

PN. ABL-355
77311

PERI-URBAN ECONOMIC GROWTH IN AFRICA



A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT AMONG:

ACCESS TO LAND, WATER, AND NATURAL RESOURCES

LAND TENURE CENTER (LTC), UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

EXPERIMENTAL APPROACHES TO RURAL SAVINGS MOBILIZATION

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY (OSU), COLUMBUS, OH

**SYSTEMS APPROACH TO REGIONAL INCOME
AND SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE ASSISTANCE (SARSA)**

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT ANTHROPOLOGY, BINGHAMTON, NY

CLARK UNIVERSITY, WORCESTER, MA

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE, BLACKSBURG, VA

SPONSORED BY:

THE U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PN-ABL-353

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST WORKSHOP ON ECONOMIC GROWTH
IN PERI-URBAN AREAS OF AFRICA

23 AND 24 OCTOBER 1989

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST WORKSHOP ON ECONOMIC GROWTH
IN PERI-URBAN AREAS OF AFRICA**

23 AND 24 OCTOBER 1989

in attendance:

**LAND TENURE CENTER (LTC)
University of Wisconsin**

**EXPERIMENTAL APPROACHES TO RURAL SAVINGS MOBILIZATION
Ohio State University (OSU)**

**HUMAN SETTLEMENTS AND NATURAL RESOURCE SYSTEMS ANALYSIS (SARSA)
Clark University
Institute for Development Anthropology
Virginia Polytechnic Institute**

and

U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)

December 1989

This project, Economic Growth in Peri-Urban Areas of Africa, is a collaborative effort between three cooperative agreements, LTC, OSU and SARSA. It is funded jointly by the Africa Bureau of USAID out of Strategic Studies funds and by the USAID Bureau of Science and Technology. This first Workshop, held October 23 and 24, was organized by the Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	iii
I. Background	1
II. Research Plan	2
A. Research Objectives	2
B. Workshops	3
C. Cooperators	3
D. Project Administration	3
E. Research Design	4
F. Country and Site Selection	5
G. Phasing	6
H. Outputs	8
III. Budget and Project Finances	8
Annex 1: Workshop Itinerary	12
Annex 2: Addresses of Workshop Participants	22
Annex 3: Summary of Workshop Proceedings	26
Annex 4: Proposed Project Administration	43

PREFACE

The project, Economic Growth in Peri-Urban Areas of Africa, is a collaborative effort between three cooperative agreements, the Land Tenure Center (LTC) of the University of Wisconsin, the Experimental Approaches to Rural Savings Mobilization of Ohio State University (OSU), and the Human Settlements and Natural Resource Systems Analysis cooperative agreement (SARSA) of Clark University, the Institute for Development Anthropology, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. It is funded jointly by the Africa Bureau of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), out of Strategic Studies Funds, and the USAID Bureau of Science and Technology.

This document reports on the proceedings of a workshop on peri-urban economic growth in Africa held on 23 and 24 October 1989 at Washington, DC. The workshop was organized by the Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin. It is the first of three to be held during the life of the project. The second workshop, dealing with issues of research design, will be hosted by OSU in April 1990. The final workshop will be hosted by SARSA during the reporting stage of the project in 1992.

This first workshop had as its primary objective the preparation of a research plan for the project. This goal was successfully met. During the two-day workshop, the participants deliberated over a number of difficult issues dealing with research design, coordination and collaboration. The research plan on pages 1 to 10 of this document describing research objectives, project administration, research design, country and site selection, phasing of research, and budget, are a few of the important decisions reached during the workshop.

There were also a number of areas of disagreement that have yet to be resolved: (a) how to operationalize the definition of peri-urban areas for purposes of research design; (b) what specific countries and research sites would be appropriate for the research; (c) how to organize the work to maximize on collaboration, yet minimize the transactions costs (administrative costs and losses in time and delays from coordination) of coordinating activities among three cooperators, USAID/W, USAID missions, and host-country collaborators; and (d) how to provide for the development of standardized, fully documented data bases that are transferable among USAID and cooperators. The selection of countries will be decided following reconnaissance visits by the cooperators to selected countries in February/March 1990. Remaining issues will need to be returned to at the second workshop in April 1990.

All of the participants deserve credit for making this workshop a success. Many difficult issues were dealt with in open and candid discussions. The research plan attests to the cooperation and substantial contributions made by all concerned. Special credit goes to Jeff Cochrane and Patty Grubb who assisted with administration, and to Joan Atherton, Jeff Cochrane, Carlos Cuevas, Carol Dickerman, Doug Graham, Jane Knowles, Peter Little, Richard Meyer, and Gloria Steele who tirelessly offered their comments and suggestions on the workshop itinerary and on these proceedings, often on short notice. My thanks as well to AID for funding and the use of their facilities, and to those in AID who so graciously served as rapporteurs, coordinators, and presenters during the workshop.

Michael Roth
Land Tenure Center

c 1'

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST WORKSHOP ON ECONOMIC GROWTH
IN PERI-URBAN AREAS OF AFRICA

I. BACKGROUND

As many as 28 African countries have undertaken policy reforms in recent years in conjunction with World Bank and IMF structural adjustment programs. These interventions followed the emergence of severe structural imbalances in the early 1980s, including deteriorating balance of payments in external trade, rising budget deficits, and declining economic performance.

Although such programs are tailored to specific country circumstances, programs in general share a number of aims in common: (a) devalue over-valued currencies to increase export competitiveness and dampen consumer demand for foreign goods; (b) raise producer prices to stimulate production and exports, and raise consumer prices to reduce outlays for consumer subsidies in the budget; (c) reduce price subsidies to eliminate market distortions; and (d) reduce or eliminate the role of state public enterprises to increase competitiveness and reduce government expenditures.

Households and firms in or near population centers are the best positioned to take advantage of emerging economic opportunities, but they also bear the brunt of economic losses in industries suffering declining growth because of the reforms. Many of the policy changes proposed for Africa--reduction in food subsidies, tighter limits on public sector employment--will impose substantial welfare losses on urban and peri-urban populations, and bring about reallocation of resources in the economy. Urban population growth in excess of 6-8 percent per year is increasing demands for public services, and exacerbating problems of limited public infrastructure.

Beyond the impacts of stabilization policies and structural adjustment, there is emerging evidence that peri-urban areas are dynamic centers of economic growth and development. They have more diverse economic activity than rural areas, particularly with regard to informal economic activities and the production of high-value agricultural commodities. They also exhibit more intense competition for scarce land, labor and capital resources. Policies aimed at employment generation will affect these centers differently than rural areas. But, the view is also emerging that peri-urban areas, as transitional zones between rural and urban economies, can promote growth and development in the rural sector through backward and forward rural-urban linkages (via output, land, labor and capital markets) between it and the rural economy.

This project is intended to improve our knowledge of the operation of land, labor and capital markets in these dynamic zones. The information will enable better policy choices and program interventions to stimulate economic growth and development in peri-urban areas. The project is also intended to improve our understanding of the evolution of markets and of market interactions to increase growth in the rural sector through more efficient rural-urban linkages.

II. RESEARCH PLAN

A. Research Objectives

The purpose of this project is to gain a deeper appreciation and understanding of the diversity, role, function and interaction of land, labor and capital markets in peri-urban areas of Africa, and to identify potential program interventions for stimulating economic growth, or lessening the social and economic costs of economic reform.

In addition to these broad goals, the project has several specific objectives:

1. Document patterns of land ownership, use, and transfers in peri-urban areas and how these patterns are being influenced by competing demands for residential use, recreation, manufacturing and service industries, and agriculture.
2. Examine how statutory law, key policies and property institutions are affecting resource use, tenure security, land distribution, investment and transactions in land.
3. Document the extent to which households, merchants and enterprises utilize formal and informal financial services (both credit and deposit services), or are suppliers of these services.
4. Determine the potential for viable financial intermediation among households and firms and the most promising institutional forms of supplying financial services to them on a self-sustained basis.
5. Analyze the critical factors determining the allocation of labor by households among farm and non-farm activities, document the major sources of farm and non-farm employment, and examine how these sources have changed over time and how they vary spatially.
6. Identify key factor market linkages between peri-urban and rural sectors and their effects on rural labor migration and capital flows. Further, study key contractual arrangements (formal and informal) that have evolved in land, labor and capital markets, and their implication for program interventions.

7. Document and evaluate the terms and conditions of flows of formal and informal finance, land purchases and rentals, and labor contracts including the transactions costs incurred by both lenders and borrowers (for credit) and buyers and sellers (for land and labor).
8. Identify potential policy and program interventions for improving the functioning of land, labor and capital markets to promote economic growth and equity objectives.

These objectives are consistent with the second strategic objective of Africa Bureau's DFA Action Plan (liberalizing commodity and factor markets) and the emerging research priorities, infrastructure and human capital development. As an added benefit, the project will exploit the complementary skills of three collaborators in research design and analysis. Potential synergies are envisioned in the study of land as collateral for mortgage, off-farm employment as a source of capital to buy land, small enterprise demand for credit, etc.

B. Workshops

Three workshops have been scheduled to date under the project. The first Workshop on Economic Growth in Peri-Urban Areas of Africa was held 23 and 24 October 1989 in Washington, DC. This workshop, organized by the Land Tenure Center, focused on the design of the research plan. Annex 1 contains the workshop itinerary and list of participants. Addresses, telephone, telex, and FAX numbers for future communications are contained in Annex 2. Annex 3 is a summary of the workshop proceedings.

The second workshop will be hosted by OSU. This workshop, now scheduled for April 1990 in Washington, DC, will focus on questionnaire and survey design. SARSA will host the third workshop sometime in 1992 reporting on research results.

Cooperators will meet informally from time to time for purposes of planning (e.g. questionnaire development, research design) and coordination of activities. The first of these meetings has been scheduled for 3 January 1990.

C. Cooperators

This project is a collaborative effort among three cooperative agreements: Land Tenure Center (LTC) of the University of Wisconsin, Experimental Approaches to Rural Savings Mobilization of Ohio State University (OSU) and its successor CA (see section II), and Human Settlements and Natural Resource Systems Analysis (SARSA) of Clark University, the Institute for Development Anthropology, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

D. Project Administration

Each cooperator has selected a project investigator (PI) to serve as a focal point for all communications, and as the final authority for all decisions:

LTC: Michael Roth
OSU: Doug Graham
SARSA: Peter Little

One institution will be selected by mutual agreement among the cooperators as the lead institution (LI) in a country to coordinate the overall research program for that country.

AID has designated a project manager (PM) from the Africa Bureau to be responsible for coordinating all aspects of the project between offices within AID/W and to serve as liaison with AID missions:

AID: Joan Atherton

A complete set of proposed responsibilities for PIs, LIs and the PM are outlined in Annex 4. The S&T cooperative agreement project managers will retain financial responsibility and oversight of the cooperative agreements.

E. Research Design

The research will be implemented in three countries with two cooperators working per country (i.e. LTC and OSU in one country, OSU and SARSA in another, and SARSA and LTC in a third). Each cooperator will serve as the LI in one country, and as a secondary institution (SI) in one country.

Research in a given country will be undertaken in two phases. In phase 1, a household baseline survey will be administered to a sample of households in the peri-urban area of one major population center. In phase 2, topical studies identified on the basis of the baseline and reconnaissance visits will be undertaken by the LI and the SI on subjects related to each one's area of expertise.

Households are the logical unit of analysis to begin studying economic activities in the peri-urban area. The household baseline survey in phase 1 is intended to:

- Provide preliminary data and an overview of economic activity for interim reporting;
- Identify research issues for more in-depth analysis in phase 2; and
- Identify sub-samples of households as strata for the subsequent in-depth studies in phase 2.

The design of the household baseline survey will follow over the next six months, and will be finalized during a second workshop scheduled for April 1990. A review of relevant literature will also be undertaken during this six-month period. Based on preliminary plans and research design, the survey will involve a one-round questionnaire tightly streamlined to gather information on only the most salient variables. Size of the sampling frame will depend on resource requirements and specific country circumstances. But based on preliminary estimation, the household baseline survey will involve about 200-250 households.

The topical studies in phase 2 are intended to permit more in-depth analysis of certain research issues identified in phase 1. Many of the research issues elaborated on in section II.A would be the focus of these individual studies. The research approach will depend on research objectives and data requirements. Several approaches are envisioned:

- Descriptive rapid reconnaissance approaches;
- Case studies of individual farms, households or financial institutions; and
- Questionnaires, stratified random sampling, and intensive data collection.

To ensure comparability of the household baseline data across the three study sites, the three collaborators will jointly design the household baseline questionnaire, and will jointly undertake data analysis. The LI will be responsible for modifying and testing the questionnaire in its respective country, designing the sampling frame, administering the household baseline survey, coordinating its analysis, and coordinating report preparation. Each collaborator (e.g. the LI and SI) will be responsible for developing the research methodology for the phase 2 topical studies in its area of interest.

F. Country and Site Selection

A number of criteria were identified for selection of countries and cities within countries:

- active land, labor and financial markets;
- presence of small-scale industrial activities;
- diversity of economic activity;
- government has active policy framework vis-a-vis peri-urban areas (e.g. green zones);
- AID mission and Africa Bureau interest;
- availability of local collaborators (researchers and institutions); and
- access and logistics.

Ten countries were identified as offering suitable research settings for the project. Primary countries satisfy most of these criteria. Secondary countries, while suitable for the research, are weak in one or more of the above criteria:

Primary Countries

Botswana
Cameroon
Senegal
Zimbabwe

Secondary Countries

Ghana
Kenya
Mali
Swaziland
Tanzania
Zambia

Final selection of three countries will be made following expression of interest by USAID missions and reconnaissance trips by the cooperators to Africa.

Several criteria will determine which cooperator or set of cooperators will work in a given country:

- key policy or program issues emphasizing the need for research on land, labor or capital markets;
- joint complementarities that may arise in research objectives;
- work already underway by a cooperator in a given country allowing the cooperator to focus its attention on fewer countries, and to economize on scarce labor and managerial resources;
- objectives of AID missions, should funding be provided; and
- termination dates of certain cooperative agreements (e.g. the OSU Cooperative Agreement in April 1992).

G. Phasing

The research will be implemented over about a 36-month time horizon.

The schedule of research activities for 3 countries over a 3 year time horizon is illustrated in Table 1. The following is the tentative schedule of activities prior to and during implementation of the research program in the first country:

<u>Dates</u>	<u>Activity</u>
Nov-Dec 1989	Draft research plan by the cooperators to AID/W, and AID/W cables by the PM to the missions to solicit expressions of interest.
Nov 1989-May 1990	Review of literature and development of a generic household baseline questionnaire and survey design.
Jan 1990	Cooperators meeting.
Feb-Mar 1990	Reconnaissance trip by the cooperators to Africa.
April 1990	Second Workshop to review household baseline questionnaire (developed Jan-April), survey design, and research plan.
June-Aug 1990	Administer phase 1 household baseline survey in 1st country.
Sept-Nov 1990	Analyze household baseline survey.
Nov-Dec 1990	Report on household baseline survey.

Nov 1990-June 1991	Phase 2 topical studies in 1st country.
June-Dec 1991	Analysis of topical studies.
Jan-Mar 1991	Final report on peri-urban research in 1st country.

The phase 1 household baseline survey and subsequent activities under the phase 2 topical studies in countries 2 and 3 will follow comparable activities in country 1 by roughly 6 months.

H. Output

Six specific outputs, noted in Table 1, will be generated during the course of this project: (1) three peri-urban workshops to plan and coordinate the research; (2) research plan and workshop proceedings; (3) annotated bibliography and literature review; (4) reports on the analysis of data from the phase 1 household baseline surveys; (5) reports prepared in conjunction with the phase 2 topical studies; and (6) data bases containing the data from the household baseline surveys and certain of the phase 2 topical surveys (i.e. those involving intensive data collection). Consideration will also be given to the interim reporting needs of missions and host-country workshops in designing individual country research plans.

III. BUDGET AND PROJECT FINANCES

Approximately \$292,000 has been budgeted for each of the cooperators to cover costs of collaboration, reconnaissance visits, staff time in the U.S., plus a portion of field expenses.

At least one mission buy-in will be required in order to conduct all the work proposed in 3 countries, along with in depth analysis and production of a full-scale comparative study of results. Absent a buy-in, work will need to be scaled back accordingly.

The budget for \$417,219 in Table 2 is indicative of the funding levels needed to cover the field expenses in one country. This amount represents the level of mission buy-in required to fully fund in-country research costs.

If AID/W cables result in more than 3 interested missions, decisions will be required on which 3 countries are most appropriate, with research in remaining countries postponed until a later date (e.g. years 4 and 5). Time constraints of the collaborators preclude managing research in more than 3 countries in the 36 month time horizon.

The possibility exists that significant inequities may arise in the funding levels available to one or more of the cooperators because of the configuration of cooperators not working in all three countries. The PM will make every effort to compensate for such inequities if they do in fact arise.

Because OSU's cooperative agreement into which this buy-in is made ends in April 1992, the activities of OSU budgeted for in the buy-in must be completed by this date. Subsequent activities (post-April 1992) will need to be programmed and funded separately under OSU's new cooperative agreement. Problems with phasing and coordination that might result from this time schedule will be considered and dealt with in the coming months.

Table 2
Draft Budget for a One Country Mission Buy-in

	Dollar Expenses
I. Personnel	
A. Phase I Household Survey:	
a. PIs and other CA staff (4 pm for the LI and 2 pm each for the other 2 cooperators x \$4,000/pm)	\$ 32,000
b. State side administration (1 pm x \$4,000)	4,000
c. Data entry persons (3 pm x \$1,500/pm)	4,500
d. Local field survey supervisor (3 pm x \$3,000/pm)	9,000
e. Local enumerators (5 persons x 3 pm :: \$600/pm)	9,000
f. Benefits (25% of salaries a-c)	<u>10,125</u>
Sub-total I-A	68,625
B. Phase II Topical Surveys:	
a. PIs and other CA staff (4 pm for the LI and 4 pm for the second cooperator x \$4,000)	32,000
b. Resident research assistants (1 person/CA x 2 CAs x 12 pm each x \$1,500)	36,000
c. State side administration (2 pm x \$4,000)	8,000
d. Secretarial assistance (2 pm x \$2,000/pm)	4,000
e. Local enumerators (2 CAs x 3 enumerators x 6 months x \$600)	21,600
f. Benefits (25% of salaries a-d)	<u>20,000</u>
Sub-total I-B	121,600
II. Travel and Per Diem	
A. Phase 1 Household Baseline:	
a. International travel (2 trips x \$3,500)	7,000
b. Vehicle hire (3 months x \$2,000/mth)	6,000
c. Vehicle fuel and upkeep (3 months x \$200/mth)	600
d. Local taxi	750
e. Per-Diem (180 days x \$100/day)	<u>18,000</u>
Sub-total II-A	32,350
B. Phase 2 Topical Studies:	
a. International travel (2 CAs x 3 trips/CA x \$3,500)	21,000
b. Vehicle hire (2 vehicles x 8 months x \$2,000/mth)	32,000
c. Vehicle fuel and upkeep (16 months x \$200/mth)	3,200
d. Per-diem (4 pm staff and 16 pm resident researchers x \$50/day)	<u>30,000</u>
Sub-total II-B	86,200

Table 2 (continued)

	Dollar Expenses
III. Other Support Costs	
a. Communications (telephone, telex, DHL, postage)	5,000
b. Supplies, immunizations, visas	5,000
c. In-country secretarial and administrative support	3,000
d. DBAI (\$2.25/\$100 salary and SOS (\$100/yr))	3,500
e. Report preparation, photocopying and distribution	5,000
d. Computer and supplies	3,500
Sub-total III	<u>25,000</u>
IV. Sub-total I-III	333,775
Indirect Cost Recovery (25%)	83,444
	<hr/>
V. Grand Total	417,219

- a. Fringe benefits are 26% for LTC, 29% for OSU, and 19% for SARSA. Indirect cost recovery is 26% of all costs for LTC, 25% of field survey costs and 47% of other costs for OSU, and 50% of salaries only for SARSA. Both of these work out to about 25% on average. Actual costs will vary depending on the particular institution.

ANNEX 1
WORKSHOP ITINERARY

PERI-URBAN ECONOMIC GROWTH IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

WORKSHOP I

23 AND 24 OCTOBER 1989

A COLLABORATIVE PROJECT BETWEEN:

**EXPERIMENTAL APPROACHES TO RURAL SAVINGS MOBILIZATION (EARS)
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

**LAND TENURE CENTER (LTC)
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN**

and

**HUMAN SETTLEMENTS AND NATURAL RESOURCE SYSTEMS ANALYSIS (SARSA)
CLARK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT ANTHROPOLOGY
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE**

WORKSHOP DATES AND ACCOMMODATIONS

WORKSHOP DATES: 23 and 24 October 1989.

WORKSHOP LOCATION: State Annex 2 (SA 2)
Room 210, 515 22nd St, NW

FACILITIES: 20 Person Conference Room, Blackboard/Dryboard, Flip Charts. No Security Clearance Required.

BEVERAGES: Coffee and Tea Available.

LUNCH: Available in the Cafeteria of State Department, accompanied by AID Staff for Clearance, or at area restaurants.

HOTEL The Carlyle Suites
1731 New Hampshire Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 234-3200

WORKSHOP ON PERI-URBAN ECONOMIC GROWTH IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

23 and 24 October 1989

**Room 210
515 22nd Street, NW**

AGENDA

22 October

Arrival at The Carlyle Suites Hotel.

8:30 pm Informal meeting of the collaborators at the hotel.

23 October

8:30-8:40 Michael Roth, LTC. Opening remarks and overview of workshop format.

8:40-8:50 Eric Chetwynd, AID/S&T/RD. Collaboration.

8:50-9:00 Joan Atherton, AID/AFR/DP. Background on the peri-urban research theme, definitions and scopes of work for the three collaborators.

In each of the following four sessions, 30 minutes will be allowed to identify issues associated with the topic. Issues will then be prioritized and time allocated accordingly so that all major points receive some discussion in the ensuing hour. The Session Coordinator will referee the time, facilitate the discussion, and seek resolution of issues. The Rapporteur will record issues on flipcharts or the blackboard and assist in the prioritization. Closure on a unified approach to resolving any issue will be encouraged, and agreement recorded for use in the drafting of the final research plan during Day 2 of the Workshop.

9:00-10:30 **Session 1: Definitions, Research Opportunities and Objectives.**

Session Coordinator: Carlos Cuevas, Doug Graham, or Dick Meyer (OSU).

Rapporteur: Joan Atherton.

Identification of Issues. (9:00-9:30).

Discussion. (9:30-10:30).

The purpose of this session is to come to a common understanding of the research topic, and to begin to define the costs and benefits of a collaborative approach. Thus, topics/issues might include:

- objectives of the overall project, and the specific research objectives of each of the cooperators.
- feasibility of each cooperator separately studying land, labor or capital markets with respect to: (a) institutions governing economic behavior; and (b) market interactions affecting economic growth.
- capturing commodity market impacts affecting the demand for land, labor and capital given the factor market focus of each collaborator.
- capturing macro policy interactions (price and trade policy, regulatory and legal policy) and the impacts of these interactions on peri-urban phenomena.
- costs and benefits of collaboration in project design and implementation.

10:30-10:45 **Coffee and tea break**

10:45-12:15 Session 2: Research Design.

Session Coordinator: Peter Little, SARSA.

Rapporteur: Dan Dworkin, AID/S&T/RD.

Identification of Issues. (10:45-11:15).

Discussion. (11:15-12:15).

This session will focus on the principal concerns in project design. It is intended to further the discussion of how each of the three cooperators will collaborate in investigating peri-urban market issues. During the course of the discussion, each collaborator is encouraged to suggest possible models for collaborative research and/or describe previous experiences pertinent to the research design. Topics/issues might include:

- extent of literature review and preliminary reconnaissance surveys in the research design.
- extent of coordination and collaboration in setting research objectives, research methodology, survey design, development of questionnaires, etc.
- composition of country research teams.
- relative mix of individual households, communities and firms as units of observation in the analysis, and level of studies required.
- relative mix of intensive data collection through continuous fieldwork and more focused short-term studies.
- project time frame, time requirements of research, and implications for research phasing with existing funding levels, and in anticipation of possible mission add-ons.
- scope of research (number of countries, primary and secondary cities within countries, and sample groups within cities).
- phasing of research (staggering of countries over time vs. simultaneous inception in multiple countries).

12:15-1:30

Lunch

1:30-3:00 Session 3: Research Methodology, Data Analysis and Reporting.

Session Coordinator: Michael Roth.

Rapporteur: Gloria Steele, AID/S&T/RD.

Identification of Issues. (1:30-2:00).

Discussion. (2:00-3:00).

This session will focus on the principal concerns related to project implementation, collection and analysis of data, and integrability of research design and outputs across cooperators and research sites. Each cooperator is encouraged to suggest possible models or describe previous relevant experiences during the course of discussion. Specific issues/topics that might be discussed:

- case study and rapid reconnaissance survey approaches vs. intensive data collection and statistical analysis for phasing of research and reporting.
- relative merits and costs of the various approaches in terms of research output, resource requirements, and reporting.
- degree of autonomy among collaborators in choice of research method, supervision, number of resident field researchers, and timing of in-country research.
- degree of autonomy in data entry, verification and analysis on computer.
- involvement of host-country institutions and implications for coordination, phasing of research and costs.
- costs and benefits of alternative approaches to research design, analysis and reporting.
- management of write-up and reporting.

3:00-3:15 Coffee and tea break

3:15-4:45 **Session 4: Research Implementation and Management.**

Session Coordinator: Bill Douglass, AID/S&T/RD.

Rapporteur: Tom Hobgood, AID/AFR/TR.

Identification of Issues. (3:15-3:45).

Discussion. (3:45-4:45).

The purpose of this session is to deal with the nitty-gritty issues of project management, coordination and collaboration. It is intended to stimulate discussion and ideas on ways to reduce the cost of project management, while facilitating collaboration and a coherent and streamlined research design. Each cooperator is encouraged to suggest possible models or describe relevant previous experiences during the course of discussion. Specific issues/topics that might be discussed include:

- alternative modes of management and collaboration (e.g. decentralized vs. centralized control of project management).
- transactions costs including administration costs of coordinating activities of three cooperators, USAID/W, USAID missions, host-country collaborators, and resident researchers.
- project interface with USAID missions.
- strategies for minimizing said transactions costs in research implementation.

4:45-5:00 **Closing Comments:** Bill Douglass and Michael Roth.

Wrap-up of day one's activities, including discussion of accomplishments and concerns, and recommendations for sessions 5 and 6 on Day 2.

8:30 **Meeting of Cooperators.**

The principal investigators of each cooperative agreement will meet to sketch out a preliminary research plan.

DAY TWO OF THE WORKSHOP

Room 210
515 22nd Street, NW

AGENDA

24 October

9:00-12:00

Session 5: Preparation of Research Plan (I).

Concrete proposals will be prepared on the design of the research program. The format of the session will be decided by the collaborators based on the outcome of the first day's activities.

Coffee and tea will be available via self service.

12:00-1:00

Lunch will be catered.

1:00-2:30

Session 6: Preparation of Research Plan (II).

Principal investigators of each cooperative agreement will meet to finalize the research plan for presentation to AID.

2:30-3:00

Presentation of Research Plan. Michael Roth.

Summary of the research plan and identification of any outstanding issues.

3:00-3:30

Plenary Session.

Discussion by AID of the research plan proposed by the collaborators.

3:30-3:45

Concluding Remarks. Joan Atherton and Bill Douglass.

3:45

End of Workshop.

Principal investigators and AID participants may continue discussion of any outstanding issues or concerns.

TENTATIVE LIST OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

EARS:	Carlos Cuevas	(614)-292-8014
	Doug Graham	(614)-292-8014
	Dick Meyer	(614)-292-8014
LTC:	Michael Roth	(608)-262-8030
	Carol Dickerman	(313)-665-6799
	Jane Knowles	(608)-262-3143
	Jeff Cochrane	
SARSA:	Peter Little	(607)-772-6244
	John Browder	(703)-231-6217
	Gerald Karaska	(617)-757-6536
	Anna Hardman	
AID:	Joan Atherton	(202)-647-2964
	AFR/DP/PPE	
	Melisa Brinkerhoff	
	S&T/RD/RRD	
	Eric Chetwynd	
	S&T/RD/RRD	
	Bill Douglass	
	S&T/RD/RRD	
	Dan Dworkin	(703)-875-4433
	S&T/RD/RRD	
Tom Hobgood		
AFR/TR/ANR		
Dana Fischer		
AFR/SWA/SRO		
Emmy Simmons		
AFR/DP/PPE		
Gloria Steele	(703)-875-4567	
S&T/RD/RRD		

ANNEX 2

ADDRESSES OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

ADDRESSES OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

EXPERIMENTAL APPROACHES TO RURAL SAVINGS MOBILIZATION (OSU)

Richard L. Meyer Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural
Home: 614-486-4582 Sociology
Ohio State University
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1099
Phone: 614-292-8014
Telex: 200327 OSUA UR
FAX: 614-292-7362

Doug Graham Same as Meyer
Home: 614-457-9583

Carlos Cuevas Same as Meyer and Graham
Home: 614-457-5922

LAND TENURE CENTER (LTC)

Michael Roth Land Tenure Center
Home: 608-273-4321 1300 University Avenue
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706
Phone: 608-262-8030
Telex: 265452 ATTN: LAND TENURE
FAX: 608-262-2141

Jane Knowles Land Tenure Center
Home: 608-238-5477 1300 University Avenue
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706
Phone: 608-262-1794
Telex: 265452 ATTN: LAND TENURE
FAX: 608-262-2141

Carol Dickerman 3543 Miller Road
Home: 313-665-6799 Ann Arbor, MI 48103
Phone: 313-665-6799

HUMAN SETTLEMENTS AND NATURAL RESOURCE SYSTEMS ANALYSIS (SARSA)

Peter Little Institute for Development Anthropology
Home: 607-723-2580 99 Collier Street
 Binghamton, NY 13902
 Phone: 607-772-6244
 Telex: 932433
 FAX: 607-773-8993

Gerald J. Karaska Economic Geography
Home: 508-757-6536 Clark University
 Worcester, MA 01610
 Phone: 508-793-7311

John Browder Department of Urban Affairs ad Planning
 Virginia Tech
 Blacksburg, VA 24061
 Phone: 703-231-5688
 FAX: 703-961-7826

Anna Hardman Department of Urban Affairs and Planning
Home: 703-961-3704 Virginia Tech
 Blacksburg, VA 24061
 Phone: 703-231-4348 (messages: 703-231-5688)
 FAX: 703-961-7826

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Joan Atherton AFR/DP/PPE
 Room 3913 NS
 Agency for International Development
 Washington, DC 20523
 Phone: 202-647-2964
 FAX: 202-647-8518

Melissa Brinkerhoff S&T/RD/RRD
Room 622-E, SA-18
Agency for International Development
Washington, DC 20523-1814
Phone: 703-875-4491
FAX: 703-875-4394

Dan Dworkin S&T/RD/RRD (SARSA project manager)
Home: 703-243-8366 Agency for International Development
Washington, DC 20523-1814
Phone: 703-875-4433
FAX: 703-875-4394

Gloria Steele S&T/RI/RRD (LTC and OSU project manager)
Home: 703-971-7589 Room 608, SA-18
Agency for International Development
Washington, DC 20523-1814
Phone: 703-875-4567
FAX: 703-875-4394

ANNEX 3

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS

I. Opening Comments on Collaboration (Eric Chetwynd, AID/S&T/RD)

Previous experience has pointed out a number of situations where additional benefits could have been obtained from greater collaboration among contractors and cooperators.

Objectives for collaboration in the peri-urban project:

- Bring key sectors, projects, institutions together to work on related issues.
- Exploit the complementarities that exist among cooperators (LTC--land markets and Von Theunen theory in explaining spatial aspects of economic development; OSU--capital market imperfections; SARSA--contract farming).
- Look at certain phenomena, such as peri-urban issues, from a broader perspective; sustainable growth requires multi-sector attention.

Cooperation is not a "natural state." In the June workshop of cooperators, participants stated an interest in collaboration, but identified a number of very important problems:

- Each university functions differently; institutions face transaction costs in working with other institutions and agencies with different operating rules.
- There are differences in budgeting, finance control and overhead.
- Universities and contractors have reputations to keep and are hesitant to work on only part of the whole.
- There are concerns of who gets the overhead, and who gets the follow on work from the Missions.

AID understands these constraints and will not think the lesser for contractors if the transactions costs of collaboration prove too high to be overcome. But, there is interest in AID to capture opportunities for cooperation, and AID has come forward with this project and funding to meet two of the most important constraints brought up at the June cooperators conference:

- Need for a common problem or set of issues to work on.
- Need for funds to cover the costs of collaboration.

This project is intended to help break down the walls between cooperators to facilitate cooperation. As a noted scholar stated:

"Art is I, Science is we."

II. Background on the Peri-Urban Research Theme, Definitions and Scopes of Work for the Three Collaborators (Joan Atherton, AID/AFR/DP)

Cooperators at this workshop are not guinea pigs for collaboration, but are here for the primary purpose of doing research on the peri-urban economy.

Below are answers to some of the questions raised to date by the cooperators concerning this project:

A. Definition of Peri-Urban

No single definition exists. But peri-urban areas seem to have the following characteristics:

- geographically bounded area surrounding a primary or secondary city;
- areas of intermediate to high population density;
- relatively intense areas of specialty crops (vegetables, horticulture, dairy) and export crops;
- linkages to both urban and rural areas;
- more intense economic activity compared to rural areas;
- more informal than formal activities compared with urban centers.

B. Motivations for the Research and Project

- Many African countries are in the process of stabilization and economic adjustment.
- From population trends, we know everyone can't be employed in agriculture. Rural sector is unlikely to continue employing the labor force given physical constraints.
- Peri-urban areas are prime for employment growth; population is expected to continue to cluster in urban zones.
- Need to look at ways to expand income and employment opportunities, and to eliminate the constraints to employment growth.
- Strategies of food security/production are being reoriented to look more carefully at the generation of employment opportunities.

- The project must look at employment from the perspective of forward and backward linkages to agriculture rather than on agriculture itself.

C. Rationale for Three Cooperators

- LTC was selected to look at land market issues, OSU at financial market issues, and SARSA at labor market issues.
- AID recognizes that the world cannot be conveniently subdivided into land, labor and capital markets or into well defined boxes. However, the Scopes of Work needed to be written toward each cooperator's comparative advantage for contractual purposes. Also, these cooperators were selected because of their comparative advantage in these issues and their unique skills.
- AID wants to capture the full dynamics of peri-urban markets, not just components.
- This project is an experiment in collaboration to seek better ways of conducting research, in particular, to capture benefits of cooperation and collaboration.
- Looking for synergies. Hope benefits will be derived from having 3 cooperators with different specialties and from different disciplines working on a common research theme.
- Looking for more efficient research design and for cost savings in conducting research.
- AID has no preconceived notions on modes of operation. Cooperators are being asked what is the best way to proceed. Flexibility and innovation are being encouraged.

D. Funding

- Regional funding is coming from African Strategic Studies funds directed by Joan Atherton out of the Africa Development Planning Office.
- Mission add-ons will be important for extending regional project funds.
- The initial expression of interest by the Senegal Mission for land markets research may provide an opportunity for a mission buy-in for this project. In the Senegal case, funding is contingent on a proposal, interim products will be necessary, and the research must be program related.
- We might use Mission funding for field research, saving regional funding for cross country analysis.

E. Other Parameters for Planning the Project

- AID is willing to consider staggering research across countries (based on prior proposals).
- AID is willing to extend the research beyond the 28 month time horizon on a no cost extension basis.
- Interim products will be necessary if time is extended.
- Need to plan research to allow expansion in the event that Mission buy-ins come about.
- Africa Bureau will contact missions to solicit expressions of interest.

III. Session 1: Definitions, Research Opportunities and Objectives

A number of key issues were considered and discussed during the session:

A. Principal Research Objectives

- Peri-urban zones are places of rapid, dynamic change. They thus might be fertile environments for introducing interventions that are quickly accepted, thereby accelerating change in urban areas, as well as in rural areas through sectoral linkages.
- Public investment in peri-urban zones alters resource access and information. Changes in macro economic policy in many countries in recent years have shifted investment incentives toward the rural sector, increasing rural incomes. What impact is this having on urbanization?
- Basic knowledge is lacking on the characteristics of peri-urban areas. An inventory of economic activities is lacking. Such an inventory would help identify key linkages with the rural sector.
- We should concentrate on describing what households are doing in peri-urban areas. Households should be the basic unit of analysis.
- The principal objective is generation of knowledge about the operation of markets in land, labor and capital in peri-urban areas of Africa. Understanding the dynamics of market behavior, will permit more intelligent choice of policies by governments, and program interventions by AID.
- Specific objectives have been included in the Scopes of Work of the cooperators. These should be reviewed and corrected as necessary as a result of the discussions at this Workshop.

- AID is not seeking a unified conceptual framework to be employed by the cooperators. Rather, it wants to bring together the talents and skills of the 3 cooperators to look at a common set of issues in peri-urban areas.

Does AID have specific hypotheses for research in peri-urban areas? Does peri-urban focus on people arriving in cities, or on the urbanization process from rural to urban areas? (Eric) Is urbanization positive, say as a vehicle for growth, or the outcome of failed policies of the past? (Doug, Richard)

- Uma Lele's book cited peri-urban zones as one of the new areas of interest, not a void to fill left by previous failures at structural adjustment or trade policy reforms. (Joan)
- Economic reforms in Africa are working. How these reforms are affecting economic activity in the dynamic peri-urban areas is not clear. (Eric)
- Since land cannot continue to support the growing population, economic growth in peri-urban areas is important.

B. Definition of Peri-Urban

Does AID have suggestions and/or thoughts on cities or countries where cooperators should work (e.g. the Sahel, Southern Africa for labor migration studies, middle income countries, countries with French vs English colonial history, more or less formal government intervention, etc.)? (Peter, Richard)

- The research is not intended to be country or region specific. The central focus should be on how to intensify activity around cities? Selection of countries should be driven more on how research objectives are defined. (Joan)
- We need to conceptualize the research from a spatial perspective based on a well defined geographic area. But, the question remains whether there are important issues at the interface between urban and rural areas that should be considered and incorporated in the planning framework? (Jerry)
- Besides strictly a geographical analysis, it is important to get a handle on the dynamics of peri-urban areas over time (temporal aspects). (Jerry) Alternatively, one might do this through careful self-selection of sites and cross-sectional analysis. (Anna, Peter)
- For a study of peri-urban market behavior, it will be difficult to capture broad regional differences. Any attempt to design research to capture differences in peri-urban markets in the Sahel vs non-Sahel, or differences in colonial history would result in too few observations to permit generalizations, particularly in view of the complex differences in policy frameworks pursued by different countries. (Michael)

- AID sees peri-urban as some defined spatial area around a central city. There is a need to bound the study area by geography so as to make the research feasible: e.g. green zones around major cities. (Joan)
- Changes in macro policy might so affect the terms of trade that we observe less urban growth and expansion, and more opportunities for the rural agricultural sector and for more rural based investment in peri-urban areas. Designing the research to include the rural dimension, or rural-urban linkages is important. (Peter)
- The tentacles reaching out from cities are very important in helping to gain understanding of the dynamics of economic behavior. Information access is also very important. (Anna)
- A strictly geographic delineation of a peri-urban area around a central city poses problems conceptually. It ignores the effect of roads and flows of labor and capital between urban and rural areas (e.g. rural-urban migration, urban demand for land in high potential agricultural areas, use of institutional credit to buy land in rural areas) that very much effect and are the result of economic decisions in urban areas. Peri-urban areas should not be defined spatially in terms of land, but in terms of human interactions and where the choices of peri-urban residents are operationalized (either urban or rural). (Michael)
- Civil servants investing money outside cities can be a function of distorted macro economic policies. Under scenarios of past policy, these distortions were important. However, under the present situation of reforms, one questions whether such phenomena should continue and be the focus of study. (Doug)

C. Literature Review

How extensive should be the literature review?

- There is not a well defined body of literature on peri-urban markets. Much will depend on how creative researchers are in picking other topics relevant to the general theme. (Peter)
- There is a lot of information in the literature on urban planning (Anna) and also a lot on gender. (Jane)
- A combination of annotated bibliography and theoretical papers would help identify research gaps and geographical coverage. (Carol) Both the literature review and reconnaissance visits can and should be completed in the initial 6 month period. (Peter)
- For a project of this complexity, more time and energy should be spent over the next 6 months on conceptual framework and research design. While the literature review is important and needed, resources on a comprehensive literature review and publication of annotated bibliography should not be the highest priority at this time. (Jerry)

D. Political Dimensions

- How do we keep elites from taking over economic activity? (Dana)
- Who are the elites? Are the economic and political processes the same between urban and rural areas? (Joan)
- Do we want to choose one area with and without direct policy intervention?
- We should probably defer considerations of distributional impacts until we first understand the economic dynamic. (Dan)

E. Issues Deferred Until Later

- Can this activity be used (as seed money) to build longer-term capacity in Africa?
- What is peri-urban? Despite much discussion, a definition permitting a well defined research design remains elusive. We will need to continue to articulate differences between urban and rural sectors, as well as on research objectives. These should point the direction for an operable definition.
- How should the temporal dimension and stage of development be incorporated into the project design? Careful selection of sites provides one alternative for studying the time dimension. Another alternative is to select countries and/or cities based on existing documentation (as in the case of Dakar, Senegal) (Peter), or court records as in the case of land markets. (Carol)
- What should the literature review cover? The issue of an extensive literature review has come into question. De-emphasizing the literature review in favor of more focus on research design in the next 6 months is gaining favor.

IV. Session 2: Research Design

There is still considerable confusion over where to start concerning research design (e.g. use of a household survey, definition and bounding of research area, literature review)?

A. Definition of Peri-Urban (continued)

- We need to articulate what distinguishes a peri-urban from a rural area. By carefully selecting sites, temporal aspects can be captured through cross-sectional analysis. (Jerry)

- Objective is to generate basic knowledge on peri-urban market behavior. To do this in a practical manner, we need to limit the focus to a geographic area. That does not preclude, however, linkages to other sectors, wherever they may be (a la Michael's suggestion of conceptualizing the research design in terms of economic choices and human interactions). (Joan)

B. Household Survey

- A consensus emerges that a general household survey or baseline is a necessary first step in the research design. A household survey could pick up who is working where and allow a broad picture to be drawn of economic activity in a peri-urban area. (Anna) This would help identify important research issues for subsequent in-depth analyses.
- The next six months should be spent on developing a household questionnaire for a baseline survey in the peri-urban area.
- There are at least several examples that can be thought of that do not fit in nicely with a household survey or households as the unit of analysis (e.g. industrial zoning, regulations on the manufacturing sector). (Joan) How should these subjects be handled?

C. Literature Review

- Let each cooperator conduct a literature review from its own perspective, but coordinated (i.e. assembly and publication) by one cooperator (Peter). Annotation and perhaps a complementary paper with some interpretation, analysis, and identification of gaps might follow. (Carol)
- Let us consider less time than 6 months, since so little published information exists in the literature. (Joan)
- The literature is not sparse. The literature on urban planning and on informal sector activities is quite extensive. However, funds for the work could be reduced by taking advantage of graduate students. (Anna, John)
- Given the importance of the research design, work on an extensive literature review and annotated bibliography should be de-emphasized. (Doug)

D. Case Studies

- Various types of data should be collected, and various research approaches followed in the project. Besides detailed data collection and quantitative analyses, it is also important to undertake more case-oriented studies and descriptive types of analyses. It is not

possible or desirable to try to generalize to each and every situation. The project is not expected to generate an enormous data bank. But, further in-depth studies will be needed on certain subjects.

- Analyses related to firms may be on a case study basis.

E. Questionnaire Design

A consensus is reached that a household survey is needed, and that households will be the primary units of observation. But the question remains how the three institutions should participate in questionnaire and survey design.

- For statistical significance, a formal sampling frame is required. Given the need for reliable analysis and the need to publish in professional journals, emphasis needs to be placed on research design early in the project.
- A common core questionnaire is probably desired across countries. (Peter) Questions will be more or less the same, but responses will differ. (Carlos)
- Let the research be conducted in multi-stages allowing each cooperator time to ask its own questions and to reduce respondent fatigue. (Richard)
- Survey instruments depend on the research design, and the research design depends on specific research objectives of the cooperators. Trying to meet too many objectives, particularly given the diverse nature of questions that will be asked, will not be easy. Questionnaires developed by LTC in the past on the security of tenure and land registration project in themselves required multiple rounds and varied widely from country to country despite having a common theme. (Michael)
- Based on previous experience, questionnaires are not easily put together by collective planning and decision making. There is an abundance of evidence of failed questionnaires and survey designs stemming from collective planning and multi-institutional efforts. Each cooperator needs more autonomy in developing the surveys for its particular subject or study. (Michael)
- Let each cooperator exchange its own questionnaires as a basis for generating a common baseline questionnaire. This would inform cooperators of the types of information sought by the other cooperators, and where they naturally dovetail. (Doug)
- By sharing each cooperator's patented questionnaires, areas of common interest can be identified. AID, however, needs to recognize the large amounts of time that are required for questionnaire development. OSU's questionnaires have been developed over many years, and are in a sense patented. (Doug)

- Discussion of questionnaires is too preliminary without yet having a sound research design. More time needs to be spent on research design and survey approach and less on questionnaire development. (Jerry)
- The second workshop in month six should deal with research design.

F. Cooperators Meetings

- Cooperators may want to consider several smaller meetings before the second workshop to work among themselves on issues related to research design.

V. Session 3: Research Methodology, Data Analysis and Reporting

A. Research Design

There are alternative ways for organizing the division of labor among cooperators (Michael):

- common questionnaires
- carve up by region
- carve up by research theme
- carve up by task

The following model is a possible template for research across one or more countries:

Phase I

HOUSEHOLD/BASELINE SURVEY IN COUNTRY A
(common questionnaire)
(random sample)

Phase II

INDIVIDUAL STUDY '1'	INDIVIDUAL STUDY 'n'
-------------------------	-----------	-------------------------

(stratified random samples based on Phase I)

Two different sets of studies have been discussed to this point in the workshop: a general household baseline in phase I, and subsequent in-depth surveys in phase II. The basic questions that need to be answered are: Who will design the questionnaires? Who will administer the questionnaires? Who will ensure the quality control in data collection? Who will enter and edit the data? What data format should be used? Who will take the responsibility for distributing the data to other cooperators?

The 28 month timetable of the project, composition of field teams, and appropriate sample sizes are further questions that need to be answered.

B. Managerial Options

- Let each cooperator manage all tasks associated with Phase I studies in at least one country. The input of all three institutions would still be essential at the level of both design and analysis of the household survey in phase I.
- Assign the tasks of data control and management to just one cooperator.

C. Research Design

- Research design will have a major impact on the time frame of the project (currently 28 months). At a glance, the time frame would require closer to 36 months.
- Phase I household survey will let us draw inferences about the frequency of activities in the population. From there we can focus on subpopulations of interest. (Anna)
- Make phase II more purposeful so that Phase I doesn't have to generate a population to meet the specialized needs of all 3 cooperators.
- Must have a random survey to understand selection bias of purposeful samples.
- How big a survey will be necessary to assure sufficient elements in each strata? Initially 350-500 households are proposed. Later for cost reasons, this figure is reduced to 200-250 households. Questions are raised about the suitability of the sample size to permit adequate stratified sampling and on size of sub-samples in Phase II.
- Greater autonomy of cooperators in Phase II in questionnaire design will permit better focus on research issues, survey design, data control and management. (Michael)

D. Criteria for Choosing Countries and Research Sites

- Areas of urban growth.
- Presence of small-scale industrial activities.
- Diversity of economic activity.
- Accelerating land transactions.
- Active labor markets.
- Government has active policy framework vis-a-vis peri-urban areas.
- Mission interest.
- Local collaboration.
- Ease of access and logistics.

E. Choice of Study Areas

- Different size cities should be considered for comparative purposes, e.g. 1 primary city and 2 secondary cities in each country. (Jerry)
- Include 4 countries (two anglo, two franco), one being Dakar and some secondary cities. (Carol)
- Need information on rural household behavior as well to put peri-urban economic activities into perspective. (Jerry)
- We want to be careful not to dilute our efforts. It will be important to choose places where urban/rural data is already available.
- Start off with 2 countries with regional funds, then invite missions for additional sites. (Joan)

F. Possible Countries

Primary Countries

Botswana
Cameroon
Senegal
Zimbabwe

Secondary Countries

Ghana
Kenya
Mali
Swaziland
Tanzania
Uganda
Zambia

G. Phasing

A tentative time schedule is considered:

- Reconnaissance survey (Jan-Feb).
- Administer household survey (Summer 1990).
- Individual studies under Phase II (October-November 1990).
- Allow 7-8 months on data collection under Phase II studies, and 7 months after for analysis.
- Let each baseline be separated by 6 months.

H. Financial Considerations

- Because OSU's cooperative agreement into which this buy-in is made ends in April 1992, careful consideration needs to be given to the scheduling of their activities under the project. (Gloria)
- The costs of conducting three baseline surveys plus subsequent studies will be very expensive. There is not enough money currently budgeted to permit that scale of activity.
- Given that AID is committing \$876,000 to this effort, it will be reluctant to fund research that doesn't include at least 3 countries at some level of investment. (Joan)
- Over time, can we replicate this study in subsequent countries for less cost? Can we help add on countries with program add-ons? (Joan)
Given the constraints on time of cooperators to adequately design and supervise field research, plus other activities they are involved in, it would be unreasonable to expect the research to be carried out in more than 3 countries. Mission interest beyond 3 countries would suggest that the project should be lengthened beyond the 36 month time horizon. (Michael)
- It is important to identify missions with interests similar to Section V.C above to raise money to supplement regional funds.
- Given existing resources, there is considerable agreement that funding levels are inadequate to support research in more than two countries given the scope of work in each country, and the high costs of living in African cities.

VI. Session 4: Research Implementation and Management

A. Household Surveys, Stage I

Several modes of management are discussed which divide labor by task:

- Let LTC take the lead in designing the household questionnaire. A mechanism should be provided for the questionnaire to be circulated among the other two cooperators for comments. (John)
- Let IDA and OSU take the lead in administering the household questionnaire.
- Virginia Tech can take the lead in data coding, data entry, tabulation, preliminary findings, then circulated for discussion.
- Stratified research and follow-up under phase II is done separately by each cooperator.

B. Reporting

- Cooperators should try to produce a descriptive report to enable AID to make comments after preliminary analysis of the household survey in the first country, so as to apply lessons to implementation of the household survey in subsequent countries.
- Two products are envisioned by the end of the household baseline in the first country: annotated bibliography and statistical analysis of the baseline.
- AID has a preference for coordinated documents at all levels and stages. (Joan)

C. Data Management

- Surveys could be staggered to avoid bottlenecks in analysis and reporting.
- Economies can be achieved if we do not wait until descriptive statistics are published from the household surveys in phase 1, but instead analyze the data as it comes in and move immediately to stratified studies in phase 2. (Peter)
- Quality control is a serious problem that will need monitoring at all levels. We should complete the research at the first site, before moving on, to allow feedback into the development of survey methods in subsequent countries. (John)
- Economies can be achieved by pretesting and developing a survey design that allows for precoding of questionnaires. (Ann)

- Some countries will require local data entry because of prohibitions on taking questionnaires out of the country. (Michael)

D. Local Collaboration

Local collaborators are important for a number of reasons:

- They can provide the entree into sources of data and provide assistance with translation, enumerators and research design. (Peter)
- The research approach followed by our respective institutions already places heavy reliance on host country collaborators. (Jane)
- Host country collaboration should be a criterion for selecting countries. (Joan)
- Not all cooperators need necessarily work with the same set of collaborators in a given country particularly in phase 2. (Michael)
- Some countries place few restrictions on research. Others are more restrictive. This is a research cost that should be added in. (Doug)
- What will local collaborators be offered? Who is to pay for the local collaboration?

E. Plan for Day 2 of the Workshop

- By the end of tomorrow, we need a detailed model of the research plan for the next 6 months, more broadly defined thereafter.
- What will be the various activities happening at specific times over the 36 month time horizon? A rough time schedule is required.
- Collaborators will meet tonight to iron out plans for a presentation of that research plan.
- There is a need to assign a principal investigator for each institution to streamline decision making, coordination, and responsibility of action. AID also needs to assign a project manager for liaison with missions and for coordination with AID offices.

VII. Session 5 and 6: Preparation of Research Plan

After deliberating over the discussions of the first day, and in the process of designing the research plan during the second day of the workshop, a number of other issues were identified that influenced the shape of the final research plan:

A. Financial Costs

How do we ensure equity in expenditures among cooperators:

- Some cities and countries are more expensive. Since not all 3 cooperators may work in the same set of countries, this poses an equity issue.
- Division by task also poses problems. Having SARSA conduct all the costs of data entry and management, for example, would impose a disproportionate burden on their budget.
- Project must absolutely have a Mission buy-in to do research in a 3rd country, and to enable the final comparative analysis across countries.
- How are mission buy-ins to be handled? The final research plan requires that all 3 cooperators do the same amount of work across countries. But, a given cooperator may do less or no work in the country providing the Mission buy-in. How are funds equitably divided?

B. Data Management

- AID wants machine readable data sets for the household surveys in phase I that are standardized and completely transportable among cooperators. Data sets should also be fully documented. Both the data sets and documentation should be outputs of the project. (Joan)
- Data management issues should be on the agenda of the April workshop at OSU.

C. Literature Review

- SARSA proposes to design a framework for assembling and publishing the annotated bibliographies prepared by each cooperator within 2 weeks.
- Each cooperator would be responsible for doing the annotation of 15-20 of the best articles in its area of interest.
- Some decision will be reached on the extent of analysis of literature to define research gaps and research objectives.

ANNEX 4

PROPOSED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

PROPOSED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

1. Principal Investigators (PI)

Each cooperator will select a project investigator for this project.

A. The PI will be the focal point of all communications with:

- Own CA staff, other CA staff.
- AID/Washington.
- Missions.

B. The PI will represent his/her CA in making decisions regarding research and administrative issues.

2. Lead Institution (LI)

A. Each CA will serve as the lead institution in one country.

B. The LI will be responsible for:

- Coordinating the overall research program in that country.
- Arranging meetings, conferences, workshops, etc., as needed to implement the study.
- Coordinating and consolidating the administrative reports and briefings provided to AID/W, the Mission and host country institutions.
- Consulting with the CAs and coordinating all aspects of the Phase 1 research including questionnaire design and revision; sampling; interviewer recruitment, training and supervision; processing and editing the data; providing a copy of the data to all CAs in the form of diskettes or computer tape.
- Paying for Phase 1 data collection costs (not including staff costs of other CAs).
- Coordinating the preparation of Phase 1 reports.
- Disseminating Phase 1 reports in-country.
- Facilitating the Phase 2 research of the CAs.

3. Project Manager (PM)

- A. AID will designate a project manager drawn from the Africa Bureau. The CA project managers in S&T are the secondary point of contact.
- B. The PM will be responsible for:
 - Coordinating all aspects of the project for offices within AID/W.
 - Assisting the CAs to secure buy-in funds for use in support of this project.
 - Obtaining country clearances for all CA travel.
 - AID liaison with Missions.
 - Disseminating the research results within the Africa Bureau, and agency wide in collaboration with S&T.
 - Convening the CAs as needed to plan and coordinate activities beyond those consultations already planned.