

AID/CSD-2263

ISW-2110

Copy for Mr. ~~Hoban~~

931011100

PD-AAL-115

University of Wisconsin
Land Tenure Center
Comprehensive Review
July 1978

I. Background	(1)
II. Structure of the Review	(2)
Approach	(2)
Team Composition	(2)
Issues Paper	(3)
Field Visit	(3)
On-site Review	(4)
III. Land Tenure Center Performance	(5)
1. Expanded Knowledge	(6)
2. Education and Training	(10)
3. Information Capacity	(13)
4. Advisory Capacity	(13)
5. Linkages	(15)
IV. Conclusions and Recommendations	(19)
1. Operations of the 211(d) Grant	(19)
2. Future AID/LTC Relationships	(21)

Annexes

- A. Land Tenure Center Issues Paper
- B. Cable Manila 11498
- C. Review Team Member Appointment Schedule
- D. Land Tenure Center Response to AID/W Issues Paper
- E. Supplementary Land Tenure Center Response

I. Background

AID support to the Land Tenure Center was initiated in the early sixties. The initial funding was for a research contract that focussed on Latin America. Subsequently, LTC was provided a 211(d) grant by AID to expand its capability to Asia and Africa. This first 211(d) grant funded LTC through 1974. A comprehensive on-site review was undertaken during the final year of the grant to gauge LTC's progress. The review concluded that it was in the Agency's interest to continue its relationships with the University of Wisconsin in the area of land tenure and recommended a two year extension.

A supplemental 211(d) grant was provided for the period 1975 to 1977. The objective for extending the 211(d) was to facilitate fuller and continuing utilization of LTC's response capacity in the land tenure area. It was recognized that land tenure issues were critical to the effective implementation of the Congressional Mandate to reach the rural poor.

A second supplemental grant was provided to cover the period 1977 through September 1979. An AID Intra-Agency Advisory Committee for the LTC organized in 1975 recommended that funding be continued. It was noted that LTC had achieved a good record of service, teaching and advice to LDCs and AID Missions. With AID's emphasis on rural development and raising income levels and well-being of the rural poor, continued advice on man/land problems was considered critical.

On July 17 and 18, 1978 an Agency Review Team met with officials of the University of Wisconsin to conduct a second Comprehensive Review of the supplemental 211(d) grant. The purpose of the review was to

focus on the performance of LTC since the last review and to recommend a future course in the relationship between AID and LTC once the 211(d) expires in September 1979.

II. Structure of the Review

The comprehensive review was carried out in accordance with the instructions and guidelines provided in AID Handbook 13 Appendix 2c (Instructions and Guidelines for the Evaluation of AID Institutional Grant Projects). The primary focus was on examining the utilization of LTC's response capability to requests and problems from LECs, other donors and particularly AID.

Approach -- The main elements in carrying out the review were: (1) team selection with a view to recruiting individuals with concern and knowledge about the problems of utilizing LTC's response capacity; (2) development of an issues paper to provide the format for discussions with LTC; (3) a team member visited USAID Philippines to get the Mission's evaluation of LTC's long term advisory assistance -- the Philippines is the only country with which LTC has recently been involved in a long term technical advisory role; and (4) an on-site review with officials and staff of the University of Wisconsin.

Team Composition -- The members of the Review Team were as follows: James Roush, PPC/OAS, Chairman; Thomas Carroll, Inter-American Development Bank; James Riordan, LA/DR;

James Dalton, NE/TECH; Allan Hoben, PFC/PDA; Thomas Mehen, DSB/RAD, Executive Secretary.

In addition to a specific geographic focus, each team member selected a broad general issue to be raised with LTC. Based on these interests the review at Wisconsin was organized in general overall sessions and also in individual meetings in which team members met with one or more relevant LTC staff to discuss his concerns.

Jim Riordan, Deputy Rural Development Officer, LA Bureau, was concerned with LTC utilization in his geographical area, and also pursued the question as to which type of relationship with LTC might make most sense in meeting AID's future needs. Jim Dalton, the Rural Development Officer for the Near East, focused on his geographic concerns and examined the question of what would be required in terms of 'core' support for the LTC to continue to service AID needs. Allan Hoben focused on the merits of LTC's recent efforts in analyzing African land tenure issues and he also reviewed intra-university relationships with LTC. Tom Carroll dealt with the relevance of LTC's work to AID program and policy decision and with LTC graduate training. Jim Roush an ex-Mission Director to Chile served as Chairman of the team.

Issues Paper -- A preliminary issues paper (see Annex A) was drafted by Thomas Mehen, DSB/RAD, project monitor of the 211(d) grant, and distributed to the evaluation team for its review. A copy was also forwarded to LTC and provided a focus for the on-site review.

Field Visit (Philippines) -- As part of the Comprehensive Review, it was important to review LTC's long term advisory assistance to the Philippine Agrarian Reform program. LTC has provided high level technical advisors who resided in the Philippines for the past four years. Though this effort was funded by USAID/Philippines and not under the 211(d) grant, it was felt to be significant because of the technical backstopping provided by LTC to the project and in particular the LTC training programs developed for Philippine technicians. These activities were made possible by the 'core' capability which has been funded by the 211(d) grant. A team member, Tom Carroll, spent one week with the Mission in Manila and in field sites in 3 provinces trying to appraise the effectiveness of LTC's inputs. A cable from USAID Philippines summarizing the Mission's appraisal of LTC's efforts is attached as Annex B.

On-site Review -- A two day review was held at Madison Wisconsin in which the review team had an opportunity to discuss directly LTC performance with the staff. Officials of the University of Wisconsin who participated in the review session included:

Bryant Kearn	Vice Chancellor
Glenn Pound	Dean of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Don Kanel	Director of the Land Tenure Center
Wayne Kusow	Assoc. Director, International Agricultural Program

Joseph Elder	Professor Sociology and South Asian Studies
Edward Friedman	Professor Political Science and South Asian Studies
Marion Brown	Professor Agricultural Journalism
Peter Dorner	Professor Agricultural Economics
William Thiesenhusen	Professor Agricultural Economics and Agricultural Journalism
James Riddell	Professor Anthropology (U. of Wisconsin -- Parkside)
James Harbeson	Professor Political Science (U. of Wisconsin -- Parkside)
Marvin Miracle	Professor Agricultural Economics
Jane Knowles	Executive Assistant
Donald Esser	Administrative Assistant
Kenneth Parsons	Professor Emeritus Agricultural Economics
Edward Fallon	Student Development Studies
John Bennett	Professor Anthropology
Raymond Penn	Professor, Emeritus Agricultural Economics
Herman Felstenhausen	Professor Agricultural Journalism and Natural Resources
Joseph Thome	Professor of Law
John Strasma	Professor of Economics and Agricultural Economics
Marta Tienda	Professor Rural Sociology

The review was structured to give team members an opportunity to meet with LTC staff members individually to discuss particular elements of LTC's capability in which they were interested.

A number of students working under LTC sponsorship were also interviewed. A list of the individual appointments by team members is attached as Annex C. In addition to these meetings there were two general sessions: an opening meeting in which the Director of the Land Tenure Center summarized the Center's response to the issues paper attached as Annex D, and a final session in which the chairman of the team, Jim Roush, conveyed some of the preliminary observations of the team and asked the LTC to provide some additional information. The response to this second inquiry is attached as Annex E.

III. LTC Performance

There were five output areas on which LTC was to concentrate under the grant. The following paragraphs summarize the major findings of the Team's review of each of the five areas.

1. Expanded Knowledge -- LTC, based upon the AID approved paper 'Proposed Research Foci' dated November 1975, was to concentrate its research efforts on five topical areas: Monitoring Land Reform Experiences, Analyzing the Interaction of Land Tenure Systems and Development, Group Farming, Peasant Participation, and Legal Aspects of Land Reform and Social Change. In general, the Review Team was satisfied that LTC's research effort has met the requirements outlined in the grant statement. Most of the Review dealt with the questions raised in the issues paper, concerning the qualitative aspects of the research program.

Question -- To what extent has the research followed the 'Proposed Research Foci' and has the effort been systematic, coherent and consistent? Has the research design concentrated on achieving a build up of knowledge of key issues?

Findings -- The Review Team found that the LTC did make attempts to systematize and build up cumulative research on a number of topics included in the grant, especially during the past year, but under the prevailing funding arrangement, AID expectations of perhaps meeting the full program outlined in the 'Proposed Research Foci' statement were unrealistic.

The 'Proposed Research Foci' statement was developed and agreed to without a full realization of what would be required adequately to fund such research. Also there was an assumption in the grant design that USAID country Missions and perhaps other donors would pick up the required field research funding. This has not materialized.

Previously LTC has developed fairly strong ties with Latin American AID Missions based largely on close association built up through \$3.6 million in centrally funded field research over the period 1962-1969. When LTC moved from the Research Grant stage in 1969 to 211(d), very little research funding was made available under the grant. AID Missions in other regions have not had close contact with LTC and consequently, LTC has not been able to develop the relationships needed to sponsor significant and systematic research undertakings outside

of Latin America. When funding for graduate thesis research had to be secured from many separate sources, it was simply not possible to make each piece of research fit into a common design.

Yet, the work being carried out under the "group farming" theme does seem to be directed toward generalizable problems and to a lesser degree, the "peasant participation" research is also more systematic.

However, the recent LTC research proposal on "Land Tenure Issues in African Development" has so far made the best effort to provide a consistent and unified direction for research programs in Africa. It was concentrated in scope and emphasized those aspects of land tenure which are relevant to AID project design needs.

Question -- How useful and policy-relevant has LTC's work and research findings been?

Findings -- In reviewing a representative selection of LTC publications and reports the Team felt that while the discrepancy between academic and programmatic focus (usual in University/AID relations) has existed, whenever the LTC had the opportunity, it did produce "useful" or policy-relevant output. Once again, the Review Team concluded that much of the reason for a lack of what may be called "operational utility," in the LTC's work stemmed more from AID's own inability and lack of organization to articulate it's needs and make these known to the University than from the academic interests and

reward system at the University.

The Team noted a very positive change in the relationship during the past year. The AID project monitor in DSB/RAD has steadfastly promoted closer liaison between the AID Bureaus/ Country Missions and LTC leadership. The results of this effort are now becoming evident, especially in the African land tenure issues paper, which is geared closely to the Agency's work in sub-sahara Africa.

The most successful instance of operational utility in recent years has been the LTC's involvement in the Philippines, the two senior tenure advisors who worked with the Manila AID Mission and with the GOP have done an excellent job in research, training and technical assistance to improve the knowledge base, define options, and generally helping to deal with reform action. For example, research by LTC staff and graduate students was helpful in identifying bottlenecks and procedural problems in field operations of the land reform that were designed to transfer titles from landlords to tenants. LTC advisors participated in efforts of Filipino officials and USAID Mission staff in correcting implementing procedures. LTC research also helped to document problems in land evaluation for purposes of compensation to landowners and payment by land reform beneficiaries. A current LTC faculty member on contract in the Philippines has initiated a study of the impact of land reform on the landless. (The fact that the present GOP land reform effort is judged too weak and slow does not detract from the very positive assessment of the LTC work there.)

Some further evidence of the utility of LTC research is a recent World Bank pamphlet on land reform which was designed to summarize the main experiences and issues for reform practitioners in LDCs and donor agencies has had inputs from several LTC staff. Recently a World Bank publication entitled "Land Reform in Latin America: Bolivia, Chile, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela" drew heavily on LTC research efforts.

Also the FAO has recently called upon the LTC for help in preparing papers for its World Conference on Agrarian Reform and two senior staff members from LTC have been working closely within FAO; they are drawing on years of LTC research to help in this effort.

Question -- Is there a need for LTC to generalize more from its research? Has it been too descriptive and micro-oriented?

Findings -- It seems that a great deal of past LTC research has been very location-specific and oriented to describing and explaining past events. However, the Team believes that it is precisely in the micro-area where the LTC can make the best contributions, as long as the selection of the case studies and the analytical methodology are conducive to the exploration of policy options and to subsequent generalizations. The Review Team believes that the LTC is vulnerable to the criticism that much of its research was historically rather than policy-oriented. But as neither the grant contract nor subsequent AID discussions specified what was meant by "response capacity," or "building a knowledge base," the team felt this issue could not be pressed too far.

As was mentioned earlier, the type of funding available in the past to the LTC has made a more systematic effort to plan many comparable field studies most difficult. The Review Team did conclude that future

LTC research should deal much more with "What can be done?" rather than "What has happened?," although it is recognized that the latter is often a pre-requisite of the former.

The Team noted that the Group Farming Project is designed with a focus on possible generalizations (by types of situations) and that the Africa Land tenure paper also takes this as one of its central objectives.

2. Education and Training -- There were a number of questions raised regarding the multidisciplinary Ph.D. program in Development Studies and also on the short term training capacity of LTC to meet technician needs from LDCs.

Question -- What evidence is there that LTC graduates have acquired competence, been involved in development efforts, and attained positions of influence?

Findings -- The Review Team was well impressed with the LTC training effort. In fact, the evidence confirmed the University's assertion that it is mainly through the training of competent graduate students and close faculty involvement in their dissertation work that the LTC's main impact on LDC's can be ultimately judged. The Review Team found the sample of graduate students of high quality and the record of careers of past students impressive. The Ph.D. program in development, which is run almost exclusively by LTC staff was universally praised by other University faculty. Apparently, its chief virtues are rigorous selection of candidates, small enrollment, careful curriculum development and flexibility. The Team did not have the opportunity to examine the program for rigor and coherence. The program is virtually unique in the U.S.

LTC provided the following list of graduates as examples of high levels of achievement of some of the more outstanding graduates and students selected from over 300 alumni:

Carlos Amat y Leon	Director of Research Direccion General de Asuntos Financieros, Ministerio de Economica Lima, Peru
Luciano Barraza	Served as: Director General, Guanos y Fertilizantes de Mexico (Mexican state-owned fertilizer enterprise)
Russell Brannon	Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky
Carlos Castillo	Served as: Vice President, Costa Rica
Elsa Chaney	Deputy Director, Office of Women in Development USAID, Washington, D.C.
*Heliodoro Diaz Cisneros	Secretario General, Colegio de Postgraduados, Escuela Nacional de Agricultura, Chapingo, Mexico; and Director, PRONDAAT
Manaul Gollas Quintero	Professor of Economics . El Colegio de Mexico, Mexico, D.F., Mexico, and Associate Director General, CONACYT
*Cassio Luiselli	Asesor, Oficina de Asesores del Casa Presidente de la Republica, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.
Serverino T. Madronio	Director, Bureau of Farm Management, Dept. of Agrarian Reform, Philippines

Rubens Medina	Chief, Hispanic Law Division, The Library of Congress Law Library, Washington, D.C.
Franklin Moore	Associate Peace Corps Director, Accra, Ghana
Jose Pastore	Associate Professor, Universidade de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brasil and served as: President, Latin American Rural Sociological Society
Rodolfo E. Quiros Guardia	Director, Alterno de Coordinacion, Presidencia de la Republica, San Jose, Costa Rica; and served as Minister of Agriculture, Costa Rica
Kali Prasad Rijal	Director, Planning, Evaluation, and Publicity Division, Department of Land Reform, Kathmandu, Nepal
*Nimal Sanderatne	Senior Economist, Rural Economics Division, Department of Economic Research, Central Bank of Ceylon, Colombo, Sri Lanka
Roger E. Soles	Representative for Honduras, Nicara- gua, and Costa Rica, Inter-American Foundation, Rosslyn, Virginia
Benjamin Villanueva	Minister of Economy, Tegucigalpa, D.C., Honduras
Fred Welz	Assistant Sales Manager PL 480 Program, Office of the General Sales Manager, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Question -- Has there been any in -service training for LDC public sector professionals?

Findings -- Special short term training programs had been arranged during the grant period for officials from Ethiopia, Turkey, Syria, the Philippines, Portugal, and Sri Lanka. Details of the training were outlined

*Development Studies Program student

in LTC's "Response to the AID Statement on possible Issues for LTC/Wisconsin Comprehensive Review" on pages 12 and 13.

3. Information Capacity -- LTC's library on agrarian reform is recognized as being a very valuable facility. The Review Team was concerned nevertheless that AID apparently had not used the information services provided by the library. Therefore the following questions were raised.

Question -- Why have AID requests for information been so negligible? What has LTC done to advise AID practitioners of the materials available?

Findings -- The Team's visit confirmed that the LTC's unique information capacity has not been fully utilized. LTC staff reported that attempts had been made in two ways to make AID professionals aware of the materials: they have worked closely with the Information Center of DSB helping to make certain that all grant supported documents are on file, supplying copies to be abstracted for Research and Development Abstracts; also, LTC sends to every AID Mission Director each new LTC publication.

Requests from AID had not been numerous (only 35 of the total 187 received by LTC from 1975 to 1978). However, AID requests were generally substantive in nature such as info to respond to Congressional inquiry on materials for a senior executive training program.

The Team concluded that more can be done in this area in the future.

4. Advisory Capacity -- The 211(d) grant provides for support to LTC for maintaining a response capability for LDCs, AID and other donor agency requests. The Review Team was interested in how effective LTC's advisory assistance had been.

Question -- How fruitful or useful has LTC collaboration been to those Missions where a sustained or long term presence of University personnel has been possible?

Findings -- LTC's long term advisory assistance since 1975 has been limited to the Philippines.

As mentioned above, the AID Mission in Manila is highly satisfied with the assistance they have received from LTC staff advisors. For example, Dr. Harkin, the first UW professor who spent 2 years in the Philippines developed useful projections of reform impact and alternative cost estimates to enable the Missions to identify U.S. support opportunities and to negotiate with GOP on future assistance. Dr. King, the current UW staff member is the main technical advisor to the Mission on all land tenure/reform matters. His careful observation from constant field visits are a main source of current information on the reform, as well as on the practical difficulties of implementation. Lately, Dr. King has become an advisor to the GOP Ministry of Land Reform, as well.

It should be stressed that the success of the work of these advisors is due to a large part to the constant linkages and back stopping they have received from the LTC in Madison.

Question -- What has been the experience of LTC's short term consulting assignments?

Findings -- The evidence is that LTC and its larger program faculty are increasingly being called upon for short term consulting. The actual advisory time made available has increased from 34 person months in 1975-1976 to 50 person months in 1976-1977, and to 86 person months in 1977-1978. So far no attempt has been made to evaluate how effective its consulting has been, however, the LTC staff noted that many of the

requests are for LTC professionals to return to Missions where they had previously consulted.

Occasionally, there have been problems associated with scheduling short missions due to the short lead-time of requests and the requirements of the academic calendars. However, the Review Team did not regard this as a great obstacle for the future.

The Review Team did note that LTC staff (and other associated UW faculty) has been engaged in a very large amount of consulting and travel which was unrelated to AID. This implies once again that AID has not been able to take advantage of the advisory capacity of the LTC and suggests that, following the pattern established most recently by DSB/RAD, a much closer relationship should be worked out for the future. This means the early identification of opportunities for field visits and/or Washington consultation is needed so that AID jobs successfully compete with other outside demands for the services of University staff members.

5. Linkages -- The grant provided funding for LTC to establish and maintain linkages with other institutions. LTC has made good progress toward building linkages both within the University of Wisconsin and with other related institutions. The Review Team was particularly interested in the linkages between AID and LTC and the possibility for improving them.

Question -- To what extent have AID's and LTC's interests been successfully reconciled? What are some of the key problems in this relationship which are amenable to improvements?

Findings -- Relationships with AID have improved over the past two years. LTC staff indicated that it had now become possible to carry on substantive and productive discussions on a wide range of activities and projects, varying from assisting in AID's preparation

for the World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development to the development of a background paper on tenure issues in Africa. The key to this improvement has been a more consistent and vigorous management of the 211(d) relationship by DSB's office of Rural Development. In the past a big problem has been the constant turnover of AID officials with whom the Center was supposed to work. Problems of communication are being improved by LTC's more frequent visits to Washington and telephone conversations.

However, much needs to be done, especially to relate the LTC's future work to the program of country Missions, and vice versa, to acquaint the LTC with some of the operational and policy problems faced by AID (or anticipated?) both in the field and at AID/W.

Question -- Why is there at times in AID an apparent reluctance to engage LTC when questions pertaining to land tenure other than redistribution arise?

Findings -- Some of this negative attitude toward LTC stems from that period of developmental assistance in which development was equated with production increases. LTC is known to have been associated with the distributive land reform, which in turn has been often viewed by technicians as an obstacle to obtaining increases in production. LTC's close identification with land redistribution and the political nature of serious land reform has put off those who still see as paramount the technical issues of production increases. But the attitude of the AID staff is changing and now this problem is seen more as one of adequate information and dialogue than hostility. However, the Review Team feels that the LTC must

continue to show that its work is relevant to and useful for what most AID people have to do.

Question -- There seems to be a deficient recognition of the fields of LTC experiences and competence which can be of direct utility in AID's work, especially in the context of the Congressional Mandate. The utility is clearly not restricted to redistributive land reforms. What can be done to take advantage of LTC's accumulated experience in fields closely related to the present thrust in rural development?

Findings -- The Review Team found a certain degree of semantical and conceptual confusion on this issue. The area of expertise in the LTC is not as clearly defined as it is in the case of some of the other universities in rural development (such as finance at Ohio State, peasant participation at Cornell).

Both LTC and AID should make an effort to clarify that the scope of LTC's total capacity is much broader than land distribution and even broader than land tenure. It involves a spectrum of problems all closely related to rural poverty, income, status and peasant's access to opportunities. For example, cooperatives, farmer organizations, local units of governments, irrigation organizations are key parts of the institutional structure related to tenure. LTC feels it can offer insights and help in many situations where tenure changes are taking place even where the classical reform situation does not prevail, such as Africa.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

The Review Team recommendations for both current operations of 211(d) grant and AID/LTC relations beyond FY 1979 when the 211(d) expires are as follows:

1. Operations of 211(d) Grant

A. LTC's overall performance to date has fulfilled the requirements of the 211(d) grant. It has made a significant effort in the past year to be responsive to AID consulting needs. It has undertaken a number of short term consulting assignments, developed a paper on land tenure issues specifically related to AID projects, and is currently programmed to assist AID/W in its preparation for the 1979 FAO World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development. Nevertheless, the Review Team believes that utilization of LTC by AID has not been nearly as great as it could have been. The responsibility for this situation rests very largely in AID itself. A great deal more needs to be done to identify clearly those areas in which the LTC can best serve AID's rural development needs, build up communication between the LTC and AID Bureau and country missions, and assure that short-term consultancies draw upon LTC's overall expertise and program capability.

The Review Team recommends that AID attempt to increase the knowledge of LTC capabilities and use of its staff and facilities by:

(i) arranging for LTC participation in the Development Studies Program on a regular basis;

(ii) arranging for LTC to review and comment on selected project and/or sector strategy papers dealing with land tenure and related topics;

(iii) requesting LTC to organize seminar/workshops on tenure and tenure-related issues for AID's regional bureaus (field location of some of the workshops should include country officials as well); and

(iv) continuing to strengthen the monitoring and review of the 211(d) grant by DSB/RAD.

B. LTC's research efforts have followed the broad guidelines and the five major topical areas outlined in the 'Proposed Research Foci' of November 1975, agreed upon by AID. However, with some exception (e.g., Group Farming) the research areas have not been approached in a systematic or unified way. This is due primarily to the lack of substantial and reliable research funding. The research carried out has been opportunistic in the sense that it followed a course where available research funding and individual interests led it.

The Review Team felt that in the future a more unified program that attempts to build on a few key questions would be of much greater value to AID. The Africa land tenure paper does present a focused approach to potential research that would be helpful to both AID and LTC. DSB/RAD should follow up with the Africa Bureau on how it might be implemented.

C. LTC has continued to strengthen its library and carry out a wide range of information dissemination activities. Direct AID use of the library has included individual requests by AID personnel preparing for new field assignments, by participants in AID training programs, and by AID funded visitors from developing countries. However, it was noted that these and other uses could be increased and improved.

The Review Team was impressed by LTC's library but felt that an examination should be undertaken of the costs and benefits of merging the library with UW's library system and tying LTC's system in with AGRICOLA, the on-line information system of the National Agriculture Library.

The LTC mailing list and contents of its publications series were developed to meet the needs of the variety of clientele the center serves. A review of the special needs of AID in this area should also be undertaken in the future.

D. The current core staff have for the most part been at LTC for quite sometime. It is clear also that additional academic tenure slots are not available from the U. of Wisconsin.

The Review Team felt that it would be useful for both AID and LTC's own work if some new blood were brought in. LTC should be encouraged to set up special post-doctoral positions at the faculty level for young people from outside LTC and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. This would enable LTC to bring in a stream of young talent from the outside interested in tenure issues.

2. Future AID/LTC Relationships

A. In general, the Review Team concluded that even though utilization of the current 211(d) grant was low and the record of LTC/AID interaction over the review period spotty, the LTC did have a unique set of experiences and talents to offer, which are central to AID's Congressional Mandate and not available elsewhere.

It was felt that work on land tenure related issues and institutions would be of continuing concern to AID. This is clearly pointed out in the AID Policy Paper on Agricultural Development which stresses the importance of land tenure. Most likely assistance for AID technicians on land tenure will be needed in the following areas: (i) project design work for AID Missions attempting to take into account tenure and equity concerns in putting together rural development projects; (ii) development of overall Mission strategy papers, such as the CDSS, for which analysis of tenure patterns could be extremely important; (iii) responding to training requests for LDC professionals and providing workshops and seminars for AID technicians on land tenure and agrarian reform issues; (iv) monitoring progress on movements in agrarian reform worldwide thereby furthering the state of the art; and (v) providing further information for overall policy and program development in relation to AID's inter-regional research and development program to deal with issues such as the relationship of tenure problems to food availabilities and population growth.

B. The Review Team examined a number of different arrangements for continuing the AID/LTC relationship: (i) Reliance on Regional Bureau Contracts and Termination of Separate Core Support to LTC -- the Review Team recognized that if LTC could survive without core funding, this approach would channel its capacity more directly on AID's programs. However, the University officials indicated that the overhead earned by LTC on such individual contracts would not revert back to LTC -- it would go to the State of Wisconsin. Secondly, the University could not justify underwriting foreign work without outside support. If the current grant funded aid were eliminated, most if not all of the LTC information capacity and research time would have to be increasingly oriented to domestic U.S. issues. Piecemeal AID contracts on as-the-need-arises basis based-upon recent experience would not be adequate to insure a center's existence as it is now, i.e., continuing to focus on land tenure issues abroad. In short this option probably means a substantially diminished LTC capacity for dealing with issues of relevance to AID if not the actual demise of LTC as a recognizable institution;

(ii) Continue Current Arrangement. The current arrangement has some merit in that it maintains a capacity which Missions can draw upon when needed and there are some cost advantages to AID continuing the grant, namely, the University of Wisconsin has picked up LTC's overhead which would be charged to AID under a contracting arrangement. But

as indicated in the body of this review, the present grant arrangement has had shortcomings. There is need for a mechanism which could tie more directly the LTC capacity together with the applied research and consulting needs of AID's Missions and Regional Bureaus. The assumption of the current grant was that the Missions would contract with LTC for the research. This has not been the case, except for perhaps the Philippines and Honduras. It seem now unrealistic, to expect an alliance of applied research efforts to emerge without a good deal more collaboration between LTC and AID -- and this runs counter to the nature of the grant mechanism.

(iii) Develop a New Arrangement -- A new mode of contracting called a cooperative agreement is currently being used by DSB/RAD with several universities. It appears to be well suited to programs of applied research work that are to be directly related to AID Mission activities. This kind of mechanism would appear to be appropriate for engaging LTC's capability. DS/RAD in fact has proposed an FY 1980 project under such an arrangement. Essentially the DS/RAD project would be designed to meet Mission needs in providing for applied research required for rural project and program development. The Review Team believes this approach has merit in that it would ensure an adequate fund for LTC applied research efforts and would closely tie those efforts to the type of rural development problems AID is dealing with.

(iv)- Title XII. The Review Team discussed with UW

officials whether a Title XII option has been explored by the University in connection with LTC. The administrators at Wisconsin stated so far their discussions with AID on Title XII indicated that there was a strong focus on agronomic and biological and not much emphasis was to be placed on the social sciences. While theoretically Title XII seems a fruitful source of core support, in practice, it does not appear to be oriented at this time to meet LTC's needs.

C. The Review Team concluded with regard to future relationships with LTC that AID should pursue the development of the proposed DSB project for FY 1980. The Review Team noted that LTC did express preference for a single instrument. They fear that dealing with several different contracting modes might complicate their relationship with AID and hamper communications. While the Review Team recognized utilizing the Cooperative Agreement mechanism would not meet all of AID requirements it would enable the Agency to include adequate applied research, consulting and other support within a framework that had sufficient flexibility that it could be responsive to both LTC and Mission needs.

At the same time the Review Team felt that more research funding should be channeled to LDC institutions and that AID should explore the possibility of doing more research on land tenure using LTC as an intermediary, e.g., by providing grants to LTC to grant to target LDC countries and institutions.

Clearances:

PPC/OAS, James Roush	_____	Date	_____
LA/DR, James Riordan	_____	Date	_____
NE/TECH, James Dalton	_____	Date	_____
PPC/PDA, Allan Hoben	_____	Date	_____
IDB, Thomas Carroll	_____	Date	_____
DS/RAD, Thomas Mehen	_____	Date	_____

Possible Issues for LTC/WisconsinComprehensive ReviewA. Background

The Land Tenure Center has been supported by a 211(d) Grant since April 1969. The first five years were subject to a review in September, 1974. A supplemental 211(d) Grant was made in June 1975 for \$415,000 (increased by \$180,000 to cover focused research) and a second supplement for \$838,000 was authorized in June 1977, extending the current grant period to September, 1979. The present review substantially covers the last three years, since mid-1975.

B. Framework for Evaluation

The main overall question is whether the project purpose of facilitating full and continuing utilization of LTC's response capacity has been met. The project design sets out five main areas in which outputs of LTC's utilization would be measured but does not provide specific quantitative targets to gauge its success. The output areas are as follows:

a. Expanded Knowledge-Focused Research

LTC was to analyze the role of land tenure and related institutional factors in the development process, especially on equity-related issues and

small farmer assistance.

b. Education & Training

LTC would provide training for LDC and U.S. students to increase their understanding of land tenure, agrarian reform issues and competence for effective participation in development work.

* c. Information Capacity

LTC would further strengthen its library and disseminate information on tenure and agrarian reform topics related to development.

d. Advisory Capacity

LTC would provide consultation and technical assistance, as requested by AID and USAID missions.

e. Linkages

LTC would build up linkages within the University of Wisconsin and with A.I.D. and other agencies working in the same or related fields.

C. Issues Related to LTC Performance under the Grant

1. Focused Research Program

The current Grant calls for focused research in five areas: (a) monitoring land reform experiences, (b) interaction of land tenure system and development, (c) group farming, (d) peasant participation, and (e) legal aspects of land reform and rural development. In a detailed document,

"Proposed Research Foci," dated November 1975, and in a subsequent "Addendum to Research Foci" dated December 1975, the LTC carefully reviewed its previous experience. These papers summarized the state of existing knowledge and drew some interesting conclusions from this work which may be applicable to a variety of situations in the LDCs. Based on this review, LTC staff identified a considerable number of priority research needs, and selecting further among these, proposed a set of specific studies to be carried out under the Grant. The research foci documents justify researchable questions on the basis of past generalizable conclusions and place these questions within a broad framework of developmental dynamics.

The main issues for this Review revolve around whether the LTC has been able to achieve significant progress along these lines under the five originally chosen topics. Were the key questions outlined in the November 1975 document utilized? What other focal questions have been asked to guide the research? What was the research design to answer them?

To what extent has the LTC research been systematic, coherent and consistent? Has it achieved a build-up of knowledge on key tenure-related issues so that valid generalizations could be drawn? To what extent have intellectual unity and a conceptual framework been developed?

There is a strong emphasis in the current Grant Project Statement on the practical and operational aspects of utilizing the LTC's capacity. There is a clear indication (see page 18 "Institution Grant Project Statement Revision -- University Wisconsin Proposal," dated September 1976) that the LTC was expected to provide "alternative approaches to differing country situations," focus "on a few key policy and operational areas" and to provide "policy guidelines and approaches."

To what extent was the LTC's work directed toward (and has achieved relevance to) policy options related to land tenure and land reforms? Can the LTC's contributions be judged "useful" for designing better rural policies and programs in the LDCs and, therefore, to enhance AID's ability (and that of other external aid agencies) to be more helpful in providing developmental assistance? What has LTC done to highlight the key issues so that AID decisionmakers know, understand and act on them? Is there evidence that LTC's work on the relationship between land tenure and rural development (a) is increasingly analyzed and presented in such a way that it could be applied by policy-makers, (b) is, in fact, being used as an input into the decision making process by development agencies and LDC?

2. Education and Training Programs

LTC has repeatedly stated that their primary aim and "output" has been the graduate-level training of LDC students

(and some U.S. students). After returning to their countries (and as staff members of development agencies) these graduates become the embodiment of LTC thinking, methodology and knowledge, and hence, it is through their actions, rather than by those of the University staff, that the benefits of the LTC are to be perceived.

What evidence is there that LTC graduates have

(a) achieved positions of influence and responsibility (b) acquired special competence, insights, skills, which enabled them to become more effective, (c) been involved in action programs related to their university training? What has been the level of the different training efforts? Was there in-service training of LDC public agriculture sector professionals? How appropriate is the Ph.D. level development program, conducted by the LTC, as judged by outside University staff, the students themselves and their actual or potential employees? How related is the Ph.D. program to the LTC proper? Is the program unique or are there other universities providing roughly comparable training in development studies?

The LTC approach to the social sciences is heavily "institutional" and inter-disciplinary, as is indeed, the core concept of land tenure. Is this approach pursued by LTC peculiar to it or are there other institutions making similar efforts?

How successful has the LTC been in achieving the

difficult task of bringing the work of the different disciplinary or sectoral specialists to bear on common problems and to their resolution? To what extent is the multi-disciplinary forms of the teaching and research program an organic and coherent one? Has it been able to achieve enough quality and rigor to satisfy the staff of the University and to provide what advances students are looking for in their career objectives?

3. Information Capacity

LTC has utilized the grant to build a strong library and informational facilities. Why have AID requests been so negligible? What has LTC done to advise AID practitioners of the materials available?

4. Advisory Capacity

In recent years, with the exception of the Philippines, the LTC has not had longer term involvement with AID country missions. During the grant period a number of shorter advisory missions by LTC staff have been arranged. There is a certain amount of dissatisfaction on both sides with the past arrangements for field missions: AID contends that it finds it difficult to mobilize LTC talent when needed, while the University staff often finds the very short lead times prior to missions unreasonable and feels that these and other administrative requirements are hard

to reconcile with academic schedules. On the other hand, many missions have been unaware of potential LTC contributions in terms of short-term advisory services.

How fruitful or useful has LTC collaboration been to those AID Missions where a more sustained presence of University personnel has been possible? (i.e., Ethiopia, Philippines)? How about some of the shorter staff visits to countries at the request of Missions? What have been the problems in responding to requests? How, in the future can LTC's capacity for advisory services be better tapped?

5. Linkages

The successful utilization of the 211(d) Grant capability hinges on effective and sustained collaboration between the University and AID as constituencies, staff motivations, time horizons and styles of work, all of which tend to diverge. There is reason to believe that in the case of the LTC grant, this relationship during much of the review period has not been as close as desired.

To what extent have AID and the LTC interests been successfully reconciled? Were AID's expectations realistic? Has AID made sufficient efforts to articulate and to communicate to LTC its interests and needs? Has LTC made sufficient efforts to learn about or address them? What are some of the key problems in this relationship, which are amenable to improvements?

D. Issues Related to LTC/AID Interactions (Past and Future)

1. Appropriateness of the 211(d) Grant Form

The present grant arrangement under 211(d) has been in effect since April, 1969. The main aim has been to build up institutional capacity and to secure continued utilization of this capacity. The last two extensions since 1975 have provided for a minimum of field work, or for extended in-country research, as this was expected to be financed outside the basic grant. Very little funding for such research, however, has materialized.

The main question is to what extent the current type of grant, especially in recent years, has been appropriate to fulfill AID expectations and to bring forth LTC capabilities for meeting these needs?

2. Proper Definition and Understanding of LTC's Special Contributions

There seems to be a deficient recognition of the fields of LTC experiences and competence which can be of direct utility in AID's work, especially in the context of the new Congressional Mandate. This utility is clearly not restricted to re-distributive land reforms. It is somewhat ironic that while in its heyday the LTC was often subject to hostility for its rural poverty approach, now, when AID's whole focus has shifted to rural income, peasant welfare and

participation, the LTC's role has not been perceived as important.

Why this apparent paradox? What can be done to take advantage of LTC's accumulated experience in fields closely related to the present AID thrust in integrated rural development? (i.e., peasant cooperation, group farming, economies of scale and equity issues in farm production, rural employment creation, etc.)

3. Future Options

In recent months considerable efforts have been made both by AID/DS/RD and by LTC to steer more of its work to AID missions and to identify fields in which the LTC capacity can be more effectively mobilized to fulfill specific operational demands. Some tentative forward planning, subject of course to the present evaluation, has also taken place with respect to a possible new relationship between AID and the LTC. A PID has been prepared, and submitted as part of DS/RAD's budget for FY 1980. Part of this evaluation should help clarify what 'core' elements, if any, should be considered for funding under the proposed future project.

In terms of AID's current program, what is the judgement on benefits foregone if the LTC loses some of its capacity? What may be LTC's "unique" role in the future which other universities do not offer? What reorientation in LTC organization and program may be needed to achieve a better

convergence with anticipated AID objectives? What are other financing options with AID and through other sources of support?

COPY

Department of State

TELEGRAM

FORM 78 MAR 64 11495 1010172

INFO

NO. 11496 1010177

ACT. ON 612-21

LTC WORK IN DETAIL. MISSION

Annex B

INFO 001-01 / 002 1

-----071362 1010102 / 21

F 1007572 JUL 78

FM AMEMBASSY MANILA

TO DECDIATE WASHDC 0191

UNCLAS MAR 1986

AIDAC

E.O. 11652: N/A

SUBJECT: UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, LAND TENURE CENTER - COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

1. IN CONNECTION WITH COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN'S LAND TENURE CENTER CONTRACT AND FORTHCOMING REVIEW TEAM VISIT MADISON JULY 17-18, MISSION WISHES TO MAKE FOLLOWING CONTRIBUTION IN ASSESSING LTC ASSISTANCE IN PHILIPPINES DURING PAST FOUR YEARS:

A. ALTHOUGH LTC WORK HERE HAS NOT BEEN FINANCED THROUGH BASIC 211 (D) GRANT BUT BY MISSION FUNDS, IT BEARS A DIRECT RELATIONSHIP TO CENTRAL FACILITIES AND PROGRAM AT MADISON.

B. HIGH QUALITY OF TECHNICAL EXPERTS, RELEVANT BACKSTOPPING FROM MADISON, TRAINING OF NATIONAL STAFF, TIMELY INFORMATION FLOWS FROM CENTRAL LIBRARY COULD NOT HAVE BEEN ACCOMPLISHED WITHOUT EXISTENCE OF CORE LTC PROGRAM

C. LTC ADVISORS HAVE BEEN VERY INSTRUMENTAL IN DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH CAPACITY ON SUSTAINED BASIS HELPFUL IN ESTABLISHING PRIORITIES FOR APPLIED/ACTION RESEARCH.

D. THEY WERE INSTRUMENTAL IN LINKING ONGOING RESEARCH FACILITY TO RELEVANT OPERATIONAL NEEDS OF RESPECTIVE LAND REFORM IMPLEMENTATION AGENCIES.

E. LTC STAFF FUNCTIONED EFFECTIVELY IN PERFORMING AN OPERATIONAL POLICY ANALYSIS ROLE BY IDENTIFYING KEY ELEMENTS IMPROVING OLT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, FOR EXAMPLE PREVENTION OF EXCESSIVE LAND USE CONVERSION OUT OF FOOD CROPS, REVISION OF LAND VALUATION AND COMPENSATION PROCEDURES, AND MORE RECENTLY ON MONITORING REFORM EFFECTS ON BENEFICIARY PRODUCTION AND INCOMES AND IDENTIFYING IMPROVEMENTS IN COLLATERAL DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS, I.E. COOPS, CREDIT, MARKETING, ETC. ASSISTANCE TO LAND RECIPIENTS.

F. MISSION IS ALSO WELL IMPRESSED WITH TRAINING RECEIVED AT UV BY GOP FELLOWSHIP RECIPIENTS UNDER AGRARIAN REFORM PROJECT.

G. IN GENERAL, MISSION IS HIGHLY SATISFIED WITH LTC'S CONTRIBUTION TO LAND REFORM ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND BASED ON PHILIPPINE EXPERIENCE STRONGLY RECOMMENDS THAT LTC-MADISON CENTRAL FACILITIES, RESEARCH TEACHING AND INFORMATION SERVICES SHOULD BE MAINTAINED AS UNIQUE AND VALUABLE RESOURCE FOR USAID'S PRESENT AND FUTURE ROLE IN FIELD OF AGRARIAN REFORM (INCLUDING PROCELENS/PROGRAMS FOR LANDLESS) AT VERY HEART OF OUR CONGRESSIONAL MANDATE.

2. ABOVE COMMUNICATED TO TOM CARROLL, MEMBER OF EVALUATION TEAM, WHO IS PRESENTLY IN FIELD REVIEWING

4
ACTION
D.S./RAD

INFO
11-24-
-8

1151A
8/1/78

LANDS
VIC

AGW
AF

7/70
IT

PIC
D.S./ASR

CA
A-2/KC

UNCLASSIFIED

Schedule of individual appointments

James Roush

Monday, July 17

3:00 Professors Elder and Friedman
240 Steenbock Lounge

4:00 Professors Kanel, Brown, Dorner and Thiesenhusen
240 Steenbock Lounge

Tuesday, July 18

9:30 Deans' meeting:
Dean Glenn Pound, Dean David Johnson (if can be in town)
with Vice Chancellor Kearl and Professors Kussow, Kanel
and Dorner

Room 140 Agriculture Hall

10:30 Professors Riddell and Harbeson
240 Steenbock Lounge

11:15 Budget meeting with Professor Kanel, Dr. Jane Knowles and
Donald Esser; also James Dalton
240 Steenbock Lounge

James Dalton

Monday, July 17

3:00 Professor Dorner
432 Meat and Animal Science

4:00 Professor Parsons
432 Meat and Animal Science

Tuesday, July 18

9:30 Professor Elder and Edward Fallon
325 King Hall

10:30 Visiting Professor John Bennett and Professor Kanel
325 King Hall

11:15 Budget meeting with Professor Kanel, Dr. Jane Knowles and
Donald Esser; also James Roush
240 Steenbock

Allan Hoben

Monday, July 17

3:00 Professors Harbeson, Riddell and Kanel
654 Meat and Animal Science

4:00 Students
654 Meat and Animal Science

Allan Hoben (continued)

Tuesday, July 18

- 8:45 Professor Bostian (if can be arranged)
- 9:30 Professor Friedman
310e King Hall
- 10:30 Professor Parsons
327 King Hall
- 11:15 Visiting Professor John Bennett
310e King Hall

James Riordan

Monday, July 17

- 3:00 Professors Brown and Thiesenhusen
310e King Hall
- 4:00 Professors Felstehausen and Penn
310e King Hall

Tuesday, July 18

- 8:45 Professor Thome
327 King Hall
- 10:30 Professor Strasma
7313 Social Science

Thomas Carroll and Thomas Mehen anticipate that they will divide up the tasks of participating in these small sessions and choose which to attend.