainable Nutritional Improvements” report. All reports should be dated. Specific date is not necessary, but month and year would be important to include on all reports produced within BASIS.

- It is recommended that meetings of BASIS standing groups (technical committee, Board etc) be scheduled a year in advance. In addition, these meetings should be scheduled so that the presence of the group member is utilized to the max. The example which relates to this recommendation was from a Board member who noted that he had four days of travel for one day of meetings. He suggested that if at all possible the meetings should be scheduled around other meetings especially for those who travel from another continents to attend.
- It is important to develop and/or maintain connections between policymakers and researchers. It appears that such connections are not common and most researchers require assistance as to how this can be accomplished. The CRSP would serve a real need if assistance could be provided relative to making the connection and encouraging research in a reinforcing role for policymakers. Workshops or special forums may be considered by the CRSP in order to make these connections. Donors should be explored to fund such meetings. An additional issue relative to policy is the need to understand how policies are formulated. This is another area in need of research.
- Consideration should be given to restructuring the Technical Committee meetings. At the present time, the TC meetings consist of every attendee presenting their research programs. However, time is not allocated to the discussion of mutual problems and how to solve them. It is recommended that the TC consider a meeting format which would move from concentration on allocation of resources and onto the next level of sharing experiences on substantive issues.
- When dealing with various cultures and organizations with differing expertise it is important to be very clear from the beginning as to who will do what. Roles, responsibilities and outcomes should be defined early and articulated to all involved personnel. Rolling decision-making should be avoided.

Activities should be designed with consideration of the strengths and capacity of the institution. Personnel and equipment requirements should be considered when determining proposed work for a cooperating institution.

- Linkages are important but researchers who come from the U.S. with specific task assignments do not often provide opportunities for linkages with their home institutions. Is there some way that BASIS could encourage linkages between researchers’ home institutions and host country institutions?
- While there is not a requirement that BASIS report to or keep USAID informed, it is important to keep the Mission and REDSO in the information loop for several reasons. BASIS operates more independently than other projects and while there is a relationship with USAID it is not as close as with other projects. Very simply, there is less reporting and less



collaboration. Since buy-ins occur through the Missions and the REDSO it is important to send reports to the project officers and send update information. In addition, project officers should be included in field visits especially when those visits are to areas where Mission or REDSO monies are being utilized.

The REDSO officer tasked with BASIS could be of significant assistance in getting regional programs underway. His knowledge and connections should be used whenever relevant.

It is also important for the CRSP to assure that information is available to the USAID officers on a time basis related to their schedule. For example, if the REDSO officer is required to begin development of the 2001 budget in December 1999 then BASIS should make sure that the officer is provided with budget information prior to December 1999. Such information would probably be brief in nature but would provide the officer with a reference point for making budget recommendations for BASIS in the planning process in his unit. Forward planning documents would be very helpful in this context.

## **E. APPENDIX**

The information for this report was acquired through interviews, informal discussion, observations and attendance at the Horn of Africa Regional Workshop in November 1999. In addition, information was accessed through Program reports and reports related to issues or sub-issues.

Persons interviewed formally included the following:

- Peter Little, BASIS Res. Program Leader, Horn of Africa, USA
- Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed, Executive Secretary, OSSREA, Ethiopia
- Tegegne Teka, Regional Project Coordinator, OSSREA, Ethiopia
- Alemayehu Azeze, Project Coordinator, OSSREA, Ethiopia
- Tegegne Gebre Egziabher, Director, IDR, Ethiopia
- Yared Amare, Researcher, IDR, Ethiopia
- Karl Schwartz, Program Officer, USAID, Ethiopia
- Laketch Mikael, USAID, Ethiopia
- John Dunlop, REDSO/ESA, Kenya
- Christopher A. Onyango, Ministry of Educ., Science & Tech., Kenya
- Charlotte Johnson-Welch, ICRW, USA
- Theresia Peter Msaki, Food Security Dept., Tanzania
- Bogalech Allemu Reta, Women's Affairs, Ethiopia
- May Sengendo, Makerere University, Uganda
- Kisamba Mugerwa, Agriculture Minister, Uganda
- Michael Roth, CRSP Project Director, USA

## **ANNEX IV: BROADENING ACCESS TO WATER RESOURCES IN SOUTHERN AFRICA**

**Zimbabwe, Malawi, Mozambique**

**Prepared by: Angelique Haugerud, EEP Member  
Jean Kearns, EEP Chair**

### **A. OVERVIEW**

Since 1997, the Southern Africa program has centered around land and water issues. This evaluation focuses upon the water resources part of the Southern Africa program. The Water Resources project was designed to inform policy on water resource management, particularly decentralized management systems, in the context of ongoing water sector reform in Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and Malawi and in the region as a whole.

It should be noted that this region is subject to current specific stresses. The impact of the floods in Mozambique together with displacement of population and food limitations added to the stress already present in that economy. The outcome of legislative, policy, and political situation in Zimbabwe is unpredictable at this time. However, it is reasonable to predict that both situations (Mozambique and Zimbabwe) will suffer negative impacts. These situations provide unique opportunities for regional research in the middle of change and undergoing great difficulties.

Water, like land, is the focus of increasing competition (and sometimes conflict) over its control and use in Southern Africa. It is also the focus of important policy reforms to which BASIS research can contribute. In the Malawi and Mozambique water projects, BASIS researchers are observing and documenting the policy-making process as it unfolds, and are collecting information on the effects of new policies that can be used to inform key policy-makers. The Malawi water project focuses on the Lake Chilwa basin in the southern part of the country and addresses current patterns of water use and access, conflict resolution, and water management policies (e.g., decentralization). The Mozambique water project in the Umbeluzi basin in the south shifted its focus in 1999 from physical measures of water flow to analysis of patterns of use and rights in relation to new legislation and administration. Government decentralization programs are still largely in the planning phase in this area. The Zimbabwe water resources project addresses water management issues, especially decentralized management systems, as water sector reforms. Research examines current patterns of water management and use; new institutional authorities and procedures such as the new catchment organizations that emerged in Zimbabwe following new water policy legislation; changes in (or elimination of) tenure and property rights systems; linkages among water, land, labor, and finance at the water user level; and linkages and contradictions across policies and across institutional and administrative dimensions of water management (such as the Ministry of Agriculture and the Department of Fisheries).

## B. RESEARCH PROGRESS

**Table 3: Comparing progress relative to workplans—Southern Africa**

(prepared by Pauline Peters, RPL, Southern Africa Region, March 2000)

<b>Workplan activity</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>Zimbabwe</b>	
Attend key meetings of new water management organizations in the three catchments (Sanyanti, Mazowe, and Manyame): 10/99-9/2000	Activity is underway but is on hold because of disturbances in the country.
Interview policymakers and implementers of water reform, review key policy documents: 10/99-9/2000	40 interviews with subcatchment council members have been conducted. The researchers will begin soon to interview the catchment members.
Training research assistants in data input and analysis programs (Nud*1 <sup>st</sup> for qualitative and SPSS for quantitative): 10-11/99.	SPSS data entry will begin upon the receipt of a new computer and SPSS program. Training is expected to occur at the end of April, 2000.
Conduct studies of water use and impacts of water reform to identify the degree of access by poor and other disadvantaged categories to water resources and, more broadly, access to factor markets, food security and livelihood: 10/99-5/2000	200 surveys of water use and awareness have been completed in Sanyati and Mazowe catchments and data entry begins at the end of April, 2000.
Analysis of surveys, interviews and case studies: 3-9/2000	The activities are on track and/or underway. Some delay caused by Zimbabwean PI's pregnancy but ameliorated by U.S. researchers being in country for much of 1999-2000. Currently negotiating to see if replacement can be made for Zimbabwean PI (from same institution i.e. CASS) for rest of fiscal year 2000.
Workshop with members of Catchment Councils and policymakers to present preliminary findings of research: 2/2000	This on hold because of political disturbances. Earlier meetings were conducted.
Workshop with teams from other two countries in water research project to discuss findings and lessons, and develop 2000-2001 workplan: 3/2000.	Planned for early July 2000 in Malawi.

Workplan activity	Status
<b>Mozambique</b>	
On basis of previous year's work on water flows, select sample of categories of water users in Umbeluzi basin; select and train students and assistants.	Completed under supervision of new senior researcher, Joel das Neves Tembe, under Arlindo Chilundo's overall supervision.
Survey of water users in Umbeluzi Basin to establish types of water use, water rights, costs and evaluation of water, conflicts and conflict resolution: 9/99-2/00	Survey is underway though delayed due to floods. Status is unclear as of April 17, 2000.
Analysis of policies on water, and those affecting water use.	Status is unknown.
Workshop with teams from other two countries in water research project to discuss findings and lessons, and develop 2000-2001 workplan: 3/2000.	Info from PI is very limited. The normal lack of good communications with the Mozambican team has been exacerbated by the floods. The RPL received a reply in the middle of April 2000 from Dr. Chilundo saying they had been "greatly disrupted by the floods but that they had finished the last part of the work". Whether this refers to the survey is unclear.

Workplan activity	Status
<b>Malawi</b>	
Finalize collaborative agreement with other agencies working in Basin (especially the DANIDA-funded environmental project).	Collaboration in actual research proved infeasible (Peters was with Khaila in October 1999 for the meeting with DANIDA. The DANIDA team has provided BASIS team with their documents and high quality computer info.
<p>Survey of categories of water users in Chilwa basin: main topics to be covered include the following: 9/99-2/00:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● assessment of quantity and quality of water used by different categories of users</li> <li>● economic evaluation of water by user categories</li> <li>● gender aspects of water use</li> <li>● relation between water rights and land rights</li> <li>● health and sanitation regarding water sources</li> </ul>	This survey was started in November 1999 and is continuing. But there have been serious delays and hiatuses due to the inability of the senior PI to supervise. The U.S. researcher (Anne Ferguson) was in country from late January to late March 2000 and managed to get some tasks back on track. As of April 2000, new assistants were being trained and it is hoped that CSR will provide a senior researcher to take over from Dr. Khaila on day-to-day supervision.
Study of conflicts over water use and mechanisms for resolution: 9/99-2/00	This is not done. Probably will have to be pushed into next year.
Analysis of existing policy documents and practices regarding water.	Most water policy documents have been collected– N’gong’ola paper made use of them in developing a water policy for the country. Interviews have been carried out with policymakers, program directors, etc. In water related sectors (MOAI, water department, ministry of health, fisheries, major NGOs) these interviews together with findings from the field research have resulted in identification of major types of conflicts that exist over water in the Chilwa basin.
Workshop with teams from other two countries in water research project to discuss findings and lessons, and develop 2000-2001 workplan: 3/2000.	Planned for July 2000.

## C. APPROACHES OR METHODOLOGIES

### 1. Competitive grants

The BASIS CRSP Program Update, October 1999 contains a listing of competitive grants for the 1997 to October 1999 period. There does not appear to be any competitive grants for Zimbabwe, Malawi, or Mozambique for this time period. However, the Southern Africa Program report in the Global Research and Competitive Grants proposal (1 January to 30 April 1998) notes that two competitive grants, one for two small planning grants on the theme of “Restructuring

Markets, Improving Food Security and Securing Sustainable Livelihoods” and one for two stocktaking exercises would be allocated funds.

No responses to the stocktaking RFP were submitted so the funds were rolled back into the overall program. One of the two small planning grants was awarded to Dr. Mataya of Bunda College of Agriculture (Malawi) and one to Dr. Aquah of the University of Botswana. Drs. Mataya and Aquah met with Drs. Carter and May to discuss a comparative design in 1997. Delays in the process were caused by funding problems for Mataya and by Aquah’s sabbatical. Proposals were received from Aquah in October 1999 and from Mataya in March 2000. These have not yet been reviewed.

## **2. Innovative policy**

The three country research programs employ different approaches and methodologies to meet the goal of developing policy. Overall the methods employed show flexibility, with the researchers utilizing, changing, or modifying research approaches as conditions change. An overview of these country projects follows.

In the **Zimbabwe water project**, BASIS-funded research builds on studies that began in 1997 by the University of Zimbabwe’s Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS). Attention had focused in part on two catchments (Mazowe and Mupfure) chosen by the Zimbabwe government as pilot sites for two new forms of water administration; by mid-1999 a new Zimbabwe National Water Authority (ZINWA) had been established and these two catchments were discontinued as official pilots. The research plan was subsequently adjusted and current research focuses on three catchments (Mazowe, Sanyati, and Manyme). Approaches/methodologies in the field research include interviews with policymakers and implementers of water reform, water users, and stakeholders (e.g. indigenous large-scale farmers, other large-scale commercial farmers, large scale miners, small-scale miners, small-scale urban farmers, and communal area farmers); focus group meetings, and observation of water management practices and water catchment council meetings at all administrative levels.

For comparative purposes, a household survey that was designed (based on non-BASIS research by Dr. Peters for **Malawi**) has been adapted by the teams in Mozambique and Zimbabwe. The survey has been conducted in Malawi and new rounds are planned. The survey was started in Mozambique, but due to the floods the status of its completion is unclear. The Zimbabwe team is adapting the survey for the local situation.

The **Malawi water project** has included participatory methodologies to identify water user categories and water use patterns; collection and review of key documents on policy and administrative procedures that affect water use and management in the Lake Chilwa basin; and a workshop for agencies and groups working in the basin or interested in its resources. The 1999-2000 workplan outlines a program of field research in the Lake Chilwa basin to document water supply and demand parameters (using existing data sources); analyze multiple and apparently conflicting policies and administrative procedures that affect water resource management; analyze a sample of water users to identify key patterns of use, rights and claims; problems such as water shortage and quality, and cases of conflict and conflict resolution; undertake detailed case studies of specific sites focused on conflict or other issues emerging from the research procedures listed above; observe and analyze the implementation and enforcement of water policies and administrative actions.

The **Mozambique water project** in 1998-99 included a workshop, review of documents on the new legislation and river basin authorities, preliminary assessment of water service delivery (conducted by 10 students from Eduardo Mondlane University under the supervision of BASIS researchers), study of ecological minimum runoff of the lower Umbeluzi River, assessment of storage potential in the lower Umbeluzi river, and training students in research techniques and the use of computer models.

## **D. IMPACT INDICATORS**

### **1. Current**

Impact indicators at this point in the CRSP activities include progress towards workplan objectives, data analysis, and data collection. In addition, the Southern Africa water related activities are currently yielding rich observations on local institutional structures, dynamics and constraints broadly representative of research management procedures.

### **2. Outcome**

Increased research capacity is an important impact indicator for the Southern Africa CRSP (water related) activities. The need for direct policy intervention is obvious in the geographic area. Research to support policy changes is urgently needed. However, this research should be implemented in the region with leadership provided by indigenous scientists. The procedures adapted by the BASIS CRSP are designed to fully involve, in a cooperative way, both in-country and U.S. scientists. This approach is focused on developing their research capacity and assisting the scientists to work cooperatively to ascertain reasonable policy actions.

### **3. Results**

Generally, it is too early to expect final results. However, the need to plot significant performance indicators in a time continuum in order to accomplish workplan goals is obvious. If the planned results are to be realized, the timetable for the bench mark activities need to be developed and adhered to tightly.

### **4. Prospects for global applicability**

BASIS CRSP research has established three primary and three secondary special objectives. The primary objectives are designed to examine ways to:

- Encourage efficient and competitive land, water, labor, and financial markets;
- Enable formation of land, water, labor, and financial markets in contexts of asset redistribution and economic restructuring; and
- Broaden access of the poor and socially disadvantaged to factor markets and sustainable livelihoods.

The water projects in Zimbabwe, Malawi, and Mozambique include elements related to each of the primary objectives.

A review of the goals together with the factor market research clearly indicates the usefulness of the research globally. Specifically, indicators developed by organizations such as World Watch as well as other futurists appear to agree that water is and will be an increasingly critical factor in the future. Critical issues related to policy development, market factors, ownership, quality, agricultural impacts, and other water related issues are emerging. These require research results that can be adopted in a variety of situations and support policy recommendations.

## **5. Significance of research discoveries**

The significance of potential research discoveries appears to be high. It will be important to monitor the research process and ensure that results and conclusions meet scientific standards.

BASIS research on water management is intended to improve understanding of the water markets in Malawi, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe, and how access to water impacts economic growth and natural resource conservation. The research should contribute significantly to understanding the effectiveness of policy reforms intended to improve capacity to deal with scarcity and conflict; to improve individual access to water, especially among disadvantaged peoples; and to increase regional capacity to manage transboundary natural resources. In addition, the research will consider the extent to which decentralized water management systems imply a wider “culture of democracy.”

## **E. STATUS**

The project has managed to continue through the crisis situation in Southern Africa. Continued progress in Zimbabwe may be questionable at least during the upcoming few months due to travel advisories by the British Government and travel warnings by the government of the U.S.A. As the conflict in the area becomes more widespread and since some of the basic reasons for the conflict (land and water) relate directly to the project, research progress may be very difficult.

The work proposed by the project for FY2000 includes the following:

The **Malawi water project** FY2000 workplan proposes to finalize agency agreements in Chilwa basin, survey users, assess quantity and quality of water used, and analyze cases of competitive use and conflict over water.

The **Mozambique water project** FY2000 workplan proposes to select a sample of various categories of users, train assistants, survey users, evaluate conflicts and conflict resolution, and analyze policies.

The **Zimbabwe water program** FY2000 workplan proposes to interview policy-makers and implementers of reform; review policy documents; train assistants in database management; and conduct studies of use and impacts of reform to identify access by the disadvantaged to resources, factor markets, food security, and livelihoods.

## **1. Collaboration/cooperation/linkage relations and activities**

### **USAID**

Researchers are very aware of the importance of involving relevant USAID missions in the work of the CRSP. During the first project year, D. Rubin (USAID) met with the USAID Regional



Mission to explain the project. Based on intelligence from that meeting, Dr. Peters and project leadership followed up on the water theme and transboundary national resource management, which were topics in which the mission personnel expressed interest. Dr. Peters made another visit to the Regional Mission in October 1999. Thus far, none of the meetings guaranteed funds for the program. Currently, the Zimbabwe Mission is kept routinely informed of BASIS work.

However, attempts to make contact with the Mozambique Mission have not been successful. Dr. Peters visited with the Malawi Mission in 1997 to inform them of the CRSP work. Follow-up contacts have not been attempted in Malawi since Peters' visit.

Michael Roth has also met with USAID personnel related to the Southern Africa water program. He and Dr. Peters visited with the Regional USAID Mission in Gaborone several times. In addition, Dr. Roth met with the Mission in Mozambique and Zimbabwe. Dr. Roth has communicated frequently with David Atwood and Dennis Weller in USAID/Africa Bureau in Washington, DC.

### **Host Country organizations**

Researchers from Host country institutions are active in the project as collaborators. The Centre for Applied Social Science (CASS), at the University of Zimbabwe, Nucleo de Estudos de Terra (NET), at Eduardo Mondlane University, and the Centre for Social Research (CSR), affiliated with the University of Malawi have personnel linked to the water project. In addition to experienced researchers, the host country institutions also realize benefits to overall research programs and possible involvement of graduate students in dynamic research activities.

Institutions collaborating on the water program also include the Zimbabwe National Water Authority (ZINWA), the Water Resources Management Strategy Group (WRMS) in Zimbabwe, the Lake Chilwa Project in Malawi (locally managed but funded by DANIDA), ARA-Sul regional river basin authority in Mozambique, and a new Dutch-organized regional organization called Water Net.

BASIS hosted a workshop on **Malawi** in January 1998 that included participants from agencies and groups working in the Lake Chilwa basin. A network of stakeholders has been established (government representatives at all levels, NGOs, community groups) in Mozambique also.

A planning workshop, organized by the Centre for Applied Social Science (CASS) at the University of Zimbabwe and in collaboration with John Bruce (LTC) and Pauline Peters (HIID), was held in Zimbabwe in July 1999. This workshop brought together researchers, government, and non-government organizations.

### **Donor organizations**

Members of the Steering Committee met with IDRC personnel in Johannesburg to inform them of the proposed work of the CRSP. Fundraising with IDRC has not been successful though discussions with organizations active in the area should be viewed as worthwhile as such activities lay a foundation for future cooperative work.

A meeting was also arranged by project leadership with the UNDP Gaborone office. The purpose of the meeting was twofold: to inform and to seek additional funds. The funding has not been realized as yet but the organization was informed.

### **Other BASIS programs, other CRSPs and external groups**

There has been some collaboration with the Horn of Africa Program but scarce funds and limited time available to the program leaders have curtailed this collaboration. At present, a formal mechanism for ensuring that collaboration occurs is not in place.

There appears to be good working relationships among Bill Derman, Anne Ferguson and Pauline Peters and between the U.S. researchers and their counterparts. The two American researchers on the water project (Derman in Zimbabwe and Ferguson in Zimbabwe and Malawi) both received Fulbright-Hayes fellowships to support their research.

## **2. Programs/Research Benefits/Contributions**

### **USAID goals**

The BASIS CRSP is in the process of conducting collaborative research on factor markets in an effort to address USAID/AFS objectives of increasing food availability, creating economic growth, and conserving natural resources. The researchers link to the USAID/AFS objectives using the BASIS Approach to Rural Development (see chart in BASIS CRSP Second Annual Report: Activities and Workplan, October 1998). The Southern Africa water research is within the mainstream of this Approach.

### **Host countries/non-US partners**

The Southern Africa water activities have involved researchers from the University of Zimbabwe, Eduardo Mondlane University, and the University of Malawi.

Each country participating in the water project in Southern Africa is also involved in national natural resources reform processes to establish new policies, procedures, and decentralized management structures for water resources. Access to water is highly constrained in the region. An exception to this is the overabundance of water in the recent flooding in Zimbabwe and Mozambique. The excessive flooding in the latter country raises the issue of cross-country agreements about regulation of dams and river flow. Such emergency situations provide a unique opportunity for host country researchers and U.S. researchers to acquire information in the middle of a crisis. The importance of such research to the host countries is apparent.

All of the country teams have put a great deal of effort into communicating with and involving, as much as is feasible, key “stakeholders” in the research. These include government representatives, at local, district, and national levels, relevant NGOs, and community groups. In Mozambique, they have set up a network of such people, along with researchers, concerned with water resources. In Malawi, the PI, Dr. Khaila, has spent considerable effort ensuring such communication—through a large initial meeting to introduce the research, and through more informal contacts with the individuals and institutions in the country. In Zimbabwe, the team has managed to link their research very closely with key groups from the community up to the national level. While the “products” of such communication and involvement seem slight so far, the researchers feel that they will be essential in the longer term for the best use of the research.

### **U.S. universities/institutions**

In an effort to encourage efficient and competitive water markets, the Southern Africa regional program aims to identify whether and how new planning institutions and procedures manage

water allocation and use. Various U.S. sites currently have or will have need for this information relative to the looming water problems, especially in the western part of the U.S. The present and continuing need to establish policies in water-short areas, according to all indications, will not reduce but will become more urgent. Issues related to water source ownership, agriculture vs. housing development, water education programs and others are becoming more frequent in the western U.S. Whatever lessons can be learned from the CRSP research will be useful as the western U.S. cities face policy issues related to water.

Several of the researchers (both U.S. and non-U.S.) have managed to involve their students in the research. Mozambique and Zimbabwe have done so. The researchers and the PI support this very important aspect of BASIS-funded research as one that might be more emphasized in future work. Malawi probably has not gone this route because the CSR is a research unit without strong ties to faculties. This might be changed in future. More involvement of U.S. students would benefit both those students and Southern African students. Generally, bringing U.S. students into the program has been difficult. Part of the reason is that it is very expensive to get a U.S. student into the field for any length of time and the current level of funding is not adequate enough to support such a program.

### **Training**

Formal training programs are not a part of the Southern Africa water program. However, because the project is collaborative in nature, researchers from the region and the U.S. share commonalities of the situations they are facing, both regionally and internationally. Collaborative work provides training for all participants.

By involving young researchers in the project, the Southern Africa program is building the capacity of the professional researchers in the region. The U.S. researchers are committed to assisting the young researchers (U.S. and host country) to learn various research and analysis techniques so they will be able to establish similar projects in the future.

### **Cross cutting themes: gender, market integration, and risk**

The cross cutting themes of relevance in this project include gender, market integration, and risk. The Southern Africa BASIS program should help improve the access of women and marginalized peoples to scarce water and land resources, by improving their representation in local resource management bodies, and influencing legal reform and policy experimentation.

### **3. Evaluation of overall CRSP fiscal and administrative management from program viewpoint**

Issues related to communication, scarcity of trained personnel, and other related items are discussed in the recommendations section of this report. Basic responsibility for these issues cannot be assumed totally by the BASIS program.

## **F. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS**

- A U.S. PI has not yet been designated to work with the Mozambican team and the adequacy of this situation needs to be examined during the upcoming site visit. Mozambican water research has focused strongly on physical and geological aspects of water management,

though Pauline Peters' interventions late in 1999 may have helped to broaden that focus. Progress of this project is uncertain as it is one of the few without a proposal indicating timelines and expected completion dates. The water research team in Mozambique set up a network of researchers, policy-makers and others interested in water resource management, and they have met several times with the ARA-Sul, the regional agency in the project area. The potential is high for this activity and it is recommended that planning be a priority.

- The summer 2000 visit by the EEP member should address questions about: the extent and effectiveness of collaboration within and across the countries in this region; possibilities for institutionalizing the research (not the results) in a policy-making body or within a body that has influence over the policy-making process; the degree to which the research is oriented toward practical policy advice as opposed to scholarly journal articles; extent to which researchers or policy-makers understand the potential long-term benefits/results of the BASIS CRSP mission; and the appropriateness of the research focus.
- One of the water project researchers raised concerns about BASIS' assumption that the water project is trying to influence policy; this researcher says that they have not told their local collaborators that they are trying to influence policy but rather that they are studying the outcomes of their policies and interactions with a range of stakeholders. S/he asks for clarification – and a larger team discussion – about the underlying principles of the research, and suggests that USAID should “simply support a catchment council ... to see if it can affect differences in policy by working with one and improving it. The Germans, the Brits, the Dutch are all there supporting institutional change and assessing their effectiveness.” Since this appears to be an issue of interest to at least one researcher, it is recommended that a dialogue be instituted which would address the topic.
- As with other similar projects, the water project suffered from major problems in disbursing funds throughout the region. INR (associated with the University of Natal) had been designated the disbursing agency, since all partners agreed that South Africa had the best banking and financial systems in the region. However, the disbursing of funds from INR to other countries in the region proved extremely slow and costly. The cumbersome bureaucratic problems included delays in monies being transferred from the South African bank to banks in the various countries. Several times, this resulted in the “loss” of funds transferred to Malawi, due both to problems in the foreign exchange procedures of the banks and to university hitches. All led to research delays and to exasperation among the researchers. In addition, the bureaucratic problems were exacerbated by the serious illness of Jenny Mander in the INR and the almost complete breakdown in communication between her and the researchers as well as the PI and the ME. Eventually, over the course of almost two years, these financial transfers improved. However, the internal accounting systems of the researchers' units and the universities within which the units operate are very poor and the invoices remain behind schedule. The evaluators do not have a suggestion to make relative to this issue but point it out as a source of continuing delays.
- There have been and continue to be communications problems (of a hardware nature) and currently these are the worst for Malawi and Zimbabwe, although a new modem has improved the situation somewhat in Malawi. In Zimbabwe, the U.S. researcher has a separate email connection, which works better than the CASS (university) link. This is a seriously underestimated problem and one which would be useful to bring more to the forefront in planning for and funding collaborative research.

- Generally, the lack of trained personnel at all levels is a common problem in most of Africa. Local programs are impacted by the lack of trained and competent administrative and secretarial help. Senior professionals are often put in the position of taking care of routine office work if it is to be done. This situation results in imposing high demands on the time of the professionals. Office work detracts from research activities and results in delays and limitations as to what is accomplished. This situation is common and donors should recognize the severe limitation of trained support personnel. Funds should be made available by donors such as USAID to train staff assistants.
- One important fact about the project as a whole is how valuable all of the Southern African researchers felt it was to encourage and support collaborative research, exchange, and information sharing across borders. They have experienced the largely “north-south” flows of aid and information: from “northern” agencies to individual countries or groups within countries. A few agencies, such as the Ford Foundation and some of the Scandinavian groups, are beginning to foster regional networks, but the need is far greater than the capacity. All agreed that the aim of BASIS Southern Africa program to encourage inter-country, regional research is an important one and one which should be continued.
- Local fuel and transportation costs have escalated in the area. These costs have become a significant obstacle to field research. Unfortunately, the obvious answer to this problem is to increase the budget, but due to an overall tight funding environment the solution to the problem is not easy.
- There is a need for more frequent meetings among the researchers. The purpose of these meetings would be to foster regional networks and develop comparative work. The value of such meetings is significant for U.S. researchers, but even more significant for the Africa researchers. The cost of such meetings is significant and therefore the possible “trade-off” of meetings versus research must be carefully considered.
- It would be beneficial to both Southern African students and to U.S. students to increase their involvement. Meetings involving students and researchers would be of value to the development of the students. Involvement of U.S. students in the project is to be encouraged. Sponsoring agencies should continue to be explored for funding support.
- A central problem for research in the region, including the water project, concerns research personnel, especially the difficulty of researchers being able to put sustained time into research. Countries outside of South Africa have extremely small pools of competent social scientists who have very high demands on their time from their universities (teaching and administration), their governments (most of the senior researchers are on several government level committees and boards), and consultancies. The latter are usually undertaken because of the need to make money: the salary levels in the region are low and have been losing value in recent years. One result is that there are frequent changes in key research personnel in the project with many of the best researchers are “poached” by international agencies. Thus, Dr. Nhira left CASS to join IDRC in Johannesburg, leaving the water project without a PI until Bev Sithole, who was then doing her doctoral dissertation, took over. Another result of these demands is that research goes more slowly than desirable. In the case of Malawi and Mozambique, PIs are also Directors of their units (CSR and NET, respectively). While both Dr. Khaila and Dr. Chilundo are highly competent researchers in their own right, they are constantly drawn into managing their units’ activities, raising funds, conducting research or

workshops for various agencies within their countries, and traveling abroad on these multiple tasks. Each has sought to bring others in as PIs, but delays and problems continue.

- The lack of a significant mass of trained personnel is a common one in developing countries. The answer is complex and to the knowledge of these evaluators the issue has not been addressed completely in such a way as to identify a practical plan of attack. Related to the lack of research personnel is the issue of the lack of trained support personnel (mentioned in a previous recommendation).
- A review of the overall southern Africa water work clearly indicates a need for: cross-country comparative research; an enlargement of the scope of the research program (topics identified through the research process); more work in BASIS cross-cutting themes; increased involvement of graduate students in the research; and other tasks. However, the limitations of funds and lack of incoming add-ons provides a real questions about the amount of work which can be accomplished under present circumstances.

Strategy relative to the funding issue should be addressed very soon. Hard questions must be asked about the sustainability of the water activities in three countries, how to capture add-on funding and ultimately what activities must be continued, finalized, added, or terminated. The BASIS reconciliation process must include attention to the possible sustainability of the current research program.

## **G. APPENDIX**

- In addition to other documents, the following reports and studies were reviewed:
- BASIS Annual Activity Report, October 1998-September 1999: Broadening Access to Water Resources in Southern Africa
- BASIS Annual Workplan: Southern Africa, October 1999-September 2000
- BASIS CRSP Program Update, October 1999
- BASIS CRSP Second Annual Report: Workplan, October 1998-September 1999
- BASIS CRSP Southern Africa Water Trip Report, Bill Derman, January 4-25, 1999
- BASIS CRSP Trip Report, Anne Ferguson, March 12-29, 1999
- BASIS CRSP Trip Report, Danielle Hartmann, July 23-August 5, 1999
- BASIS Research and Training Program in Southern Africa: Synthesis of the Southern African Regional Planning Workshop, June 1997
- BASIS Southern Africa 1 October 1998-30 September 1999 Workplan
- BASIS Southern Africa Program, memo from Michael Roth, February 24, 2000
- BASIS Southern Africa Reconnaissance Mission Report, 2-13 March 1997
- BASIS Southern Africa Second Planning Meeting for Research Agendas on Water Resource Use in Malawi, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe, 7-9 September, Joanne H. Leestermaker
- BASIS Trip Report, Michael Roth and Pauline Peters, January 5-27, 1999
- Broadening Access to Water Resources in Southern Africa, Pauline Peters, undated

- Research Proposal: BASIS Southern Africa Second Planning Meeting for Research Agendas on Water Resource Use in Malawi, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe, 7-9 September 1998, Harare, Zimbabwe
- Research Proposal: Broadening Access to Land Markets in Southern Africa
- Research Proposal: Water Resource Management and Water Policy Formation in Four Countries
- Southern Africa: BASIS CRSP Research Projects, undated
- Trip Report, Pauline Peters, October 20-November 20, 1999

## **H. LISTING OF INTERVIEWS, DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

Due to unforeseen problems which prevented the scheduled field visit, it was determined to prepare a desk review of the program in order to meet the deadline for the EEP report submission. The desk review was prepared by EEP members Drs. Angelique Haugerud and Jean Kearns. Each evaluator reviewed documents independently and prepared separate statements which, after finalization, were combined into the final report.

Thus, without the information which would be acquired in a site visit, this evaluation must be viewed a preliminary. As previously stated, it was important to prepare this evaluation within a certain time frame so the report could be utilized in the EEP CRSP evaluation.

In order to assure accuracy, it is planned that a member of the EEP will visit the project site (Zimbabwe, Malawi, and Mozambique) before September 2000. At that time, the report will be revised to reflect information acquired in the site visit.

# **ANNEX V: BROADENING ACCESS TO LAND MARKETS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA**

**Namibia, South Africa, Zimbabwe**

**Prepared by: Allen M. Featherstone, EEP Member**

**Dates of visit: March 4-12, 2000**

## **A. OVERVIEW**

*Cross-Cutting Objective:* To inform policy recommendations aimed at broadening access to land markets and encouraging sustainable use of farmland acquired by disadvantaged people in South Africa, Namibia, and Zimbabwe. Specifically, the rate at which farmland is redistributed — both as a result of private transactions and public land reform programs — in selected regions of each country. In addition, relationships between land tenure, managerial arrangements, farm and household characteristics, access to credit, investment in agriculture, land use and rural livelihoods on redistributed farmland. The proposed research is to span a period of five years with annual census surveys of farmland transactions, sample surveys of households using redistributed farmland, and a series of workshops and reports to refine methodology and reports to refine methodology and disseminate findings.

Land reform is a crucial issue in Namibia, South Africa, and Zimbabwe (hence referred to as Southern Africa in this document). The recent events in Zimbabwe have illustrated this point. Land reform in Southern Africa has important political and economic consequences of which there is a natural tension between the achievement of political and economic goals. The achievement of a political goal may have unstable economic consequences and vice versa. Various mechanisms for land reform exist in the region ranging from those which are heavily driven by the public sector to those that allow the private market allocate land. A number of mechanisms for land reform lay between those extremes.

In South Africa, several schemes for land reform ranging from those that are heavily government-driven to those which are heavily private sector-driven are in close proximity providing an ideal climate for comparative analysis. In Namibia and Zimbabwe, the issues are no less acute but are more difficult in that basic data on exact ownership patterns and how those ownership patterns are changing are unavailable. Thus, BASIS researchers in Namibia and Zimbabwe needed to do much more preliminary work before the ultimate goals of the research stated above could be achieved.

The goal of this project is to examine the issues of broadening access to land markets and sustainable use of farmland by disadvantaged people in selected parts of Southern Africa. The ultimate aim is to evaluate the various means by which farmland is transferred and ultimately used with a specific focus on the well being of disadvantaged people. Because the issue is not only transfer, but subsequent use, this project was by necessity designed to be two consecutive five-year projects.

A specific set of deliverables and phasing for the work was set out in the proposal beginning in January 1998 and ending in 2003 for the first five-year project. Specific deliverables and dissemination plans were put together, with much of the dissemination coming towards the end



of the five-year program. Another objective was to develop local research capacity in the process of the completion of the BASIS research.

## **B. RESEARCH PROGRESS**

Research progress will be mainly discussed in South Africa and Namibia as these were the two countries visited. When I discuss recommendations, I will provide a more comments on Zimbabwe. I will discuss the progress relative to workplans, methodologies, impact indicators, prospects of global applicability, and significance of research discoveries for Namibia and then South Africa.

The research progress of Namibia and South Africa was good, although generally uneven. Much of this unevenness arose from the linking of partners that were not equally far along on tasks when the project began. South Africa was very far along with regards to the census work. Namibia and Zimbabwe needed to develop the procedures from ground zero. As a result, initial stages in Namibia and Zimbabwe were more difficult than in South Africa. However, the payoff from the initial stages will likely be higher in Namibia and Zimbabwe than in South Africa.

## **C. PROGRESS RELATIVE TO WORKPLANS—*NAMIBIA***

**Table 4: Comparing progress relative to workplans—Namibia**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Percent Complete</b>
Process data on the Survey	January-March 2000	95
Consultation with national partners	February-March 2000	60
Data Cleaning and checking of Census	February-June 2000	15
Data Collection for Census	February-June 2000	15
Transferal of Census Data to Microsoft Access and ArcView	February-June 2000	50
Preparation for Regional Conference	March-July 2000	10
Reporting on census	August-October	Not started
Annual Reporting	October – November	Not Started

The table above presents the progress on the Namibian project relative to the workplans as prepared by Ben Fuller. In general, based on this Table and the general sense obtained on the site visit, the work seems to be progressing well relative to the time table. The timeline for the project is generally met with regards to the phase 1, 2, and 3 of the project proposal. The household survey was completed on 30 households and is in the process of being analyzed. It should be noted that the progress of the project was affected by the fact that there was a change in researchers mid way through. The original PI was Dr Hangule, the Director of the Multi-Disciplinary SSS in the University. But very early in the program, he was directed by the government to be on the team negotiating over the Caprivi strip disagreement with Botswana. Otto Kamwi, the junior researcher who had been most actively involved, resigned to take up a civil servant post. Dr. Fuller did not become officially involved until recently. This has caused a need to streamline some of the projects such as the household survey.

### **1. Approaches and Methodologies**

The general approaches and methodologies follow those developed by South Africa with regards to the general census. Innovations in methodology include the use of ArcView to map land transfer patterns. The incorporation of the census land transfer data into a geographic mapping system is a very innovative approach to determining landownership and land transfer patterns. As other data become available in this form the relationships between other variables and land transfer will be able to be fully investigated.

### **2. Impact Indicators**

The impact of the work is generally good. The Namibian government is very aware of the work and is looking forward to obtaining the ArcView information for policy analysis. The collection and assembly of the data in electronic form for use in a geographical information system will provide a useful product in and of itself. The data will allow the government to look at ownership patterns so that land could be more efficiently acquired for distribution purposes. The examination of the outcomes of the land transactions will be very useful for longer-term land reform policy.

The Namibian Nature Foundation is also very aware of the work for their use in land use analysis. They intend to look at land use and landownership patterns and relate those to optimal returns and bio-diversity. The ability to have access to the landownership data electronically will provide an excellent foundation for further work.

A working paper entitled “An Analysis of First Census Survey of Commercial Agricultural Land Transactions in Namibia: 1990 to 1998” has been completed. Other impacts from the work are anticipated as the household survey analysis is completed and the results analyzed. Continuing the census will also provide additional impact. Finally, it should be noted that there is some interest in this work from the commercial farmers union.

### **3. Prospects of Global Applicability**

Because of the use of methodology and the global importance of the issue, the project has excellent global applicability. Land reform, while being an issue in Namibia, is also an issue in

numerous regions around the world. As economies struggle to move into market economies, movement from state ownership to private ownership is very important. The historical success of land reform has not been good. While the reason for land reform is not necessarily the same for Namibia as for other parts of the world, lessons learned from this process will have global applicability.

With regards to the methodology, the ability to link and analyze various databases in a spatial format is cutting edge. This type of work is currently going on in other parts of the world, however, the methodology is probably no further along than it is in Namibia. Therefore, the potential exists for applicability from a methodological standpoint if researchers are provided the resources to pursue these avenues.

#### **4. Significance of Research Discoveries**

The significance of the research discoveries is rather limited at this point given the length of the project to this point. Preliminary work suggests that over 7% of available commercial farmland has been transferred to those defined as disadvantaged. However, it was found that if white women are factored out of the analysis, the rate of transfer decreases to 4.2%. As work continues, there is excellent potential for significant research discoveries to occur as discussed above.

#### **D. PROGRESS RELATIVE TO WORKPLANS—SOUTH AFRICA**

Table 2 presents the progress relative to the workplan. Based on this Table and the general sense obtained on the site visit, the work seems to be progressing well relative to the time table. Each of the deliverables was provided in the time frame outlined in the proposal. It was anticipated at the time of my visit that the 3<sup>rd</sup> round of the census would be completed before the end of the year.

**Table 5: Comparing progress relative to workplans—South Africa**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Status</b>
Analyze 2 <sup>nd</sup> Census Survey	August to December 1999	Completed
Conduct 3 <sup>rd</sup> Census Survey	July to October 2000	Planned to be Completed
Analyze 1 <sup>st</sup> Household Survey	August to December 1999	Completed
Attend Land Market Workshop	July 2000	Planned to be Completed
Visit by Doug Graham	June to July 2000	Planned to be Completed

## **1. Approaches and Methodologies**

The general approach for Namibia and Zimbabwe was developed by the South Africa researchers. The variety of mechanisms being used in South Africa for land reform vary from a government assisted approach to a private sector approach. This provides a rich setting for comparative analysis. As information regarding the subsequent performance of farmers under various methods of land reform becomes available, a rich set of information should become available.

## **2. Impact Indicators**

The impact of the work is excellent. Mr. Paul Zille, who is in charge of the Land Reform Credit Facility for Khula Enterprise Finance Ltd., is very aware of the work being done by the team in Pietermaritzburg. Professor Mike Lyne provided insight into the development of the Land Reform Credit Facility. Mr. Zille indicated that without the input from Professor Lyne, there would not have been a product. In addition, the Minister of Land Affairs has requested a meeting with Professor Lyne to discuss land reform.

There has also been a professional impact from the work done in South Africa. Several papers have been produced including the "Land redistribution in KwaZulu-Natal: an analysis of farmland transactions in 1997" published in *Development Southern Africa*. Other working papers have been produced and are at various points in the publication process. These include a mini-symposium accepted for the meetings of the International Association of Agricultural Economists (IAAE). In addition, a contributed paper is in review for those meetings.

## **3. Prospects of Global Applicability**

The issue of global applicability is much the same as stated above for Namibia. Land reform is an important issue in many parts of the world. Information on characteristics of successful land reform programs will be of interest in other regions of the world. The ability to study a broad variety of schemes for land transfer to disadvantaged people groups should allow for rich comparative analysis. Finally, the acceptance of a mini-symposium dealing with land reform at the triennial meetings of the IAAE is a signal of the global interest and perhaps applicability of the results.

## **4. Significance of Research Discoveries**

Results from the work suggest that land transferred via government grants was of lower quality than land purchased privately. In addition just 0.35% was transferred to disadvantaged people. Relative to government assisted transfers, private market transfers to disadvantaged people accounted for a smaller share in terms of quality but a larger share in terms of value redistributed. In other work, it was found that tenure security adds to agricultural performance. It was also found that tenure arrangements on government assisted land reform projects are less secure than the private market. Thus, work in South Africa has documented that the private market has a role to play in land reform. The potential for other significant research discoveries to occur is high as the performance of the new occupants is followed over time.

## **E. STATUS**

### **1. Collaboration/Cooperation/Linkage Relations and Activities**

#### **USAID Mission**

Neither South Africa nor Namibia is collaborating directly with USAID. Gary Cohen of USAID/Namibia was interested in the work. He felt that the results of the work would be of importance in understanding landownership patterns in Namibia.

#### **Host Country Organizations**

South Africa has had contact with the Land Reform Credit Facility of the Khula Enterprise Finance Ltd. As stated above, the BASIS researchers have provided important input into the design of land reform schemes. In addition, a meeting has been requested by the Minister of Land Affairs to discuss land reform.

Namibia has had contact with the Namibia Nature Foundations, Environmental Affairs, and the Ministry of Lands, Resettlement, and Rehabilitation. The work is extremely important for various reasons to these individuals.

#### **Donor Organizations**

South Africa has identified alternative sources of funding within country. At the time of my visit, it was likely that they would use those funding sources and not renew with BASIS.

Namibia BASIS has made contacts with other donor organizations. The Ford Foundation provided N\$40,000 for field work. In addition, a small grant was obtained from the Finnish National Academy of Sciences for this work.

#### **Other BASIS Programs**

The main collaboration among BASIS programs is among researchers in the three countries. Two annual meetings have been held where the teams from the three countries have interchanged information. A third meeting is scheduled in Namibia this July. South Africa had contact with Ragan Petrie (Land Tenure Center) and Douglas Graham (Ohio State). Namibia had contact with John Bruce (Land Tenure Center) and Douglas Graham (Ohio State).

### **2. Program/Research Benefits/Contributions**

#### **USAID goals**

The Southern Africa BASIS program should contribute to achieving USAID goals related to policymaking in Namibia and South Africa. Findings from these projects are likely to impact policymaking in both Namibia and South Africa. As both of these countries try to strengthen their economies, the agricultural sector will be key. Providing opportunity for those currently disadvantaged has the potential to provide the stability necessary for these countries to continue economic progress.

## **Host countries/non-U.S. partners**

The BASIS project has provided research support for many organizations discussed above. In addition, BASIS has an excellent link with the University of Namibia and the University of Natal-Pietermaritzburg in South Africa. The linkages provided to scholars at these institutions should strengthen both the teaching and research capabilities within those Universities. The projects have provided research opportunities for the host countries.

## **U.S. Universities and Training**

BASIS in South Africa has maintained contact with Ohio State University through Douglas Graham. In addition, Andrew Graham worked on the BASIS project as part of his master's program at the University of Natal-Pietermaritzburg. Ragan Petrie of the Land Tenure Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison also benefited from the BASIS project as it provided data for her research. There is some discussion about making the data from Namibia available on the web. If that occurs, the potential for training and research will be excellent.

## **Overall**

The research has the potential to yield research benefits to the U.S. Land tenure is such an important issue in Africa and other parts of the world. Increased understanding of mechanisms that successful lead to the redistribution of land to the disadvantaged will have important geo-political implications in this region of the world and other parts of the world. Thus, the U.S. has economic, political, and humanitarian interests in enhancing growth and reducing poverty in Southern Africa. It was also mentioned by Mr. Kapiye in the Ministry of Lands, Resettlement, and Rehabilitation of the crucial need for the project to not stop with the census portion but to actually analyze the effect on households as is planned in the future.

## **Cross cutting themes: gender, market integration, and risk**

The BASIS project in Southern Africa does address the cross cutting themes of gender, market integration, and risk. Gender is especially addressed in the census of transactions as land acquisition by gender is one of the variables being monitored. Ragan Petrie's work focuses specifically on the gender issue. Market integration is also addressed by this project in the very nature of the land reform. Macroeconomic policy to stimulate growth of the agricultural sector is at the very core of land reform. The ability to study multiple approaches allows a rich setting for comparative analysis. Risk has not been substantially addressed up until this point in the project. However, the ability to study households over an extended period of time will allow a rich setting to examine the risk households face under different land reform mechanisms, the strategies they use to cope, and the success of those strategies.

## **CRSP Fiscal and Administrative Management**

A few issues came up with regards to fiscal and administrative management. The project suffered early due to a lack of communication among individuals. It seems that for the most part many of these difficulties have been dealt with over time. A few points are worth noting. The first is the importance in dollar denominating all disbursements. There was a concern regarding exchange rate fluctuations. Secondly, it was suggested that the dispensing agent needs to be involved with the project to build trust among the parties. It seems that unfamiliarity with the personalities led to some problems. In addition, it seems that communication is key. In some

cases, electronic communication systems did not work leading to difficulties. In addition, communication with more than one individual at an institution seems to be necessary. In one case, an individual was unaware the reports that were delegated to someone else were *not* being filed in a timely manner. It may be useful to consider disbursing all funds from the management entity instead of subcontracting the accounting function out on a regional basis. It was indicated that the intermediary did not have much success in obtaining complete accountability for all funds disbursed from the receiving parties.

It was also indicated that the reporting requirements were more than what was initially anticipated. It seems that the reporting requirements anticipated by the researchers were different than those required. One recommendation would be that reporting expectations be clearly defined before the projects are initiated. In addition there seemed to be concern that the reporting was somewhat repetitive. It would be useful to streamline the reporting requirements as much as possible along with being more clearly defined up-front.

## **F. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS**

The BASIS project in Southern Africa appears to be positioned to make some important contributions regarding the land reform research. These issues are of widespread importance not only regionally, but globally. However, this project, as any multi-national projects, has not occurred without suffering some difficulties. Specific recommendations revolve around two basic themes: the research mission and the organizational dimension.

### **1. Research Recommendations**

It appears that the opportunity exists for substantial contribution from the project given the immense amount of data gathered. However, the projects are understaffed. Thus, the potential impact of the first phase may be limited because of the sheer amount of analysis that could be produced. More research opportunity exists than researcher effort available. Therefore it is suggested that creative mechanisms be developed for linking potential researchers (U.S. or non-U.S. students) with available projects. It may be useful to set up a thesis or dissertation grant process where the projects would be defined. Funds could be allocated to fund a student for the field research portion of the work and an advisor site visit.

It appears that there is some concern with the use of common methods. In general, the use of common methods is to be encouraged to increase comparability. However, the partners were not on an equal footing going into the project, thus, progress was not made at the same rate. This has caused frustration among the researchers through no fault of their own. In addition, issues and opportunities arise that need to be addressed within the country to have immediate impact within the policymaking arena in individual countries. Therefore, the common methodology is probably a little too rigid to work well. In addition, funds were not available to allow common methodology to develop given the status of electronic communications. Therefore, without a substantial infusion of funds, it is likely that a common methodology will not be able to be pulled off. Again, this is not unique to this research project. Coordination needs to be more grassroots than top-down. Does that mean that comparative analysis cannot be pulled together? This is probably not the case. It is likely that the comparative analysis will be more of an inductive rather than of a deductive nature than was initially envisioned. I think allowing the participants to

interact towards the end of the project would allow for comparative analysis and future recommendations.

## **2. Organizational Dimensions**

I think that there needs to be a distinction between deductive versus inductive collaboration. Deductive collaboration is going to be much more expensive than inductive collaboration. Deductive would involve a common methodology to be used in various countries. It would by necessity involve more intense face to face contact (perhaps on a monthly or quarterly basis). In addition, it would probably involve purchasing a larger amount of the researchers time than an inductive type approach. The approach could have worked if the BASIS funds would have been able to be leveraged substantially. While some leveraging has occurred as discussed above, it has not occurred to the point to fund a deductive approach.

Therefore to still provide useful comparative analysis, a more inductive type of approach probably needs to be followed at this point for Southern Africa given the funding base. It seems that good scientists were identified that had a common interest in land reform issues. Providing those individuals “seed” money to further work in the region on those issues in a flexible manner with annual meetings to coordinate and interact, is probably about all that can be expected. Using “field” work grants could expand the amount of U.S.-Host Institution collaboration.

It is also imperative to provide more lead time to adjust to structural changes in renewals. The need to develop relationships with partners in a short time frame was perceived as an insurmountable barrier. This could probably be alleviated somewhat by trying to expand the existing pool of researchers available to partner with. Perhaps providing opportunities to pull potential BASIS collaborators in by sponsoring a BASIS program and providing travel grants to targeted individuals could facilitate this.

## **G. LIST OF INTERVIEWS, DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

My evaluation was based on the interviews listed below and on a review of the BASIS workplans available. Briefing memos were provided by Pauline Peters and Michael Roth. In addition, I also reviewed the documents produced from the research including progress reports, working papers, and journal articles. Finally, I visited both South Africa and Namibia from March 6 through March 10.

### **1. List of Interviews**

#### **March 6, 2000**

Mike Lyne (BASIS researcher and Associate Professor, University of Natal-Pietermaritzburg) and Mark Darroch (BASIS researcher and Senior Lecturer, University of Natal-Pietermaritzburg)

Paul Zille (Manager, Land Reform Credit Facility, Khula Enterprise Finance Ltd.), by phone

Jenny Mander (Director, Institute of Natural Resources, Administers the Financial Aspects of the Land Reform work)



**March 7, 2000**

Andrew Graham (Graduate Student and BASIS researcher) Also met with two of the principals associated with the Ignome project. Andrew provided a site visit to Ignome and Durban. These provided a contrast between Land Reform projects that are successful and those that are struggling.

**March 8, 2000**

Ben Fuller (BASIS researcher and Senior Research Fellow, Social Sciences Division, University of Namibia)

**March 9, 2000**

Dr. Chris Brown (Director, Namibia Nature Foundation)

John Mandelson (Director of Environmental Affairs)

Gary Cohen (Special Projects Officer, U.S. Agency for International Development USAID/Namibia)

**March 10, 2000**

Mr. Kapiye (Ministry of Lands, Resettlement, and Rehabilitation)