



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search  
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>  
[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

# **Agricultural Advisory Services in South Africa**

Discussion Paper

Frikkie Liebenberg

Senior Lecturer, Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development, Faculty  
of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, University of Pretoria

17 July 2015

## Table of Contents

1	Overview of technical and farmer support to white farmers in South Africa .....	1
1.1	Extension Services .....	1
2	White Farmer Settlement .....	3
2.1	Schemes introduced from 1956.....	4
2.1.1	Results achieved through the Settlement Schemes .....	5
3	Lessons learned with the support to white farmers .....	6
4	Homelands .....	8
4.1	The Homeland Era .....	9
4.2	The transition .....	10
5	Agricultural Development Agenda .....	11
6	The State of Technical Advisory Services .....	12
6.1	Departments of Agriculture .....	12
6.1.1	Departmental Technical Advisory Services .....	12
6.1.2	Extension recovery programme .....	15
6.1.3	Expenditure on farmer support .....	16
6.2	Universities .....	17
6.3	State funded agencies.....	18
6.3.1	Agricultural Research Council.....	18
6.3.2	Development Agencies .....	18
6.4	Private Sector Extension Services.....	18
6.4.1	Commodity .....	19
6.4.2	Organised Agriculture.....	20
6.4.3	Non Government Organizations (NGO) .....	20
6.4.4	Private consultants .....	20
6.5	Agri-business & banks.....	20
6.5.1	Commercial Banks.....	21
6.5.2	Land Bank support to Emerging Farmers .....	21
7	Farmers and Farm Characteristics.....	24
7.1	Involvement in farming.....	24
7.1.1	Agricultural activity .....	24

7.1.2	Nature of food production.....	26
7.1.3	Where is cropping activity practiced.....	27
7.1.4	Reason for involvement and selling of produce.....	28
7.1.5	Tenure type .....	29
7.1.6	Area of cropland production .....	29
7.1.7	Sell to whom .....	29
7.1.8	Support received .....	30
7.1.9	Main source of income.....	31
8	Provision of Support to Target Beneficiaries: A Alternative Concept.....	32
8.1	Market focus and selection criteria .....	32
8.2	Land Bank.....	34
8.3	Loan conditions.....	34
8.4	Service modality .....	35
8.5	Cost of service provision.....	35
8.6	Infrastructure support.....	35
9	Recommendations.....	36
10	References.....	38
11	Annexure A: Agricultural Technical Services Providers.....	40

## List of Figures

Figure 1:	Government expenditure on extension and farmer support .....	17
Figure 2:	Households involved in the production of food and agricultural products, 2012. ....	25
Figure 3:	Geographic distribution by type of households involved in agriculture .....	26
Figure 4:	Kind of food production/agricultural activities households are involved in.....	26
Figure 5:	Locality of where households practice agricultural production .....	27
Figure 6:	Reasons for involvement in agriculture .....	28
Figure 7:	Reasons for involvement in agriculture amongst households that sell produce.....	29
Figure 8:	Agriculturally related government assistance provided to households .....	30
Figure 9:	Main source of household income .....	31

## List of Tables

Table 1:	Extension job differentiation.....	12
Table 2:	Available extension staff circa 2007 .....	13
Table 3:	Racial profile of the departmental extension service, 2007 .....	14
Table 4:	Projected staffing needs .....	14
Table 5:	Households and persons according to the main reason for involvement in agriculture, 2012.....	33

# **1 Overview of technical and farmer support to white farmers in South Africa**

## **1.1 Extension Services**

The early history of the agricultural extension services in South Africa dates to the reconstruction years that followed from 1902 when scientists were imported from England to assist in the development of local agriculture (Van Vuren, 1952). As a result of unfamiliarity with local agricultural conditions their advice and guidance were not always regarded of practical value and as early as 1907 the first scientists from South Africa were sent to study abroad. The technical support services circa 1910 consisted of a number of specialist services that each focused on the services of its branch with no central coordination. Often regarded as a highhanded specialist phase in the development of the extension services the concept of agricultural demonstration trains were introduced in 1914 with the idea of more personal and closer contact with farmers and their problems. This contributed much towards proving the Department's goodwill to a prejudiced and sceptical farming community<sup>1</sup>.

In 1925 the Department established a separate Division of Extension to act as the link between farmers and the specialist technical services of the Department with only 6 scientists to serve all four provinces. Through personal contact it succeeded in proving the value and importance of a more integrated approach to farmer support. In addition, the concept of cooperative demonstrations was introduced where the reaction of crops, pastures, fertilizers, etc. to the environment was first determined, and then used as demonstration trials to farmers to see for themselves and thus become more readily convinced (Van Vuren, 1952). Tours were also organised to give farmers the opportunity of seeing what others were doing, or of visiting places and institutions of value from an agricultural point of view.

During this period the responsibility for the faculties of agriculture was transferred to the Department of Agriculture where, under the 1926 Stellenbosch University and Elsenburg Act, they were managed in close collaboration with the scientific capacity at the regional centres. Scientific research capacity was thus closely coordinated with the service focus of the Department.

Until 1933 the functions of the extension service were mainly advisory, but the assistance schemes introduced to assist farmers during the drought introduced the addition of regulatory duties. Examples of which are the Soil Erosion and Small Dam Scheme of 1933, the Livestock and Meat Industries Act

---

<sup>1</sup> Following on the Boer War visits to farms by government officials were not welcomed in some parts of the country (Du Toit, 1954)

of 1934, the Weeds Act of 1937 and finally the Soil Conservation Act of 1946. This considerably increased the duties of the extension officers, but resulted in more widespread contacts being made with farmers that might otherwise have been impossible.

Personal contact with farming matters gradually made extension officers realise that the various farming activities were inseparably linked. Whereas specialist extension dealt with farming from the point of view of a single industry or subject, the concept of planned whole-farm demonstrations introduced from 1942 considers the proper relationship between the various branches of farming under local conditions. This required a thorough study of farming matters under local conditions in addition to an intimate knowledge of the personal factor: namely the *ability* and *bent* of the farmer concerned (Van Vuren, 1952). The idea of a whole-farm approach within the context of a specific climatic and economic region was born, which in 1948 led to the introduction of a decentralised approach to extension within what was later to become eight regional offices.

During the early 1940s the extension services also introduced home economics to concentrate on the training of the rural women as well the Land Service that focussed on skills training among the youth — similar to the 4H Club movement in the United States of America.

In 1952 the agricultural technical services (research and specialist services) of the Department were restructured to reflect the regional focus of the Division of Extension. Through this seven Regional Development Centres was created — later to be renamed Agricultural Development Institutes — where the full range of disciplines and services were focused on addressing farming problems and development needs within the context of agro-economic regions. This structure largely stayed in place until, first the university Faculties of Agriculture were transferred to the responsibility of the National Department of Education in 1971, followed by the systematic creation of national commodity institutes from 1979 through 1988. During this time the extension services changed its activities to focus solely on farmer study groups instead of individual contact visits. By 1988 a Commission of Enquiry into Agricultural Service Provision found that about 40 percent of the extension positions in the department were vacant and that the service needed nearly 300 positions in addition to the existing staff plan (RSA 1984).

In response to the growing dissatisfaction with the expertise level of the extension services of the department the private input supply companies, farmer co-operatives and certain producer/commodity organizations began to create their own advisory services around this time.

The system was further fragmented by the creation of the Agricultural Research Council in 1992. Soon hereafter the Agricultural Development Institutes were used to form the administrations of the nine Provincial Departments of Agriculture in 1995 under the new constitutional dispensation where

agriculture became a shared competence between national and provincial governments. Several of the provincial Departments were merged with the administrations of the former Homelands and “right-sizing” the staff component proved to be a major challenge for the decade to come.

## **2 White Farmer Settlement**

In an analysis of government spending in South Africa since 1910 Liebenberg observed that the picture that emerges from the spending relativities within agriculture fails to fully capture the support given to farmers under the farmer settlement programs, especially for the earlier half of the century (Liebenberg 2013). Initially this took the form of subsidized loan schemes to farmers (the subsidy equivalent of which is not included in the expenditure estimates reported). In this section the history of the earlier state sponsored farmer settlement is briefly discussed as this undoubtedly impacted on productivity trends in the sector.

During the two Anglo-Boer Wars the Colonial Government of the day created the Cattle Preservation Department, which did not, however, function efficiently — this was in addition to initiatives such as the labour colonies established by the Dutch Reformed Church. In December 1901 the first Land Board was appointed which took over the assets and functions of the Cattle Preservation Department to establish the Squatter settlements at Pietersburg, Zeerust, Potchefstroom and Ventersdorp. These settlements, however, did not serve the purpose for which they had been created. Two pieces of legislation were required to aid in farmer settlement. The first was the Settlers Ordinance of 1902, in terms of which the Lieutenant-Governor was authorized to divide Crown lands into farms and allocate them. The next was the Crown Lands Disposal Ordinance of 1903 which made more liberal provision for the allocation of Crown land and the granting of advances to provide for farming requirements.

In 1925 the Department of Labour introduced the Training of the Rural Unemployed program, which was transferred to the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture in 1930 to provide support to newly settled farmers. The program was again transferred, inclusive of the technical support personnel servicing it, to the Department of Lands in 1940. The Agricultural Credit Board was later transferred to this department which was then renamed the Department of Agricultural Credit and Land Tenure. In so doing all the functions related to the administration of farmer settlement, the provision of credit and the direct technical support to beneficiary farmers were integrated into one department.



## 2.1 Schemes introduced from 1956

A brief summary of the history of the main schemes that served to support farmer settlement and the nature thereof as summarised in the *Farming in South Africa* (DOA 1960) is reported here to illustrate the nature of past farmer settlement initiatives.

The Department of Lands came into existence when the Union was established on 31 May, 1910. Its functions included the administration of all matters relating to Crown lands, irrigation, land settlement, land boards and surveying. On 16 October, 1912, the Land Settlement Act (Act 12 of 1912) came into force. This act originally was a rehabilitation measure to place suitable people on Crown lands so that they could contribute to the progress and prosperity of the country in the agricultural field, and above all making independent citizens of those to whom Crown land had been granted. The amended Land Settlement Act (Act 21 of 1956) introduced three schemes in terms of which Crown land was granted to suitable applicants:

*Scheme 1:* Section 20 of the Land Settlement Act of 1956, as amended (also known as the one-tenth contribution acquisition system).

In this case the applicant chose the land for which he<sup>2</sup> intends to apply and obtained an option to purchase from the owner at a reasonable price. If the applicant satisfied the prescribed requirements and the acquisition was approved he had to pay at least one-tenth of the approved price, subject to the provision that the State's maximum contribution amounted to R10 300 at the time.

During the first two years the settler made no payments, but the interest for this period — 4 $\frac{7}{8}$  per cent — as well as transfer costs, were capitalized in the price of the land. The annual payment was calculated over a 63 year period. If the settler satisfied all the prescribed conditions after 5 years, he was entitled to the title deed, after which he could make use of the land at his own discretion (implying that prior to this point he had to heed the advice of extension officers).

*Scheme 2:* Granting of land in terms of Section 23 of the Land Settlement Act of 1956.

Vacant Crown land or land that was reverted to the state was divided into economic farming units, was offered for allotment in the Government Gazette and press in terms of this scheme. The land was rented to the successful applicant for five years. This period could be extended to a maximum of 10 years, but it was a condition that the option of purchase be exercised within the second period. When the option to purchase was exercised, the price with interest was redeemed over a period of 65 years.

---

<sup>2</sup> Applicants were restricted to men only.

The successful settler paid no interest for the first two years in this case, but as with Scheme 1, the interest for the first two years was capitalized in the purchase price. The settler paid two percent rent calculated on the sales price of the holding during the third year, and from the fourth year the rate of interest was  $4\frac{7}{8}$  per cent per annum.

In the case of grants made in terms of Section 23, settlers were entitled to conveyance 10 years after the commencement of the lease on condition that they satisfied all the conditions as laid down by the Act.

*Scheme 3:* The allotment of land in terms of section 29 of the Land Settlement Act of 1956 (i.e. allotment of farming units to successful applicants as probationary lessees in 'closer settlement' areas).

Under this scheme, which was limited mainly to irrigation areas, the size of the incorporated irrigable land varied from 15 to 30 morgen (approximately 12 to 25 hectares) per holding. Initially a temporary occupation right of a maximum of 5 years was approved and the probationer lessee regarded as a trainee. He usually had little or no expense in the cultivation of his holding at the beginning, except for labour costs which he had to pay himself. Probationary lessees were under the supervision of trained agriculturists during the probationary period. The time taken to complete the training course satisfactorily depended entirely on the efforts and initiative of the trainee. After expiry of the probationary lease — usually from 18 months to 2 years — the holding was granted on the same provisions as described in Scheme 2.

Provision was also made for the payment of subsistence allowances and the provision of medical services to probationer lessees. These costs were recovered from crops and any other income which may have accrued to the probationary lessee from time-to-time. During the probationary period the State took a quarter of all crops sold to cover the cost of feed, fertiliser, etc. with which the probationer lessee was provided. A third of the balance was kept in trust for the probationary lessee and the balance was paid to him after any recoverable debts, such as the medical services, had been deducted.

### **2.1.1 Results achieved through the Settlement Schemes**

In 1960 the activities of the Department of Agriculture in terms of the above-mentioned three schemes were summarised as follows (DOA 1960):

*Section 20* (i.e. the one-tenth contribution acquisition system): Between 1912 and 1959, 8,261 holdings were purchased on behalf of successful applicants. These holdings covered an area of 4.17 million hectares and were granted at the probationary value of R38,435 million (nominal values). A

large number of these settlers had taken transfer while others had ceded their interest in the leases to other non-landowners.

*Section 23:* The allotment of vacant Crown land: Between 1912 and 1959, 12,648 allotments, covering a total area of 10.34 million hectares valued at R27.96 million (nominal values) were granted to successful applicants. As in the case of acquisition in terms of Section 20, there were a large number who had taken transfer, while some settlers had ceded their leases to approved non-landowners.

*Section 29:* The allotting of farming units in closer settlement areas: The planning of settlements in farming units was a very important aspect and done in conjunction with the Departments of Water Affairs and Agricultural Technical Services. In denser settlement areas a house and out- buildings were erected on each holding which was fenced, partly cleared and levelled. These expenses were included in the purchase price.

*Grants to settlers:* Between 1912 and 1960 it is estimated that R5.00 million (nominal values) were granted to settlers as advances in terms of the various sections of the Land Settlement Act. These advances included the acquisition of cattle and fixed improvements.

From information available on income generated by the few *Section 29* irrigation schemes settled by 1960, indicates that they already began to make a contribution to the national income of agriculture around the second half of the 1950's (*Farming South Africa*, 1960).

### **3 Lessons learned with the support to white farmers**

In an analysis of the support to white farmers and agricultural development in South Africa and juxtaposing this against contemporary farmer support initiatives Schirmer (2005) identified “two problems with the contemporary administration's attempts to transform the racial imbalances in the agricultural sector. First, placing poor people with few agricultural resources on redistributed land is likely to produce the kind of risk avoidance exhibited by poor white farmers. These land reform beneficiaries will therefore remain generally deprived and the sector will continue to be dominated by large-scale white farmers. Second, even if initiatives are undertaken to channel resources to poor land reform beneficiaries, this may not be sufficient to transform agricultural practices. Such resources will therefore be wasted as they cannot bring about the transformations required to create a more equitable agricultural sector.”

He warns against “the ability of land reform miraculously to eradicate or even make a serious dent in the rural poverty which prevails in South Africa.” He urges that policy makers should formulate

workable ways of supporting *potentially progressive* farmers and that the then Integrated Programme of Land Redistribution and Agricultural Development, which provided greater amounts of support to those who commit more of their own resources to farming than the average rural resident, is in some ways a sensible strategy. It makes economic sense to support those who demonstrate a clear willingness to be progressive, but such a strategy does not do enough to tackle the widespread deprivation in the rural areas.

He concludes that ... "the central policy lesson of the history ... is that governments who merely throw money at poverty are unlikely to achieve significant development." What is required, instead, is the structural transformation of the circumstances which create poverty. Undertaking the task of transforming wider circumstances in a top-down fashion has, in almost every case in which it was tried, resulted in disaster. Such attempts are generally beyond the capacity of any state and provoke widespread resistance amongst intended 'beneficiaries'. The solution is for states to consult and work closely with people on the ground. This too, however, is fraught with difficulty. It still requires high levels of competency and determination within the state and runs the danger of being captured by narrowly defined groups which will manipulate the state to secure their own short term interests. In South Africa, especially in those provinces which most require rural development, state capacity is low and there are many local political imperatives at play pushing officials in policy directions that contradict the aims of development and poverty reduction.

He cautions that agricultural development policies must be designed carefully and cautiously. They must be ready to draw in as much capacity and expertise from outside the state as possible. And they must prioritise initiatives by realistically taking into account abilities in the state, the broader needs of the society and the requirements of the poor themselves. Making credit available to poor farmers can, for example, be a useful way to enhance their capacity. But for this to work private-sector credit institutions have to be drawn in — which means that their concerns have to be accommodated, the credit demands of poor people have to be understood, and the state must promote and protect those institutions in the rural areas which themselves can develop into sources of credit (stokvels, for example).

Providing more effective infrastructure can further enhance the capacity of poor farmers in remote areas. However, merely embarking on the large-scale provision of infrastructure can lead to inappropriate, low-quality, high-cost projects which are a drain on the state budget and provide few tangible benefits. Again these pitfalls can be avoided by understanding local needs, enlisting private-sector providers and encouraging local people to become part of the provision process. Through consultation between various levels of the state and representatives of local interest groups it becomes possible to draw farmers and potential farmers into the development process. But it is important never to lose sight of how difficult it is to create effective dialogue between, on the one hand,

government officials with interests of their own and differentiated and disenfranchised local groups, on the other.

Lastly, innovative subsidy programmes which provide support that stretches over a number of years could make a substantial difference to the capacity of poor farmers. Such programmes should be designed effectively and realistically. To avoid repeating the mistakes of the past, all subsidies must be subjected to negotiated and agreed upon conditions. The bottom line is that those who receive subsidies must agree to use them to enhance the productive capacity of their farms, but the details of what this would constitute in different parts of South Africa should be carefully negotiated. The farmers should be evaluated on an annual basis and the subsidy must either be withdrawn or reduced if it is not being used to improve farming practices. In the end, the grand and costly schemes of the apartheid state should be eschewed in favour of targeted, effective interventions which provide the poor with real capacity and gradually allow them to help themselves.”

## **4 Homelands**

In their analysis of Extension and Smallholder Agriculture Williams, et al. (2008) provides an overview of the development of extension in the former Homeland areas. A brief summary of their findings are presented here.

In order to regulate production and land use in the reserves and the homelands a variety of measures were promulgated most of which served to undermine rural production and land based livelihoods. In 1929 the Union government established a Native Agricultural and Lands Branch within the Department of Native Affairs. This had a tiny budget and focused on soil conservation and the regulation of livestock numbers. In 1936 the Land Act created the South African Native Trust (SANT) which had responsibility for administering African reserve areas. The South African Native Trust imposed systems of control over livestock, introduced the division of arable and grazing land and enforced residential planning and soil conservation measures. However most of the state agricultural branch's “attention was directed to the newly acquired white farmlands, with the hope that these tracts could be preserved until resources for development became available” (Butler, Rotberg, & Adams, 1978)

In 1939 Proclamation 31 enabled officials to declare a ‘betterment area’ and empowered them to count and cull livestock where they saw fit. In 1945 the Department of Native Affairs published A New Era for Reclamation which set out the vision for betterment land use planning and villagisation. In 1950 the Tomlinson Commission set out to “conduct an exhaustive enquiry into and report on a comprehensive scheme for the rehabilitation of Native areas”. It recommended the abolition of communal tenure and allocation of land together with a comprehensive agricultural support

programme to enable the creation of a class of 'contented Bantu farmers' able to earn an income of 120 pounds a year. At the same time the Commission recorded that the Reserves could only support 51% of the population recorded in the 1951 census. It proposed culling 55% of the livestock. The Commission calculated that a family would require 52.5 morgen of land to make a gross annual income of 70 pounds. The nationalist government rejected Tomlinson Commission recommendations for depopulating the reserves and investing in agricultural development. They opted for increased control measures such as betterment planning while rapidly swelling the already overcrowded homelands with people displaced through forced removals. (de Satge, 1988)

#### **4.1 The Homeland Era**

The homeland era which commenced with Transkei's 'independence' in 1976 opened the way for homeland extension services and the development of agricultural development corporations like TRACOR, AGRIVEN and Agriwane. Three agencies were involved in setting and implementing agricultural policy in the homelands: homeland government departments, the advisory services branch of the Department of Bantu Administration and Development, and the Bantu Investment Corporation. Each of these had a different perspective. Homeland governments set out to provide basic extension services and Bantu Administration and Development focused on the implementation of betterment while the Bantu Investment Corporation favoured large scale projects. (Butler et al., 1978).

The homeland development approach during the 1970's and early 1980's revolved around centrally managed showcase capital intensive projects. Smallholders or waged employees were settled on these schemes which provided management, inputs, tillage and marketing services. However these schemes largely failed to create independent farmers and many became hugely expensive and inefficient.

The Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), established in 1983, introduced the Farmer Support Programme (FSP) as an alternative to the large capital intensive schemes. The FSP focused on small farmers in the homeland areas. The DBSA defined a farmer as anyone who used resources part-time or full-time to produce agricultural goods. The programme set out to integrate the promotion of agricultural activities with other non-farm related rural development activities. However the overall FSP development objective was the "promotion of structural change away from subsistent agricultural production to commercial production by providing comprehensive agricultural support services and incentives to existing farmers." (Van Rooyen, 1995). After a mid-term evaluation this objective was redefined in 1989 to focus on providing farmer access to support services over a wide base. The FSP ran between 1987 and 1993. It focused on the supply of: inputs and capital to farmers; mechanisation services; marketing services; extension services, demonstration and research, and training.

The programme estimated that it reached 55,000 people through 35 FSPs before it was overtaken by the demise of the homelands and their reintegration into the nine provinces emerging from the new democratic dispensation in 1994.

A review of extension, training and research services provided as part of the FSP (Hayward & Botha, 1995) identified a wide range of problems:

- Provision of poor quality extension support in most instances. The low effectiveness of services was not due to lack of field officers but rather to the low quality of their formal education and the lack of appropriate in-service training to meet on the job support needs
- No meaningful contact between extension and research given that most research capability remained targeted at the commercial sector
- Extension methods were outdated and had not adapted to changing international extension approaches
- Farmers were encouraged to use inputs at too high a level against their actual achievement pushing many into debt
- Some 40 farmer training centres had been constructed in the former homelands while occupancy rates were 15 – 20%
- Lack of co-ordination between Departments of Agriculture and Agricultural Corporations

From the subsequent reorientation of the DBSA's priorities it appears to have largely abandoned farmer support in favour of building the capacity of local government.

## **4.2 The transition**

For a brief period there was a focus on the development of a rural development strategy under the Government of National Unity located within Department of Land Affairs and the Reconstruction and Development Program office. The Rural Development Strategy proposed that:

“The main strategy is to create a national network of local service centres (LSCs) where a variety of services can be accessed. The local services centres in rural areas will receive subsidisation, and some activities in all local service centres may be subsidised to assist with targeting. Each will have a local control structure, and will need to prove accountability and transparency to maintain its accreditation. They will mostly assist entrepreneurs in obtaining access to hard skills training, for which they must pay, and will provide on-site 'hand-holding' to developing businesses for sustained periods.” However the Rural Development Strategy never really progressed beyond a think piece and it was largely eclipsed when the Reconstruction and Development Program office was subsequently closed in March 1996.

For much of the 1990's the provision of farmer support services was overshadowed by the new institutional priorities of merging all the different homeland departments of agriculture with the agriculture and extension services which had supported white commercial farmers into a new look National Department and nine new provincial departments. In this process much of the emphasis was understandably on right-sizing and restructuring leading to major cuts in staffing. One of the results of the transition process was that farmer support now became the preserve of both the National and provincial Departments of Agriculture.

## **5 Agricultural Development Agenda**

In 2009, a number of changes were made to the national ministries. Among these was the creation of the Ministry of Rural Development and Land Affairs. At the beginning of the new democratic state (in 1994) Agriculture and Land Affairs were separate ministries. In 1996, the two ministries were joined into a single ministry ostensibly because of the need to ensure greater coordination between the pre- and post-settlement issues plaguing land reform. This latest cabinet reshuffling again separates the two functions, but brings together agriculture, forestry and fisheries (Worth, 2013).

In the ensuing years, the departments have continued with their plans and strategies; in particular CASP has continued to be used as the National Departments principle wedge into provincial operations — albeit it is still focused primarily on infrastructure and training (including funding of the physical and curricular upgrading of South Africa's 11 colleges of agriculture).

The Integrated Growth and Development Plan for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries appears to be the first formal documentation of the strategy for achieving a range of objectives shared in common among the three conjoined sectors. This plan replaces the Strategic Plan for South African Agriculture published in 2001.

The primary aim of the Integrated Growth and Development Plan regarding agriculture is to: “position agriculture for the purpose of improving national food safety and security, and agricultural economic output in a profitable and sustainable manner, through a qualitative and quantitative improvement of South Africa's agricultural productivity, and its trade and regulatory environment.” It is anticipated that: “By achieving the aforementioned, agriculture can contribute vitally to rural economic growth and development, and thus increase rural employment, both on- and off-farm.”

The key strategies identified are: Support to new and existing producers, Access to markets, and Access to resources. In terms of support to the three categories of farmers identified the Integrated Growth and Development Plan notes that farmers of all categories “currently receive less support



from the State than their counterparts in every industrialised country in the world”. This situation is discussed in the next section.

## 6 The State of Technical Advisory Services

### 6.1 Departments of Agriculture

#### 6.1.1 Departmental Technical Advisory Services

A detailed report entitled “The state of extension and advisory service within the agricultural Public Service: A Need for Recovery” (Department of Agriculture, 2008) provides a sober assessment of the state of the nation's extension services. This report flows from the Extension indaba held earlier in 2008. The section below summarises key information from the report.

The report states that the “capacity of provinces to deliver quality extension services to farmers varies and to some it is already suffocating”. Extension and advisory services personnel are expected to work with a wide range of clients flowing from subsistence to large scale commercial.

#### *Extension job differentiation*

Table 1 below highlights the different extension bands as they are currently conceptualised.

**Table 1: Extension job differentiation**

JOB TITLE	MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS	LEVEL OF EMPLOYMENT
Agricultural Community Officer	Standard 10 + in service training in agricultural studies	NGO and Local Government
Agricultural Development Officer	Standard 12- + 3 or more years post-matric agricultural diploma	Social Development/Health/Local government
Agricultural Advisors	B.Tech/Bachelors/Hons in Agriculture	Provincial
Subject Matter Specialist	BSc (Hons) degree in Agriculture	Provincial and National

#### *Extension staff employed per province*

Table 2 provides a breakdown of employed extension personnel as provided by provinces as at January 2007. The largest numbers of extension officials are from Limpopo Province which constitutes 30% of the total followed by Eastern Cape Province at 28% and KwaZulu Natal at 16%. Gauteng Province and Northern Cape Province have the smallest number of appointed extension personnel standing at less than 2% of the total pool.

**Table 2: Available extension staff circa 2007**

PROVINCE	TOTAL	
	No.	%
Eastern Cape	623	28
Free State	40	3
Gauteng	29	1
KwaZulu Natal	360	16
Limpopo	666	30
Mpumalanga	189	9
Northern Cape	23	1
North West	137	6
Western Cape	25	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2 155</b>	<b>100</b>

*Qualification assessment*

Only 427 out of 2 155 (20%) have degree or higher qualification. About 1 728 out of 2 155 (80%) of the extension personnel have a diploma qualification. Overall 8 out of 10 are insufficiently qualified to operate as Agricultural Advisors or Subject Matter Experts.

Only Gauteng and Free State Provinces have a good percentage of officials with degree qualifications and higher. The Eastern Cape and KwaZulu Natal has the lowest percentage of extension officials with degree qualifications and higher.

*Gender and qualification*

In 6 out of 9 provinces, female extension officials are more educated than their male counterparts. It is only in Free State, Gauteng and Western Cape where male officials are more educated than their female counterparts. The latter can be attributed to the trends in recruitment whereby females have joined the service fairly late compared to their male counterparts.

*In service training*

According to the report very few extension officials have been exposed to formal skills programmes that are crucial to the delivery of product and services to farmers. Only 204 out of 2 155 (9%) had completed training in communication, 238 out of 2 155 (11%) had completed project management, 140 out of 2 155 (6%) had completed computer training and 143 out of 2 155 (7%) had completed training related to people management and empowerment.

Less than 25% of extension staff was exposed to technical training programmes since joining the public service.

*Extension demographics*

Table 3 below indicates the racial profile of the extension service.

**Table 3: Racial profile of the departmental extension service, 2007**

PROVINCES	RACIAL PROFILE				
	Africans	Coloureds	Indians	Whites	Total
	No	No	No	No	
Eastern Cape	611	0	0	12	623
Free State	55	1	0	14	70
Gauteng	27	0	0	2	29
KwaZulu Natal	358	0	1	1	360
Limpopo	658	0	0	8	666
Mpumalanga	186	0	0	3	189
Northern Cape	7	9	0	7	23
North West	131	0	0	6	137
Western Cape	9	16	0	33	58
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 042</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>2 155</b>

In terms of gender, the majority of the officials are males (73%). Only KwaZulu Natal has a 50/50 gender representation followed by Mpumalanga with almost a 60/40 representation. In all other provinces the situation requires immediate attention.

*Projected extension: farmer ratios*

The projected ratio of extension personnel to farmers based on extrapolated farmer populations is shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: Projected staffing needs**

Province	Current No. of extension officials	Suggested number based on different ratios	
		1: 500	1: 250
Eastern Cape	623	1 344	2 688
Free State	70	52	103
Gauteng	29	19	38
KwaZulu Natal	360	710	1 419
Limpopo	666	1181	2 361
Mpumalanga	189	337	675
Northern Cape	23	26	52
North West	137	129	257
Western Cape	58	61	123
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 155</b>	<b>3 559</b>	<b>7 706</b>

Currently the Eastern Cape, KwaZulu Natal, Limpopo and Mpumalanga have the highest shortfall of extension personnel given the number of communal farmers in these provinces as well as projects emerging as the results of the land reform programme through CASP and other initiatives.

### **6.1.2 Extension recovery programme**

The National Department of Agriculture planned a way forward to improve the quality of (“revitalise” and “capacitate”) extension services. This took the shape of the Extension Recovery Programme launched in 2011. The programme operates around five “pillars”:

#### *Pillar 1: Ensure visibility and accountability of extension*

This pillar is aimed at overcoming the poor image extension has in the eyes of farmers. The plan is to equip (and train) extension workers with tools (a record book and a digital pen) to aid them to record information about the farmers with whom they work. It would enable them to have information at hand and to ‘relay’ information through the pen to a central database. This live information is meant to increase the relevance of their engagements with farmers.

#### *Pillar 2: Promote professionalism and improve the image of extension*

The aim with this pillar is to upgrade the through affiliation (and active membership in) of extension officers with professional bodies participating (preferably by presenting scientific or position papers) in professional conferences.

#### *Pillar 3: Recruit extension personnel*

The DAFF has committed itself to ensuring that there is enough extension and advisory service personnel on the ground to comply with the recommended extension-to-farmer ratios of 1:400 in crop farming, 1:500 in livestock and 1:500 in mixed farming. Provinces are expected to engage in an extension recruitment and capacity-building drive to move closer to the targeted 9 000 extension personnel to serve the sector. Recruitment should be aligned to the provinces’ growth and development strategies. It is presumed that hiring will also be governed by the standards set for minimum educational qualifications.

#### *Pillar 4: Reskill and re-orientate extension workers*

The DAFF has set out a training programme to provide the current extension personnel with the skills and competencies set out in the Norms and Standards. Part of this is addressed through in-house training and short courses. It is also being pursued through encouraging and financing extension personnel without the relevant qualifications to obtain them.

#### *Pillar 5: Provide ICT infrastructure and other resources*

This pillar simply seeks to ensure that extension workers have the computers and other information technology equipment they need to be able to carry out their work effectively. It also involves setting up and connecting extension workers to an internet-based extension (technical) information system called Extension Suite Online.

Regarding the Extension Recovery Programme, the current strategic plan for DAFF 2012- 2016 notes the following:

While the Extension Recovery Programme can claim a number of successes—for instance by materially increasing the presence of extension officers on the ground—it is widely recognised that it is not adequate in either scale or scope. DAFF is embarking on a process of creating a national policy on extension and advisory services, which among other things, will consider alternative extension methodologies, possible alternative institutional arrangements for providing extension services (including the ‘public/private mix’ in the overall extension system), and the creation of a professional body to help advance the extension profession.

Expenditure increased from R797,9 million in 2008/09 to R1,3 million in 2011/12, at an average annual rate of 16,3% , because of an increase in spending in the National Extension Support Services sub program as a result of the Extension Recovery Plan component of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Program conditional grant introduced in 2008/09. Expenditure on consultants was 2,2% of the total compensation of the employees in 2011/12.

The next stage of the programme calls for training of 1600 extension workers:

- 700 extension personnel to upgrade their qualifications to a minimum of a first (Bachelor’s) degree
- 900 extension officers to be trained on Extension Suite Online


It is too early to tell if the recovery programme is or will have any positive impact on service delivery and the improved well-being of farmers. The latest annual report of the department of agriculture shows that some progress has been made in recruiting new extension personnel, but progress in this regard has been variable amongst provinces and much still needs to be done (DAFF, 2014). A mid-term external review of the program is currently being done and the recommendations forthcoming.

In order to improve the professional standard of extension services extension officers are now required to register with the Agri-SETA. Failure to meet the standards set would result in the candidate not being able to take a position as an extension specialist.

### **6.1.3 Expenditure on farmer support**

Figure 1 shows the trend in expenditure by the departments of agriculture on farmer support, extension (included in farmer support and development expenditure) and the land reform for rural development programs of government since 2004/5. Average expenditure on farmer support and development over the past five years were on the order of R4 405 million per year with extension

services representing roughly 55 percent thereof. The expenditure by the Department of Land Affairs on the Land Reform for Agriculture program is roughly the same as the combined expenditure on extension by DAFF and the provincial departments (after accounting for conditional grant transfers between DAFF and the provincial departments).



**Figure 1: Government expenditure on extension and farmer support**

Source: RSA 2004-2014

To place this in context, the expenditure on extension translates to a spending intensity ratio of about R47 000 (2010 values) per commercial farmer, or R4 000 (2010 values) per farm worker.

## 6.2 Universities

There are nine universities that have faculties of agriculture in South Africa. Only three of which has programs dedicated to extension training. The total researcher capacity in Full-time Equivalent staff was reported to be only 140 persons, or 18 percent of the total researcher capacity in agricultural sciences in the country (Flaherty et al, 2010). Another five Universities of Technology offer agricultural training; mainly focussed on agricultural production and management qualifications.

There are 12 agricultural colleges, nine of which offer higher education qualifications. These qualifications are generally production related three-year diplomas in agriculture. Only the Cape Institute for Agricultural Training at Elsenburg offers a named extension diploma. Cedara (at Kwazulu Natal Department of Agriculture) and the Cape Institute for Agricultural Training offer B-Agric qualifications under the aegis of partner universities. Most colleges are also involved in farmer training. With the exception of Grootfontein (which is managed by DAFF), the agricultural colleges are managed by their respective Provincial Departments of Agriculture.

The Colleges are to become semi-autonomous training institutes operating under its own legislation. In the interim the curricula at the colleges are being reviewed and the colleges are in the process of being re-accredited — part of which involves upgrading of infrastructure and are funded with CASP funds. In some cases the colleges are transferred/linked with universities, such as the Lowveld College of agriculture which have since 2015 become part of the new University of Mpumalanga.

Under the competitive funding base for agricultural research in the country many faculties of agriculture have developed centres of excellence in particular fields in competition to the services traditionally provided by the Agricultural Research Council. These centres of excellence at the faculties of agriculture serve as a potential source of support to farmer settlement either through training, or outright service provision. It is worth considering luring them into the regional development needs of the regions within which they reside.

### **6.3 State funded agencies**

Worth (2012) identify three state funded agencies Agri-TV, the Agricultural Research Council, and the Agri-business Development Agency (Kwazulu Natal).

#### **6.3.1 Agricultural Research Council**

The institutes of the Agricultural Research Council formerly served as the applied commodity and specialist services research arm of the former Department of Agricultural Technical Services. In 1992 they were transferred to the newly established Agricultural Research Council in an effort to avail the expertise to the former homelands and to enable a more demand driven basis for research service provision. After the scathing review it got in 1997 the Agricultural Research Council shifted its focus to support small holder agriculture. A functions accounting, prior to its establishment, indicated that the Council needed 750 researchers to provide adequate support to the sector; it has never achieved this and is currently operating with only 443 researchers.

#### **6.3.2 Development Agencies**

A number of these exist at national and provincial level. Proper inventory of what exist and the capacity available; need better understanding on their usefulness. However, many more is believed to exist, such as CASIDRA (Western Cape), the Mpumalanga Agricultural Development Corporations and Ncera Farms (Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries). Information on these agencies is very limited and a concerted effort ought to be made to inventories these agencies in an effort to expand our knowledge of the full list of potential service providers to farmer settlement and support.

### **6.4 Private Sector Extension Services**

According to Worth (2012) one of the implicit behaviours among farmers is that when they reach a state of what can be termed self-reliance or a state where their knowledge and skills in their particular

field outstrip those available from the State and concomitantly, they are willing to fund research and extension specific to their primary production focus. This behaviour manifests itself collectively and commodity-based agricultural support organisations are created. In South Africa there are numerous examples of such agencies that provide research, extension, information sharing and economic development support to their paying members.

A parallel process occurs in the professional private sector. The 'traditional' home of agricultural experts has been in higher education institutions and the government. However, increasingly, individuals have left these institutions and set up private consulting and/or service providing businesses. They offer a wide range of agricultural related services including technical production advice, marketing, infrastructure development (e.g. irrigation), business management and research.

These organisations and businesses are potential partners in the overall extension strategy and their inclusion needs to be deliberately considered and cultivated. A table that lists some commodity-based organisations and the functions they undertake are presented in Annexure A3. Several have clearly stated extension (or extension-like) mandates and functions; some do not. For some, no information was readily available. The list is, by no means, exhaustive.

#### **6.4.1 Commodity**

About thirty three commodity organizations currently exist in South Africa and the services they provide are listed in Annexure A4. Generically these services include producer representation, industry promotion, information sharing, quality assurance, industry transformation, research (either directing, funding, or conducting), extension, production support, industry development, institutional capacity building. These services are largely funded through membership fees, proceeds from trust funds and through levy income.

Some of these organizations have well established farmer support programs aimed at new entrants to farming and have become preferred service providers to departmental farmer settlement programs. With sufficient funding, many private-sector firms can organize, manage and deliver extension services more efficiently than government agencies. For example, in some countries, private-sector firms can hire, fire and compensate employees based on performance; therefore, they may be able to successfully deliver extension programmes as long as there are adequate funding. However, if these extension activities are publicly funded and public funds decline as governments attempt to shift the cost of extension services to the farmers themselves, then most private-sector firms will shift their focus to alternative funding sources and abandon these extension activities (Swanson, 2008).



### **6.4.2 Organised Agriculture**

Four institutions exist within this sphere, namely AgriSA, the Transvaal Agricultural Union (perceived to be solely focussed on commercial Agriculture, but reality is different), the National African Farmers Union (NAFU) primarily focussing on black smallholder farmers and the African Farmers Association of South Africa (AFASA). These organizations serve as the mouthpiece for farmers at national level, with the purpose of ensuring the best possible financial and social position for the farmer within the national economy.

### **6.4.3 Non Government Organizations (NGO)**

In South Africa there are 16 NGO's focussing on agriculture; 23 on rural development; and 10 that deal with land issues. The services provided by these institutions generally range from skills development through to legal support. As it stands these organisations could serve as an additional source of scarce capacity.

### **6.4.4 Private consultants**

Worth identified private sector 29 consultants consisting of individuals, associations and companies. The scope of their services is diverse, ranging from input supply through to agricultural and rural development support. This list is probably not exhaustive and depending on incentives provided many more could develop in a relatively short space of time, making it difficult to identify really good expert support. It nevertheless could serve as a rich source of partnerships available to extension services.

## **6.5 Agri-business & banks**

Another source of support to farmers is commercial banks and agri-business industries. Commercial banks have well established agricultural divisions dedicated to provide financial support to commercial farmers, but obviously at commercial principles. Although banks do not promote themselves as extension service providers, they do possess the potential to assist in the provision of access to technical support to their clients.

The Land Bank's mandate was reformulated in 2002 to effect a change in the patterns of land ownership, by promoting greater participation in the agricultural sector by historically disadvantaged persons and an increase in ownership of agricultural land by such persons, through the provision of appropriate financial services. The Land Bank outsources the provision of technical support to third parties preferring not to have the in-house capacity to do so, nor does it intent to develop this capacity under its expanded mandate of social development financing.

The Agribusiness sector provide technical support services to commercial farmers with supply contracts in the interest of securing produce of the appropriate quality, etc., and in so doing serve as

another source of technical support available to farmers, albeit to more skilled farmers, but in many cases not exclusively so.

### **6.5.1 Commercial Banks**

All the major commercial banks have an agricultural division specializing in tailor made financial services to the farming community. These include specialist services from agricultural economists and advisors ranging from support in the development of business plans, insurance services and grain trading on Safex. Although they do not possess over the capacity of technical extension services, they do assist in linking their clients with service providers at co-operatives, commodity organizations and input suppliers in this respect. They are also involved with joint venture finance to developing agriculture, where they administrate the financial scheme of assistance to the project, whilst the mentorship, training and management thereof is done through a subsidiary. However, some has inferred that they prefer to focus primarily on service provision to individual farmers in developing agriculture

### **6.5.2 Land Bank support to Emerging Farmers**

The REM (Retail Emerging Market) program of the Land Bank is one of several public programs that provide financing to emerging farmers. Two such programs belong to the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF). One of these, MAFISA, is very similar to the REM. It offers short term credit to emerging farmers on terms similar to those offered under REM. MAFISA originally provided wholesale financing through nine intermediaries – the number of participating intermediaries is now only three. Established with an endowment of 1 Billion Rand in 2004, MAFISA has provided loans to some 5,000 disadvantaged farmers — most somewhat smaller than the typical client of REM, but still in the category of emerging farmers. Some of the MAFISA endowment has been returned to Treasury, and the remaining funds have been relocated to the Land Bank. An evaluation is now being carried out to examine the experience and the impact of MAFISA to date. Because REM and MAFISA are so similar, and because Land Bank has greater capacity to manage such a program, many observers believe that the two programs should be merged into one program under the Land Bank (i.e., REM or an expanded version of it). This seems a reasonable option, but with annual transfers from Treasury to Land Bank to help to cover the cost of the subsidy element of the program.

A second program of DAFF offers grants to support short term operating expenses and small operating needs such as machinery. These grants are managed at the Provincial level and come from funds that are transferred from national to provincial level under the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Program. It targets a similar group of beneficiaries as does MAFISA — and can cause friction when MAFISA beneficiaries realize that some of their peers receive grants under CASP.

A program similar to the grants under CASP is managed by the Department of Rural Development and Land Affairs. This program serves only farmers who are on land reform acreages. It has a much larger budget than does the grant program under CASP (and has been referred to by some as “CASP on steroids”).

The Land Bank had disbursed R1.8 billion to emerging farmers from 2009 to 2013 and this amount for development was expected to increase to R6 billion by the end of the MTEF period (2016/17). To achieve R6 billion by 2016, different elements of Land Bank had been established: the Retail Emerging Market (REM) which target small-scale black farmers, offering a cash flow lending based approach; concessionary funding and interest rates; non-financial support (end-to-end farm support); and cashless disbursement. The emphasis is on comprehensive support. The Wholesale Finance Facility (WFF) was also launched to form part of the network of support through market-established intermediaries to ensure that emerging farmers received subsidized interest rates and comprehensive support.

#### *Products and services*

The Land Bank has 28 branch offices located throughout the country with a further 27 satellite offices linked to the branches. Land Bank gives low, medium and high-risk clients access to a full range of long, medium and short-term loans to meet all financial needs, including land and equipment purchases, asset improvement and production credit. A series of tailor made programs and products have been developed specific to the needs of previously-disadvantaged people in the sector. The development of the requisite business plan needed to apply for a loan is done through intermediaries, be that co-operatives, commodity organizations, NGOs, private consultants, etc. in which the bank facilitate their inclusion. Currently the bank has 10 of these — commodity specific — intermediaries and the experience with this arrangement has been positive. Initiatives are underway to elicit support from intermediaries from specialist institutions such as seed and input companies.

Since the Land Bank has no in-house technical support capacity technical support to farmers from intermediaries includes training, skills development and mentoring of smallholder beneficiaries. The commodity organizations, many of which fund their operations from trust funds and funding sourced from the programs of DAFF and the Department of Rural Development and Land Affairs, have proofed successful in establishing commercially successful black farmers. Examples of which is the small farmer development program of GrainSA and the Shearing Shed initiative of the National Wool Growers Association (NWGA). The latter program has been in operation for 15 years and provide support to 15 000 wool and sheep farmers in the former Ciskei and Transkei territories of the Eastern Cape, where the provincial department of Agriculture second their extension staff to the NWGA who

train them and then employ them in the provision of technical advisory services to the target beneficiaries.

The number of clients served by the Bank through this approach is currently small and is currently the most cost effective way of providing the technical support under this scenario. If the number of clients were to grow significantly the burden on the financial resources of the intermediary services of the commodity organizations specifically would become unsustainable absent a significant increase in support from government programs. The Bank foresees that going forward (and with an expansion of the number of clients) “it may make sense to develop some technical capacity within the Bank and ring fence it as an autonomous subsidiary”. This would, however, require that it draws on government capacity as well.

#### *Government support*

The existence of the existing somewhat parallel efforts of government departments has led to fragmentation of effort and inefficiency and has caused frictions and problems in implementation. The current setup between national and provincial departments of agriculture thus does not lend itself to effective central coordination of the available capacity in government and an institutional solution have to be created to fill this void. In the view of many observers, the existence of these somewhat parallel efforts has led to fragmentation of effort and inefficiency and has caused frictions and problems in implementation. A mechanism was developed in 2004 to coordinate the support for these various programs (and an operational manual for such coordination was developed and agreed) – but it has never been implemented.

Consolidating the finance support initiatives of DAFF and Department of Rural Development and Land Affairs into the REM would circumvent these problems. The existence of an efficient public service extension service would go a long way to assist the Land Bank. It is clear that the extension services capacity provided by government faces enormous challenges in providing adequate support to farmers. This situation pre-dates the switch to a democratic constitution. Not only were Homeland administrations incapable to create the requisite capacity to serve black smallholder farmers in their areas, but the extension services of the former Department of Agricultural Technical Services servicing commercial agriculture were already understaffed by about 40 percent circa 1988 (Liebenberg, 2013). If history is to serve as a guide, developing the capacity through recruitment and training would take decades and increased budgetary allocations by government to match the operational needs of the new incumbents. In the meantime the expectations of smallholders have to be met in some way.

To do so would require creative partnerships between whatever resources are available in the country aiming at utilizing this in the most cost effective manner. For this to happen would require a clear vision and focus in directing the individual efforts. Here the Land Bank can play a pivotal role in resourcing the required capacity in support of beneficiaries of farmer settlement, at least in the short term. Its financial sustainability is a strong consideration and for this to be achieved a clear focus on its intended client base is required.

## **7 Farmers and Farm Characteristics**

A major constraint in the planning of the nature and extent of technical advisory services needed to develop the agricultural sector in the country is the absence of reliable and comprehensive agricultural census data that cover the complete commercial sector and subsistence agriculture. The nearest alternative is information that can be cleaned from the General Household Surveys. Using the information obtainable from the General Household Survey of 2012 (Stats SA, 2013b) an effort is made here to shed some light on the characteristics of those involved in an agricultural activity.

### **7.1 Involvement in farming**


Past agricultural censuses and surveys used a minimum non-urban area cultivated as the basis of selecting farms for enumeration in the census. In recent years the register of farm businesses of the South African Revenue services was used to select farms for enumeration and in so doing farms below a certain level of turnover is excluded from the census. Using a more expanded definition of farming the Survey of Large and Small Scale Agriculture of 2000 identified 1 093 000 farming operations, 86 percent of which was farming operations in the former homelands. Using the farming unit as the basis of enumeration and failing to capture information on the farmer demographics this survey proved to be of little value.

Efforts to gain an insight into the number of persons involved in agricultural activities the October Household Survey of the late 1990's captured a little information on this. This question was transferred to the Labour Force Surveys of 2000 through to 2007 from where it was again transferred to the General Household Survey and since 2012 the number of questions covering agriculture was expanded to cover a minimal set of questions on the nature of the agricultural activity. It is from this that an effort is made to shed some light on the client base of the agricultural technical advisory services.

#### **7.1.1 Agricultural activity**

A total of 2.633 million households (200 000 less than identified in the 2011 Population Census, Stats SA, 2013a) were found to be involved in an agricultural activity. As shown in Figure 2, 65 percent of

households involved in agricultural activities reside in just three provinces, Eastern Cape (20.7), Kwazulu-Natal (20.3) and Limpopo (24.1) (Stats SA, 2013b). The overall gender distribution for the country is fairly even, but large variations occur between provinces, with females headed households representing more than fifty percent of the households involved in agricultural activities in the Eastern Cape, Kwazulu Natal and Limpopo provinces.




**Figure 2: Households involved in the production of food and agricultural products, 2012.**

Source: Stats SA (2013b)

As a share of the total population of a province the Eastern Cape, Mpumalanga and Limpopo shows the highest concentration of households involved in agricultural activities. In terms of racial composition 92.8 percent of these households are black followed by 5.3 percent whites. Coloured households represent 1.7 percent of the households involved in an agricultural activity with Indian only 0.2 percent.

Figure 3 shows that in terms of the geographic distribution the majority of the agricultural households are located in the Rural informal areas (former Homeland reserves), These are also the areas that are the least well equipped in terms of research and extension infrastructure compared to the facilities available to farmers in the remainder of the country.




**Figure 3: Geographic distribution by type of households involved in agriculture**

Source: Stats SA (2013b)

### 7.1.2 Nature of food production

Figure 4 shows that ninety nine percent of all households involved in agricultural production are centred on four industries. Twenty seven percent of the households are involved in fruit and vegetable production followed by 26 percent for poultry, 25 percent for grains and 20 percent in livestock. Fodder, Industrial crops, aquaculture, forestry and game amount to only 1.1 percent of the agricultural activities.




**Figure 4: Kind of food production/agricultural activities households are involved in**

Source: Stats SA (2013b)

The predominance of Fruit and Vegetable and poultry production results from the broad definition followed in casting the net to include all involvement in agricultural production activities. Except for poultry production, these relativities in production involvement do not reflect the relative importance of the industries in the national production accounts for agriculture and is a misrepresentation of where the need for technical support actually lies. By excluding households that practice their activities in backyards a different picture emerges. Households involved in fruit and vegetable production then represents only five percent of the total, whereas Poultry producing households increase in share to 44 percent followed by Livestock (38 percent) and Grains (11 percent).

### 7.1.3 Where is cropping activity practiced

The significance of backyard agricultural activities are clearly emphasised in Figure 5 which shows that 87 percent of the households involved in crop planting activities practice this in backyard gardens. Only ten percent of the crop planting is done on farmland. Only two provinces (Kwazulu Natal and Limpopo) are responsible for 71 percent of households involved in crop planting on farmland, followed by Mpumalanga (11 percent) and Eastern Cape (8 percent). Kwazulu-Natal on its own represents 43 percent of the households involved in crop planting on farmland.



**Figure 5: Locality of where households practice agricultural production**


Source: Stats SA (2013b)

Crop planting on communal land is concentrated in Kwazulu-Natal (35), Mpumalanga (24), Limpopo (19) and Eastern Cape (11). This is in contrast to the total land area available for crop farming in these provinces.



#### 7.1.4 Reason for involvement and selling of produce

The reasons for growing farm produce, or keeping stock is shown in Figure 6. Here 75 percent of all households involved in agricultural activities indicated that this is done mainly for extra food and nine percent as their main source of food. Only seven percent indicated that their reason for involvement is to generate income. Translated to the number of persons living in these households some 12 million people are thus directly depended on agriculture, of which nine million fall in the category of households whose involvement is mainly as a source of extra food and 1.1 million as their main source of food.




**Figure 6: Reasons for involvement in agriculture**

Source: Stats SA (2013b)

Out of the 2.6 million households only 214 000 are selling produce. Figure 7 shows the distribution of those according to the reason for being involved in agricultural production. Here 70 percent of the households that sell produce do so as a source of extra income (42 percent), or extra food (28 percent). A further nine percent of those that sell produce are primarily in producing food for own consumption and only 20 percent are involved primarily for income generation. The latter is assumed to be fully commercialised farming households.

In terms of the share of the provincial households involved in agricultural activities the largest concentrations of these are in the Northern Cape, followed by Free State and North West provinces. In the remainder of the provinces these households represent only about 7/8 percent of the farming households. 65 percent of the 214 428 households are larger than two persons per households, but less than five.



**Figure 7: Reasons for involvement in agriculture amongst households that sell produce**

Source: Stats SA (2013b)

### 7.1.5 Tenure type

In terms of tenure status 55 percent of the households own the land they are farming on, with a further 16 percent practicing their activities on tribal land. 26 percent of the households indicated their tenure status as not applicable or unknown or failed to specify. About four percent of the households practice their farming activities on state, rented, share-cropping or other types of tenure.

### 7.1.6 Area of cropland production

Given the high share of backyard gardening, 62 percent of the plots used for crop farming are less than 500 m<sup>2</sup> — nine percent if backyard activities are excluded. Focussing on only those households that sell produce, the share of plots smaller than 500m<sup>2</sup> still represent a significant 38 percent of the households — eight percent if backyard activities are excluded.

Among households that sell produce those that do so from backyard production represent 42 percent, or 89 000 households, of the total of 214 000. This could have important implications for the size of loans if development financing is extended to these households, as the per unit administration cost on loans as well as the cost of extension support could be significantly higher per household.

### 7.1.7 Sell to whom


In terms of whom the households sold their produce to, 76 percent indicated that this is sold through local outlets within the district and 13 percent to neighbouring district. Interesting differences appear when comparing the different population groups. It is only the white population group that has a clearly diversified set of marketing outlets. Here 82 percent of produce are sold through local (40), formal (30) and neighbouring markets. It is also the only population group that shows a clear focus

on export markets. Black and coloured households largely rely on local buyers within the district. This indicates that much needs to be done to improve and diversify the linkages of these households to market outlets.


### 7.1.8 Support received

Only 24 percent of the households involved in agricultural activities received any form of agriculture related assistance from government in 2012 as shown in Figure 6, Panel a. Of those households that received assistance 32 percent received dipping and vaccination services for livestock. Another 32 percent received free inputs and a further three percent received inputs as part of a loan. Extension and training respectively was provided to 18 and 13 percent of the households. Households that sell produce represented 22 percent of the households that received assistance, stated differently, 64 percent of the households that sell produce received assistance from government (Figure 8, Panel b). This was mainly in the form of Dipping and vaccination services (29 percent) free inputs (26 percent), inputs as part of loans (4 percent) and three percent received loans (82 percent of loans granted). Here the share of households who received training (18 percent) and extension visits (28 percent) are significantly higher.

**Panel a: All households in agriculture**



**Panel b: Households that sell**



**Figure 8: Agriculturally related government assistance provided to households**

Source: Stats SA (2013b)


As a proportion of the assistance provided through training and extension to agricultural households less than a third were extended to households that sell agricultural produce. A significant proportion of the extension and training services provided by government, thus focus on households that do not exhibit a clear potential for commercialization, if involvement in sales serve as a criterion for this.

### 7.1.9 Main source of income


Out of 2 633 003 households 0.8 million earned an income through salaries and 0.2 million through business activities. Nearly two million received some form of grant, half of which regarded this as their main source of income. In fact, 59 percent indicated that they received grants, remittances and pensions.

As their main source of income Figure 9, Panel a, shows that 31 percent of the households regarded income from salaries as their main source of income; only seven percent indicated this to be their main source of income. A sobering statistic is that only three percent of the 214 thousand households that generate an income through the sale of farm products and services regard this as their main source of income (Panel b). Grants, remittances, and pensions combined are the main source of income for 47 percent of households that sell agricultural produce. Salaries and business income were indicated as the main source of income for another 47 percent of the households.

**Panel a: All households in agriculture**



**Panel b: Households that sell**



**Figure 9: Main source of household income**

Source: Stats SA (2013b)

The prominence of grants and remittances among households that sell agricultural produce is a concern as this may serve as a disincentive for households to fully exploit the commercial

opportunities from agricultural production available to them, a matter that would have to receive attention in future farm settlement support policy initiatives.

## **8 Provision of Support to Target Beneficiaries: A Alternative Concept**

Government expects extension to be the primary vehicle for delivering on its agricultural agenda. The concern raised by the DAFF and reinforced by research conducted by the University of Kwazulu-Natal is that extension officers are not equipped to deliver on this agenda (Worth 2009). Not only is the size of the service a problem (Hall and Aliber, 2010), the ability to hire sufficient numbers of capable extension workers in the short to medium term is also limited. In addition to increasing the number of extension workers government will need to ensure that they are appropriately trained and allow them the time and opportunity to gain experience — a process that cannot realistically be completed in a short period of time. The solution in the interim, thus, lies in creative partnerships with other extension service providers (and with farmers) as the government develop this capacity.

The ability to utilise the existing capacity in government optimally is further constraint in that resources cannot readily be re-located, or shared, between provinces under the constitutional dispensation that now prevail. Staff working in one province is effectively working for a separate accounting authority. Administratively it is very complicated and time consuming to share resources between provinces when the need arise and alternative institutional solutions need to be developed. In this the government has re-course to state owned entities such as the Agricultural Research Council that potentially could provide a solution to this conundrum, but developing this would also take time.

In the short run solutions to a number of critical considerations need to be found. First a dedicated focus on the intended beneficiaries that shows the potential to develop into commercialised clientele need to be developed. This would limit the number of potential clients that could be assisted to manageable numbers and ensure greater efficiency in program implementation. The terms and conditions of assistance provided to beneficiaries also needs to be revised to incorporate a greater sense of ‘ownership and commitment’ amongst beneficiaries — we cannot have programs providing grants and free inputs running in parallel to a tenancy system for example as this would be counterproductive. Finally the cost of service provision should be defined and contained within reasonable proportions to avoid having insufficient levels of resources available to technical support staff to actually execute their duties and provide an effective service.

### **8.1 Market focus and selection criteria**

In its Integrated Growth and Development Plan the DAFF estimated the number of smallholder farmers as about 200 000. Using the information available from the 2012 General Household Survey

Table 5 shows that about 195 175 of the agriculturally active households do so to produce food to generate income. Roughly 49 024 households (172 333 persons) do so as their main source of income and another 146 151 (638 240 persons) as extra source of income. Assuming that the current 39 996 farming units in commercial agriculture (Stats SA 2010) is included in the 49 024 households involved in agriculture as their main income, this leaves a further 9 028 households that are involved in agriculture primarily for commercial purposes — probably already clients of the Land Bank and/or commercial banks. The 146 151 households that are involved for an extra income then serves as a group of smallholder farmers that may potentially be converted to commercial farmers if properly supported and resourced. Depending on the aspiration of the individuals involved, it can be foreseen that not all of these household heads may want to commit themselves to the loan conditions and prefer to ‘go it on their own’.

**Table 5: Households and persons according to the main reason for involvement in agriculture, 2012**

Reason	Households	Persons
Main income	49 024	172 332.7
Extra income	146 151	638 240.2
Main food	226 668	1 121 820.3
Extra food	1 982 408	8 945 873.5
Leisure	172 269	681 993.3
Unspecified	56 483	204 498.7
Total	2 633 003	11 764 758.6

Source: Stats SA (2013b)

The remaining majority of 2.209 million households are involved primarily to produce food for own consumption, i.e. subsistence farming. Here one can further distinguish between households involved in agricultural activities as their main source of food amount to 226 668 (1.12 million persons), or as an extra source of food 1.98 million households (representing 8.9 million persons). If provided with the incentives it is possible that a small proportion of these farmers may aspire to become potentially commercialised farmers, however, for this a level of extension support would be called for that would best be provided by the provincial departments.

It is suggested that for investment to be effective the extension services should have a dedicated focus in servicing the different beneficiaries. Therefore, the Land Bank should develop criteria to select appropriate clients that already have a commercial focus in their involvement in agriculture, i.e. the 146 151 smallholder farmers identified here. Households that focus primarily on meeting daily dietary needs are best left to be served by the departments of agriculture.

## **8.2 Land Bank**

The Land Bank has to be ensured of effective technical advisory support to beneficiaries in order for it to deliver successfully on its social development. It has never had any in-house technical support capacity and do not intend to develop this — for risk considerations. The Land Bank relies on contracting farmer support services from intermediaries. These service providers take responsibility for training and skills development through mentoring of the smallholder beneficiaries. By extending this practice and expanding this into a sustained medium term arrangement the Land Bank could take the lead in transforming the government provided extension services by ensuring that provincial capacities form part of the initiative.

Recognizing the hesitance of the Land Bank to get directly involved in technical service provision, the situation with the settlement of emerging farmers may call for a more close (and firm) involvement in steering the service. It should consider creating a small in-house capacity dedicated to serving the loans (and accompanying technical support). This can be grown from the existing capacity of the Land Reform program of the Department of Land Affairs and Rural Development. In so doing the administration of the title deeds, etc. is left with the Department of Land Affairs, but the program (and support capacity) and its Land Reform program is transferred to the Land Bank. This would see that the current fragmented approach to farmer settlement support is consolidated in one institution, thus ensuring better coordination and greater cost effectiveness in service delivery.

Once new entrants reach a certain level of performance they can be passed on to the care of the support services of the provincial departments of agriculture.

## **8.3 Loan conditions**

To date much of the support provided to new entrants/beneficiaries to farming through the restitution and land reform initiatives have been extended through grants and, or donations. This practice, much as the goodwill for this is appreciated, must be replaced with an alternative that select beneficiaries with the drive to succeed and build ownership in program success for farmer settlement to become a sustained reality.

The principles of such an alternative is found in the tenant farmer schemes of the mid-1900's under which beneficiaries received training and an initial start-up package of inputs together with dedicated (compulsory) technical services support throughout the period of a maximum of five years during which (s)he could exercise the option to buy. Once the option to purchase has been exercised the beneficiary then transfers and become the sole responsibility of the departmental technical services. The benefit of this is that the program capitalises itself and beneficiaries take full responsibility for their own success.

#### **8.4 Service modality**

The most cost effective approach to provide technical support to settlement farmers would be to outsource this activity to service providers with a proven success rate within the target areas. A critical need would be to establish a small performance monitoring and evaluation (either within the Land Bank or outsourced) to monitor programme compliance. To reduce the monitoring costs of such a programme, a random auditing process could be instituted. This kind of regulation, given the lack of capacity in government, can only be undertaken on a small scale basis, targeted at areas with some agricultural potential and entrusted to officials with some capacity and local knowledge. If it could be implemented effectively it would make a small but real difference.

Service providers should facilitate in the development of business plans in consultation with the target beneficiaries and farmers must be seen to adhere to the planned program of activities. Provision should be made to allow for input and participation from multiple service providers from the government, NGO's and commodity organizations.

To avoid the problem of a lack of accountability by any participant there should be an element of cost sharing between national and provincial governments as well as between government and the farmer. The practice of providing grants (especially on production inputs) should be replaced by a subsidy where some of the cost should be recovered from the end beneficiary in line with the program followed in support of earlier white farmer settlement programmes.

#### **8.5 Cost of service provision**

The total expenditure on farmer support services (farmer settlement, extension and financing) by the national and provincial departments of agriculture alone amount to R6 826 million (USD 621 million) in financial year 2013/14. Extension support in aggregate between the DAFF and the provincial departments amounted to roughly R4 507 million (USD 410 million).

If one were to focus on the full complement of households involved in agriculture for an extra income then the cost of providing an intensive level of technical advisory support to ensure success (at USD 5 000 per household) would be R731 (USD 66 million).

#### **8.6 Infrastructure support**

A critical factor for the success and sustained rural development would be the development of rural infrastructure and research and extension facilities by the state to back stop these initiatives. From an affordability point of view a dedicated focus on specific regions would be desirable for specific provinces.



## 9 Recommendations

From past initiatives it is clear that government should formulate workable ways of supporting *potentially progressive* farmers and provide greater amounts of support to those who commit more of their own resources to farming than the average rural resident. It makes economic sense to support those who demonstrate a clear willingness to be progressive, but such a strategy does not do enough to tackle the widespread deprivation in the rural areas.

Governments who merely throw money at poverty are unlikely to achieve significant development. What is required is a structural transformation of the circumstances which create poverty the solution for which lies in government to consult and work closely with people on the ground. As was the case when the earlier extension services shifted its approach from specialist advisory services to the whole-farm approach within the context of district/regional level development plans. However, it still requires high levels of competency and determination within government. In South Africa, especially in those provinces which most require rural development, state capacity is low and there are many local political imperatives at play pushing officials in policy directions that contradict the aims of development and poverty reduction.

Developing the appropriate levels of capacity takes decades to develop, is costly and will probably never be fully achieved. In the meantime the pressure on government to effect rural and farmer development is reaching crisis levels. The solution lies in harnessing what capacity is available within government and elsewhere in the economy (many of which reside in the private sector) and to develop and utilise these resources to greater effect. New institutional innovations that allow for greater levels of coordination, but since one is working with private organisations and sometimes private individuals this will only be achieved if they are provided with incentives that spur them to collaborate fully and continue to do so for decades to come. Here the Land Bank can play the role of a catalyst and become the centre through which support services (inclusive of a monitoring service) can be directed toward those beneficiaries that show the greatest promise of succeeding.

Government is still required to provide support to all farmers from commercial through to subsistence farmers. The emphasis should be on providing quality not quantity, which will require the retention of a core of competent scientists with adequate and stable levels of resourcing available to them. Central to this is the expansion and development of research and development facilities in the former homeland areas that never enjoyed the benefit of having regional service centres around which co-operative experiments can be conducted aimed at developing appropriate farming systems for these production regions.

Finally, there is a dire need for a comprehensive agricultural census of ALL farmers in the country of the appropriate detail and rigour similar to what used to be conducted up to the early 1960's. Having access to information of this nature would greatly aid government and others in developing a more sustainable development strategy for agriculture and the rural areas in general and reduce the waste of resources through programs that are inappropriately designed.

## 10 References

- Butler, J., Rotberg, R. I., & Adams, J. B. (1978). *The Black Homelands of South Africa: The Political and Economic Development of Bophuthatswana and Kwa-Zulu*. University of California Press.
- de Satge, R. (1988). *Herschel in history*. National Land Committee course in land use and livelihoods. PLAAS and Developmental Services.
- DOA (Department of Agriculture), (1960). *Farming in South Africa*. Vol. 36(2) May.
- Du Toit, M.S. (1954) Report of the Secretary for Agriculture for the year ending 31 August, 1953: V. Technical Services. *Farming in South Africa*. Vol:32 (January 1954): 30-34.
- Flaherty, K., F Liebenberg and J Kirsten. (2010). *South Africa: Recent Developments in Public Agricultural Research*. ASTI Country Note. Washington DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Hall, R. and Aliber, M. (2010) *The Case for Re-Strategising Spending Priorities to Support Small-Scale Farmers in South Africa*. Plaas. University of the Western Cape
- Hayward, J and Botha, C (1995) Extension, training and research. In R. Singini & J. Van Rooyen (Eds.), *Serving small scale farmers: An evaluation of DBSA's farmer support programmes*. Halfway House: Development Bank of Southern Africa.
- Liebenberg, F. (2013). *South African Agricultural Production, Productivity and Research Performance in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*. Doctoral Thesis. University of Pretoria.
- RSA (Republic of South Africa) (1984) *Report of the Committee of Enquiry Into Agricultural Service Provision*. RSA: Pretoria.
- RSA (Republic of South Africa). (2004-2014) *Estimates of National Expenditure*. Pretoria: Department of Finance.
- Schirmer, S. (2005). White Farmers and Development in South Africa, *South African Historical Journal*, Vol.52(1): 82-101.
- Stats SA. (2013a). *Census 2011: Agricultural Households*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.
- Stats SA. (2013b). *General Household Survey, 2012*. [Online]. [www.statssa.gov.za](http://www.statssa.gov.za)

- Swanson, BE. (2008). Global Review of Good Agricultural Extension and Advisory Service Practices. Rome: Food and Agricultural Organization.
- Van Rooyen, J. (1995) Overview of DBSA's farmer support programme: 1987-1993. In R. Singini & J. van Rooyen (Eds.), *Serving small-scale farmers: An evaluation of the DBSA's farmer support programmes*. Halfway House, Development Bank of South Africa.
- Van Vuren. J.P.J. (1952). "Agricultural Extension Services." *Farming in South Africa*. 27(312)(March 1952):227-230.
- Williams, B., D. Mayson, R. de Satge, S. Epstein, and T Semwayo. (2008) Extension and Small Holder Agriculture: Key Issues From a Review of the Literature. Pretoria: Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.
- Worth, SH. (2009) *An assessment of the appropriateness of agricultural extension education in South Africa*. Doctoral Thesis. University of KwaZulu-Natal.
- Worth, S. (2012). Agricultural Extension in South Africa: Status Quo Report: Discussion Document. Pretoria: Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.

## 11 Annexure A: Agricultural Technical Services Providers

This inventory is adapted from Worth (2012)

### *Universities and their respective agricultural qualifications*

University	Qualifications Offered							
	Diplo ma	BSc (3-yr)	B Agric (3-yr)	Extension Degree	BSc.Agric (4-yr)	Honours	Masters	PhD
Fort Hare			X		X	X	X	X
Free State			X		X	X	X	X
KwaZulu-Natal*			X	X	X	X	X	X
Limpopo* (1)					X	X	X	X
North West					X	X	X	X
Pretoria*				X	X	X	X	X
Stellenbosch			X		X	X	X	X
UNISA	X	X						
Venda					X	X	X	X
Zululand					X	X	X	X

### *Universities of Technology*

- 1) Cape Peninsula University of Technology
- 2) Central University of Technology
- 3) Mangosuthu University of Technology
- 4) Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University
- 5) Tshwane University of Technology

### *Colleges of Agriculture*

College	Programmes offered
1) Cedara (Kwazulu-Natal)	Diploma B Agric in association with UKZN In-house Extension Training
2) Cape Institute for Agricultural Training (Elsenburg)	Diploma B Agric in association with Stellenbosch In-house Extension Training
3) Fort Cox (Eastern Cape)	Farmer Training In-house Extension Training
4) Glen (Free State)	Diploma In-house Extension Training
5) Grootfontein (Eastern Cape) -1	Diploma In-house Extension Training
6) Lowveld (Mpumalanga); part of Mpumalanga University	Diploma In-house Extension Training
7) Madzivhandila (Limpopo)	Farmer Training In-house Extension Training
8) Owen Sitole (Kwazulu-Natal)	Diploma In-house Extension Training
9) Potchefstroom (North West)	Diploma In-house Extension Training
10) Taung (North West)	Diploma In-house Extension Training
11) Tompi Seleka (Limpopo)	Farmer Training

College	Programmes offered
	In-house Extension Training
12) Tsolo (Eastern Cape)	Farmer Training In-house Extension Training

### *State-funded Agricultural Agencies*

Service	Description
AgriTV	TV programme adding value to the business of Agriculture; SABC 2
Agricultural Research Council (ARC)	Agricultural Research through 11 research institutes Training to address the information gap between R&D and end-users Technology transfer: facilitate partnerships and coordinate and integrate technology transfer processes to deliver tangible products and services into the market place for the benefit of the society
Agri-Business Development Agency (KZN)	Coordinates services provided by government and the private sector including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building, training, mentoring &amp; skills development among black commercial farmers</li> <li>• Technical support to black commercial farmers for business, technical, production, and marketing support</li> <li>• Providing and developing infrastructure for commercial production</li> <li>• Providing access to funding and resources</li> <li>• Facilitating access to opportunities in the agribusiness value chain</li> </ul>

### *A selection of commodity – based organisations in South Africa*

Agency	Description
1) Banana Growers' Association of South Africa	No information available
2) Canned Fruit Producers' Association	No information available
3) Citrus Growers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gain, retain and optimize market access</li> <li>• Fund, control and implement research and development</li> <li>• Provide product and quality assurance</li> <li>• Engage with government and other stakeholders</li> <li>• Assist grower profitability and sustainability</li> <li>• Drive industry transformation</li> <li>• Facilitate efficient logistics</li> </ul>
4) Citrus Research International (Pty) Ltd (CRI)§	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximise the long-term global competitiveness of the southern African citrus growers through the development, support, co- ordination and provision of research and technical services</li> <li>• Transferring research outputs to the intended users</li> <li>• Co-ordinating transfer of knowledge to the southern African citrus growers and their service agents</li> </ul>
5) Cotton SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information services</li> <li>• Stimulating production and use of cotton</li> <li>• Research, quality standards and norms as well as training</li> <li>• Act as industry forum</li> <li>• Advisory body to various Government Departments</li> <li>• Overseeing Cotton Sector Strategy Plan</li> <li>• Small-scale cotton farmer development</li> <li>• Training emerging and small-scale farmers</li> <li>• Improving research and extension services and technology transfer</li> </ul>
6) Deciduous Fruit Producers' Trust (DFPT)	See FruitGro
7) Dry Bean Producers' Organisation (DPO)	No information available
8) Forestry South Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Represent growers of timber in South Africa</li> </ul>

Agency	Description
(FSA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote the interests of all growers of all commercial tree species and to create unity of purpose amongst members</li> <li>Promote the sustainable commercial production and utilisation of timber and forest</li> <li>Promote the growth, development and well-being of the South African Forestry Industry</li> <li>Promote policies and practices which support free competition and foster and encourage entrepreneurship and innovation</li> <li>Promote, support and encourage education and training, research and development and technology transfer in the interests of members</li> <li>Collect, analyse, exchange and disseminate information, literature and statistics relevant to the need of its members</li> </ul>
9) FruitGro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manage the research process for the fresh deciduous fruit industry</li> <li>Direct and guide research to address industry needs</li> <li>Facilitate capacity development</li> <li>Transfer information and research results to growers</li> </ul>
10) Grain SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides strategic support to grain producers in South Africa to promote sustainable production and profitability</li> <li>Extension related services:</li> <li>Production information</li> <li>Production environment information</li> <li>External information</li> <li>Input product information</li> <li>Marketing information</li> <li>Macro environment information</li> <li>Farmer Development Programme to develop black commercial farmers</li> </ul>
11) Hluhluwe Pineapple Marketing Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Market and promote pineapples produced by members</li> <li>Mouth-piece for/represent the members</li> <li>Conduct pineapple research.</li> <li>No mention of formal extension function</li> </ul>
12) Milk Producers' Organisation (MPO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Represents and empowers milk producers</li> <li>Extension activities:</li> <li>Dairy information days</li> <li>Mentorship programmes</li> <li>Training and technology transfer for farm managers, emerging farmers and farm workers</li> <li>Conference and expos</li> <li>Advice and assistance to developing/aspiring milk producers</li> </ul>
13) National Emergent Red Meat Producers' Organisation (Nerpo)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitate the empowerment of members to improve their social and economic well-being and to enable them to sustainably utilise market opportunities</li> <li>Build institutional capacity</li> <li>Commercialisation of the emerging sector by facilitating access to technical support, credit facilities and markets</li> <li>Economic empowerment of members, youth and women through the creation of business opportunities within the supply chain</li> </ul>
14) National Ostrich Processors of South Africa (NOPSA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote the interests of the ostrich processing industry</li> <li>Coordinate matters affecting the ostrich processing industry</li> <li>Forum for dialogue amongst members and to promote dialogue between processors and producers</li> <li>No mention of any formal extension</li> </ul>
15) National Woolgrowers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the profitability of wool sheep farming</li> <li>Producer-driven research into marketing with a section dedicated to new farmer development</li> <li>Providing information to woolgrowers</li> <li>Promotion of sustainable and profitable wool sheep farming</li> <li>Focus on commercial farmers, communal farmers, and shearing</li> </ul>
16) Red Meat Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine industry policy, decides on strategy, guides and monitors progress of strategy</li> <li>Liaise with all industry and state structures</li> </ul>

Agency	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key focus areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Animal Health and Bio Security</li> <li>b. Information gathering and dissemination</li> <li>c. Commercialising the Emergent Sector.</li> <li>d. Production improvement.</li> <li>e. Good Management Practices.</li> <li>f. Training</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
17) SA Canegrowers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Represent 47000 private cane growers</li> <li>Look after the interests of all private cane growers</li> <li>Responsible for grower development and empowerment programmes</li> <li>Collaborate with the South African Sugarcane Research Institute on extension and research and development issues</li> <li>Provide economic and technical advice and support to the grower organisation structures as well as farm business advisory services to individual growers</li> </ul>
18) SA Mango Growers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solve producer problems through research and facilitate communication between researchers and producers</li> <li>Does not seem to have a formal extension function</li> </ul>
19) South Africa Avocado Growers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collect and distribute information about avocado production and marketing</li> <li>Research into avocado production and marketing</li> <li>Recommend quality requirements and the application thereof</li> <li>Extension to farmers</li> <li>Provide a discussion forum</li> </ul>
20) South African Cotton Producers' Organisation (SACPO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Cotton SA</li> </ul>
21) South African Meat Industry Company (SAMIC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure always 100% integrity beef, lamb and pork (refers to issues of fraud and collusion)</li> <li>Independent 'Brand' auditing on Trademarks at farms, feedlots, abattoirs, and deboning plants and outlets</li> <li>Independent hides and skins audits on behalf of the National Department of Agriculture for export purposes at Abattoirs, Intermediate stores as well as at the harbours</li> <li>Assessment of qualified meat classifiers</li> <li>Independent inspections at all abattoirs, meat traders, imported meat and hide and skins plants</li> <li>Hold and judge carcass competitions related to market requirements and consumer demands are</li> <li>No mention of formal extension function</li> </ul>
22) South African Mohair Growers' Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote mohair production and general farming of Angora Goats</li> <li>Have farmer study groups</li> </ul>
23) South African Nursery Association (SANA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a professional national communication among Nursery businesses</li> <li>Training in in displays and merchandising No mention of formal extension programme</li> </ul>
24) South African Ostrich Producers Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No information available</li> </ul>
25) South African Pork Producers Organisation (SAPPO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate and manage emerging pig farming projects countrywide towards becoming commercially successful"</li> <li>Training, mentorship, advice and veterinary support for new producers</li> </ul>
26) South African Poultry Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote and advance improvement of the poultry and all poultry-related industries</li> <li>Publish/Provide advice to producers</li> <li>Training programmes (target is not stated)</li> </ul>
27) South African Rooibos Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocacy and research, food safety, certification, and conservation agencies for the collective benefit of the industry</li> <li>No reference to formal extension function</li> </ul>
28) South African Subtropical Fruits Growing Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical support and advisory services to its growers</li> <li>Funding of appropriate technical and market research</li> <li>Provision of relevant market information</li> <li>Local and export market development through generic promotion</li> <li>Liaison with government and other bodies</li> </ul>



Agency	Description
29) South African Sugar Association (SASA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote the global competitiveness, profitability and sustainability of the South African sugar industry</li> <li>Associated South African Cane Growers' Association and the sugar milling companies undertake development projects and are involved in BBBEE</li> </ul>
30) SASRI Extension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides link between researchers and sugarcane farmers</li> <li>Offers a range of services including fertiliser advice, disease diagnoses and education courses</li> <li>Research on variety improvement, crop protection, crop performance &amp; management, systems design &amp; optimization</li> </ul>
31) Tomato Producers' Organisation (TPO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No information available</li> </ul>
32) VinPro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation services in viticulture, oenology, soil science, agro-economy and general management</li> <li>BEE Advisory Service assists producers with strategic land reform, specialised project evaluation and</li> </ul>
33) Wild life ranching SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research and information sharing</li> <li>No mention of extension</li> </ul>

### *Organised agriculture*

Agency	Description
Agri-SA & Transvaal Agricultural Union of SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mouthpiece for all farmers (of all races) at national level, with the purpose of ensuring the best possible financial and social position for the farmer within the national economy</li> </ul>
National Agricultural Farmers Union And AFASA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mouthpiece of predominantly black small-holder farmers in South Africa.</li> <li>NAFU strives to actively promote the interests primarily of black farmers who are largely a disproportionately disadvantaged farming community</li> <li>Lobbies for policy reforms to level playing field; key areas: land acquisition, agricultural funding, market access and public policy</li> <li>Lobby for the provision of appropriate services e.g. extension, marketing and credit to members</li> <li>Facilitate the provision of training</li> <li>Empower women and young people so as to enable them to participate fully in farming activities</li> </ul>

### *NGOs focussing on agriculture*

Organisation	Profile
1) Abalimi Bezekhaya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Environment, Rural Development, Skills Development, Monitoring and Evaluation</li> <li>Empower the disadvantaged through urban agriculture and environmental programmes and projects. We support our target groups' ability to replicate their success and transform their lives in their urban and rural environments. ABALIMI assists by providing the following support services: Project implementation, Agricultural and horticultural commodities, Training, Organisation building, Facilitation of partnerships, Research, monitoring and evaluation.</li> </ul>
2) African Centre for Biosafety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Advocacy and Awareness, Agriculture and Food Security, Environment, Skills Development</li> <li>Increase the capacity of civil society on the continent in order to contribute towards the protection of biodiversity, biosafety, food sovereignty, sustainable agriculture; and To contribute to the creation and implementation of comprehensive and stringent biosafety policies, legislation and procedures on the African continent and in so doing, oppose commercialisation of GM crops in Africa specifically, and the application of transgenic technologies, generally.</li> </ul>
3) AgriAids	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Advocacy and Awareness, Agriculture and Food Security, HIV/AIDS, Skills</li> </ul>

Organisation	Profile
	<p>Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribute to a more healthy and productive agricultural workforce and an increased corporate social responsibility (CSR) within the agricultural sector of South Africa, by implementing HIV/Aids programmes within the agricultural sector</li> <li>Empower farm workers to be responsible for their own wellness, through implementing HIV and other life improving programmes on farms and farming communities</li> </ul>
4) Agricultural and Rural Development Research Institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Economic Development, Education, Research, Monitoring and Evaluation</li> <li>Promote sustainable community development through specialized research and collaboration with other stakeholders</li> </ul>
5) Association for Rural Advancement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Land, Legal Services, Rural Development</li> <li>Work with black rural people in KwaZulu-Natal whose land and development rights have been undermined, whose tenure is insecure and who do not have sufficient access to land and resources to fulfil their developmental aspirations or basic needs</li> </ul>
6) Buhle Farmers' Academy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Economic Development, Skills Development</li> <li>Equip new farmers to establish profitable farming businesses by enhancing skills and facilitating support resulting in economic growth and sustainable development and resource use in Africa</li> <li>Enable new and emerging farmers to establish themselves in viable farming businesses through effective skills training and support</li> </ul>
7) Enviro Solutions Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Arts and Culture, Children, Environment, HIV/AIDS, Poverty</li> <li>Support the development of environmental solutions that are financially viable, sustainable and accessible to everyone</li> <li>Environmental awareness; income generation strategies for no- and low- income households; promoting alternative systems (especially food gardens, alternative energy production, waste management and water saving systems), working towards a minimization of the use of resources</li> </ul>
8) Fairtrade Label South Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Advocacy and Awareness, Agriculture and Food Security, Rural Development, Labour</li> <li>Alleviate rural poverty and to empower small-scale farmers as well as disadvantaged workers primarily in Africa by creating market opportunities for and increasing sales of Fairtrade labelled products in South Africa</li> </ul>
9) Food and Trees for Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Advocacy and Awareness, Agriculture and Food Security, Environment, Poverty</li> <li>Work in partnership with government, the private and public sectors and civil society to improve the quality of life and environments for all communities of the country</li> <li>Greening, environmental awareness and education towards happier people on a healthier planet</li> </ul>
10) Foodbank - Johannesburg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Poverty, Welfare and Social Development</li> <li>Food Rescue, Food Procurement Food Distribution, Community Development to promote development and not dependency</li> <li>School feeding programme</li> </ul>
11) Grassland Society of Southern Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Education, Environment, Research</li> <li>Advancing ecology and management of African rangelands and pastures in a changing world by publishing research, annual congress, facilitating the translation of science into policy and practice, developing human capacity to study and manage rangelands and pastures, assisting decision makers to understand the links between ecosystem services, global change, sustainability and human wellbeing</li> </ul>
12) NEPAD Business Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Democracy and Governance, Economic Development, Infrastructure, Networking, Poverty</li> <li>Deliver on the NEPAD ideals which are to alleviate poverty, to halt the marginalisation of Africa in the globalisation process and to fully integrate Africa into the global economy. This will be done through the delivery of sustainable projects for the benefit of the African people and the prosperity of the African continent</li> </ul>
13) Noah Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Children, Early Childhood Development, Welfare and Social Development</li> <li>Empower communities with the knowledge, skills, strategies, and self- confidence to do successfully run their own community-based organisations supporting the well-being of vulnerable children</li> </ul>
14) RULIV (Rural and Urban Living)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Strengthening, Democracy and Governance, Rural Development</li> </ul>

Organisation	Profile
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build expertise in the development and management of participatory agricultural and socio-economic development projects, including managing natural resources, providing strategic skills to assist municipalities and local development agencies to better implement and manage their community and economic development projects</li> </ul>
15) Umthathi Training Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in Agriculture and Food Security, Arts and Culture, Children, Policy, Rural Development, Skills Development</li> <li>Enable sustainable health by providing an integrated programme of capacity-building training and developmental education, in sustainable organic food production methods, health &amp; nutrition education, income generation and to contribute to conservation by enhancing biodiversity</li> </ul>
16) Valley Trust (The)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Development, Education, Health, HIVAids, Human Rights, Land, Research, Skills Development</li> <li>HIV and AIDS Integrated School Community Development (ISCD) Umndeni Care Programme (UCP) Economic Security Programme Izingane Zethu Intervention (IZI) Land and Plant Use Programme Leadership and Management Capacity Development Programme</li> </ul>

### *NGOs focussing on rural development*

Organisation	Profile
1) Africa Co-operative Action Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocacy and Awareness, Entrepreneurship, Environment, Rural Development, Women</li> <li>Design and implement training and mentoring programmes aimed at equipping people to be sustainable in every aspect of their lives and to influence, motivate and assist others to achieve the same</li> <li>Sustainable Agriculture Entrepreneurial Development Mainstreaming: HIV and AIDS Partnership Programme ABET and training modules development</li> </ul>
2) Association for Water and Rural Development (AWARD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and test new and appropriate ways of managing water to address issues of water security in the catchment, both through wise resource management and equitable allocation</li> <li>Award coordinated guidelines for the development of catchment management strategies in South Africa; Understanding And Monitoring Changes In Wetland Health. (AWARD's Work In The Craigieburn Wetland Recognises The Integral Links Between Wetland Health And Peoples' Livelihoods); Public Participation through Catchment Management Forums And Anthol Rainwater Harvesting Project which is completed. PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN (PACAM) – (AWARD is developing an awareness raising and support programme that prepares different user groups for participation in catchment management processes); LoGo WIP (Local Government – Water Information Project). (AWARD encourages integration amongst institutions and planning frameworks, as well as community involvement).</li> </ul>
3) Bergzicht Training Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early Childhood Development, Rural Development, Skills Development, Urban Development</li> <li>Empower unemployed and/or semi-skilled people with accredited, innovative and affordable learning opportunities, to empower them to start their own business, or to secure living-wage employment for them through an in-house employment bureau</li> </ul>
4) Biowatch South Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocacy and Awareness, Economic Development, Environment, International Relations, Poverty, Research, Rural Development</li> <li>Prevent biological diversity from being privatised for corporate gain. We aspire to an environment where people control their food supply systems, where the benefits from commercial use of biological resources are fairly shared and where ordinary citizens are encouraged to help make policy choices about new technologies, such as, genetic modification. We are working towards a future where there is no hunger, where there is social justice and where our land, water and air is protected.</li> <li>Seed saving and food security with emerging farmers Sustainable agriculture and access to markets with emerging farmers Research in policy, seed security and Genetic Engineering Media and Information Policy, Lobbying and Advocacy and Awareness, Economic Development, Rural Development Advocacy</li> </ul>
5) Border Rural Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocate for enhanced resource flows into the former homelands. Manage and facilitate processes of pro-poor development. Achieve policy impact to extend and replicate the benefits of project successes.</li> <li>The organisation will deliver this work through a value-driven and balanced institutional approach that seeks to: Maximise accountability to communities. Ensure a high level of service through utilising various mechanisms for delivery (staff, partnerships and</li> </ul>

Organisation	Profile
	<p>outsourcing). Harness the capacities of civil society.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Realise a critical partnership with government.</li> </ul>
6) Built Environment Support Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocacy and Awareness, Economic Development, Environment, Housing, Rural Development, Urban Development</li> <li>Support the poor and vulnerable to access resources and increasingly gain control over their lives and destinies, through the promotion of sustainable livelihoods and habitable environments, achieving basic socio-economic rights and capacitating local government, with added emphasis on small rural towns</li> </ul>
7) Bulungula Incubator (The)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education, Entrepreneurship, Health, Rural Development, Skills Development</li> <li>Agent in the creation of vibrant, sustainable, rural communities. We aim to achieve this through partnering with the Nqileni Community, other NGO's and innovative thinkers to find synergies between the traditional rural African lifestyle and culture, and external technologies and innovations.</li> </ul>
8) CALEB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education, Gender, Human Rights, Rural Development, Women</li> <li>See that women and young women on farms enjoy their rights as enshrined in our constitution and are respected and treated with dignity. Young people on farms who are empowered, healthy, goal directed, valued and engaged in their communities</li> </ul>
9) Centre for Rural Legal Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocacy and Awareness, Land, Rural Development</li> <li>Independent policy development body dedicated to the equitable distribution of power and resources in the rural areas of South Africa</li> </ul>
10) Community Law and Rural Development Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocacy and Awareness, Justice, Legal Services, Rural Development</li> <li>Create self-sufficient communities through enhancing rural communities' capacity to understand and pursue human rights, access to justice and democratic values as enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa to advance their socio-economic and justice aspirations for improved quality of life</li> </ul>
11) Connect Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic Development, Entrepreneurship, Information Communication Technology (ICT), Networking, Rural Development</li> <li>Make ICT available to rural Africa and use it to facilitate the efficient and effective delivery of public and private sector services that all people have a right to</li> </ul>
12) Environmental Monitoring Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocacy and Awareness, Environment, Research, Rural Development</li> <li>Climate Change Fair Trade Rural Development Water and Climate Change</li> </ul>
13) Hand in Hand South Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poverty, Rural Development, Skills Development, Urban Development, Welfare and Social Development</li> <li>Reduce poverty amongst the underprivileged with the focus of income generation through capacity building and empowerment of mainly women and youth in rural and peri-urban areas</li> </ul>
14) Ithuteng Dipuo Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arts and Culture, Children, Education, Poverty, Rural Development, Sport and Recreation, Youth</li> <li>Alleviate poverty in the rural areas by providing educational material, numeracy skills as well as constructive support to teachers who have limited excess to available material</li> <li>Improve poverty, health and social development</li> <li>Support sport development by cultivating awareness towards sport among the youth to become active in sport</li> <li>Enhance community development</li> <li>Establish a solid foundation for sport awareness and sufficient coaches within the previously disadvantaged communities in order to track down potential talent which was overlooked until now</li> </ul>
15) Nkuzi Development Association - Polokwane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocacy and Awareness, HIV/AIDS, Human Rights, Land, Networking, Policy, Research, Rural Development, Skills Development</li> <li>Enable and support marginalised rural and peri-urban communities in exercising their land and related rights</li> <li>Facilitate the acquisition of land and its productive and sustainable use</li> </ul>
16) Phakamani Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entrepreneurship, Poverty, Rural Development, Women</li> <li>Empower poor women entrepreneurs to succeed at micro-enterprise, so they can create income, savings, and hope for the next generation. We provide an integrated programme of training, micro-loans (no collateral required), and on-going support.</li> </ul>
17) Rural Action Committee - Mpumalanga (The)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human Rights, Land, Rural Development</li> <li>Works with disadvantaged rural and peri-urban communities to promote human rights, tenure rights and sustainable development in Mpumalanga</li> <li>Farm Dweller Support Programme: providing para-legal and legal support to farm dwellers threatened with evictions Human Rights Awareness and Intervention Programme provides</li> </ul>

Organisation	Profile
	information, networking and direct support in cases of human rights abuse Sustainable Livelihoods Programme provides project planning, capacity building and project management support to select rural communities As a sub-programme TRAC-MP provides project planning, capacity building and project management support to selected rural communities The Mpumalanga Mentorship Lead Programme provides post transfer support to land reform beneficiaries.
18) Rural Legal Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy and Awareness, Human Rights, Land, Legal Services, Rural Development</li> <li>• People From Farms Fora/ Forums (PF3s): Establishment, development and supporting provincial and local organising of Farm workers, farm dwellers, labour tenants and the evicted to advance their security of tenure</li> <li>• Provision of Legal Services for People From Farms</li> <li>• Monitoring of Public Service provision</li> <li>• Lobbying</li> </ul>
19) SaveAct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy and Awareness, Health, HIV/AIDS, Rural Development, Skills Development, Women</li> <li>• Promoting Savings and Credit Groups as effective instruments for accessing financial services, building sustainable livelihoods, and empowering women and other vulnerable groups</li> </ul>
20) Sinamandla	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children, Economic Development, Rural Development, Women</li> <li>• Self-help Group (SHG) Programme: Sinamandla assists, capacitates and supports local South African non-profit and community-based organisations to promote self-reliance as a central concept within development networks and practices in local communities</li> </ul>
21) Siyakhula Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education, Rural Development, Skills Development</li> <li>• Assist community leaders, CBOs, NPOs and government officials develop skills so that they can efficiently initiate and manage development and job creation projects to the benefit of the communities they serve</li> </ul>
22) Transkei Land Service Organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy and Awareness, Agriculture and Food Security, Gender, Land, Rural Development</li> <li>• Knowledge based contribution to land reform, support equitable access to land by rural communities, support the development of institutional capacity of rural communities, render effective, efficient and accountable service delivery in land and agrarian reform, facilitate sustainable productive use of land to improve livelihoods of communities, develop innovative and sustainable models of land use practices</li> <li>• Land agrarian reform programmes Land use planning comprises rural livelihoods and land care Gender (women on land, policy advocacy, HIV/AIDS OVC's) Local economic development</li> </ul>
23) Umthathi Training Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agriculture and Food Security, Arts and Culture, Children, Policy, Rural Development, Skills Development</li> <li>• Enable sustainable health by providing an integrated programme of capacity-building training and developmental education, in sustainable organic food production methods, health &amp; nutrition education, income generation and to contribute to conservation by enhancing biodiversity</li> <li>• Agriculture Programme Community Development Programme Schools Garden Programme</li> </ul>

### *NGOs Focusing on land issues*

Organisation	Profile
1) Association for Rural Advancement	See Agricultural NGOs
2) Centre for Rural Legal Studies	See Rural Development NGOs
3) Development Action Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing, Land, Research, Urban Development</li> <li>• Create, implement and support opportunities for community-centred settlement development and to advocate for and foster a pro-poor policy environment which addresses economic, social and spatial imbalance</li> </ul>
4) Inkezo Land Company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic Development, Entrepreneurship, Land</li> <li>• Sustainable sugar industry in South Africa ensured through diverse ownership of agricultural land under sugarcane by competent farmers</li> </ul>
5) Nkuzi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy and Awareness, HIV/AIDS, Human Rights, Land, Networking, Policy, Research,</li> </ul>

Organisation	Profile
Development Association - Polokwane	<p>Rural Development, Skills Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enable and support marginalised rural and peri-urban communities in exercising their land and related rights</li> <li>• Facilitate the acquisition of land and its productive and sustainable use</li> <li>• Advocacy and Farm dweller support Programme: to assist farm-workers to access their land and other human rights Land reform implementation: communities are assisted to acquire land and also assisted with funds and training to use the land productively HIV/AIDS Awareness: farm-workers and dwellers are educated about the HIV/AIDS pandemic Policy and Research Programme: A variety of land related phenomena are researched for the benefit of our client communities</li> </ul>
6) Rural Legal Trust	See Rural Development NGOs
7) Transkei Land Service Organisation	See Rural Development NGOs
8) Valley Trust (The)	See Agricultural NGOs
9) Vumelana Advisory Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding and Grant-Making, Land</li> <li>• Foster a successful land reform process in which newly enfranchised land owners are able to put their property to effective economic use and thereby: provide income and employment for their members; contribute to the development of their local economies; and ultimately enable more rural people to become more effective participants in more inclusive markets.</li> <li>• Procure the technical skills required to structure viable partnerships between local landowners and private investors in a manner that builds the long-term wealth of the communal property institutions supported.</li> <li>• Enable communal landowners and beneficiaries of the land reform process to conclude commercially viable transactions with private investors that have the financial capital and skills needed to make their land productive. Applications received are reviewed on a competitive basis to identify those with the best mix of need, potential commercial viability and capacity to honour their commitments.</li> </ul>
10) Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment, Housing, Land, Welfare and Social Development</li> <li>• No additional information available</li> </ul>

#### *Private agricultural (and related) consultants*

Company	Description
1) ABSi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AgriBusiness Systems international</li> </ul>
2) Advance Seed Euro Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A South African based agricultural farming, processing and trading organisation</li> </ul>
3) AFMA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Animal Feed Manufacturers Association</li> </ul>
4) Afri-Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A South African based group of agricultural consultants. Amongst other our fields of expertise include agricultural development</li> </ul>
5) AGFACTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information about agriculture and the agricultural machinery industry in South Africa</li> </ul>
6) AGIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Southern African Agricultural Geo-referenced Information System (AGIS)</li> </ul>
7) AGRA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An agricultural Co-operative and one of the main forces in the farming and agricultural sectors in Namibia</li> </ul>
8) Agri-IQ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural consulting, facilitation and management of farms</li> <li>• Agricultural capacity building</li> </ul>
9) Agri-spot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural consultants</li> </ul>
10) Agribrand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</li> </ul>
11) AgriBSA - Breedplan and Genestar South Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides Genestar and Breedplan solutions to the agricultural industry</li> </ul>
12) AgriBudget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A farm management and planning tool towards success</li> </ul>
13) Agricol Seeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A seed company involved in various divisions in this field. With an extended network of branches and agents all over South Africa.</li> </ul>
14) Agricon Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For independent professional agribusiness consulting, project feasibility, land and enterprise development and farm supervision in Central and Southern Africa</li> </ul>

<b>Company</b>	<b>Description</b>
15) Agrisearch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agricultural chemicals registration, consulting, agricultural research, crop trials, chemical trials, crop analysis, etc.</li> </ul>
16) Agro Organics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suppliers of agricultural systems that promote environmentally, socially and economically sound food production</li> </ul>
17) ARS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agri Risk Specialists, ARS, specialises in crop insurance and fulfills a leading role in the South African agriculture</li> </ul>
18) B&R VERSPREIDERS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</li> </ul>
19) BKB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>South African leader in wool and mohair auctions</li> </ul>
20) Centre for Agricultural Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vermicompost courses and sell compost worms</li> </ul>
21) Citrus Research International	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Serves to clarify the different roles that CRI plays within the Southern African citrus industry and should aid technology transfer between these parties</li> </ul>
22) Coastal Farmer's Homepage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supplies fertiliser, agro-chemicals, fuels, bulk animal feeds, hardware to the sugar farming industry and more recently to the private sector</li> </ul>
23) May Agri Solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</li> </ul>
24) Motheo Consultants and Project Management (Cc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</li> </ul>
25) NRM Consulting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Helps clients with strategic advice in natural resources management</li> </ul>
26) Potato Net	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</li> </ul>
27) Schoeman en Vennote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</li> </ul>
28) Tammac Consultants Agricultural Consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</li> </ul>
29) Wetland Consulting Services (Pty.) Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offers a specialised service in wetland and river consulting</li> </ul>

### *Banks*

<b>Company</b>	<b>Description</b>
1) ABSA	Financing, Risk analysis, Advisory services, Insurance, Hedging and trading, Joint Venture finance to developing agriculture where government instruments are applied
2) Standard Bank South Africa	Financing, Specialist agricultural economics services, managers and advisors, crop and input insurance and risk management through trading on Safex and portfolio management
3) First National Bank	Financing, insurance,
3) Land Bank	Full range of long, medium and short-term loans to meet all financial needs, including land and equipment purchases, asset improvement and production credit.