



BASIS CRSP Phase II Request for Pre-Proposals Deadline: 31 August 2000

The Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Markets Systems (BASIS) Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP) invites researchers to submit pre-proposals for three-year, collaborative research projects at a funding level of \$150,000-\$200,000 per year. Three to four pre-proposals will be selected by October 1, 2000 and will immediately be awarded up to \$25,000 to assist in further project development through preliminary fieldwork, and/or visits with research collaborators. Principal investigators of successful pre-proposals will participate in the development of the overall BASIS CRSP Phase II continuation proposal for the October 2001 through September 2006 period. The overall proposal will be presented to USAID in early 2001 and final approval is anticipated by mid-2001. Work on the projects will begin in October 2001.

BASIS operates in support of USAID's Center for Economic Growth and Agricultural Development, Office of Agriculture and Food Security. BASIS aims to improve the quality of life for the rural poor in the developing world through policy-relevant research that is dedicated to improving access to resources and enhancing the operation of factor markets. As a virtual institute comprised of researchers from around the globe, BASIS CRSP Phase II will support two types of activities:

1. The set of principal research projects that are being solicited through this request for pre-proposals; and,
2. An ongoing series of policy-oriented conferences that integrate the themes and findings of the principal research projects into a coherent and effective voice about policy priorities and options.

BASIS seeks to improve access to and allocation of the factors of production, including land, water, labor and capital and other financial markets. Responses to this request for pre-proposals should put forward an innovative research plan that promises to add significantly to our knowledge about factors markets as described in one of the following themes:

1. Breaking Constraints to Resource Access, Resource Use and Asset Accumulation by Poor Rural Households
2. Institutional Innovations to Broaden Access to and Strengthen Land, Water, Labor and Financial Markets
3. Enhancing the Operation of Factor Markets to Achieve Sustainable Use of Environmentally Sensitive Resources

BASIS views gender and the interrelationship among factor markets as crucial to understanding these themes. (For more detailed descriptions of the themes, see Annex 2.) Joint proposals (from multiple institutions) and those that incorporate a multi-disciplinary or a cross-regional approach to research are encouraged. At least one principal investigator must come from a BASIS contracting institution, as detailed in Annex 3, and one must come from a host-country or regional organization.

In addition to contributing to knowledge, pre-proposals should formulate plans to build research capacity with host country researchers through collaborative interaction in the design and implementation of the research and in their targeted and effective dissemination. Pre-proposals must demonstrate the capacity to engage with policymakers and work toward the adoption of policies that emerge from the research findings.

The BASIS CRSP will disseminate its vision and results to the community of decisionmakers who shape policy in the bilateral and multilateral aid agencies. Researchers whose projects are selected for BASIS-Phase II will be expected to help develop and participate in the BASIS Policy Conference Series that will be directed to this audience. The design and development of this Series will be undertaken at a later date. Respondents need not budget or otherwise plan for these activities at this time.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Pre-proposals must be submitted in hard **and** electronic formats by a BASIS Contracting Institution (see Annex 3) to BASIS using the following address:

Danielle Hartmann
BASIS CRSP
Land Tenure Center
University of Wisconsin-Madison
1357 University Ave, Madison, Wisconsin 53715 USA
email: basis-me@facstaff.wisc.edu

Pre-proposals must be received by **August 31, 2000**. Fax copies will NOT be accepted. The complete pre-proposal should include the following items:

1. Title page, including a list of Principal Investigators (include name, title, institutional address, phone, fax, and email), total project budget, and funds requested from BASIS
2. An abstract not to exceed 200 words
3. A narrative description of the project not to exceed 20 double-spaced pages. In addition to detailing the intellectual context and proposed research methodology, the narrative description should take care to describe the policy relevance of the research and how the project will contribute to host research capacity
4. Anticipated outputs including dissemination activities targeted at policy makers as well as academic publications
5. A schedule or time line of activities over the life of the project
6. A budget for the life of the proposal that gives detail for each institution as well as an overall budget summary (templates provided in Annex 5). Given uncertainty regarding USAID's funding, the budget section should also discuss how the project would be carried out in the event of a 25% budget cutback
7. One paragraph summary of each researcher's qualifications
8. Curricula Vitae for Principal Investigators

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Pre-proposals will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

1. **Technical merit of proposal (45 points)**—Contribution to factor market research and relevant policy debate, contribution to BASIS themes and USAID objectives; utilization of cross-cutting themes (gender and factor market integration); relevance of sites chosen for themes/topics selected; appropriateness of research methodology; plans for disseminating findings to the academic community (journal articles, books, conferences); qualification of researchers, and feasibility of research design, schedule and budget.
2. **Integration into policy debate (20 points)**—Established relationship with host country policy makers or demonstrated capacity for engaging policy makers; plan for involving policy makers in various stages of research design and implementation; and plans for disseminating findings to policy community and for encouraging incorporation of research findings into policy formulation.
3. **Collaboration and capacity building (20 points)**—An established relationship between collaborators; collaborative relationship gives equitable intellectual control over the project to both US and host-country institutions/researchers; strategies to develop institutional capacities and capability of collaborating researchers.
4. **Broader applicability and synthesis (10 points)** —Geographic scope; multidisciplinary approach; broader regional or contextual applicability; opportunities for synthesis with other research findings or for cross-regional comparisons.
5. **Overall quality and coherence (5 points)**

SELECTION PROCESS

A review panel comprised of the incoming BASIS CRSP Program Director (Michael Carter), the USAID Project Officer (Lena Heron) and three independent reviewers will score proposals based on the above criteria. The review panel will then select from the top-rated proposals to ensure a BASIS project portfolio that is balanced for regional coverage and theme coherence.

KEY DATES

- **31 August 2000:** Pre-proposals must be delivered to the BASIS CRSP
- **1 October 2000:** Review Committee selects pre-proposals
- **November 2000:** Principal investigators of selected proposals meet in Madison to work on BASIS Phase II proposal.
- **15 January 2001:** BASIS Phase II Continuation Proposal (containing approved pre-proposals) submitted to USAID/AFS. PIs will be invited to participate in the presentation of the BASIS Phase II Continuation Proposal to USAID.
- **15 March 2001:** USAID/AFS makes program continuation decision and recommends modifications
- **31 August 2001:** Final proposals and 1st year work plans due.
- **1 October 2001:** Start of Phase II

For more information:

- Please refer to the BASIS web site for background information about the BASIS CRSP, technical reports emerging from current research activities, and administrative material produced in BASIS Phase I, especially the *BASIS Strategy for Program Renewal*, released in November 1999:
<http://www.wisc.edu/lrc/basis.html>
- Comments or questions regarding the above documents or this RFP should be sent at any time to Danielle Hartmann at dehartmann@facstaff.wisc.edu; phone: 608-262-5538; fax: 608-262-2141.

ANNEX 1 – Background on the BASIS CRSP and Operating Procedures

ANNEX 2 – Conceptual Vision and Research Themes

ANNEX 3 – BASIS Contracting Institutions

ANNEX 4 – BASIS Partners

ANNEX 5 – Budget Guidelines

ANNEX 1:
Background on the BASIS CRSP and Operating Procedures

Overview

The BASIS CRSP is a 5-year cooperative agreement with the USAID office of Agriculture and Food Security (USAID/AFS). Phase I of BASIS is now midway through its 4th year of operation. By early 2001 we will submit to USAID/AFS the BASIS CRSP Phase II continuation proposal for program continuation for the period October 2001 to September 2006. Based on this five-year extension proposal and evaluations by the BASIS External Evaluation Panel and USAID management review committee, USAID/AFS will make its decision on program renewal.

BASIS-Phase II Audiences

As a policy-oriented research program, BASIS will speak to three audiences:

The Academic Community through the publication of journal articles and books and participation in conferences;

The Host Country Policy-Making Community (including local USAID missions) through *BASIS Briefs* as well as engagement activities planned by each research project; and,

The International Policy-Making Community (including USAID/Global; the World Bank; FAO; the regional development banks and other donors) through the BASIS Policy Conference Series and its associated publications.

BASIS Briefs

BASIS Briefs are concise summaries of important topics, current debates and new research findings. Contributions are intended to be relevant and accessible to host country policy makers. For examples of *BASIS Briefs* produced during Phase I, see <http://www.wisc.edu/lrc/bas-puba.html#brief>.

BASIS Policy Conference Series

To enhance the additivity, impact and synthesis of its research program, BASIS will sponsor a policy conference series. As part of the process of crafting the BASIS-Phase II proposal, PIs from the selected pre-proposals will join together in defining the specific themes that will constitute the Policy Conference Series. In the early years of BASIS-Phase II, the conferences will draw on the proposals and other relevant work to articulate the major constraints that confront poor rural households, and the research and policy agenda for resolving them. In subsequent years, the conference series will distill and pull together results from the Phase II research projects. Conferences will be sited, planned and pitched to insure the meaningful participation of members of the international policy-making community. The conferences will integrate as appropriate work undertaken in BASIS-Phase I, as well as work carried out by other researchers. Each conference will be designed to result in a publication (book or special journal issue) aimed at the general policy audience.

Funding of the BASIS CRSP

USAID has advised that core funding for BASIS is expected to be +/- \$1 million per year. While add-on funding will not be intermingled with core-funded activities in approved proposals, BASIS Contracting Institutions (see Annex 3) will have opportunities to solicit and manage add-on funding from regional missions or bureaus.

Collaboration

Grants under the BASIS CRSP are intended for collaborative ventures between U.S. and foreign counterparts. It will not always be possible to identify full partners at the pre-proposal writing stage; in such cases the pre-proposal should indicate a clear strategy for establishing partnerships. The principal investigator may also request assistance from BASIS in identifying potential host-country partners.

Approvals

The USAID mission in the country in which research will be undertaken must be informed of the proposal before research can begin. Researchers themselves must obtain any visas or other permissions required by host-country governments. All grant awards will be made conditional on obtaining all required clearances.

Work plan and Results Review

The principal investigators of approved projects will be responsible for submitting an annual work plan to be approved by BASIS. Assuming satisfactory progress on the research project (including timely submission of required reports), annual funding allocations to each program will follow the budget developed at the beginning of the project. However, because BASIS is itself subject to annual budgetary approval, it is possible that a change in research funding will be necessitated in the event that core USAID declines below projected levels. Such changes will be negotiated with each PI and subject to the approval of the BASIS technical committee. Should core USAID funding increase, BASIS will be able to fund additional projects and or make needed additions to ongoing work.

Principal Investigators

Each pre-proposal must identify at least one Principal Investigator (PI) from a BASIS Contracting Institution (see Annex 3) and one PI from a host-country institution. BASIS Contracting Institutions are those US institutions that participated in BASIS Phase I and have the administrative and technical capacity to manage large research projects. PIs are those individuals that assume the technical and administrative responsibility for the activity. Reporting requirements will include an annual work plan and budget, an annual activity report summarizing results and accomplishments, impact analysis and results monitoring, trip reports (per trip), research outputs and summaries, and research updates as needed. PIs will also be expected to participate in the formulation of the full proposal for BASIS-Phase II to USAID, and to participate in Policy Conference Series detailed below.

Background on Phase I

During the first phase of the BASIS CRSP annual core funding of approximately \$1 million and additional contributions by USAID missions and regional bureaus have supported projects in Central America, Southern Africa, the Horn of Africa, Central Asia and Russia. For more information on BASIS Phase 1 and the projects in each of these regions see the BASIS web site [<http://www.wisc.edu/lrc/basis.html>] or contact Danielle Hartmann at dehartmann@facstaff.wisc.edu; phone: 608-262-5538; fax: 608-262-2141.

ANNEX 2:
BASIS CRSP II
Conceptual Vision and Research Themes

Overview

The BASIS CRSP supports collaborative research, training, capacity building and outreach on the access to and allocation of land, water, employment and financial resources as they relate to economic growth, food security and sustainable resource management. The BASIS assumes that broad access to key factors of production critically influences rapid, sustainable and participatory development and that a better understanding of the allocation of these factors is critical for appropriate policy formation, implementation, and analysis.

Conceptual vision

The BASIS CRSP incorporates an interdisciplinary approach and uses standard and innovative methodologies to show how linkages across different modes of factor access and allocation influence patterns and consequences of development. These interlinked modes of access to land, water, employment and financial capital influence several important effects including:

- (1) patterns of asset accumulation based on wealth, class, gender, race, ethnicity, and location
- (2) intra-household behavior and resource allocation
- (3) access to income-generating opportunities and improvements in productivity
- (4) the sustainability of resource use, livelihoods, and the environment

The research should not focus on these effects, but rather on the constraints to factor market access, effectiveness and integration, and the possible strategies and policies to address these constraints.

By documenting and analyzing the interconnections among various modes of access and factor allocations, including markets, the BASIS approach identifies conditions that shape household and individual market participation, risk management, livelihood and investment strategies. Policy choices cannot ignore these strategies if they are to be successful and sustainable. Whenever a growth dilemma occurs (e.g., sluggish price responsiveness or rapid but exclusionary growth), a question arises about the underlying problems. Are they induced by policy failure? Or are they due to intrinsic features of unregulated factor markets in a world of imperfect information, transactions costs, and social differentiation? The BASIS research agenda seeks to distinguish among different sources of market and policy choices and their implications for key development objectives.

Research themes

The BASIS CRSP II research program comprises three research themes and two crosscutting themes (market integration and gender). Each theme contains research priorities that will be linked thematically and regionally by the BASIS Management Entity in making the final selection of pre-proposals to reveal global synergies. The BASIS CRSP stipulates that research be conducted in areas related to the key factors of land, water, labor use/employment, and finance, and that each research project should incorporate crosscutting issues.

THEME 1:
**Breaking Constraints to Resource Access,
Resource Use and Asset Accumulation by Poor Rural Households**

The ability of households to take advantage of new farm and non-farm opportunities requires *inter alia* access to land, water, labor and financial resources and human and social capital to enable households and individuals to respond to opportunity. Structural adjustment and privatization programs have sought to liberalize prices, relax trade barriers, and reduce or eliminate subsidies. When markets do not exist or are incomplete and/or dysfunctional, households must wholly or partially rely on their own private wealth and social endowments to find substitutes for the missing insurance, employment opportunities, or financial services.

Poverty is the outcome of both low asset levels and unproductive asset use. It has often been noted that poor people pursue unproductive asset accumulation strategies, storing their meager savings in forms that yield low and negative rates of return and that constrain productivity and responsiveness to income-generating opportunities. Asset levels and exchanges through factor markets can play an important role in household and individual strategies to cope with drought, economic downturns, and political uncertainty, or to enable responses to economic opportunities that emerge. Indeed, as uncertainty can cause excessive income diversification and discourage investment in productive futures, strategies that provide for more stable incomes and growth opportunities can help poor resource households accumulate wealth and achieve higher incomes through investment in productive opportunities. For many poor resource households, non-farm employment opportunities are crucial to income diversification and survival as they provide both a survival strategy and an accumulation mechanism for channeling investments into agriculture

The poor and socially disadvantaged must have the capacity to use market and non-market institutions to gain access to resources in order to escape structural (reproduced) poverty, engage agricultural commercialization, adopt new technology, or reap the benefits of remunerative non-farm earnings. Otherwise, they remain trapped and are often forced to overuse the natural resources on which they depend.

Research under this theme is intended to lay the foundations for understanding the linkages among resource access/allocation and ways the household and individuals managed assets and livelihoods to cope with uncertainty or to respond to opportunity. Illustrative questions:

1. *How, in the presence of economic, environmental and political risk, can individuals and households improve livelihoods and/or income stability through, for example, removing impediments that constrain access to land, water, labor, and financial capital?*
2. *How does differential access to land, water, labor and financial capital constrain responses to production, investment opportunities, and the ability of individuals and households to cope with crisis or achieve sustainable livelihoods?*
3. *To what extent could efficient land, labor, and financial markets or non-market mechanisms serve to mitigate the effect of safety-net losses, reductions in wealth, or losses in employment resulting from economic reforms, drought, or other external shocks?*

4. *How severely and in what market and policy environments do factor market dysfunctionalities lead to unproductive asset accumulation strategies that perpetuate poverty? What innovative institutions and policy actions can help stabilize incomes to enhance both asset use and accumulation?*
 5. *How are the poor and socially disadvantaged constrained in their adoption of technological innovations that hold potential for improving livelihoods and resource productivity?*
-

THEME 2:
**Institutional Innovations to Broaden Access to and
Strengthen Land, Water, Labor and Financial Markets**

Informal and formal institutions critically influence the processes through which households and individuals gain access to, exercise rights over, and use factors of production. When markets are missing or incomplete or when they exclude particular groups from productive factors or instruments for risk management, informal institutions are mostly responsible for resource allocation and management (land rentals and sharecropping, rotating credit and savings associations, family or tribal allocation). However, while informal institutions may substitute for missing markets to facilitate risk management and resource allocation, they may also constrain innovation, block growth, and foster social inequality.

Formal institutions (property rights definition and enforcement, contract design and enforcement, appropriate legal and regulatory frameworks) are often important for more efficient and equitable performance of land, water, labor and financial market and non-market allocations, although they may often produce negative outcomes.

Research under this theme would seek to better understand the consequences of market liberalization and other policy reforms in relation to the workings of informal and formal institutional infrastructure, and to identify desirable patterns of institutional innovation. In some environments this may mean promoting appropriate formal institutions where informal institutions have prevailed (e.g. Africa). In other environments this may mean the substitution of a new institutional and organizational framework to support market development after the breakdown of former command institutions (e.g. Central Asia and former Soviet Union).

This theme seeks to better understand the features of formal and informal institutional arrangements that make them successful in particular environments, and to identify lessons useful for the design and application of new institutions or implementation strategies. Illustrative questions:

1. *How can new institutional structures and procedures for managing key factors (as in reforms of land and water policy, or modes of redistributing land and property shares in former command economies) broaden and deepen access to resources and encourage their productive use?*
 2. *In what circumstances does the introduction of formal institutions disturb rather than complement informal institutional arrangements, and how do these disturbances influence access to resources (e.g. by gender, ethnicity, income levels), and the use of resources?*
 3. *How do social relations and groupings, (based on locality, ethnicity, kinship, etc.) channel access to key factors and what are their strengths and weaknesses in the face of market development?*
 4. *How do informal and formal institutions evolve, change, persist, and complement markets during market evolution and reform? What policy and program interventions are advised to either curtail, enable or encourage this change?*
-

THEME 3

Enhancing the Operation of Factor Markets to Achieve Sustainable Use of Environmentally Sensitive Resources

Research under this theme investigates issues surrounding market and non-market allocation of factors and associated use of environmentally sensitive resources. It specifically poses questions about the difficulties of achieving sustainable use of environmental resources, particularly in the context of political and economic restructuring where states and/or markets are weak. Major challenges lie in attempts to reconcile goals of environmental protection and sustainable use with rising demands for income and livelihoods.

Low productivity agriculture in some cases forces extension of crop cultivation, reduction of fallow in the farming system, encroachment onto fragile lands, and the downward spiral in agricultural productivity. In other cases, socially disadvantaged populations disenfranchised from resources and economic opportunity are forced to overuse the natural resource bases to sustain livelihoods.

However, in other cases, political and economic restructurings are posing special problems for managing environmentally sensitive resources. In Eastern Europe and Central Asia, policymakers are tackling difficult problems of decentralizing water and pasture management in the process of restructuring state farms and collectives. Land reform programs in southern Africa, are seeking to redesign water agreements constructed to serve large scale commercial sectors in the process of redistributing land to smallholders and beneficiary groups. In eastern Africa and Central Asia research could explore the efficiency of water use in irrigation schemes and watersheds to both increase productivity, broaden access, and conserve shrinking water supplies. In Central America, the relationship between structural adjustment programs, resources access and resource degradation could be explored. In many places throughout Africa, the challenge of improving the livelihoods of pastoralists who are pressured by farmland encroachment and population growth present opportunity for interesting policy relevant research. In all regions, policymakers are seeking solutions to environmental degradation and resource scarcity through redistributive programs and policy reforms aimed at improving the efficiency and sustainability of scarce land, water and financial capital resources. Illustrative questions:

1. *Under what conditions can alternative institutional arrangements for allocating scarce water, forest and grazing resources (common property institutions, markets, corporate entities, or conservation trusts) promote environmental conservation and sustainable use?*
 2. *How, in the context of economic reform and transition (centrally planned to market economy, or land redistribution from wealthy landlords to the poor), can environmentally sensitive resources be sustainably and productively managed?*
 3. *What are the appropriate legal and policy frameworks and enforcement mechanisms to reduce or resolve conflicts in the use of land, water and pasture resources?*
 4. *Under what situations are common property management approaches (trusts, water users associations, buffer zones) or markets (resource pricing and revenue sharing) the most effective instruments for managing environmentally sensitive resources and reducing conflict over their use?*
-

CROSSCUTTING THEME 1

Gender

Analysis in terms of individuals and households has been found to be insufficient for full understanding of patterns of factor allocation and economic development. In particular, a large literature from several disciplinary approaches has shown that understanding gender relations is critical, while more recent attention to age/generational differences adds to this conclusion. The assumption of a unitary household has been criticized by many (Guyer 1981; Alderman et al. 1995). Alternative models begin with a recognition that the interests of those within the household can be both competing and complementary.

Detailed studies of households, individuals, and gender relations have shown that pooling of resources within a household does not always happen as economic theory had previously suggested. Using simulation analysis, Smith (1995) shows that both the supply response and the basic human needs response are fundamentally shaped by the intra-household distribution of assets, income, and bargaining power. Anthropological research also shows how these intra-household processes are strongly mediated by cultural norms about the division of labor, income use, and authority, and demonstrates the need to situate households within broader sets of social relations (i.e. intra-household and inter-household levels of analysis).

Linkages among gender differentiation, food security, and resource use are, however, complex and location-specific. Women may face more constrained access to land or financial services but intra-household or inter-household income pooling might offset these differences. Also, restricted access to one market according to gender may distort resource allocation in other markets; e.g., restricted access to land or wage employment may push women into less remunerative petty trading. Paying close attention to intra-household allocation can help improve the ability to predict outcomes of gender-targeted reforms on improving the welfare of women and of other members of the household. Illustrative questions:

1. *How are women constrained in their accumulation and management of assets or in access to factor markets (land, water, labor, and financial capital) that slow or impede their ability to cope with crisis or achieve sustainable livelihoods?*
 2. *What institutional innovations can help broaden access of women in ways that improve the use of land, water, employment and financial services?*
 3. *How can gender-differentiated access to resources and circumscribed access to employment opportunities be changed to broaden and deepen the participation of women in agricultural commercialization, non-farm employment and technical change?*
 4. *In what ways can greater participation of women in decision making and equitable access to resources and employment opportunities contribute to better husbandry of environmentally sensitive resources?*
-

CROSSCUTTING THEME 2

Factor Market Integration (the Nexus)

Much of the classic peasant studies literature on the microeconomics of low-income agrarian economies explain why particular markets may not exist or may not function well. Factor-market problems discussed in the literature include: nonexistent insurance markets, segmented labor and financial markets, sluggish land markets constrained by competing or contradictory property rights systems, and inchoate modes of access to water sources. Much of the recent economics literature reflects new insights on endogenous market failures, rooted in the economics of information, incentives, and transactions costs. In turn, the multi-disciplinary approaches of political ecology document the complex social, political and economic dimensions of differentiated modes of factor allocation.

While land, water, employment and finance could each be considered in isolation, it is in their coming together that their impact on the dynamics of growth and transformation can be most thoroughly understood. Poorly functioning labor markets induce poor, land-short groups to undervalue their own labor time relative to the market wage and to intensively cultivate any land to which they gain access. Bannerjee and Newman (1993) and Ljungqvist (1994) explore how missing and financial and contingency markets impart an initial wealth bias to decisions about how to accumulate physical and human capital, respectively. Carter and Olinto (1996) show how a land titling program pursued out of sequence with financial market reform could make growth even less inclusionary of the resource poor, a result that others have documented in African countries (Shipton 1988, Haugerud 1989, Migot-Adholla et al. 1991, Bassett and Crummey 1993).

Even where macroeconomic reforms have succeeded in stimulating growth in many developing countries, economic growth could be enhanced by alleviating market dysfunctionalities and eliminating policy mistakes. These distortions frequently operate through the factor market nexus. Illustrative questions:

1. *How do differential access to land, water, labor, and financial capital markets constrain responses to production, investment opportunities, and the ability of individuals and households to cope with crisis or achieve sustainable livelihoods?*
 2. *How can institutional innovations in accessing and integrating land, water, labor and financial capital help improve rural incomes, total factor productivity and sustainability of resource use?*
 3. *In what ways can factor market interventions be coordinated and integrated to improve access to, and synergies between, land, water, labor and financial capital in improving response to agricultural commercialization?*
 4. *What are the appropriate speed, sequencing, breadth, and synergy of policy reforms, given different initial conditions?*
 5. *In the context of political and economic transition, how could appropriate combinations of policy reforms, asset transfers, institutional innovations, and sequencing of interventions help support transitions to higher income growth and sustainable management of resources?*
-

ANNEX 3:
BASIS Contracting Institutions

BASIS Contracting Institutions are those US institutions that participated in BASIS Phase I and have the administrative and technical capacity to manage large research projects. These institutions have demonstrated their capacity through their past performance in international development research.

All pre-proposals for BASIS CRSP Phase II must be submitted by a Principal Investigator at a Contracting Institution. All pre-proposals must also include a PI from a host country institution. Any organization that is not a Contracting Institution is welcome to contact the key person named at any of the institutions listed below to discuss collaborative activities.

Institution	Key Contact
<p>1. Center for International Development at Harvard University (CID) Harvard University 79 John F. Kennedy Street Cambridge, MA 02138 USA Phone: 617-495-4112 Fax: 617-495-8685 URL: www.ksg.harvard.edu/CID/</p>	<p>Dr. Pauline Peters Phone: 617-495-3785 Email: Pauline_peters@harvard.edu</p>
<p>2. Cornell University Department of Agricultural, Resources, and Managerial Economics 351 Warren Hall Ithaca, NY 14853-7801 USA Phone: 607-255-2191 Fax: 607-255-9984 URL: www.cals.cornell.edu/dept/arme/</p>	<p>Dr. Christopher Barrett Phone: 607-255-4489 Email: cbb2@cornell.edu</p>
<p>3. Institute for Development Anthropology (IDA) 99 Collier Street PO Box 2307 Binghamton, NY 13902-2207 USA Phone: 607-772-6244 Fax: 607-773-8993 Email: devanth@binghamtom.edu URL: www.devanth.org/</p>	<p>Dr. Michael Horowitz Phone: 607-772-6244 Email: mhorowi@binghamton.edu</p>
<p>4. Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS) University of Maryland, College Park 2105 Morrill Hall College Park, MD 20742 USA Phone: 301-405-3110 Fax: 301-405-3020 Email: info@iris.econ.umd.edu URL: www.inform.umd.edu/IRIS</p>	<p>Dr. Anthony Lanyi Phone: 301-405-2785 Email: lanyi@iris.econ.umd.edu</p>

Institution	Key Contact
<p>5. Institute of International Agriculture Michigan State University 324 Agriculture Hall East Lansing, MI 48824-1039 USA Phone: 517-355-0174 Fax: 517-353-1888 Email: iia@msu.edu URL: www.iia.msu.edu</p>	<p>Dr. Dan Clay Phone: 517-355-0174 Email: clay@msu.edu</p>
<p>6. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) 2033 K Street, NW Washington, DC 20006-1002 USA Phone: 202-862-5600 Fax: 202-467-4439 Email: ifpri@cgiar.org URL: www.ifpri.org</p>	<p>Dr. John Maluccio Phone: 202-862-5693 Email: j.maluccio@cgiar.org</p>
<p>7. The Ohio State University 2120 Fyffe Road Columbus, OH 43210-1067 USA Phone: 614-292-8019 Fax: 614-292-7362 URL: www.osu.edu</p>	<p>Dr. Claudio Gonzalez-Vega Phone: 614-292-6376 Email: gonzalez.4@osu.edu</p>
<p>8. Rural Development Institute (RDI) 4746 11th Avenue, NE, #504 Seattle, WA 98105 Phone: 206-528-5880 Fax: 206-528-5881 Email: rdi@u.washington.edu URL: www.law.washington.edu/rdi</p>	<p>Mr. Tim Hanstad Phone: 206-528-5880 Email: timh@rdiland.org</p>
<p>9. University of Wisconsin-Madison Land Tenure Center 1357 University Avenue Madison, WI 53715 USA Phone: 608-262-3657 Fax: 608-262-2141 Email: lrc-uw@facstaff.wisc.edu URL: www.wisc.edu/lrc/</p>	<p>Dr. Harvey Jacobs Phone: 608-262-5537 Email: hmjacobs@facstaff.wisc.edu</p>
<p>10. University of Wisconsin Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics 427 Lorch Street, 429 Taylor Hall Madison, WI 53706-1503 USA Phone: 608-262-8966 Fax: 608-263-4472 URL: http://www.aae.wisc.edu/</p>	<p>Dr. Michael Carter Phone: 608-263-2478 Email: carter@aae.wisc.edu</p>

ANNEX 4:
BASIS Partners

BASIS Partners are those institutions that participated in BASIS Phase I and wish to submit pre-proposals for consideration for BASIS Phase II. These institutions are familiar with USAID and CRSPs activities. We understand that each institution and researcher may already have established relationships with colleagues in these or other countries, but please feel free to contact them to discuss current or potential future CRSP activities.

Institution	Key Contact
1. Centre for Applied Social Science (CASS) (Zimbabwe)	Dr. Francis Gonese Email: gonese@trep.co.zw
2. Clark Atlanta University Department of Economics	Dr. Mesfin Bezuneh Email: MBEZUNEH@cau.edu
3. La Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales - Programa El Salvador (FLACSO)	Carlos Guillermo Ramos Email: fudecso@ejje.com
4. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations - Land Tenure Service	Dr. David Palmer Email: david.palmer@fao.org
5. Fundacion Salvadoreña para el Desarrollo Economico y Social (FUSADES)	Ms. Anabella Lardé de Palomo Email: apalomo@fusades.com.sv
6. International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF)	Dr. Brent Swallow Email: B.Swallow@cgiar.org
7. Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA)	Dr. Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed Email: ossrea@telecom.net.et
8. Policy and Praxis (South Africa)	Dr. Julian May Email: Mayj@wpo.mtb.und.ac.za
9. Tegemeo Institute of Agricultural Policy and Development, Egerton University (Kenya)	Dr. Wilson Nguyo Email: Tegemeo@nbnet.co.ke
10. Universidad Centroamericana José Simeón Cañas (UCA)	Mr. Alvaro Trigueros-Argüello Email: atriguer@eco.uca.edu.sv
11. University of Botswana Directorate of Research and Development (DRD)	Dr. Ben Acquah Email: acquahbk@mopipi.ub.bw
12. University of Namibia, Social Sciences Division, Multidisciplinary Research Centre	Dr. Ben Fuller Email: bfuller@unam.na
13. Williams College Dept. of Economics/Center for Development Economics	Dr. Jonathan Conning Email: jconning@williams.edu
14. World Council of Credit Unions	Ms. Lucy Ito Email: lito@woccu.org

ANNEX 5: Budget Guidelines

An indicative budget must be submitted using the template provided. Line items are provided as guidelines, but are not comprehensive. The budget must be broken out by yearly expenditures and estimated matching contributions must be included.

Upon approval of the pre-proposal a detailed budget will be required. Each proposal must include a budget for each institution participating in the activity, providing accurate institutional costs and negotiated administrative rates. Individual institutional budgets are necessary to monitor US-based and host-country expenses.

MATCHING:

One requirement of all CRSPs is that 25% of all US-based expenses must be matched **by non-federal sources**. All projects must provide indicative matching figures for their projects in the templates provided.

The matching requirement for US universities participating in a CRSP is based on the concept that pursuit of CRSP goals will mutually benefit USAID's interest in providing development assistance for developing countries and the interest of US universities in improving US agriculture. Matching shows institutional commitment to the program.

What expenses must be matched? All USAID-financed costs that are associated with the performance of employees of participating US institutions working in the US and in the developing countries on both short and long-term assignments are program costs of the CRSP and must be matched. In general, this means everything must be matched, **except:**

- cost to operate the ME;
- funds committed under a formal CRSP host-country subagreement, including funds for facilities, host country personnel services, and equipment and commodity purchases by a participating US institution for use by a host country entity or by the US institution in a host country;
- costs for training of participants. Provisions for such training normally would be made in the formal subagreement. Participants are defined as foreign nationals sponsored by AID to receive training outside their home countries;
- hospital and medical costs of US personnel of the CRSP while serving overseas. Participating institutions must carry their own medical insurance for their personnel, and participants must be covered by USAID's insurance program.

What counts as a match? Anything that is:

- a continuing component of the CRSP program at the institution which is international in dimension and appropriate to the specific CRSP goals;
- an additive to an appropriate existing program at the institution which is international in dimension and appropriate to the CRSP goals; and
- a reordering, modification, or enhancement of an appropriate existing research program at the institution, developed as an international dimension appropriate to the CRSP goals.

Specifically, this means that the following can be considered a match:

- All contributions, including cash and third party in-kind.¹ Primarily, this means salaries of senior staff working on the project. Other examples might include airfares or other travel costs which are picked up by other organizations, printing costs for project-related documents, and so on.
- Unrecovered indirect costs.
- Volunteer services furnished by professional and technical personnel, consultants, and other skilled and unskilled labor if the service is an integral and necessary part of an approved project or program.²
- Joint funding for project from non-federal sources.

What documentation must be provided? Normal accounting procedures must be followed for cash matching contributions. The following requirements pertain to the supporting records for in-kind contributions from third parties.

- Volunteer services shall be documented and supported by the same methods used by the recipient for its own employees.
- Values for recipient contributions of services and property shall be established in accordance with the applicable cost principles, with qualifications in the case of property.
- The basis for determining the valuation for personal services, material, equipment, buildings, and land shall be documented.
- When an employer other than the recipient furnishes the services of an employee, these services shall be valued at the employee's regular rate of pay (plus an amount of fringe benefits that are reasonable, allowable, and allocable, but exclusive of overhead costs), provided these services are in the same skill for which the employee is normally paid.

¹ Matching contributions must meet all of the following criteria:

- Are verifiable from the recipient's records.
- Are not included as contributions for any other federally-assisted project or program.
- Are necessary and reasonable for proper and efficient accomplishment of project or program objectives.
- Are allowable under the applicable cost principles.
- Are not paid by the Federal Government under another award.
- Are provided for in the approved budget.

² Rates for volunteer services shall be consistent with those paid for similar work in the recipient's organization. In those instances in which the required skills are not found in the recipient organization, rates shall be consistent with those paid for similar work in the labor market in which the recipient competes for the kind of services involved. In either case, paid fringe benefits that are reasonable, allowable, and allocable may be included in the valuation.