



Land Tenure Center

CASS / LTC LAND REFORM AND RESETTLEMENT RESEARCH SUPPORT PROGRAMME

ALTERNATIVE MODELS STUDY: SCOPE OF WORK

I. Principal Investigators

- Francis Gonese, CASS, UZ
- Dr. C. M. Mukora, Dept. of Geography and Environmental Science, UZ
- Dr. B. Kinsey, Institute of Development Studies, UZ, and Free University Amsterdam
- Nelson Marongwe, ZERO
- Thomas Mitchell, University of Wisconsin-Madison Law School

II. Background

1. Land reform in Zimbabwe has been carried out largely through state-initiated-and-managed transfers of agricultural land from the predominantly white large-scale commercial farming sub-sector to black farmers. This process has been guided by a dominant perception that land reform and associated activities are necessarily functions for agencies of the state. Non-state players, notably NGOs and church organizations, have made a significant but limited contribution, but this experience has not been systematically documented. Two decades after inception at independence, the pace and scope of implementation of the reform programme still lag behind both policy targets and expectations.
2. Fifteen years after it first became operational, Zimbabwe's land reform programme, the focus of government's efforts to achieve growth with equity, "had never been evaluated to determine the strengths and weaknesses as well as the need for its redesign" (GOZ 1995 p2). The same is true today. While programme targets have been reviewed regularly in narrow terms (e.g. numbers of beneficiaries), empirical analyses (Mutepfa, et al. 1998; Rukuni et al. 1994; Moyo 1995, among others) point out the need for modifications in order to facilitate greater stakeholder involvement, enhance efficiency and effectiveness of implementation, create greater flexibility, and improve output delivery. Numerous factors have been identified that necessitate a review of the approaches taken to land redistribution. Among the more important are:

- The models employed to date are largely interventions designed prior to independence and have not sought to incorporate subsequent lessons from experience. The perspectives of beneficiaries and personnel involved with field-level implementation are particularly absent. The early models have been applied in blanket fashion and have exhibited considerable inflexibility in coping with dynamic conditions and the changing demands of the land reform process.
- Experience has shown that land availability has been the major determining factor in the location and nature of resettlement ultimately implemented (GOZ 1996, 1998; Moyo 1995; Rukuni et al. 1994). At the same time, the existing models have proved inadequate or ineffective in addressing specific circumstances, such as cases where small and isolated land units have been acquired for the programme; where the productive capabilities of the land acquired does not correspond with the planning underlying the models; or where the needs of beneficiaries lie outside what can be met from agricultural production. There is an evident need to allow for approaches and models that diversify livelihood possibilities and settlement patterns on land that may have limited potential under conventional cropping. (For example, opportunities offered by ostrich farming, wildlife management and other models for natural resource utilization should be considered for inclusion under the reform programme.)
- In particular, the land reform process requires models that will, among other things, enable beneficiaries to participate in export and other high-value crop production in order to open up the present exclusive structure and strengthen the country's long-term capacity to generate foreign exchange.

III. Study Goals

1. The proposed study of alternative models will identify and offer for policy consideration a mix of approaches in land settlement, resource use and management that can be applied in implementing the Land Reform and Resettlement Programme (LRRP) in Zimbabwe. The study will focus on the lessons of models and approaches implemented to date by the Government of Zimbabwe (under LRRP-1), NGOs in Zimbabwe, and other governments elsewhere. The intention is to construct a "menu" of options for implementing land reform. Each option will have been individually evaluated for technical soundness, and the overall mix of options can be altered by policymakers to best suit changing conditions. The gains and losses from conflicting objectives—such as equity and efficiency, for example—can be explicitly recognized in designing programme components to meet overall goals, such as agricultural productivity, equity, poverty alleviation, increased rural incomes and enhanced rural development. Considerations regarding design, optimal resource use and effective land redistribution will also be taken into account, as will the cultural compatibility of the models identified.

2. The ultimate goal of the study is to identify a set of models or approaches that allow policymakers and planners to select among operational characteristics, such as flexibility, cost, expeditious implementation and increased involvement by non-state players, while at the same time ensuring greater sustainability of resource utilization and economically and socially optimal agricultural production among farming communities created by resettlement. This latter is important as implementation of the programme is envisaged to support or enhance food and related production for both programme beneficiaries and the nation at large.

IV. Study Objectives

The following are the specific objectives of the study:

Carry out a critical and conceptual review of resettlement models employed to date on land acquired by the state with a view to assessing their relative technical strengths and weaknesses. The full inventory of the models to be analyzed includes:

- A and its variants (accelerated; A1; A2; the irrigation model; etc.)
 - B and C
 - D and the three-tier model
 - Communal Area reorganization
 - “Fast track” resettlement
 - “Peri-urban” agricultural resettlement
2. Undertake a similar review and conceptual analysis of non-state initiated settlement approaches to determine strengths that can be adopted to complement the mainstream national programme. “Complementary approach” schemes reportedly implemented (or implementable) under various non-state initiatives (including Communication Links, Campfire experience, Safire, conservancies, etc.) will be reviewed under this category.
 3. Undertake field evaluations of the models used in both state and non-state initiatives in order to identify strengths and deficiencies in implementation, as well as to assess their relative suitability as effective and efficient approaches in resource use and management. A special case to be included in the field analyses here are spontaneous / squatter settlements.

Evaluate land reform and resettlement experiences of other countries with a view to identifying pertinent lessons and design criteria that will serve to strengthen the Zimbabwean programme.

Finally, based on the outputs of IV.1. to IV.4., suggest a pragmatic mix of approaches that can be adopted for implementation in line with the objectives of the LRRP-2 (i.e. a suggested mix from empirically tested Existing and Improved Government Approaches (EIGA) and Complementary Approaches (CA) or models).

V. Methodology

1. Four sets of interrelated activities arise from these objectives and will be undertaken by the study:
 - a) An analysis of the conceptual and technical soundness of existing approaches and models in both state and non-state categories; this will involve a thorough review of available literature and research. The major sources of such literature include:
 - Government documents outlining policies regarding the LLRP and its various elements and components;
 - Project reports relevant to specific schemes or resettlement activities;
 - Evaluation reports by Government and related institutions;
 - Academic research and other evaluative work by private organizations.
 - b) Field visits to selected schemes under existing models to analyze empirically the strengths and deficiencies of the models; both formal and informal resettlement will be analyzed for all major agro-ecological zones.
 - c) Study of relevant international experience - to evaluate land settlement, land use and management experience in other countries that have undertaken similar reform programmes. In addition to reviewing documentary evidence of international experience, the investigators will organize a two-week study tour of selected sites in South Africa. The sites will be identified by CASS in collaboration with the Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS) of the University of the Western Cape, and
 - d) Compilation of a final report with recommendations from findings of the preceding activities.
2. Both formal and informal interviews will be held with officials involved in the planning, implementation and management of the respective approaches under review, and at all levels of the implementation process, i.e. national, provincial, regional, district, ward and site.
3. Similarly, different stakeholders' attitudes and views will be captured and evaluated through interviews with key informants from relevant interest groups in the agricultural industry and actual and potential beneficiaries.
4. Data collection tools to be employed during field visits to the different sites and schemes will include: PRAs; focus-group discussions with beneficiaries and local leadership; interviews with beneficiaries, technical support staff and management officials.

5. The efficacy of existing and prospective approaches, together with the institutional arrangements for their implementation, will be reviewed using the following set of analytical criteria:
 - 5.1 The overall goals and objectives of the land reform and resettlement programme in Zimbabwe and the extent to which the different approaches realize them
 - 5.2 Selection of programme beneficiaries, including beneficiary and/or community participation; transparency; gender sensitivity; assessment of impact made by the intervention on beneficiaries' livelihoods and the contribution to the national economy
 - 5.3 Mode of land acquisition and the extent to which this lends itself to participation by beneficiaries and other non-state players, including: method of acquisition e.g. whether existing state land, subdivision of a purchased or confiscated unit, or transfer of an intact commercial farm; procedures, speed and costs of land acquisition; and the extent to which beneficiaries have a say in what land they want to be resettled on
 - 5.4 Planning and design, including: considerations of optimal and/or maximum holding sizes in different agro-ecological regions; physical capital and infrastructure; and planning parameters and targets
 - 5.5 Resource access and plot allocation, including: natural capital and resource endowments; identification and demarcation of land holding; ensuring transparency, gender sensitivity, beneficiary / community participation, and inclusion of all deserving/interested social groups (trained farmers, the landless; war veterans; ex-farm-workers, etc.);
 - 4.6 Beneficiaries' productivity and overall scheme performance vis-à-vis planning targets, including: physical and social capital; land utilization; projected production targets; short- and long-run performance dimensions; environmental impact and sustainability of farming systems
 - 4.7 Scheme management and development of local / community institutions, including: state and/or NGO-instituted structures; emerging local social organizations and institutions; beneficiaries' participation in social and institutional developments in emerging communities; conflict resolution issues; role of traditional authorities
 - 5.8 Tenure issues, including: state land, titling and other means of ensuring access; women's access to land; implications for development and investment; land subdivision, leasing, renting, sharing and trading

5.9 Investment and infrastructural development, including: beneficiary-initiated investment and plot development; access to credit, markets and economic support networks; provision, implementation and management of infrastructure; financing of maintenance; cost recovery—land, infrastructure, social services, credit, etc.

Model performance will be evaluated at multiple levels—from the level of the individual, through the levels of the household, resettlement scheme and agro-ecological zone, to the national programme.

VI. Outputs

Four outputs are envisaged under the study:

- ◆ A preliminary review of international experience to serve as a guide for the evaluation of actual experience in Zimbabwe and elsewhere.
- ◆ A workshop to be held in October (or early November) 2001 to present an interim report (preliminary findings) to identified policy makers. Activities of other studies under the project could be synchronized with this timing to enable the other researchers to make their own (preliminary) findings at the workshop.
- ◆ The final synthesis report from the study – to be submitted at the end of December 2001 (or in early January 2002).
- ◆ A series of working papers / policy briefs that will be produced throughout the period of the study as and when subcomponents are completed and policy lessons begin to emerge.

VII. Proposed Workplan

Conceptual analysis based on review of Government reports, NGO assessments, Scholarly works and publications (concurrent for both EIGA and CA approaches)
March - July 2001

Evaluation of land resettlement and land use and management experiences of other countries (conceptual analysis of approaches based on review of Government reports, NGO assessments, and scholarly publications)
June – August 2001

Field visits to selected EIGA and CA sites in Zimbabwe
July - September 2001

Identify relevant models and approaches for study tour in South Africa in collaboration with PLAAS
August – September 2001

Written reports summarizing strengths and weaknesses of current models
September - October 2001

6. Undertake study tour of selected sites in South Africa
September - October 2001

7. Analyze data and draft report
October – November 2001

8. Write and submit final report
December 2001

VIII. Proposed Budget Outline

See Appendix

REFERENCES

Government of Zimbabwe, 1995. *Review of the Land Resettlement Programme, 1980-1995*. Harare: Ministry of Local Government, Rural and Urban Development, District Development Fund.

Government of Zimbabwe, 1996. *Policy Paper on Land Redistribution and Resettlement in Zimbabwe*. Harare.

Government of Zimbabwe, 1998. *Inception Phase Framework Plan: 1999 to 2000: An Implementation Plan of the Land Reform and Resettlement Programme – Phase 2*.

Moyo, S. 1995. *The Land Question in Zimbabwe*. SAPES Trust. Harare.

Mutepfa, et al., 1998. *Enhancing Land Reforms in Southern Africa*. Harare.

Rukuni, M. et al. 1994. *Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Appropriate Agricultural Land Tenure Systems: Volume One*. Harare.

APPENDIX: PROPOSED BUDGET
Jan 2001 to June 2002

| | Cost | Count | Unit | Total Cost | |
|--|----------|--------|-----------|---------------|-------------------|
| | | | | US \$ | Z \$ @ 1:55.00 |
| LTC Budget | | | | | |
| Salary / benefits: | | | | | |
| Thomas Mitchell ^a | \$11 976 | 2 | Months | 5 988 | 329 340 |
| Bill Kinsey | 400 | 24 | Days | 9 600 | 528 000 |
| Charles Chavunduka | | | | 0 | 0 |
| Charles Chavunduka, Airfare | 2 500 | 1 | Return | 2 500 | 137 500 |
| Charles Chavunduka, Per-diem | 50 | 60 | day | 3 000 | 165 000 |
| Mitchell Airfare – US/Zimbabwe | 2 500 | 2 | Rt | 5 000 | 275 000 |
| Mitchell Airfare – Zimbabwe-RSA | 600 | 1 | Rt | 600 | 33 000 |
| Mitchell Per-diem | 148 | 50 | Day | 7 400 | 407 000 |
| Total LTC direct Costs | | | | 34 088 | 1 874 840 |
| Indirect Cost Recovery | 25% | | | 8 522 | 468 710 |
| Total LTC Costs | | | | 42 610 | 2 343 550 |
| CASS Budget | | | | | |
| Salaries | | | | | |
| Francis Gonese ^b | 0 | 6 | Months | 0 | 0 |
| C.M. Mukora ^b | 1 500 | 3 | Months | 4 500 | 247 500 |
| Bill Kinsey ^c | 400 | 24 | Days | 9 600 | 528 000 |
| Nelson Marongwe | 1 500 | 4 | Months | 6 000 | 330 000 |
| Research Assistants ^d | 50 | 72 | Days | 3 600 | 198 000 |
| Field Visits in Zimbabwe: | | | | | |
| Transport | 0.39 | 10 000 | Kilometre | 3 900 | 214 500 |
| Subsistence | | | | 5 000 | 275 000 |
| International Travel | | | | | |
| Zimbabwe to South Africa | 600 | 2 | Trips | 1 200 | 66 000 |
| Road transportation | | | | 2 000 | 110 000 |
| Accommodation and Subsistence | | | | 3 000 | 165 000 |
| Production of Reports: | | | | | |
| Consumables | | | | 500 | 27 500 |
| Total CASS direct costs | | | | 39 300 | 2 161 500 |
| Indirect Cost Recovery | 15% | | | 5 895 | 324 225 |
| Total CASS Costs | | | | 45 195 | 2 485 725 |
| Total Study Costs (LTC plus CASS) | | | | 87 805 | 4 829 275 |

NOTES:

- Half-time matching provided by the University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Allowing for half month commitment by the researchers due to other research engagements and responsibilities.
- Researcher brought in on focused consultancy basis
- Anticipated engagement for a total of six months during the study period.