Preface

This review of South African extension trends has been prepared by Phuhlisani as background research to inform dialogue around the direction of public extension services for agriculture, forestry and fisheries in South Africa.

The review reflects on the changing understandings of the concept and purpose of agricultural extension and draws out key trends based on a review of the literature and an assessment of the changing approaches to extension pre and post 1994.

The research has been made possible by a grant awarded to Phuhlisani by the Ford Foundation to facilitate the development of a new and integrated national extension policy in partnership with the Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries and the Agricultural Research Council.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AET</td>
<td>Agricultural Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISP</td>
<td>Agricultural Input Support Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>African National Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>Agricultural Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDC</td>
<td>Agricultural Rural Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Animation Rurale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASGISA</td>
<td>Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Agricultural Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>Cape Institute for Agricultural Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRDP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Rural Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACLT</td>
<td>Department of Agricultural Credit and Land Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAEE</td>
<td>Division of Agricultural Education and Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAEM</td>
<td>Department of Agricultural Economics and Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAFF</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAMR</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture and Marketing Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAPE</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture and Production Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATS</td>
<td>Department of Agricultural Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBSA</td>
<td>Development Bank of Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>Department of Land Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOAF</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSCE</td>
<td>Division of Soil Conservation and Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Free State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSD</td>
<td>Farmer Support Development (Programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP</td>
<td>Farmer Support Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSRE</td>
<td>Farming System of Research and Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Gauteng Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>Human Development programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGDP</td>
<td>Integrated Growth and Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISRDS</td>
<td>Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARP</td>
<td>The Land and Agrarian Reform Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDA</td>
<td>Limpopo Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGDS</td>
<td>Limpopo Department of Growth and Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>Limpopo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRAD</td>
<td>Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEC</td>
<td>Member of the Executive Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPU</td>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSP</td>
<td>Medium Term Strategic Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFU</td>
<td>National Farmers Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDA</td>
<td>National Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCLASS</td>
<td>Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Producer Support Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDP</td>
<td>Reconstruction and Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIS</td>
<td>Revitalisation of smallholder irrigation schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULIV</td>
<td>Rural and Urban Livelihoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary
Toward establishing a policy framework within which services to farmers, and incentives for them, support wise decision-making about the use of resources for agricultural production, fishing and forestry.

1 Introduction

The Department of Agriculture, and Forestry and Fisheries (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. This report provides a summary review of the current situation obtaining regarding extension services in South Africa.

1.1 Key factors framing South African Agriculture

Both prior to and after the 1994 democratic elections, the dominant perception of South African agriculture has been one of duality. The farming community has been presented as generally divided into two broad categories: well-established and enfranchised large-scale farmers who farm almost exclusively for the market (most of whom are white and wealthy); and less formal, disenfranchised smaller-scale farmers who farm primarily for home consumption (the vast majority of which are black and materially poor). However, this narrative homogenises a much more complex reality with a great diversity of agricultural systems and people – a continuum of farmers and farming. Duality was politically entrenched and led to separate extension services for white and black farmers as a part of the pogrom against black peasant farmers ever advancing beyond surplus farming and State protection of white farmers and providing them with incentives to progress in farming. While it is important to remove the realities of this duality, duality should not be the mainspring for planning agricultural transformation, development and extension; the danger of focusing on duality as the problem limits the scope, range and nature of responses required to ensure that South African farmers and its agriculture advance equitably into the future.

Market regulation has also featured strongly in South African agriculture. It was a prime instrument to entrench power for the minority population. And deregulating the market has been one of the key strategies used by the post-1994 government to normalise agriculture.

However, deregulating markets had both positive and negative effects on the agricultural sector. It created uncertainty for control-dependent farmers and opportunities for entrepreneurial farmers. The net effect is that the industry is less dependent on the State and more internationally competitive. It has also led to fewer but larger commercial farms, which has implications for land reform programmes.

Sentiments around land and land ownership are one of the most significant factors driving the agricultural sector. There is substantial emotion attached to land and land ownership. In communities using communal land systems governed by rules of tribal custom, traditional leaders see their authority eroding. Communities displaced by the land laws of the previous governments are looking for compensation; many are not interested in farming and land allocations often result is collective farming activities. Established white farmers whose family have lived and work their land for generations also have a strong attachment to the land and feel threatened by the reform process.

1Adapted from ANC (1994)
Another reality impacting agriculture is that agriculture’s contribution to South Africa’s economy has declined to about 4%. Interest in agriculture as a career has also declined. The result is a tension between the socio-political aim to establish a healthy black farming community in an increasingly competitive environment that is shrinking in absolute numbers of farmers and limited in terms of the technical and economic viability of primary production in many parts of the country.

2 The context for extension

Three key factors frame the context within which Extension operates: farmers, agricultural production and economic factors.

Farmers: A farmer is anyone who is engaged in the primary production of food, fibre and/or fuel. There are approximately 2.2 million farming households working approximately 100 million hectares of formally identified farms and an unknown amount of land farmed at household level. Because farmers’ reasons and aims for farming vary, as do land size and other factors, rather than categorising farmers into labelled categories, it is more helpful to understand them according to a wider range of factors and the continua they represents as set out below.

Factors framing the characteristics of farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Nature of continuum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td>Status quo – Intentional change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Farmer as an innovator – Farmer as an an end user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land size</td>
<td>As a function of technology used in the context of economic viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary purpose</td>
<td>Household food consumption – Market-orientated/profit driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliance</td>
<td>Dependent on external support – Self-reliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-economic context</td>
<td>Tradition orientation – Market/Income orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production paradigm</td>
<td>Low external input (including organic) – High external input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology paradigm</td>
<td>Labour intensive/’Traditional’ technologies – Capital intensive mechanism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the 2.24 million farmers (and farming households) will land in a unique spot on the matrix framed by the above factors. It is within this dynamic context of farmers that extension services must be crafted – both strategically and tactically.

Agricultural Production: With regard to land use, only 14% (14 million hectares) can sustain crop production, of which 1.35 million hectares is irrigated. The remaining 86% (86.5 million hectares) is used for extensive grazing, forestry and nature conservation. The so-called commercial (white) farmers occupy almost 87% of South Africa’s 100.6 million hectares and produce more than 95% of marketed output. The balance of the agricultural land is occupied by smallholder (black) farmers – concentrated primarily in the erstwhile homelands. There are three main sectors of agricultural production in South Africa: field crop production (about 33% of total agricultural output), livestock production (40%) and horticulture (including fruits and vegetables) (27%).

Economic factors: Since the time of controlled agricultural markets, the government has greatly relaxed such controls and there is, de jure, generally more equitable access to markets. However, de facto, the opening of markets has not meant that those disconnected from markets are now connected. The established marketing systems within South African agriculture are well entrenched and still dominated by the white farming community who have the advantage of location, history and experience. The black farming community is generally more remote from markets, has less volume to sell, is less organised, less skilled and less experienced in agricultural business management.
Extension, then, must operate in highly varied contexts where agricultural production is hemmed in by limitations of land and climate, and by historical imbalances of land distribution and ownership leading to inequitable access to agricultural markets and other economic infrastructure. Thus extension must be flexible, agile and resourceful in its efforts to engage a wide range of farmers in conversation about matters related to their farms and their future vision for them. And it must be structured so that it is in a position to respond at ground/farmer-level as well as contribute to national strategic goals for the sector.

3 Public Sector Agricultural Extension in South Africa

The main characteristic of public sector extension during the apartheid years is that there were separate extension services for each of the major population groups – resulting in 15 separate extension services. The ‘white’ extension service was well resourced and worked to expand their clients’ productivity and profitability. ‘Black’ extension services were underfunded, poorly managed and operated with politically motivated, rather than developmentally motivated objectives. Extension in these areas manifested primarily in two ways: state-funded, capital intensive, estate-style production projects that focused on production; and betterment planning which essentially involved enforced land-use planning, fencing and the provision of limited infrastructure with the primary aim being to ease State administration of homelands through consolidating residential, arable and grazing areas. Betterment planning disrupted economic and social patterns with long-term adverse effects.

By the mid 1980s, thinking around homeland extension changed. In 1987, the Farmer Support Programme (FSP) was introduced as an alternative to the large capital-intensive schemes with the hope of developing the capacity of black farmers – targeting smallholder farmers in the homeland areas. While more developmentally aligned, in most cases the extension services did not have the resources and capacity needed to implement FSP effectively.

These ‘failed’ approaches to support agriculture among the majority populations led to a plethora of problems that were deeply entrenched in the homeland areas and lives of the farming families there. They became materially poor (with average incomes at half those of the national average for black households) and economically dependent on the white-controlled ‘urban’ economy. In some areas up to 75% of the employable males work outside the district and did so on a semi-permanent basis.

By the end of the apartheid era, the agricultural landscape had changed dramatically. There were fewer market controls in place. Commercial farming was being forced to take cost cutting measures and to further mechanise their farms. Displaced farm workers and their families put even greater pressure on rural agricultural land. Cash-economy related poverty was entrenched among the vast majority of black smallholder farmers. Although under stress, the white commercial farming sector still held the advantage and had the greater capacity and facility to operate in the more demanding and competitive environment created by the new policy dispensation.

3.1 Policy setting for extension

For the incoming government, agriculture and land featured prominently in its reform agenda. However, the new government inherited an agricultural economy, industry and landscape characterised by the declining importance of the sector in the economy, declining profitability of farming (in the face of market deregulation, discontinuation of subsidies, and increasing labour costs), strong emotions around land rights, a resurgence of and movement to re-legitimise ‘traditional’ agricultural values (including indigenous knowledge), a disparate agricultural support system separated not only by race, but housed in several different public structures (mostly in the homelands) each with its own focus, and resistance to change and accommodation between the
dominant minority and the newly-hopeful previously-disadvantaged majority who were largely disconnected from the practical and economic infrastructure required to engage in profitable farming.

Within this muddled and murky environment, the new State worked to establish coherence and a more equitable and coordinated agricultural sector. A key underpinning to the policy framework for agriculture that has evolved since 1994 is the positioning of agriculture in the Constitution; national strategic policy is a National competency, whereas implementation and operations are Provincial competencies. While this puts decision-making closer to the farmer, it also creates disparities in priorities and budgets.

A second major policy factor in the provision of support to farmers and the transformation of the agricultural sector has been the uncertainty about the political and governmental structural relationships among the departments of agriculture, rural development and land affairs. Integral to this are the issues and functions related to food security, sustainable livelihoods, agricultural education and training, and nature/wildlife/biodiversity conservation. The lack of a coherent and coordinated approach to these seven areas of operation – all of which touch on primary agriculture and impact on extension – has served to cloud and confuse provision of support to farmers and farming communities. There are, for example, clear disconnections between land reform and post-settlement support to beneficiaries and between allocation processes and agricultural planning processes for the same land.

Agricultural, Rural Development and Land Reform policy are interrelated factors impacting on extension options. While each is afforded an important space at policy level, policy largely addresses public structuring and funding, and provides general frameworks, but does not clearly articulate what is expected nor how development actually occurs and how it can be fostered at the coal face (e.g. at the level of the extension worker and other implementing agents on the ground). What is presented is often a list of well-worded and well-intentioned ideals to be realised through projects that do not address whole issues.

**Agricultural Policy:** Since the publication of the White Paper on Agriculture in 1995, numerous Acts, policies, and strategies have been developed and implemented at both National and Provincial levels with the primary intent of redressing the disparities inherited from the past and to foster equitable access to all South Africans, with a particular emphasis on previously marginalised smallholder black farmers. Key policies are discussed below.

- **Strategy for South African Agriculture (SSAA) (2001):** The base strategy that brings together the varied concerns about the agricultural sector and the changes that need to be effected to fulfil the intentions of the State to transform the sector to one characterised by greater unification and participation, equitable access and participation strategy, global competitiveness and profitability, and sustainable resource management. The strategy does not present an operational plan for its implementation, but does provide a set of operating principles.

- **The Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP):** Launched in 2003, CASP mobilised State funds to provide post-settlement support to selected land reform beneficiaries. Support comprises information and technology management, technical and advisory assistance, and regulatory services, marketing and business development, training and capacity building, on/off farm infrastructure and product inputs and financial support – all aimed primarily at strengthening rural economies, households and farm enterprises. CASP has been criticised for poorly coordinated implementation and limited impact. CASP is still operational and commands significant budgets; R1,1 billion in 2011/12 and R1,7 billion for 2012/13 and a projected R1,4 billion for 2013/14.

- **The Land and Agrarian Reform Project (LARP):** LARP was launched in 2008 to accelerate the rate of land reform through creating synergy through a one-stop-shop service system. LARP
has generally not been able to achieve its aims – in part because CASP (the source of funds) did not align itself with LARP, and in part that it did not effectively engage extension support.

- **Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry: Integrated Growth and Development Plan (IGDP):** In 2009, national agriculture was reorganised into the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry with the view of bringing these three sectors under common support. A result of this was the IGDP, which replaces the Strategic Plan for South African Agriculture published in 2001. It opens a portal for potential progress in that the Department openly admits that it is the beginning of a work in progress and entertains the idea of very ‘low level’ development workers who are specifically trained and deployed with a clear and focused mission at village or local level.

Tracing the essential aspects of the array of agricultural and related policy brings to the fore a number of critical themes which impact on extension policy, practice and deployment and management. Key among these is that agricultural support (in policy and practice) has essentially shifted from supporting large-scale (white) commercial farmers in a controlled market and subsidised environment to supporting black smallholder farmers in a free-market system and subsidy-free environment with the aim of assisting the latter to become commercial farmers. What has been lacking is effective implementation – through extension – on the ground.

**Rural development policy:** Rural development policy follows a similar trajectory as agricultural policy. A brief summary follows.

- **Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Strategy (ISRDS):** Launched in 2000. This policy sought to integrate service delivery policy and operations at local level to deal with the multi-dimensional nature of poverty – and in specific with land ownership issues. The strategy was not funded per se, but was to mobilise, coordinate and integrate existing State budgets. The operational period was 2000-2010 – during which time significant advances in rural development were to have been achieved. The ISRDS has been replaced by the CRDP.

- **Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP):** Launched in 2009. While still emphasising land ownership, the CRDP centres more on agrarian reform aiming at vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities. The chief vehicle is “a rapid and fundamental change in the relations (systems and patterns of ownership and control) of land, livestock and community”. A key element of the overall programme is training and job creation at the local level. An element of this is the training and deploying of “para-development specialists at ward level who will be equipped to train and mentor selected community members who are unemployed” – in effect, rural development workers not unlike agricultural extension workers. These people will be temporarily employed. The introduction of this concept for rural development is worth considering within the extension delivery framework.

**Land reform:** Land reform is one of the central features of the new democratic State. It drives a significant amount of the policy and operational issues that create the context within which agricultural extension operates. Substantial portions of public funds have been devoted to land reform. Policy stems from the White Paper on Land Reform Policy through to various Acts (and amendments) meant to find a mechanism to redressing the skewed, biased and race-based land ownership pattern that still obtain in most of South Africa. The Land Reform Programme consists of three main components: Land redistribution; Restitution of land unjustly taken from people and communities; and Land tenure reform. Progress in land reform has been slow and the target of transferring 30% of the land to black ownership is many years away from being realised. Land reform has been further beset with inadequate post-settlement support and has been criticised for resulting in transferred land remaining unproductive.

### 3.2 Extension policy
The trajectory of extension in South Africa follows that of the agricultural sector. The entrenched paradigm of a dualistic agriculture was echoed in the extension structures that were created to ‘support’ their respective (dual) farming clients. As noted earlier, when the new government came to power 1994, there were 15 different extension services in the country. There was little or no ‘good practice’. Development theories applied to extension were founded on the flawed social engineering ideologies and extension projects were driven by the primacy given to management and control and dominated by a paradigm of economies of scale. The extension approaches and methods employed were largely unchanged from the 1940s and 1950s. They were centred on transferring technology to maximise yields, managing production and controlling resources. Being cut off from the rest of the world afforded the country little opportunity to explore new avenues or modes of extension. As a result the majority of land users in South Africa remained poor, operated with limited resources and limited access to infrastructure, and disconnected from input and product markets.

National-level extension support: The aim of the new government was to “establish a policy framework within which services to farmers, and incentives for them, support wise decision-making about the use of resources for agricultural production”. Extension was deemed to be pivotal and critical to realising the aims of transforming agriculture and ensuring that previously excluded farmers were positioned to be fully engaged in the agricultural value-chain. This would be achieved through farmer-driven, people-centred methods, effective service delivery that gave more power and greater equality to rural people and build on their knowledge and work with them to find locally acceptable and sustainable solutions. It was anticipated that community agricultural facilitators would be deployed to provide advice.

As extension operations are a provincial competency, the National Department of Agriculture sets policy and determines funding, but the individual provinces have wide latitude in setting operational strategies and allocating resources. Translating policy into practical operational service delivery that fills those aims has proven illusive.

In terms of budgets, extension is rarely listed as a cost centre. It is generally included in a wider expense area called, in most cases, ‘Farmer Support’. Included in the budgets are funds for extension operations as well as for food security and farmer settlement. Approximately R4,86 billion has estimates for the current 2012/13 financial year which amounts to nearly. However, there are wide disparities in fund allocations to provinces.

On a national scale, it is evident that extension has not had the impact intended. This is due to the vast numbers of people requiring assistance, the relatively few and inadequately trained and resourced extension workers, the misguided and budget-consuming effort to force ‘carbon-copy’ commercialisation of so-called ‘subsistence’ and ‘emerging’ farmers, and the failure to appreciate that the desired transformation is a difficult and labour-intensive process that requires staying the course over a long period of time.

Aware of the limitations of the extension service, the National Department of Agriculture instituted a number of bolstering initiatives. They published norms and standards for extension to guide the training, deployment and management of extension workers and for the range and purpose of work they should undertake. This led to the Extension Recovery Programme which was intended to revitalise the extension service – in large measure through additional training and education.

### 3.3 National structuring for extension support

DAFF has four operational divisions one of which is Food Security and Agrarian Reform under which extension resorts in the form of National Extension Support Services. This unit provides national extension policies, norms and standards on the transfer of technology. It provides strategic leadership and guidance for the planning, coordination and implementation of
extension and advisory services in the sector which is operationalised through the nine provincial Departments of Agriculture.

### 3.4 The Provinces

Each of South Africa’s nine provinces has a Department responsible for Agricultural Extension. The names vary depending on the scope of the work assigned to the relevant Member of Executive Committee (MEC), the range of concerns and priorities and the clustering of service sectors.

Each province has configured its extension service somewhat differently and many have undergone numerous reorganisations and restructuring. While written policy appears to give precedence to extension, extension posts appear to attract lower post gradings and lower salary packages than their counterpart scientists housed in research. A common complaint from extension workers is lack of resources (especially operational funds, e.g. transport) to do their work, lack of clarity about their mission, and lack of motivation due to poor leadership and poor career advancement opportunities.

At last count (2007) there were 2210 extension workers allocated at shown in the table below. There are considerably more extension personnel in provinces which contain the erstwhile homelands where the vast majority of population targeted by extension policy reside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Extension Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC*</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN*</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIM*</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPU</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2210</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reviewing the structures and policy statements of the Provincial Departments of Agriculture, it is noted that the language and terms used to describe and define the work of these departments are inconsistent. While each Province has an extension service, that service is often housed within a programme or unit that does not immediately suggest the core function is extension. Only Free State and Western Cape have units that carry the name or term ‘extension’. The table below gives an indication of the range and array of terms used to describe and ‘label’ the work carried out by the Provincial Departments of Agriculture. The table is not meant to be definitive and is compiled solely from the information presented above. It is included simply to demonstrate the lack of coherence and ‘searching’ for meaning in the work being carried out.

Descriptors used to identify structures housing provincial extension services
The rationale for the choice of terms used to describe extension in its service delivery structure is implicit in the documentation reviewed. One clarion point is that the Provincial Departments of Agriculture view extension as something more than merely sharing information and technology. They appear also to see agriculture in the wider context of rural development. Some (like North West) have specifically mentioned (and put a structure in place to support) agri-business.

There appears also an indication that the primary focus is on economically poor, resource-constrained land users (farmers), but in a mostly implicit (but occasionally explicit) paradigm that the ultimate objective is reaching the ‘status’ a nebulously defined ‘commercial farmer’. It clearly raises the debate over the primary objective of extension – particularly in the South African context and its particular history around land and agriculture.

4 Private sector extension

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 often manifests itself collectively and commodity-based agricultural support organisations are created. In South Africa there are numerous 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 rapid sweep of the landscape, presents three broad ranges of private (non-public sector) extension: commodity-based organisations, private consulting companies and NGOs.
Commodity-based organisations: Thirty-three commodity-based organisations were reviewed. There is consistency of policy or activity regarding extension (or extension-like) mandates and functions. However, most do have some level of farmer information service; some have prioritised training. Some deliberately target new entrants and smaller scale producers. Others appear to have more protection motivated agendas. The notable exception is the South African Sugar Association and its subsidiary Sugar Research Institute (SARI) the latter of which has a well established and experience extension unit that works specifically with black small-scale cane growers.

Private consulting companies: Twenty-nine private agricultural consulting agencies were identified in this review. It is clear that there are many more – some with local service footprints and others with national and even international footprints. The scope of their work is less defined, but the review clearly illustrates the vastness of this potential resource for partnerships in extension. There are companies offering services in every aspect of agriculture including research, input supply, planning, marketing, technical and business advice, irrigation design, and post-harvest services.

NGOs: South Africa has a long history of NGOs offering advice, support and other services to farmers and rural communities. Many of these were originally associated with anti-apartheid efforts. Others are connected to religious organisations. Still others are private trusts created to fulfil a perceived need. They can be broadly grouped into three areas:

- NGOs dedicated to agriculture
- NGOs dedicated rural development
- NGOs dedicated to land issues

Sixteen agricultural NGOs, 23 rural development NGOs and 10 land NGOs were identified in the review conducted. Their interests range from relief, to projects to sustainability-driving programmes. They work primarily among the rural poor; some have local mandates, others have national mandates. Some work on the ground, others also focus on policy change.

5 Other potential extension partners

Other potential extension partners include state-funded agricultural agencies, organised agriculture, universities, universities of technology and agricultural colleges. The tables that follow provide a brief overview of these institutions.

State-funded agencies: Chief among the potential state-funded partners is the Agricultural Research Council which, heretofore, has focussed on research for ‘commercial’ agriculture, but which has more recently begun working with small-scale and disenfranchised farmers.

Organised agriculture: Essentially there are two main agencies: Agri-SA and the National Farmers Union (NAFU), which represent South African farmers, the latter predominately black smallholder farmers. In both cases, these institutions lobby on behalf of their members and offer information and, in the case of NAFU, offer training.

Universities: 10 South African universities have agricultural education and research programme; three (3) have dedicated programmes in extension.
Universities and their respective agricultural qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Diploma (3-yr)</th>
<th>BSc (3-yr)</th>
<th>B Agric (3-yr)</th>
<th>Extension Degree</th>
<th>BScAgric (4-yr)</th>
<th>Honours</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hare</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo* (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zululand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Have programmes dedicated to Extension  (1) Extension offered at Masters and PhD only

Universities of Technology: The following five (5) universities of technology offer qualifications in agricultural production and/or agricultural management including Diploma (3-year), Bachelor of Technology (1-year post diploma), Master of Technology, and Doctor 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: There are 12 agricultural colleges. Of these nine (9) offer production related three-year diplomas in agriculture. Only the Cape Institute for Agricultural Training (CIAT) offers a named extension diploma. Cedara and CIAT 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.

6 Agricultural education and training

Beyond the potential of higher education institutions as partners in extension provision, these institutions also impact on the extension potential of South Africa in that they offer the formal qualifications that create the pool from which extension workers are recruited. Thus, it is crucial that these institutions be aligned to any new extension policy to ensure that the graduates are appropriately trained to deliver on the policy.

In 2005, the National Department of Agriculture (NDA) launched the National Education and Training Strategy for Agriculture and Rural Development in South Africa (known as the AET strategy). The strategy suggests that agricultural education and training is meant to include agricultural extension as an integral part of AET and identifies extension as a key competency and skill set needed to meet the demands of the agricultural development agenda as well as to integrate such issues as rural change, HIV/AIDS, and household livelihood systems. AET is meant
to be aligned with urgent challenges facing South African agriculture and to develop human resources for all levels of agriculture.

7 The Future of Agricultural Extension

As can be readily observed from the review of the myriad policies, the underlying aim of all government policy is to “bring the previously excluded black community into the mainstream economy.” It is the desire of the state that the majority of South African’s who have been excluded and who have been largely prevented from benefiting from the possibilities that the resources of the country create, be given a fair chance at prosperity. As complex as it is in the urban setting to achieve this, achieving it in the rural areas is even more daunting and requires greater breadth of vision, coordination of effort and harmonisation of action.

Government expects extension to be the primary vehicle for delivering on its agricultural agenda, but is aware that extension officers are not equipped to deliver on this agenda. There is also doubt that it would be practicable to hire sufficient numbers of capable extension workers. Further, it would require creative partnerships with other extension services providers and farmers to build the capacity of the extension service and personnel. It must be understood that land and agrarian reform programmes are complex and require a high degree of competency among implementing agencies – in particular: i) the capacity to administer land; and ii) the capacity to support the establishment of new farmers.

Land administration and extension needs to be decentralised so that services are within closer reach of the people who need them. This requires a commensurate strengthening of the capacity of local institutions (including the ground-level extension services) to respond to localised needs, issues and opportunities. Capacity is not merely training, but includes unfettered budgets and accompaniment. Similarly, ground-level institutions must have the capacity to facilitate the flow of funds, information and advice and to walk with farmers as their capacity is fostered.

7.1 Approaches to Agricultural Extension

Extension falls into four general approaches: linear, advisory, facilitation and learning. Linear models focus on transferring technology developed by researchers with extension officers being conduits to farmers on supply-led basis; farmers are not active partners in innovation, but ‘beneficiaries’. Advisory models are demand-led technology transfer where advice and support is provided when requested by farmers who are ‘beneficiaries’. Facilitation models are also demand-led, but stress the engagement between and amongst researchers, extension officers and farmers in the pursuit of knowledge/technology development. Rather than always developing the final technology, research develops principles of sustainable agriculture, and ‘curricula’ and tools for learning. Farmers engage as active partners in the process. Learning models are very similar to facilitation models, but are supply-led where extension takes active steps to build capacity among farmers to participate in the learning process and where the extension worker, the governance structure and the farmer are individually and collectively engaged in a reflection-based learning process characterised by investigation, application and service/sharing.

There is no one ‘correct’ approach. What is important is that the extension practitioner is reasonably well versed in each of the approaches and the methods they employ in practice. They need to know when which mode is appropriate for the farmer(s) with whom they are engaging. The choice is made, not on the basis of the extension practitioner’s preference, but based on what will most effectively position the farmer so that he is in command of the processes and factors that affect his farming operations and limit his choices.

Sustainable Livelihoods: Another facet to incorporate into the designing of extension is the Sustainable Livelihoods (SL) concept. Applying SL to extension can assist farmers in moving from merely escaping poverty to helping them build wealth by deliberately building on existing assets (including human capacity) to improve assets and reduce vulnerability.
**The extension carousel:** To facilitate the flexibility and agility needed by extension, requires that extension workers have knowledge and skills in technical production, farm management and farm business economics.

**Caveats:** Designing extension policy and preparing extension workers to implement it must take into account three key things:

- The social issues (many very prevalent in rural areas) that must be concurrently addressed (e.g. social (not just racial) divisions, illiteracy and low education levels, and HIV/AIDS.
- The practical, economic and social barriers to markets need also to be simultaneously removed.
- Agrarian reform and building capacity on the ground is slow process; there are no short cuts. It requires long-term vision, patience and sustained, persistent and deliberate action.

Extension policy that does not take account of these factors may well succeed initially, but will founder in the long run.
1 Introduction

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.

This report provides a review of the current situation obtaining relevant to extension services in South Africa. It will address extension as related to agriculture, fisheries and forestry. While extension only formally exists within the agricultural sector, support to producers and other elements of the fishery and forestry sectors is relevant in understanding the history of the growth these latter sectors and to the formulation of the an comprehensive extension strategy for the whole of the National Department and the relevant Provincial Departments.

1.1 Agriculture

South African agriculture (both historically and currently) is driven by a number of factors

- Duality
- The government’s approach to market regulation
- Sentiments around land ownership
- Agriculture’s declining contribution to the gross national product

Each factor is discussed briefly to provide a snapshot of broader landscape of South African agriculture to provide the setting for a more extensive discussion of South African extension.

1.1.1 Duality

Both prior to and after the 1994 democratic elections, South African agriculture has been characterised by its duality. The farming community is generally divided into two broad categories: well-established and enfranchised large-scale farmers who farm almost exclusively for the market (most of whom are white and wealthy); and less formal, disenfranchised smaller-scale farmers who farm primarily for home consumption (the vast majority of which are black and materially poor).

This duality was politically entrenched during the apartheid years when white farmers and black farmers were serviced by separate extension (and development) agencies with very distinctly separate agendas and support (both financial and otherwise) – delivered to black farmers through the erstwhile homelands and to white farmers though the central and provincial administrations. Duality was created through direct state intervention in the agricultural sector. Bundy (1988) adequately describes the pogrom against black peasant farmers ever advancing beyond surplus farming and State protection of white farmers and providing them with incentives to progress in farming.

This duality around land size, purpose of production, race, enfranchisement and economic wealth drives much of the agricultural policy adopted since 1994 – with the specific intention of eliminating this duality along all these fronts. Agricultural reform
includes such measures land reform and land redistribution, agricultural support programmes to disadvantaged farmers and their attending communities, and economic empowerment programmes at black farmers and black entrepreneurs along the value chain.

Thus, while the duality still holds true, since 1994, a number of black farmers have joined the ranks of the formerly exclusively white farming domain – particularly in sugar cane production, and to a lesser extent, fruit production. Similarly, a number black South Africans can be found managing post-harvest operations (particularly in cane and livestock).

1.1.2 The government’s approach to market regulation

The governments in power prior to 1994 regulated the agricultural market. Through the Marketing Act of 1937, the government controlled domestic agricultural markets and trade. This began to change in the 1980s and 1990s when the government reduced restrictions on the domestic agricultural market. Between 1994 and 1997 the government introduced wide-sweeping reforms through which domestic markets, foreign trade, and prices in the whole economy were liberalised. This began a shift to a market-orientation in agriculture including domestic markets, exports and imports. South African agriculture was forced to look more closely at economic viability and less about socio-political motives for farming.

Deregulating markets had a direct impact on the agricultural sector; for some it was a difficult period of transition. It created uncertainty among farmers who had long operated within a protected market. It also opened opportunities for entrepreneurial farmers and fostered greater efficiency both on the macro and farm-level. As noted by OECD (2006 policy review), “The net effect of these changes is that the South African agricultural industry has become less dependent on state support and internationally more competitive”.

Another impact was a rationalisation of the so-called commercial farming sector which generally led to fewer but larger commercial farms. This phenomenon had implications for the land reform programme and underscored the distance between the established and economically connected farms and the large number of less formal and largely economically disconnected so-called subsistence farmers. (OECD 2006 policy)

1.1.3 Sentiments around land ownership

Sentiments around land and land ownership are one of the most significant factors driving the agricultural sector. There is substantial emotion attached to land and land ownership. In communities using communal land systems governed by rules of tribal custom, traditional leaders see their authority eroding. Communities displaced by the land laws of the previous governments are looking for compensation; many are not interested in farming and land allocations often result is collective farming activities. Established white farmers whose family have lived and work their land for generations also have a strong attachment to the land and feel threatened by the reform process.

1.1.4 Agriculture’s declining contribution to the gross national product

As South Africa’s economy has diversified over the last several decades, the percentage contribution of agriculture to South Africa’s gross national product has declined to about
With this decline, interest in agriculture as a career has also declined. The result is a tension between the socio-political aim to establish a healthy black farming community in an increasingly competitive environment that is shrinking in absolute numbers of farmers and limited in terms of the technical and economic viability of primary production in many parts of the country.

### 1.2 The context for extension

The foregoing is the setting in which agricultural extension services operate. Beyond this, the specific parameters within which extension operates within the agricultural sector can be grouped into three key areas: farmers, agricultural production and economic factors. These factors provide a framework for analysing extension services and for exploring (and in practice determining) extension approaches and the capacity requirements of both the extension service as a whole and the various extension agents and their collaborators.

#### 1.2.1 Farmers

For the purpose of extension, a farmer is anyone who is engaged in the primary production of food, fibre and/or fuel. In South Africa, most farmers are land-based, but there is a growing number of farmers who produce using other methods such as hydroponics and pot-based production (particularly in more urban settings) who are generally left out of the statistical information available.

Categorisation of farmers is difficult (and often counterproductive) and varies depending on the determinants used. Clarity on this is critical for extension as it speaks to the underlying assumptions about the farmer and his or her intentions in the sector. The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry frequently groups farmers, as set out in the following diagram, using a framework of commercial, smallholder and households augmenting their food supply. It shows that there are approximately 3.14 million farming households in South Africa that operate on a known area of 96 million hectares of formally identified farms and an unknown amount of land farmed at household level. Other sources indicate that the total amount of agricultural land is 100.6 million hectares.

---

2Traditionally, extension has excluded agricultural processors who are not also primary producers. However, extension does have a connection to the value-chain on both the input and market sides of primary production. This will be discussed under economic factors.
Notwithstanding this foregoing categorisation, farmers produce for different reasons. Their reasons are not exclusively determined by the size of their land or the nature of access to it (e.g. purchased, land reform, permission to occupy). Irrespective of these factors, some farmers purely for profit running (or at least attempting to run) their farms as a business; others farm for a combination of household food consumption and income from marketing produce (with relative priorities for both); and some farm for purely household food consumption – whether as a primary source of food or to augment food acquired through other means. Livestock keeping introduces another dimension – ‘farming’ for social status; thus there are many livestock farmers who keep cattle and even small stock for predominantly cultural/social reasons and who consume and/or market their livestock as an exception.

Rather than categorising farmers, it is more helpful to extension to understand the matrix of continua within which farmers operate. The continua are generally as set out below.

* According to DBE between 1994 and 31 March 2011 there were 198,901 redistribution beneficiaries and 1,645,898 restitution beneficiaries in 337,000 households. Some restitution beneficiaries received financial compensation and not land. Overall no reliable data currently exists to determine how many beneficiaries/households are active on land transferred through the land reform programme.
Factors framing the characteristics of farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Nature of continuum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td>Status quo – Intentional change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Farmer as an innovator – Farmer as an end user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land size</td>
<td>As a function of technology used in the context of economic viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary purpose</td>
<td>Household food consumption – Market-orientated/profit driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliance</td>
<td>Dependent on external support – Self-reliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-economic context</td>
<td>Tradition orientation – Market/Income orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production paradigm</td>
<td>Low external input (including organic) – High external input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology paradigm</td>
<td>Labour intensive/’Traditional’ technologies – Capital intensive mechanisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the 2,240,000 farmers (and farming households) will land in a unique spot on the matrix framed by the above factors. It is within this dynamic context of farmers that extension services must be crafted – both strategically and tactically.

1.2.2 Agricultural production

Using the larger of the land estimates, South Africa has 100.6 million hectares of agricultural land. Only 14% (14 million hectares) receives sufficient rainfall to sustain arable production. The balance, approximately 86% (86.5 million hectares), is used for extensive grazing forestry and nature conservation. Of the 14 million hectares of the arable land, only 1.35 million hectares is irrigated, but it accounts for approximately one-third of South Africa’s total agricultural output (Abstract 2002).

The so-called commercial (white) farmers occupy almost 87% of South Africa’s 100.6 million hectares. They produce more than 95% of marketed output. The balance of the agricultural land is occupied by smallholder (black) farmers. They are concentrated primarily in the erstwhile homelands. (Kirsten & Vink 2003)

There are three main sectors of agricultural production in South Africa: field crop production (about 33% of total agricultural output), livestock production (40%) and horticulture (including fruits and vegetables) (27%). The OEDC (2006) agricultural policy review reports the following:

“Overall, agricultural production is well diversified. However, due to adverse regional conditions, farmers in some regions have little scope to diversify. The southern and western interior (semi-arid area) is only suitable for extensive livestock production (sheep, cattle). Intensive livestock farming (dairy, poultry and pork production) is practised in the arable areas of the country, generally closer to the major metropolitan markets or on the coast where access to imported feed is easier. The country is a net importer of meat, most imports being from the neighbouring Botswana and Namibia.”

1.2.3 Economic factors

As noted earlier, one of the key changes in agriculture has been the deregulation of agricultural markets. However, the opening of markets has not meant that those disconnected from markets are now connected. The established marketing systems
within South African agriculture are well entrenched and still dominated by the white farming community who have the advantage of location, history and experience.

The black farming community is generally more remote from markets, has less volume to sell, is less organised, less skilled and less experienced in agricultural business management.

Thus, primary agricultural production is hemmed in by limitations of land and climate, and by historical imbalances of land distribution and ownership leading to inequitable access to agricultural markets and other economic

The de facto situation regarding the economy and markets and the presumptions about farmers entrenched in the pre-democracy thinking influenced and coloured the approaches adopted for public sector agricultural extension to black farmers. As will be discussed in greater detail in the sections that follow, the state provided extension (and other farmer support) initially with a primacy on control. This shifted slightly to state-controlled farming projects. In the 1980s the concept of a Farmer Support Programme was initiated. All of these effectively failed to deliver any meaningful change in the condition of the farmers – including their living standards, their personal farming ability and the capacity of their farms.

2 Agricultural Extension

2.1 Origins

Worth (2009) notes the following:

Agriculture has long been an intricate part of South African life. Even in the face of agriculture’s declining contribution to South Africa’s GDP, it still remains a significant factor in the lives of many rural communities and families. Control of land and the economic value of agricultural production has been a central issue in the wider political history of South Africa. Much of the provision of service to agriculture focused on farmers producing for the market. A number of setbacks to agriculture, particularly with reference to access to land, finance and markets, were directly linked to fear on the part of the white community of any growing economic empowerment of the black community. Thus, agriculture was highly politicised (Bundy 1988, NDA 1998).

Agricultural Extension was formally established in 1924. However, prior to the 1950s the state was not generally engaged with planned agricultural development amongst South Africa’s indigenous population (NDA 1998). Settlers and missionaries used agriculture as one of the means of ‘civilising’ the country, including keeping African men at home to participate in church activities. As early as 1915 documentation records the introduction of the plough and other technologies such as crop rotation and plant spacing. Concern was raised that the local population should be trained in proper (Western) agriculture rather than be allowed to continue with traditional livelihoods and methods (Kingon 1915).

Bundy (1988) noted that the geopolitical entity of South Africa evolved in broad sweeps from indigenous governance, the arrival of European settlers, colonial governance, the Apartheid era, to the current democratic state. As this history unfolded, agriculture expanded in both the black and white communities. Tribal-based agriculture gave rise to peasant farming among the black communities; the white settlers pursued
commercial farming. Advances in agriculture in the black community were often met with increasingly restrictive measures designed to ensure that white farmers were the first beneficiaries of the agricultural capacity of the land and which lead to the general demise of black peasantry to sub-subsistence farming, farm labour and migrant labour to the service the white cash economy (Bundy 1988).

Once the basic structures of separate development and apartheid were in place, the state began formally providing support to black agriculturalists (in their reserved territories). As is noted by the NDA (1998) a parallel system of extension developed, one for commercial white farmers, and one for subsistence black farmers. This extended to the agricultural colleges and university agricultural faculties established in the first half of the 20th Century. Other policies limiting access by non-whites to education and economic infrastructure widened the divide between black and white producers.

Parastatal organisations to promote agricultural development emerged, particularly in the homelands. They largely pursued an agenda of commercialisation of smallholder farming based on state managed or state supported, capital intensive production schemes. In the homelands, these agencies worked in tandem with the homeland extension services. The agricultural parastatals were developed to compensate for the generally low level of skills among extension practitioners trained in the colleges, technikons and universities (Worth 1994; Machete 2004; DBSA 2005).

A review of stated mission statements of the various institutions in South Africa offering agricultural training indicates that the primary focus of training was to serve the interests of commercial agriculture. Universities trained in agricultural science and research. Colleges and technikons trained in practical agriculture. Issues of smallholder agriculture, food security, rural livelihoods, etc. do not feature on the agricultural educational agenda.

The National Department of Agriculture (NDA 1998) stated that Agricultural Extension needed reform. The NDA (1998) identified five key problems in the provision of Agricultural Extension to smallholder, black farmers (who lived primarily in the erstwhile homeland areas of South Africa):

- The low qualification of Agricultural Extension practitioners serving the homelands
- The difficulty of delivering service to these farmers due partly to the wide diversity of systems, needs and contexts they presented
- Poor communication within the extension service
- Lack of accountability to farmers
- Lack of vision and focus about the purpose and client

The framework for reforms (NDA 1998) covers six elements:

- Targeting: with smallholder farmers being the principal focus of government Agricultural Extension, with special emphasis on subsistence farmers food-deficit households
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- Accountability: including improving proximity of access, being responsive to farmers’ needs and a range of funding options including public-private partnerships
- Realigning the salary: operational budget ratio from 5:95 to 30:70
- Incentives: with a focus on rewarding performance which is subject to review
- Gender: addressing the fact that a significant proportion of the smallholder farmers are women and the fact that the majority of Agricultural Extension practitioners are male.

The NDA (1998) also indicated that reforms would be implemented through three areas of action relevant to the needs of smallholder and resource-constrained farmers:

- Improving research-extension links;
- Training and retraining of extension staff; and
- A new approach to the delivery of extension.

2.2 The Apartheid Era (1948-1994)

The National Party government inherited both a set of laws and an ethos that entrenched separation of agricultural systems not only along racial, but along cultural lines. This was later manifested in separate extension services for each of the cultural/language groups in the country. The more substantial of these were the white extension service, and the extension services in the more resourced homelands such as Bophuthatswana, Transkei, KwaZulu, and Kgangwane.

The presiding Marketing Act that put government in control of the markets had already been in force for ten years by the time the National Party came to power. Control was consolidated with the passage of the Marketing Act of 1968.

Building on this history, the apartheid government further entrenched separation. The creation of the homelands had two immediate impacts on extension: large numbers of people were allocated to a small amount of land thereby truncating the possibilities for expansion of farming activities beyond traditional homestead-based farming; and the pool of expertise in agriculture was diluted in a maze of separate administrations that did not interact in any meaningful way.

Kirsten and Vink (2003) explain that in the 1970s the “policy of subsidising the maize price effectively promoted overproduction and the ploughing up of unsuitable land. Agricultural policy in the period up to the late 1970s can thus be characterised as a combination of segregation of land ownership and a two-track approach to access to support services. This had a number of major effects on the farming sector as a whole. First, it resulted in extraordinary institutional duplication with attendant high fiscal cost. South Africa ended up with 14 Departments of Agriculture by 1984 and with internal barriers to trade in farm commodities through duplication of control over marketing. Second, it created ‘two agricultures’ which differed in access to land and support services, productivity, etc. Third, it created the anomaly of a country that regularly exported food ‘surpluses’ while most of the population lived well below minimum levels
of living. Fourth, there was much evidence of severe environmental damage to fragile
land resources in both the commercial farming areas and the homelands. Fifth, the
combination of subsidies and distorted prices led to high rates of growth in farmland
prices”. Sixth, the processes of forced removals and homeland consolidation created a
high level of uncertainty among individual farmers, both black and white, as to the
protection of existing property rights, with predictable economic consequences in some
of the ecologically most vulnerable parts of the country”.

As a part of the 14 Departments of Agriculture noted by Kirsten and Vink, extension
services were set up in the homelands – in each of these Departments of Agriculture.
Typically, such services were underfunded, poorly managed and operated with politically
motivated, rather than developmentally motivated objectives. Often these objectives
were pursued through state-funded, capital intensive, estate-style production projects
that focused on production (often under the guise of smallholder farmer development)
(Worth 1994).

This approach to agricultural development (and ultimately extension) was influenced by a
number of factors. One is the Tomlinson Commission of the 1950s which essentially
sought to improve agricultural productivity in the homelands through comprehensive
farmer support linked to economic incentives (van Zyl 1993). While initially ignored
because it gave too much economic capacity to the homelands, in the 1970s and 1980s
this concept was to drive much of the extension and development thinking in the
homelands. Creating economically viable units became the basis for setting up state-
managed projects (Worth 1994). The eventual application of the provisions of the
Commission led to the promotion of small-scale farming as a development strategy for
the homeland farmers; this gave rise to the “concept of an ‘economic unit’ farm size to
enable a rural household to produce a liveable income through full-time farming” (de
Villiers 2005).

Rejecting the Tomlinson Commission recommendations, rather than building capacity in
the homelands, the government opted to control and contain the homeland (and the
people residing there) and through this improve the welfare of the people. Rather than
using incentives for profitable, productive farming, emphasis was placed on a concept
developed in 1936, known as “betterment planning”. It essentially involved enforced
land-use planning, fencing and the provision of limited infrastructure. The aim of
betterment planning was to ease administration of these areas by the state through
consolidating residential, arable and grazing areas. The two main objectives or
imperatives were to select the best land for the various land uses (e.g. crops, grazing and
homesteads) and to introduce better land care practices (de Villiers 2005).

‘Betterment planning’ was an inflexible system that forced an entirely new way of living
clusters of homesteads, along hills or ridges, with their fields near rivers and streams
(De Wet, 1987). They grazed their cattle on the hills and in the forests, or further from
home. With “betterment” they changed to new fields and to new residential areas.”

Agriculturally, ‘betterment’ included fencing of grazing land, promoting contour
ploughing, planting woodlots, and culling cattle. It resulted in households having about
two hectares of arable land – too small to offer any real incentive to pursue farming as a
livelihood. A farmer was ‘appointed’ to ‘manage’ his allocated agricultural land; misuse of
that land could lead to a ‘farmer’ being ‘fired’ (i.e. forcibly removed) (de Villiers 2005).
Socially, it restructured housing patterns forcing the concentration of homesteads into planned villages. Not only did residents end up with smaller fields and gardens than they previously had, they also had to walk greater distances for fuel, water and thatching grass.

Despite targeted rural communities resisting the enforcement of betterment planning in the 1940s and 1950s, the practice continued and even found its way into post-apartheid agricultural planning.

A net result of betterment planning was that “Farming in the homelands…remained a subsistence type of production under resource-poor conditions (Kirsten et al, 1994) and little attention was paid to services supporting those in farming, while infrastructural and institutional support was restricted (van Rooyen & Nene, 1998)” (de Villiers 2005; 1-2).

Betterment planning, when later married to ‘economic units’ in farming, ultimately led to the project approach that was so popular in the homelands (and is currently being revisited).

More recent studies conducted by Mchunu (2008) and Salomon (2011) found that the betterment planning was a major contributor to the loss of traditional farming practices (particularly livestock management) and, contrary to popular belief among agricultural technocrats, one of the primary reasons for over-stocking, over-grazing and the apparent deterioration of grazing lands. However, betterment planning also remained a mainstay of agricultural development and extension throughout the homeland era.

It was into such an environment that the homeland extension services were born. Extension agents were trained to support this type of approach with its emphasis on pre-planned, technologically focused, managed (perhaps controlled) production that fed into a highly regulated market with fixed marketing channels, set market prices and entrenched preference given to white farmers. Extension workers were trained at the former ‘black’ agricultural colleges with varying levels of competence and deployed to the homeland services. Of their training, Ngomane (2011: 59) notes:

“... the racial-based training programs for extension practitioners in South Africa have greatly compromised the profession. In a nutshell, graduates from the homelands received low quality training, and served only subsistence smallholder farmers. Competent University graduates supported the commercial farmers. The combination of these factors, namely, segregation policies and curriculum content weaknesses has contributed somewhat to the negative perception of public extension in South Africa. It is these factors that helped intensify the criticism against extension in the country, which permeated even the government policy-making process.”

This racially/culturally separated and control-based approach to agricultural development (and by default, extension) and its concomitant training of extension agents continued in this fashion right through to the 1970s and 1980s.

During these two decades world events led the government to take actions that directly and indirectly affected the South Africa landscape. The economic situation in the 1970s and 1980s saw a significant increase in the rate of inflation that led to a distortion of prices and further fostered larger-scale production behaviour – reinforcing the position of the white farmers and reinforcing the project-farming mind-set in the homelands. It was
evident by the end of the 1980s that the whole agricultural sector had to be reformed (Kirsten & Vink 2003).

As intimated earlier, the pressure of ‘economic farming’ was augmented met with a commensurate emphasis on mechanisation in most facets of crop production, but especially in harvesting. There was increased pressure on food production in the homelands and tighter control over agricultural marketing affected by the 1968 Marketing Act (Kirsten & Vink 2003). The Act introduced a marketing system which was “a system of control for the movement, pricing, quality standards, selling and supply of a large volume of farm production, with a view to, amongst others, securing price stability and narrowing the gap between producer and consumer prices in South Africa” (Agricultural Digest 2005/2006). It effectively consolidated the government’s control over the markets. During this period there was a noticeable shift away from policies that supported or addressed smallholder (black) farmers in entering commercial agriculture (Kirsten & Vink 2003).

Further, during this period, there were a number of international and South African security scares which motivated the South African government to effect cuts in the agricultural budget from 1.5% to 0.6% of GDP in order to provide greater budgets for defence and education. Of note, however, is the fact that this decrease in budget reduced agricultural funds for white farmers, but increased agricultural budget allocations to the homelands (Kirsten & Vink 2003).

2.2.1 The Farmer Support Programme

The Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA) was established in 1983. In 1987 the DBSA introduced the Farmer Support Programme (FSP) as an alternative to the large capital-intensive schemes. It was introduced with the hope of finally attaining the heretofore- elusive objective of developing the capacity of black farmers. It targeted smallholder farmers in the homeland areas with the specific aim of dealing with the constraints faced by smallholder farmers in these areas ensuring that they had the same support services as had been afforded to white farmers (Kirsten & van Zyl, 1996). The overall 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;

Legal restrictions limiting black ownership of land outside the homelands limited the FSP to the homelands.
Extension services, demonstration and research; and
Training.

The introduction of the FSP was a break with the status quo thinking within the state-funded structures about the position, role and place of smallholder black farmers in the agricultural economy. It was a significant step in that it brought together issues of land use and productivity (Muller 1992). While originally it was anticipated that 500,000 farmers on 8 million hectares of land (including indebted land held by white farmers), eventually the programme estimated that it reached 55,000 people through 35 programmes before it was overtaken by the end of the homelands and their reintegration into the nine provinces emerging from the 1994 elections.

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 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 out-dated 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

In the evaluation of the FSP in 1993 it was noted that FSP strategy in the future might be determined by the demands of a land reform programme. However in the subsequent reorientation of the

Despite its shortcomings, the FSP proved to be a far less costly way to develop farmers and farming in the neglected black community when compared with settlement modules. An example of the relative costs is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Settlement models</th>
<th>Farmer Support Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>Dryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fixed cost per ha</td>
<td>25264</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual variable cost per ha</td>
<td>6063</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed cost per farmer</td>
<td>194533</td>
<td>80484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable cost per farmer</td>
<td>48685</td>
<td>6200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 The homelands

The political history of the South African homelands is relatively well documented. Their foundation and premise is well understood. And they carry with them justifiable highly emotive sentiments. However, beyond these sentiments lie some fundamental
assumptions that have influenced agricultural development and the way extension has been and continues to be both perceived and executed.

As previously noted, administrative control and physical ‘betterment planning’, was the focus of government intervention in homeland agriculture in the early 1970s (De Wet 1987). However, ‘betterment planning’ could not deliver any substantial improvement. This was in part due to precisely the reasons put forward by the Tomlinson Commission – that farmers would need economic incentives. It was also due to its “neglect of the social, cultural and political components of rural development” (van Zyl 1993). There was some improvement in the standard of living of homeland households, but it was limited to those able to access incomes through wages (often outside the homeland). The majority of households, however, became increasingly impoverished, as they could find neither jobs nor arable land (de Villiers 2005).

The absence of commercial farming in the homelands was officially (i.e. by the State) attributed to a lack of managerial and entrepreneurial ability among black farmers. This sentiment has persisted, notwithstanding abundant evidence to the contrary including some remarkable successes within the black community, throughout the pre-democratic period (Bundy 1988, Matsetela 1981, van Rooyen 1987). In fact, Bundy (1988) argued that it was precisely because of the successes of black farmers that the Colonial and apartheid governments introduced restrictive measures to make safe the way for white farmers.

The belief in the inability of black farmers coupled to the resource management focus of ‘betterment planning’ served to justify the use of public funds and institutions and external management to ‘develop’ agriculture, resulting in the previously mentioned large-scale centrally-managed projects with little or no farmer participation. In some cases these projects were recast into schemes to settle selected farmer workers as ‘project farmers’ still under the control of central management. Farmer settlement projects then became the flagship approach for developing agriculture in the late 1970s and early 1980s. While these projects did see increase production and productivity, they did not establish sustainable development processes (Van Rooyen et al 1987), and in some cases even cause a decline in the nutritional status of the families involved because food normally retained through the customary household food security system was sold as a part of the overall farm management system governing the project (Worth 2012). This latter point is indicative of the need for extension to take cognisance of the agricultural, family and cultural systems within which farmers farm in order to contextualise and make appropriate any interventions or engagements proposed.

By the 1980s it was evident that the project approach could not be sustained. The projects were too expensive to maintain and growing unpopular as the ‘farmer development’ aspect failed to deliver (Bembridge 1980, Worth 1994) largely owing to the de facto restrictions and limitations place on ‘project farmers’ by virtue of the centralised management arrangements that effectively made all significant farm management decisions (van Rooyen 1987).

Irrespective of how it came about, Nel and Binns (2000) highlight the following about the rural areas in the former homelands:

- Extensive rural areas are severely degraded;
• The primary sources of income are in fact from urban areas, namely migrant remittances and state old age pensions;
• In many rural areas, less than 1% of Blacks can be classified as full-time commercial farmers and only 10% of income is not derived from urban sources;
• Poverty levels in rural areas are considerably significantly higher than they are in urban areas;
• The average income of Black households in rural areas is half that of nationally aggregated Black household incomes;
• The percentage of households living in poverty in rural areas is, on average, three times higher than in urban areas;
• In some areas up to 75% of the employable males work outside the district and do so on a semi-permanent basis.

Beyond this, Nel and Binns (2000) argue through the policies of the pre-democracy government “forced the Black populace into a situation of dependence on white controlled capitalism and progressively entrenched their position as a servile proletariat”.

By the 1980s, the agricultural and related policy framework began fundamental changes. Initially much of this was sparked by changes in the wider South African economy to which agriculture was still a primary contributor. Vink (1993) catalogued the following influential changes that occurred within the still controlled market system:

• The South African financial sector was significantly liberalised in the late 1970s
• Liberalisation led to weakened exchange rates increased interest rates
• The reserve requirements for bank were changed to the extent that the Land Bank was no longer able to subsidise farmers’ interest rates
• The Reserve Bank’s use of interest rate policy forced interest rates to very high levels
• By the mid-1980s many of the laws limiting movement of labour were scrapped mobilising the heretofore shackled labour force

Specifically within the agricultural sector, Vink (1993) noted the following reforms in the 1980s:

• The elimination of restrictive registration of processors in the red meat industry;
• The abrogation of most controls on domestic marketing of deciduous and citrus fruit;
• The elimination of production quotas in the wine industry;
• The deregulation of the single channels for grain sorghum and leaf tobacco
• The proposed deregulation of the mohair and maize schemes; and
• The eventual abrogation control schemes in the banana, wool, egg and chicory industries.

This liberalisation restricted the capacity of Government to micro-manage the various elements of the agricultural sector.

The pressure of a freer market forced commercial farmers to be more competitive and to cut costs in order to remain profitable. Further, in the midst of these policy changes, the country experienced widespread drought in 1983/1984 which put further stress on commercial farms (in terms of maintaining profits) and on smallholder farmers in terms of producing food for their households.

Although less directly related to extension, changes in production systems on commercial farms effected in response to the liberalisation of markets and the loss of subsidies and controlled prices in the 1970s led to a reduction in the number of permanent and temporary farm workers (on commercial farms) from 1.6 million in 1970 to 600 000 in 2005. One knock-on effect for smallholder agriculture was that many of the workers who lost their full-time jobs were rural women who used this employment to supplement family income; their work was reduced to part-time seasonal work (SPP 2009).

Another knock-on impact was the displacement and eviction of the dismissed workers and their families from the commercial farms on which they had been resident. Over the first 10 years of the new South African democracy, over 2.5 million farm workers and their families were displaced from commercial farms – of which 1 million had been evicted (mostly without any legal process). Many of these families repatriated to their ‘homeland’ homesteads and to the peri-urban areas around nearby towns and cities (SPP 2009).

Thus by the end of the apartheid era, the agricultural landscape had changed dramatically. There were fewer market controls in place. Commercial farming was being forced to take cost cutting measures and to further mechanise their farms. Displaced farm workers and their families put even greater pressure on rural agricultural land. Cash-economy related poverty was entrenched among the vast majority of black smallholder farmers. Although under stress, the white commercial farming sector still held the advantage and had the greater capacity and facility to operate in the more demanding and competitive environment created by the new policy dispensation.
Also by this time, the image of agriculture, particularly among the young was negative and continued to decline. Kidane (2012) and Terrblanche (2008) both indicate that there is little interest in agriculture among the young and agricultural science as a high school subject has a very high failure rate.

2.4 The Democratic Era (1994 – present)

For the incoming democratically elected government, agriculture and its relationship to land featured prominently in its reform agenda. However, the new government inherited an agricultural economy, industry and landscape characterised by the declining importance of the sector in the economy, declining profitability of farming (in the face of market deregulation, discontinuation of subsidies, and increasing labour costs) strong emotions around land rights, a resurgence of and movement to re-legitimise ‘traditional’ agricultural values (including indigenous knowledge), a disparate agricultural support system separated not only by race, but housed in several different public structures (mostly in the homelands) each with its own focus, and resistance to change and accommodation between the dominant minority and the newly-hopeful previously-disadvantaged majority who were largely disconnected from the practical and economic infrastructure required to engage in profitable farming.

A report issued jointly in 2000 by the then National Department of Agriculture and Stats SA, documents the following conditions of the South African agriculture in 1996.

- 1.4 million households were engaged in subsistence or small-scale crop farming in the former homelands. Over 1 million of these cultivated areas of less than two hectares. (The average size of a commercial farm was approximately 1349 hectares.)
- Of the 2.2 million employed people in the former homelands, 823000 (37%) were subsistence farmers and 277000 were small-scale farmers who sold at
least some of their produce, or as farm workers employed on commercial farms.

- Some 902000 households owned livestock, 766 000 households owned chickens and 1.2 million households grew field crops. Very few had surpluses to sell. Seventy-five percent of those that did sell earned R200 or less from such sales. Among employed people in the ‘homeland’ provinces, Eastern Cape had the highest proportion of subsistence farmers (60%) followed by KwaZulu-Natal (56%), Free State (5%) and North West (4%).

- In the former homelands, more than three in every five subsistence farmers (64%) engaged their families’ assistance for farming activities.

- Pensions and remittances were the principal source of income for households containing only subsistence farmers; 43% of the households in which all employed members were subsistence farmers depended on pensions as their main source of income, and an additional 34% of such households depended on remittances.

- Subsistence farmers in the former homelands were predominantly female and 80% were between 20-59 years old.

- Women comprised the majority of subsistence farmers; in the Eastern Cape 64% were women.

In a similar vein, the agricultural workforce also presented challenges for the new government. The above-mentioned joint labour report documents the following conditions of the South African agricultural workforce in 1996.

- The agricultural labour force is more youthful than any other sector of the economy. Thirty-seven per cent of people employed in the agricultural sector were 15-29 years compared with 21% in mining, 22% in private households, 24% in electricity, gas and water and 24% in transport falling into this age category.

- Thirty-two per cent of the employed labour force in agriculture had received no schooling – the highest of all the major sectors. Even among people employed in private households (dominated by domestic workers), only 22% had no schooling.

- In all sectors except construction, a larger proportion of women compared with men were employed on a part-time basis. The proportion of women employed on a part-time basis in agriculture was the highest of all the sectors (19%).

- Elementary work and skilled agricultural work dominated the work opportunities available in agriculture. Only in private households was the proportion of elementary workers (90%) higher than in agriculture (58%). Only 3% of those employed in the agricultural sector fell into the highest occupation category (managers and professionals), compared with 41% in the finance sector and 56% in community and social services sector (including government).

The 2001 agricultural strategy describes the end of this period thus:
South African commercial agriculture has followed a more capital-intensive growth path, while significant agricultural resources (human and material) lie unused or underutilised in the former homeland areas. Both these phenomena have affected the income-earning potential of rural people. Further, the entrepreneurial abilities of Black farmers were suppressed, first by their exclusion from the commercial land market and then because commercially viable freehold farming was almost impossible in the former homeland areas. Employment opportunities in commercial agriculture were and still are largely limited to unskilled workers earning low wages, and a large share of total employment in commercial agriculture is of a seasonal and temporary nature only. Furthermore, this growth path has meant that upstream (input firms) and downstream (processors of food and fibre) industries relating to agriculture were stunted, therefore depriving rural people of economic opportunities.

Within this muddled and murky environment, the new state worked to establish coherence with a view of creating a more equitable and coordinated agricultural sector.

Agricultural policy

A key underpinning to the policy framework for agriculture is the positioning of agriculture in the Constitution where national strategic policy is a national competency and implementation and operations are provincial competencies. While this puts decision-making closer to the farmer, it also creates disparities in priorities and budgets.

A second major factor in the provision of support to farmers and the transformation of the agricultural sector has been the uncertainty about the political and governmental structural relationship among the departments of agriculture, rural development and land affairs. Integral to this are the issues and functions related to food security, sustainable livelihoods, agricultural education and training, and nature/wildlife/biodiversity conservation. The lack of a coherent and coordinated approach to these seven areas of operation – all of which touch on primary agriculture and impact extension – has served to cloud and confuse provision of support to farmers and farming communities. There are clear disconnections between land reform and post-settlement support to beneficiaries and between allocation processes and agricultural planning processes for the same land.

Since the publication of the White Paper on Agriculture in 1995, numerous Acts, policies, and strategies have been developed and implemented at both National and Provincial levels with the primary intent of redressing the disparities inherited from the past and to foster equitable access to all South Africans, with a particular emphasis on previously marginalised smallholder black farmers. The table below sets out the major policy changes introduced since the 1990s.

**Key agricultural policies by year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act/Policy/Strategy</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Key focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deregulation of agricultural marketing</td>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Included deregulation of marketing of agricultural products; abolishing pro-agriculture tax concessions; and trade policy reform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Laws Rationalisation and Amendment Act (51 of 1994)</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Rationalising various disparate laws relevant to forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act/Policy/Strategy</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Key focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| White Paper on Agriculture             | 1995 | Set a vision for agriculture: A highly efficient and economically viable market-directed farming sector, characterised by a wide range of farm sizes, which will be regarded as the economic and social pivot of rural South Africa and which will influence the rest of the economy and society.  
Gave a mission for agricultural policy: Ensure equitable access to agriculture and promote the contribution of agriculture to the development of all communities, society at large and the national economy, in order to enhance income, food security, employment and quality of life in a sustainable manner. |
| Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act (3 of 1996) | 1996 | To provide for security of tenure of labour tenants and those persons occupying or using land as a result of their association with labour tenants;  
To provide for the acquisition of land and rights in land by labour tenants |
| Marketing of Agricultural Products (47 of 1996) | 1996 | Abolished the agricultural marketing schemes established in terms of the 1968 Marketing Act  
Provided for the establishment of a National Marketing Council statutory levies, control of exports of agricultural products, records & returns, and registration – all subject to consultation  
Provides for the collection and dissemination of agricultural marketing information |
Set out goals to be pursued over a five-year time frame. The National Forest Act, 1998 (Act No. 84 of 1998) was promulgated to give effect to the provisions of the White Paper. A number of strategies and policies were subsequently developed. These include the following:  
National Forestry Action Programme and its reviews;  
Policy regarding access to State Forests;  
Compliance and Enforcement Policy;  
Draft Strategy Framework for Forestry Enterprise Development;  
Participatory Forest Management Policy and Strategy;  
Key Issue Paper for Policy on Transfer of State Owned Industrial Plantation;  
Woodland Strategy Framework;  
Urban Greening Strategy; and  
Forestry Sector Transformation Charter. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act/Policy/Strategy</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Key focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genetically Modified Organisms Act (15 of 1997)</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>To promote the responsible development, production, use and application of genetically modified organisms in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Paper on South African Land Policy</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Set out the vision and implementation strategy for South Africa’s land policy; a policy that is just, builds reconciliation and stability, contributes to economic growth, and bolsters household welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural discussion (&quot;Agricultural policy in South Africa&quot;) document</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Published to examine agriculture in the light of change in international trade arrangements, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Laws Rationalisation Act (72 of 1998)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>To provide for the rationalisation of certain laws relating to agricultural affairs that remained in force in various areas of the national territory of the Republic prior to the commencement of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa; and to provide for matters connected therewith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Living Resources Act f 1998)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>To provide for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the conservation of the marine ecosystem,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the long-term sustainable utilisation of marine living resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the orderly access to exploitation, utilisation and protection of certain marine living resources; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>provide for the exercise of control over marine living resources in a fair and equitable manner to the benefit of all the citizens of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creating protected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing for the protection of trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measures to control and remedy deforestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of a National Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishing fire danger rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Firebreaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire fighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offences and penalties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act/Policy/Strategy</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Key focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Act (36 of 1998)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Key changes impacting agriculture:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giving priority for water to human consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Termination of the riparian principle of water rights,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of an integrated catchment management system,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Termination of subsidised water prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onderstepoort Biological Products Incorporation (1999)</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>To provide for the establishment of a company to manage Onderstepoort Biological Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To build capacity in manufacturing technologies, infrastructure and the development of new products (primarily vaccines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Safety Act (40 of 2000)</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>To provide for measures to promote meat safety and the safety of animal products;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To establish and maintain essential national standards in respect of abattoirs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To regulate the importation and exportation of meat;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To establish meat safety schemes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Strategy</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>To attain socially cohesive an stable rural communities with viable institutions, sustainable economies and universal access to social amenities, able to attract and retain skilled and knowledgeable people, who equipped to contribute to growth and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To use and develop existing institutional, planning, management and funding mechanisms to focus the expenditure of government in the three spheres to more effectively and efficiently respond to needs and opportunities. It is not predicated on additional funding from government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act/Policy/Strategy</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Key focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Strategic Plan for South African Agriculture | 2001   | Framework for democratising agriculture focusing on equity, global competitiveness and sustainable resource management to achieve:  
Increased creation of wealth in agriculture and rural areas  
Increased sustainable employment  
Increased incomes and increased foreign exchange earnings  
Reduced poverty and inequalities in land and enterprise ownership  
Improved farming efficiency  
Improved national and household food security  
Stable and safe rural communities, reduced levels of crime and violence, and sustained rural development  
Improved investor confidence leading to increased domestic and foreign investment in agricultural activities and rural areas  
Pride and dignity in agriculture as an occupation and sector |
| Animal Health Act (7 of 2002) | 2002   | To provide for measures to promote animal health and to control animal diseases;  
To regulate the importation and exportation of animals;  
To establish animal health schemes |
| Animal Identification Act of 2002 | 2002   | Setting out the requirements for identifying animals (including branding) |
| Land and Agricultural Development Bank Act of 2002 | 2002   | Reformulating the Land Bank to comply with the aims and objectives of the new South African constitution  
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 service |
<p>| KwaZulu Cane Growers Association Act: Repeal Act of 2002 | 2002   | Repealing the KwaZulu Cane Growers Act |
| Farmer Settlement Programme | 2004*  | To provide post-settlement agricultural support to land reform beneficiaries (* dedicated funding from 2004) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act/Policy/Strategy</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Key focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>To provide post-settlement support to the targeted beneficiaries of land reform and to other producers who have acquired land through private means and are, for example, engaged in value-adding enterprises domestically or involved in export.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes: as for the 2001 strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Six priority areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information and technology management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical and advisory assistance, and regulatory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing and business development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training and capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On/off farm infrastructure and product inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The beneficiaries:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The hungry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsistence and household food producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural macro-systems within the consumer environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Strategy for Agricultural Education and Training (AET Strategy)</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Develop and maintain an effective and well-coordinated AET that is integrated at all levels and responds appropriately to South African Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance equitable access and meaningful participation in AET for all South Africans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure the application of effective quality assurance of AET at all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm and Standards for Agricultural Extension</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>To guide the provision of extension and advisory services to all spectra of clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To act as the guidelines for the implementation of Agricultural Advisory Service Programme across all provinces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry: Integrated Growth and Development Plan 2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Replaces the Strategic Plan for South African Agriculture, which was published in 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To provide a long-term strategy for the growth and development of South Africa’s agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors, so as to enable them to address key national priorities and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To develop a common vision encompassing all three sectors, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To develop an integrated implementation framework which allows common issues to be addressed in unison, and specific issues to be addressed in separate policies and strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Policy review

The discussion which follows on various policies that feed into developing an extension policy covers:

- Agricultural policy
- Rural Development
- Land Reform

While they are presented separately for the purpose of examination and exploration, the review of the policies presented show a considerable amount of overlap. This overlap highlights one of the difficulties being experienced in realising the very objectives of outlined in the white papers on agriculture and land reform. The over-riding sense is that policy addresses public structuring and funding, provides general frameworks but does not clearly articulate at the coal face (e.g. at the level of the extension worker and other implementing agents on the ground) what is expected nor how development actually occurs and how it can be fostered. What is presented is often a list of well-worded and well-intentioned ideals to be realised through projects that do not address whole issues.

The latest policy from DAFF (the Integrated Growth and Development Plan for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) opens a portal for potential progress in that the Department openly admits that it is the beginning of a work in progress and entertains the idea of very ‘low level’ development workers who are specifically trained and deployed with a clear and focused mission.

3.1 Agricultural policy

A key underpinning to the policy framework for agriculture is the positioning of agriculture in the Constitution where national strategic policy is a national competency and implementation and operations are provincial competencies. While this puts decision-making closer to the farmer – which is in line with principle of subsidiarity – it also creates disparities in priorities and budgets, as there remains little coherence of between the provinces even though they all follow the same general vision set Nationally.

A second major factor in the provision of support to farmers and the transformation of the agricultural sector has been the uncertainty about the political and governmental structural relationship among the departments (functions) of agriculture, rural development and land affairs (land reform). Integral to this are the issues and functions related to food security, sustainable livelihoods, agricultural education and training, and nature/wildlife/biodiversity conservation. The lack of a coherent and coordinated approach to these seven areas of operation – all of which touch on primary agriculture and impact extension – has served to cloud and confuse provision of support to farmers and farming communities. There are clear disconnections between land reform and post-settlement support to beneficiaries and between allocation processes and agricultural planning processes for the same land. An attempt to resolve this is captured in the Integrated Growth and Development Plan for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry published just this year. The IGDP is discussed at the end of this sub-section.
Since the publication of the White Paper on Agriculture in 1995, numerous Acts, policies, and strategies have been developed and implemented at both National and Provincial levels with the primary intent of redressing the disparities inherited from the past and to foster equitable access to all South Africans, with a particular emphasis on previously marginalised smallholder black farmers. The most critical of these are captured in the table above.

Tracing the essential aspects of the array of agricultural and related policy brings to the fore a number of critical themes which impact on extension policy, practice and deployment and management.

A key factor is that agricultural support has essentially shifted from support to large-scale (white) commercial farmers in a controlled market and subsidised environment to support for black smallholder farmers in a free-market system and subsidy-free environment with the aim of assisting the latter to become commercial farmers (SPP 2009).

Of particular concern is that each review made of progress in agricultural development and transformation and rural wealth creation results in what appears to be a new strategy that, while reiterating the imperatives, highlighting the critical objectives and putting in place initiatives and mechanisms meant to fast-track expenditure and to overcome the national-provincial policy-operations divide.

The following sets out the range of agricultural policy as it has evolved since publishing the White Paper on Agriculture.

### 3.1.1 Strategy for South African Agriculture (SSAA) (2001)

The SSAA is the based strategy that brings together the varied concerns about the agricultural sector and the changes that need to be effected to fulfil the intentions of the State to transform agriculture away from a dualistic systems dominated by a minority of white farmers and pre-production and post-harvest role-players in the value chain to one which genuinely allows for equitable participation by any interested South African in the agriculture industry. It is particularly concerned with ensuring that farmers on smallholdings and who are largely disenfranchised from the mainstream of the agricultural value-chain are given both the opportunity and the capacity to participate (profitably) in the value-chain. The 2001 agricultural strategy highlights the following key concerns:

- Constrained global competitiveness and low profitability
- Skewed participation
- Low investor confidence in agriculture
- Inadequate, ineffective and inefficient support and delivery mechanisms
- Poor and unsustainable management of natural resources

To address these issues three core strategies were identified:
• Equitable access and participation strategy
• Global competitiveness and profitability
• Sustainable resource management

**Equitable access and participation strategy:** This strategy includes land reform, access to support services and agricultural opportunities (maintaining support to large-scale farmers and introduction more effective support to “new” farmers with special attention being given to farmers on communal land. The following are also part of this aspect of the programme:

• Improved market access and removal of market barriers to new entrants
• Enhanced transfer of technology to new farmers through one-stop farmer support centres at local level
• Implement a human resource development plan, which includes young entrepreneurial development and mentorship projects
• Improved access to a comprehensive range of rural financial services via outreach and efficiency of rural finance institutions
• Improved focus, collaboration and coordination between government institutions, organised agriculture, nongovernment organisations and civic associations that are involved with farmer development programmes through forums at national, provincial and local level. Such forums could be used to identify needs and appropriate programmes that should receive priority, discuss and resolve problem areas with existing programmes, explore the need for incentives and public-private partnerships to improve the viability of programmes and to make inputs with respect to policies and policy instruments
• Improved ability and efficiency of the extension personnel within the private sector and Provincial Departments of Agriculture.

**Global competitiveness and profitability:** The aim of this strategy is to enhance profitability through sustained global competitiveness in the agricultural sector’s input supply, primary production, agro-processing, and agri-tourism industries.

**Sustainable resource management:** The objective of this strategy is to build capacity among farmers to use and manage resources (natural and otherwise) wisely and sustainably. The strategy highlights the fact that is “will require a long-term view with a clear vision and values that will guide the present use of resources to ensure their long-term supply” and understands that this will have to be incorporated into other programmes such as landcare and land redistribution. It is connected to issues around biodiversity conservation, and the use of sustainable farming systems.

The strategy does not present an operational plan for its implementation. Rather it provided a set of operating principles:

• Proper coordination among the various entities involved in implementation, including within and between the public, private and voluntary sectors
• Goal orientation among all these entities, to ensure that all are focused on achieving universal benefits, rather than merely sectional interests
• Capacity building at all levels, and in the many dimensions, ranging across the spectrum from advanced scientific knowledge to greater participation in project implementation at grassroots

• Sound planning of the implementation process to ensure that projects are started and completed at the right time, and to oversee coordination between the various entities and projects

• A proper sequencing of implementation actions with the necessary support actions (capacity building, institution building, planning, etc.)

• Monitoring of progress to ensure the proper management of the implementation process. This requires special attention to the provision of information and to management information systems as well as installing a monitoring and evaluation system.

The strategy proposed that an action plan would be developed in collaboration between the National Department of Agriculture and organised agriculture. From this a number of shorter-term strategic plans were drafted and implemented. However, having no ground-engaging mandate (that being a provincial competency), the National Department was limited largely to creating support structures within its own Ministry, creating policy, submitting bills, drafting Acts and mobilising funds. It has largely been in the combination of setting policy and mobilising funds that the National Department has been able to influence the achievement of the original objectives for the transformation of the agricultural sector. This is borne out by the following range of programmes and initiatives developed over the ensuing years.

### 3.1.2 The Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP)

In 2003 government reviewed state spending in the agricultural sector to identify cost drivers and spending pressures. It was concluded that there was insufficient provision made for farmer support within the agriculture budget.

Among the strategies devised to address this was creation of the comprehensive agricultural support programme (CASP). The aim of this programme is to provide post-settlement support to the targeted beneficiaries of land reform and to other producers who have acquired land through private means and are, for example, engaged in value-adding enterprises domestically or involved in export.

The programme addresses six priority areas:

- Information and technology management
- Technical and advisory assistance, and regulatory services
- Marketing and business development
- Training and capacity building
- On/off farm infrastructure and product inputs
- Financial support
Its anticipated expected outcomes are:

- Increased creation of wealth in agriculture and rural areas
- Increased sustainable employment
- Increased incomes and increased foreign exchange earnings
- Reduces poverty and inequalities in land and enterprise ownership
- Improved farming efficiency
- Improved national and household food security
- Stable and safe rural communities, reduces levels of crime and violence, and sustainable rural development
- Improved investor confidence, leading to increased domestic and foreign investment
- Pride and dignity in agriculture as an occupation and sector

Its designated beneficiaries are identified as:

- The hungry
- Subsistence and household food producers
- Farmers
- Agricultural macro-systems within the consumer environment

One of the intended mainstays of the programme was the provision of grants to communities – subject to conditions such as community involvement and ownership, funding is for appropriate agricultural activities that lead to employment opportunities. The grants were meant to complement provincial farmer support budgets. As a part of the process, norms and standards were created for inputs, activities, participation, client reactions, knowledge gain, attitudinal change, practice adoption or behaviour change, and impacts on social, economic and environment. On record are norms and standards for infrastructure and marketing.

The Surplus Peoples Project (SPP) was critical of CASP which was meant to provide a package of support to newly settled farmers. They argue that CASP was not synchronised with LRAD and focused only on infrastructure, and therefore was not comprehensive (SPP 2009). Similarly, a review of the South African experience with emerging farmers by the FAO (2010) notes:

“The Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) was introduced in 2003 to address the lack of after-care support, even though initial evaluation of this programme showed that the resources that were made available were primarily (75 percent of the budget) used for infrastructure development (Lebert et al., 2007). The Mentorship Programme was recently introduced to address the need of newly established farmers for specific technical expertise and know-how of the workings of particular commodity chains in which they seek to become involved. Many of the measures introduced by the State have increased the cost per reform beneficiary; therefore, achieving more desirable outcomes is of public importance.”
**CASP Budget allocations per province (R’000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>2004/5&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2005/6&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2006/7&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2007/8&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2008/9</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2011/12&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2012/13&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>67132</td>
<td>63409</td>
<td>63459</td>
<td>100975</td>
<td>111301</td>
<td>160760</td>
<td>175225</td>
<td>195198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>35261</td>
<td>97285</td>
<td>35887</td>
<td>69917</td>
<td>47975</td>
<td>61514</td>
<td>64754</td>
<td>106372</td>
<td>194382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>6367</td>
<td>7727</td>
<td>22921</td>
<td>22921</td>
<td>28928</td>
<td>33844</td>
<td>42187</td>
<td>44060</td>
<td>48016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>37016</td>
<td>46270</td>
<td>55524</td>
<td>68301</td>
<td>100545</td>
<td>117762</td>
<td>135804</td>
<td>164691</td>
<td>183726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>73072</td>
<td>139716</td>
<td>101860</td>
<td>175723</td>
<td>221832</td>
<td>131196</td>
<td>172743</td>
<td>212076</td>
<td>264062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPU</td>
<td>21295</td>
<td>69476</td>
<td>51356</td>
<td>76534</td>
<td>53035</td>
<td>70067</td>
<td>72026</td>
<td>102932</td>
<td>114829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>43317</td>
<td>58986</td>
<td>45836</td>
<td>88436</td>
<td>82303</td>
<td>101724</td>
<td>102138</td>
<td>143054</td>
<td>424999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>40313</td>
<td>69556</td>
<td>69556</td>
<td>54895</td>
<td>78233</td>
<td>84685</td>
<td>112424</td>
<td>134112</td>
<td>155277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>35492</td>
<td>67979</td>
<td>34706</td>
<td>36696</td>
<td>49205</td>
<td>57598</td>
<td>63064</td>
<td>82346</td>
<td>91863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>292133</td>
<td>624127</td>
<td>481055</td>
<td>656882</td>
<td>763031</td>
<td>769691</td>
<td>925900</td>
<td>1165168</td>
<td>1672352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Consolidated Grants in which CASP allocations were included (usually as the major share)
<sup>2</sup> 2004-2010 figures are audited figures; 2010-2013 figures are estimates
<sup>3</sup> Totals are the sum of the annual allocations; there are significant variations between the provincial treasury records and the national treasury record for allocations to provinces

The National Treasury estimate for the aggregated CASP allocations to provinces for 2013/14 is R1366847

### 3.1.3 The Land and Agrarian Reform Project (LARP)

According to the LARP concept document (NDA 2008) stated that “The Land and Agrarian Reform Project (LARP) provides a new Framework for delivery and collaboration on land reform and agricultural support to accelerate the rate and sustainability of transformation through aligned and joint action by all involved stakeholders. It creates a delivery paradigm for agricultural and other support services based upon the concept of ‘One-Stop Shop’ service centres located close to farming and rural beneficiaries.”

LARP’s objectives were to:

1. Redistribute 5 million hectares of white-owned agricultural land to 10 000 new agricultural producers
2. Increase Black entrepreneurs in the agribusiness industry by 10%.
3. Provide universal access to agricultural support services to the target groups.
4. Increase agricultural production by 10-15% for the target groups, under the LETSEMA-ILIMA Campaign.
5. Increase agricultural trade by 10-15% for the target groups.

The motivation was stated as follows: “By redistributing land, increasing tenure security and black entrepreneurship, improving access to support services, and increasing production and trade, LARP will directly contribute to the overall goals of the Agricultural Sector Plan, namely participation, global competitiveness and sustainability, and to the White Paper on South African Land Policy” (NDA 2008).

The project concept also indicated that side-by-side with integrating land and agricultural services, there was an equal need for “a comprehensive approach that addresses the
entire spectrum of social and physical needs of farm and rural dwellers is required in planning and implementation of land reform, agrarian and rural projects”.

Thus it was argued that in order to achieve the success of emerging farmers, would require “a comprehensive approach with all services inclusively considered at the planning stage and serviced in an integrated manner at the local level”. It was with this in mind that LARP was created. It would provide integrated planning and a one-stop local delivery framework.

The NDA acknowledged that CASP had focused mainly on infrastructure and training and that it had not yet addressed the support needs identified in LARP. In response to this funding arrangements were amended to ensure a comprehensive agricultural support programme that will address the LARP universal access priority.

Among the role-players identified to ensure delivery, LARP note the “crucial role to be played by extension in the provision of support services and the implementation of the universal access pillar of LARP”. The NDA (2008) argued that, “South Africa has approximately one-third of the required number of extension officers to meet its development targets and that 80% of the current extension staff are not adequately trained”. This gave rise to the Extension Recovery Plan.

LARP is a project (not a programme). It was designed to create momentum and demonstrate possibilities. Specifically, it would “identify opportunities for 2-3 key commodities for each province, linking agricultural production, processing activities, input suppliers, consumer interests and local and international markets” (NDA 2008).

To achieve this integrated approach would “require strengthening the role of extension services and training in these areas and linkages to commodity organizations”. It was with this in mind that LARP would facilitate “alignment and coordination agricultural support services available at national, provincial and local level and in the private sector” through a “One-Stop Shop concept”. These shops were to comprise “service delivery and information centres close to the beneficiaries where initially all financing options and services, both grants and loans, private and public, will be made available to new farmers and where a farm business planning service can be accessed” (NDA 2008).

Notwithstanding its intentions, there has been substantial confusion around the implementation of LARP. The uncertainty centred on whether LARP was meant replace land reform programmes and initiative (e.g. LRAD (see section on Land Reform)) or if was meant to run in parallel with existing programmes. Lahiff (2008:30) found that: “Given that LARP appears to have no budget of its own, and shares the targets already set for land reform in general, it seems, at best, to represent a new way of using existing resources”.

In a further critique, Lahiff indicated that it appears that LARP’s beneficiaries and outcomes are different from those of existing programmes (Wächter2008). Specifically, Lahiff states that this divergence occurs: “particularly with regard to the much greater size of landholdings envisaged (500 ha per beneficiary on average), compared to past performance” (2008:30). Ultimately, Lahiff concludes that: “LARP clearly has no means of influencing the amount of land transferred as a result of successful restitution claims, and does not appear to contribute to the restitution programme in any way” (Lahiff 2008:30).
Lahiff (2008:35) raises a further concern that is both relevant and pertinent to extension. He stated:

“The relatively small numbers of beneficiaries targeted by the redistribution programme in general (60 000 by 2014) and by LARP in particular (10 000 over two years), together with the consistent emphasis on increased agricultural output for the market, clearly demonstrate that the main thrust of policy is directed towards those with the skills and resources to produce on a substantial scale. Despite the political rhetoric, there appears to be little understanding of the needs of relatively poor households, including farm dwellers, or specific measures to ensure that they adequately addressed. While many of the newer elements of redistribution policy, including area-based planning, have the potential to include poorer participants and contribute to poverty alleviation, experience to date suggests that this is unlikely to be achieved on a significant scale unless it is clearly prioritised at every stage of the process, with maximum participation by poor and marginalised groups.”

The implications for extension are evident.

3.1.4 Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry: Integrated Growth and Development Plan (IGDP)

In 2009, the State President announced a number of changes 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 (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.

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 new ministry represents the “strong affinity” these three sectors have with one another – particularly because they are natural resource based and rural. It is anticipated that the key interventions in the three sectors will “remain distinct”, but it is recognised that they share similar potential trajectories for transformation the effecting of which rests on a set of questions DAFF wants examined together:

- What is required to ensure that the respective growth paths become more inclusive?
- What should sectoral development look like?
- What market dynamics are at work in shaping these sectors, and how could we influence these to operate differently?
- How can growth be promoted without compromising the integrity of the underlying natural resource base?
- How can better care of the natural resource base promote stronger growth?
• How can policies and programmes be implemented more efficaciously for the common good while keeping an eye on the most vulnerable?

These questions are a useful framework for planning any operational activity within the agricultural sector – including the design of an extension policy and delivery structure.

The IGDP 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. According to the published document, this plan replaces the Strategic Plan for South African Agriculture published in 2001. Having said this, it is evident that this new plan echoes much of the 2001 strategy and as such it appears that the 2001 strategy can still be used as a reference point for issues related to the way forward for the agricultural sector in South Africa.

The agricultural aspect of the IGDP is predicated on the following position statement: “The importance of agriculture in the broader economic framework of South Africa must be re-emphasised, focussing in particular on:

• Ensuring national and household-level food security;
• The economic growth and development of agriculture; and
• Rural economic development”.

The primary aim of the IGDP 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. And 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 focus of IGDP is three-fold:

• Social wellbeing: characterised by “equity and transformation”;
• Economic growth: characterised by “equitable growth and competitiveness”; and
• Sustainability: characterised by “sustainable use of natural resources”

The key strategies identified are:

• Support to new and existing producers
• Access to markets
• Access to resources

The anticipated key outcomes are:

• Accelerated transformation of the sector
• Job creation within the sector
• Food Security – national and at household level
• Increased productivity – particularly on smallholder and subsistence producer farms
• Improve profitability and competitiveness – particularly of smallholder farms
• Improve natural resource management for greater resilience using ecosystem approach
• Integrated climate change strategies and early warning systems for natural disasters

In setting out the renewed plan, DAFF reiterates its perception of the types of producers who comprise its clients (beneficiaries); they identify three “distinct types”:

• Commercial farmers;
• Smallholder farmers; and
• Subsistence producers.

**Commercial farmers** are identified with the following characteristics:

• They number less than 40000;
• They are predominantly white;
• They occupy approximately 82 million hectares;
• The farms the run are primarily family businesses, but with a discernible trend towards adopting corporate farming (particularly in some subsectors); and
• They are responsible for more than 95% of South Africa’s formal marketed agricultural output

**Smallholder farmers** are identified with the following characteristics:

• They number approximately 200 000 (belonging to about 140 000 households);
• They are predominantly black; and
• Most are located in the former homeland areas of the country, residing on a total of about 14 million hectares of agricultural land which also accommodates most of the subsistence producers.

Without explanation, this new policy leaves out the “hungry” as a category of farmer as was included in the Norms and Standards for Extension and in the CASP documentation.

The IGDP notes that, “the agricultural conditions within the former homelands are complex” and that: “The impediments to fuller and more productive use of agricultural resources in the former homelands remain controversial”. Further details are not provided except to cite three factors:
• Infrastructure is poor;
• Land degradation is widespread; and
• Some areas have large amounts of underutilised good quality arable land

Subsistence producers are identified with the following characteristics:

• They consist of approximately 2 million households\(^4\) who practise agriculture mainly for purposes of own-consumption;
• The most common production system is gardening; and
• Few are, or seek to be, fully self-sufficient in food production, but use their production as a means of ensuring a basic level of nutrition or reducing household food costs (i.e. production supplements/substitutes some food purchases).

In presenting these characteristics, no information is presented about the current capacity of these farmers to engage effectively/efficiently at their current level of production.

The IGDP does comment on the value of production of the ‘smallholder farmers’ or ‘subsistence producers’ or of the trends in their numbers or the pressures affecting them (other than issues of economic disconnection, infrastructure, etc.).

The IGDP does, however, make the following observation about commercial farming in South Africa:

> “Since the mid-20th century, there has been a steady decline in the number of commercial farming units, resulting ultimately in a significant concentration of farm holdings. The process is complex, but among other things reflects the fact that as the South Africa economy has diversified, farming has become a relatively unattractive career choice, such that upon retirement many commercial farmers have no one to whom they can bequeath their farms. Despite the decrease in the number of farming units, output from commercial agriculture has continued to grow, implying an increase in the efficiency of production”.

In terms of support to the three categories of farmers identified, the IGDP notes that farmers of all categories “currently receive less support from the State than their counterparts in every industrialised country in the world”. These farmers’ competitiveness is further undermined subsidies offered to their farmers by South Africa’s agricultural trade partners. Using the Producer Support Estimate (PSE) as an indicator, South Africa currently falls considerably lower than the average calculated by OECD. While most so-called developed countries offer support on average equal to 1% of GDP, in South Africa support to farmers is only 0,6% (last calculated between 2005 and 2007). Prior to the reforms beginning in the 1970s, South Africa’s support to farmers

\(^4\) Note that the General Household Survey of 2011 indicates that there are 3.1 million black agriculturally active households. Data on the numbers of smallholder producers varies between different sources.
actually exceeded (in percentage terms) support offered to farmers in countries like the USA; since the 1980s the reverse is now true. With direct reference to extension services, the IDGP argues that, “Since 1994, State support has largely shifted away from the large-scale commercial farming subsector, in favour of smallholders and subsistence producers. However, due to the fact that the number of smallholders and subsistence producers is so vast relative to the extension corps, the actual support rendered to smallholders and subsistence producers has been patchy and generally inadequate”.

In response to the various issues faced by all categories of farmers – but with particular concern for the ‘smallholder farmers’ and ‘subsistence producers’ – DAFF’s IGDP has identified “need for improved support, and spending strategies, ensuring that government spending is a reflection of government policy and strategy for transformation”.

DAFF is confident that input support interventions targeting smallholders can boost production and food security.” They cite the example of Malawi’s Agricultural Input Support Programme (AISP), “which has raised yields across a large number of staple foods produced by smallholder farmers. Higher yields further enabled more households to withstand or cope with food price shocks”.

Further, DAFF specifically urges enforcing and compliance with various South African-specific transformation and reform policies and as has, thus, indicated that the IGDP will operate within the following South African-specific initiatives and frameworks:

- Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa (ASGISA);
- National Industrial Policy Framework;
- Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF);
- Market and trade policies;
- Land reform policy;
- Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP);
- Integrated Strategy on the Promotion of Entrepreneurship and Small Enterprises, 2005;
- Livelihoods Development Support Programme;
- Second Economy Strategy Project (SESP);
- Agricultural Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (AgriBEE); and
- Competition Act

DAFF argues that “in order to fast-track transformation within South Africa, systems and polices need to be put in place to enforce and ensure compliance amongst all parties”. DAFF will put pressure on the rest of the State systems to earnestly deliver on these as yet insufficiently implemented strategies.

Similarly, DAFF also plans to ensure that the IGDP operates within the following regional strategies:

- NEPAD and CAADP; and
- SADC trade protocol.
DAFF admits that the renewed strategy is the “beginning of a work in progress”. However, if this is the genuine position, then it speaks to a preparedness to be flexible. The implications for extension are extensive. Extension is the interface facility between policy and farmer. It is a human interface that will require a skill and knowledge set that is not currently the norm amongst extension practitioners of any educational qualification.

3.2 Rural development

In 2000 the government launched the Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Strategy. Rural development was viewed as a multi-dimensional issue. Seen as something more than merely poverty alleviation through social programmes and transfers, rural development was meant to “place emphasis on changing environments to enable the poor to earn more, invest in themselves and their communities and contribute toward maintenance of key infrastructure”. It was believed that “a successful strategy will make people less poor, rather then more comfortable in their poverty”.

Sustainability was seen to be “derived from increased local growth, and were rural people care about success and are able to access resources to keep the strategy going”. And integration was about “effective co-ordination across traditional sectors in all levels of government” (in contrast to it addressing the integrated nature of rural development).

The strategy notes that South African agriculture (as a primary/first-level sector of the economy) for the most part achieved its full potential “in such a distorted manner that large numbers of people were excluded from the benefits of modernization”.

It identifies a key deficiency in South African agriculture

South African commercial agriculture has followed a more capital-intensive growth path than should have been the case, and significant agricultural resources lie unused in the former homeland areas. Both of these phenomena have affected the income-earning potential of rural people. The entrepreneurial abilities of African farmers were suppressed, first in the rural areas in general by their exclusion from the commercial land market, and secondly in the former homeland areas where commercially viable farming became, by definition, almost impossible. Employment opportunities in commercial agriculture were (and still are) largely limited to unskilled workers and thus poorly paid, and more than half of total employment in commercial agriculture is of a seasonal and temporary nature only. Furthermore, this growth path has meant that upstream and downstream industries related to agriculture (input provision, processing of food and fibre) were stunted and urban-based, thus depriving rural people of further opportunities.

The strategy lands squarely on the issue of land ownership and access to natural resources by the majority of the rural population – and rightly argues that this and the skewed development of infrastructure have greatly increased the cost of living in rural areas.

In terms of strategic focus, agriculture is specifically identified as an important contributor to rural development, but it is expressly argued that while “natural resources will always be an important determining factor in rural development”, “agriculture need not be the only source of growth, and in many areas it will not be the most important”.
The strategy raises a critical point about the complexity and diversity of the rural population (even in its commonality of poverty and disconnection from infrastructure and services):

Overlaying these differences are a range of other variations including ecological and natural resources, human settlement patterns, language and cultural differences, lifestyle differences, the proximity or distance of large urban and industrial conglomerates, etc., all of which contribute to the intricacies of the rural picture. Furthermore, because of their poverty and vulnerability, rural households commonly resort to a variety of different strategies to ensure their survival so that it has become more appropriate to describe their economic activities as livelihood strategies rather than jobs or employment.

The government argued that “very little change in the plight of rural people on the ground has been realized” despite the best efforts of the state departments. And although policy speaks directly of the need for focus on rural development, “commitment appears to have lapsed when it came to funding allocations [for rural development] at local levels.” It is argued that most efforts “failed to achieve the desired synergy because they failed to design a mechanism for integration”.

Seeing integration as a delivery issue (as opposed to a development issue) led to the focus of the strategy to be on integrating services and programmes at the municipal level. Therefore the key elements of the strategy, for the most part, focus on mechanisms, decision-making, lines of responsibility and funding arrangements. It is further clear from explanations offered in the base document that it was intended to be project driven, based on project plans (developed using standardised documents, designs and unit costing) submitted to the state for funding (part grant, part loan); approved projects were to be supervised both during and after implementation.

The strategy was not funded per se, but was to mobilise, coordinate and integrate existing State budgets. The operational period was 2000-2010 – during which time significant advances in rural development were to have been achieved.

3.2.1 Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)

As noted earlier, in 2009 there was a major change in policy for rural development resulting in creating the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform under a single ministry. This reemphasised the sentiment expressed in the ISRDS that rural development was intimately linked to land reform. Although operating in a separate Ministry, the new rural development strategy was more squarely centred on agrarian reform. The new programme is called the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP).

In the new cast of CRDP, the new objective for rural development was (and is currently): Vibrant, Equitable and Sustainable Rural Communities with an over-arching goal of social cohesion and development. Its mission is to initiate, facilitate, coordinate, catalyse and implement an integrated rural development programme. And the strategy to be followed is “Agrarian transformation” which is specifically defined as “a rapid and fundamental change in the relations (systems and patterns of ownership and control) of land, livestock and community”.

The general pillars of the CRDP are:
• To roll out the CRDP to all rural municipalities;
• To improve productivity in land reform projects through effective implementation of the Recapitalization and Development Programme;
• To expedite the finalisation of land claims;
• To improve corporate governance and ensure enhanced service delivery;
• To implement proper change management and innovation strategies; and
• To enhance the efficiency of information management system

The “core clients” of the CRDP are:

• Rural Communities
• Landless and tenure insecure communities
• Emergent black farmers
• All spheres of government
• Users of spatial information
• Land owners
• Non governmental organizations
• Private Sector

In addition to specific operational targets, by 2014 the CRDP hopes to deliver:

• Increased access to and productive use of land by 2014;
• Improved access to affordable and diverse food by 2014;
• Improved rural service to support sustainable livelihoods by 2014; and
• Improved access to sustainable employment and skills development by 2014.

The philosophy underlying the CRDP strategy is first to develop a fresh approach to rural development. It is focused on enabling rural people to take control of their destiny, with the support from government, and thereby dealing effectively with rural poverty through the optimal use and management of natural resources.

It is intended that this will be achieved through a “co-ordinated and integrated broad-based agrarian transformation as well as the strategic investment in economic and social infrastructure that will benefit the entire rural communities”.

The indicator of success is “sustainable and vibrant rural communities succeeding throughout South Africa”.

The CRDP proposed a three-pronged strategy to realise its objective:

• Agrarian transformation
• Rural development
• Land Reform
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Agrarian transformation focuses on the following:

- Increased production and the optimal and sustainable use of natural resources including land, grass, trees, water, natural gases, mineral resources etc.;
- Livestock farming (cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, chickens, turkey, game, bees, fish, etc.), including the related value chain processes;
- Cropping (grain, vegetables, fruit, spices, medicines, etc.), including the related value chain processes;
- The establishment and strengthening of rural livelihoods for vibrant local economic development;
- The use of appropriate technology, modern approaches and indigenous knowledge systems; and
- Food security, dignity and an improved quality of life for each rural household.

Rural development focuses on the following:

- Improved economic infrastructure (both basic like roads, etc. and agricultural such as markets, shed, fencing, storage facilities, irrigation schemes, etc.):
- Improved social infrastructure (such as social mobilisation, savings clubs, improved educational facilities, strengthening of non-farming livelihood activities and democratising the process and improving social cohesion)

Land reform will focus on the following:

- Increasing the pace of land redistribution
- Increasing the pace of land tenure reform:
- Speeding up the settlement of outstanding land restitution claims:
- Effective support to all land reform programmes through land planning and information (this is ‘in-house’ support and does not include support to land beneficiaries)

A key element of the overall programme is training and job creation at the local level. An element of this is the training and deploying of “para-development specialists at ward level who will be equipped to train and mentor selected community members who are unemployed” – in effect, rural development workers not unlike agricultural extension workers. These people will be temporarily employed. The introduction of this concept for rural development is worth considering within the extension delivery framework.

3.3 Land reform

Land reform is, of course, one of the central features of the new democratic state. It drives a significant amount of the policy and operational issues that create the context within which agricultural extension operates. Substantial portions of public funds and
have been devoted to land reform. Policy stems from the White Paper on Land Reform Policy through to various Acts (and amendments) meant to find a mechanism to redressing the skewed, biased and race-based land ownership pattern that still obtain in most of South Africa.

The Land Reform Programme consists of three main components:

- Land redistribution;
- Restitution of land unjustly taken from people and communities; and
- Land tenure reform.

The purpose of land restitution is to restore land or provide compensation to people dispossessed of land rights through legislation enacted by earlier South African governments from 1913. The current South African Constitution provides the justification and framework for land reform. Land restitution operates under the following legislation:

- The Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act 22 of 1994), which provides for the restitution of land or the award of equitable redress to persons or communities dispossessed of land as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices; and
- The Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Act, 2003 (Act 48 of 2003), which empowers the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform to purchase, acquire in any other manner or expropriate land or rights in land for the purpose of restitution awards or for any related land reform purpose.

Land redistribution aims at providing people with access to land for either settlement or agricultural purposes. A primary aim is to settle small-scale and new (emerging) farmers on viable farming operations in the commercial farming areas. Under the programme, grants are given to qualifying beneficiaries who can access a range of grants depending on the amount of their own contribution in labour and/or cash. The cost is essentially borne by the State. It operates under the following legislation:

- The Land Reform: Provision of Land and Assistance Act, 1993 (Act 126 of 1993), aims to redress the imbalanced land allocation of the past by providing land and financial assistance to historically disadvantaged persons and communities.

The land redistribution programme aims to transfer 30% of agricultural land held by white owners, to previously disadvantaged South African. There are a number of redistributive mechanisms that are/have been used:

- The Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG);
- Farm equity schemes;
- Municipal commonage grants and
- Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development programme (LRAD).
It was expected that the 30% target would be achieved by the end of 2001. It was not, and, learning from the manifold difficulties associated with the programme, the target date was extended to 15 years. According to Rugege (2004), “Although land delivery has accelerated with the current Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development, it is unlikely that 24.7 million hectares will be distributed in 15 years”.

OECD (2006) explained that the reason “the land redistribution programme has performed below targets due to inadequate institutional capacity, financial resources, and a lack of appropriate agricultural support services and co-ordination as well as the financial costs, budget limits and administrative capacity”.

Tenure reform is intended to provide security of tenure for people living for a long time on land owned by others without secure rights. These include current and former farm workers, sharecroppers, and labour tenants. The policy also aims to protect such people living in such vulnerable circumstances (Rugege 2004). Tenure reform operates in the first instance under the following legislation:

- The Distribution and Transfer of Certain State Land Act, 1993 (Act 119 of 1993) provides for the distribution and transfer of State land to persons or descendants of persons who were removed from such land and had prior to 27 April 1994 submitted applications to the then Advisory Commission on Land Allocation and the said Commission had confirmed their possible entitlement to such land.
- The Upgrading of Land Tenure Rights Act, 1991 (Act 112 of 1991) provides for the upgrading of various forms of tenure to ownership.
- The Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights Act, 1996 (Act 31 of 1996), which provides for the temporary protection of certain rights and interests in land which are not otherwise adequately protected by law, until comprehensive new legislation is in place;
- The Extension of Security of Tenure Act, 1997 (Act 62 of 1997), which provides for security of tenure to people living on land belonging to another person and regulates the conditions under which the eviction of such people may take place;
- The Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act, 1996 (Act 3 of 1996), which provides for security of tenure to labour tenants and their associates and for the acquisition of land by labour tenants;
- The Communal Property Associations Act, 1996 (Act 28 of 1996), which provides for the establishment of legal entities enabling communities to acquire, hold and manage land on an agreed basis in terms of a constitution.
- The Communal Land Rights Act, 2004 (Act 11 of 2004), once the commencement date is published, will provide for secure land tenure rights to persons and communities who occupy and use communal land as defined in that Act.
- The KwaZulu-Natal Ingonyama Trust Act, 1994 (KZN Act 3 of 1994 – G.N. 28 of 1994 dated 24 April 1994) was passed by the then KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and was amended by the (national) KwaZulu-Natal Ingonyama Trust Amendment Act, 1997 (Act 9 of 1997). It provides for the establishment of the Ingonyama Trust with the Ingonyama of Isizwe sakwaZulu as the sole trustee and the establishment of the board (KwaZulu-Natal Ingonyama Trust Board).
Progress in land reform has run well behind targets. Further, it is plagued with difficulties with post-reform/settlement support for beneficiaries. Extension services are ill equipped – in terms of numbers, resources and training – to cope with the volume and nature of support required by those acquiring land and, in particular, farms under the land reform programme.

Cousins (No Date) summarises the land reform situation as follows:

In 1994 the new democratic government set itself some very ambitious targets for land reform. Restitution claims would be resolved and implemented within 10 years. Redistribution of 30% of white-owned agricultural land would be achieved within 5 years.

These targets were clearly unrealistic. Progress was very slow to begin with, and by the end of the Mandela era very little land had been restored or redistributed. Under the Mbeki administration that took office in 1999, the targets were revised: the completion date for restitution was extended to 2008, and then again to 2011, and the date for redistributing 30% of farmland was extended to 2014.

By 2008 a total of 5.8 million hectares (around 5% of commercial farmland) had been transferred to blacks through a combination of restitution and redistribution. Over 90% of land claims had been resolved, most of them urban claims, but the majority of large rural claims were still unresolved.

Laws and programmes aimed at protecting the tenure rights of farm workers and labour tenants have been ineffective: evictions have continued, and more people have lost access to rural land in this way than have gained it through land reform. Legislation on communal land rights that strengthened the powers of chiefs over land was passed in 2004, but is subject to a constitutional challenge and has not yet been implemented.

Critics have chided government for the slow pace of land reform, and warned of the possibility of the land question becoming politically explosive, as in Zimbabwe. Land activists see the ‘willing seller, willing buyer’ approach as expensive and cumbersome but also unjust, given that land was forcibly appropriated by the racial minority in the past.

The small budget for land reform (around 1% of the national budget) has also been heavily criticized. The National Treasury, however, has been reluctant to vote more money to land reform because of the failure of many projects and lack of evidence that land reform is making any impact on rural poverty. Critics have in turn pointed to the almost complete failure of government to provide adequate post-settlement support, and to badly designed business plans. Water reform has not been integrated into land reform.

Should land reform support the emergence of large- and medium-scale black commercial farmers (which will limit the number of people that benefit), or promote small-scale agriculture (thus broadening the spread of benefits)? This has been a highly controversial issue. The Mbeki administration tended to favour emergent commercial farmers, but the 2009 ANC manifesto emphasizes small-
scale production within a programme of agrarian reform that will be implemented in communal areas as well as on land reform farms.

A major constraint on land reform is weak capacity in the relevant government departments. There are insufficient staff members, many are not adequately trained, and staff turnover is high. The government agricultural extension service is very weak. Many agricultural officials see household-based production systems as inefficient and ‘backwards’, favour large scale farming methods, and are not motivated to support land reform for the poor.

The FAO (2010) notes that “land and agrarian reform are long and costly processes” and confirm that South Africa is no exception to this. They suggest that the vision of transferring 30% of the country’s agricultural land to black people was over ambitious – noting that that the government has postponed achieving this goal to 2014, “after it was recognized that the transfer process alone would take 20 years”. This latter target, as noted above by Rugege is still unlikely.

FAO notes further that the agrarian reform process and been even more difficult. “Initially, when land redistribution was mainly concerned with the transfer of land to poor people, little attention was paid to what beneficiaries did or wanted to do with that land. As the programme evolved, policy makers became progressively more specific. At present, the principal strategic goal of the land and agrarian reform programme is the establishment of a class of black, market-oriented farmers who make optimal use of the land resources that have been transferred to them.” They caution that land reform alone should not be seen as the vehicle for economic development in rural areas. They caution further that beneficiaries must see tangible improvements in their livelihoods within a fairly short period of time. Otherwise, the “beneficiaries tend to defect and abandon their stake in the land”. The window is estimated at about 4 years. One of the ways to facilitate the desired improvements, is by building on urban-rural linkages. This has evident possibilities for post-harvest elements of rural production and is another aspect to consider when planning an extension strategy.

OCED (2006) echoes the observations of Cousins and the FAO: “... some of the beneficiaries of land reform have suffered defaults, being inadequately prepared for commercial farming in a high risk environment, or unable to raise sufficient capital for commercial production. “With clear implications for extension OCED identifies the following needs for successful land reform:

- Adjustment assistance should be an inherent component of land reform.
- Proper selection and follow-up of beneficiaries is crucial for land reform to develop sustainable commercial farming.
- Training and extension is essential, not only in farm technologies, but also in marketing and financial management.
- Mentoring by commercial farmers of new entrants is a useful strategy.
- Appropriate support services need to be developed:
  - Financial services;
  - Market information;
  - Input supply networks;
  - Transportation and storage infrastructure; and
4 Extension policy

This section provides an overview of the national and provincial extension policies and structures. The trajectory of extension in South Africa is the same as for the agricultural sector. The dualistic nature of agriculture was echoed in the extension structures that were created to ‘support’ their respective farming clients. As has already been discussed, by the time of the democratic elections in 1994, there were 14 different extension services in the country. There was little or no ‘good practice’. Development theories applied to extension were founded on the flawed social engineering ideologies. The extension approaches and methods employed were largely unchanged from the 1940s and 1950s. They were centred on transferring technology to maximise yields, managing production and controlling resources. Being cut off from the rest of the world afforded the country little opportunity to explore new avenues or modes of extension. As a result the majority of land users in South Africa remained poor, operated with limited resources and limited access to infrastructure, and disconnected from input and product markets.

4.1 National

At the onset of the new government, the apparent intention was to “establish a policy framework within which services to farmers, and incentives for them, support wise decision-making about the use of resources for agricultural production” (ANC 1994).

It was recognised that Extension would be pivotal to realising the aims of transforming agriculture and ensuring that previously excluded farmers are positioned to be fully engaged in the agricultural value-chain. The 2001 Strategy for South African Agriculture indicates that extension would be “critical” to achieving the aims of the strategy, but is relatively silent on the approaches and modes of operation (ANC 1994).

ANC policy wanted to move away from any form of extension that would rest solely on extending research findings to farmers while rather paternalistically ignoring what those farmers already know. The party was aware that “Internationally, such extension approaches have not been successful” and that more people-centred methods would be more appropriate. They saw the need to ensure “effective service delivery while giving more power and greater equality to rural people”. They anticipated an extension service that was farmer-driven (rather than state-driven) and would consciously seek to “build on people’s knowledge and work with them to find locally acceptable and sustainable solutions” (ANC 1994).

It is in that policy that “Cadres of Community Agricultural Facilitators should be set up and trained to provide accessible and locally accountable advice to their communities”. As noted earlier this has now found expression (as para-development specialists) in the recently published IGDP for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.
As stated earlier extension operations are a provincial competency. While the National Department of Agriculture sets policy and determines funding, the individual provinces have wide latitude in setting operational strategies and allocating resources. Thus translating the desired policy into a practical operational service delivery mechanism that fills those aims has proven illusive.

Each of the nine provinces has configured its extension service somewhat differently. And several of the Provincial Departments of Agriculture have undergone numerous reorganisations and restructuring. While written policy appears to give precedence to extension, extension posts appear to attract lower post gradings and lower salary packages than their counterpart scientists housed in research. A common complaint from extension workers is lack of resources (especially operational funds, e.g. transport) to do their work, lack of clarity about their mission, and lack of motivation due to poor leadership and poor career advancement opportunities.

In terms of budgets, extension is rarely listed as a cost centre. It is generally included in a wider expense area called, in most cases, ‘Farmer Support’. Included in the budgets are funds for extension operations as well as for food security and farmer settlement. The table below shows the various budgets for the expanded extension (farmer support) for each province since 2004 and with estimates for the current 2012/13 financial year which amounts to nearly R4,86 billion.

**Farmer Support Budgets per Province (R '000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>293471</td>
<td>323119</td>
<td>365398</td>
<td>466666</td>
<td>486786</td>
<td>503142</td>
<td>439969</td>
<td>443679</td>
<td>453879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>45713</td>
<td>86843</td>
<td>74628</td>
<td>87509</td>
<td>99054</td>
<td>123979</td>
<td>148887</td>
<td>223410</td>
<td>286499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>60368</td>
<td>57420</td>
<td>65035</td>
<td>113174</td>
<td>149801</td>
<td>185087</td>
<td>164701</td>
<td>201923</td>
<td>238059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>554611</td>
<td>674236</td>
<td>727647</td>
<td>713940</td>
<td>988108</td>
<td>1027086</td>
<td>1158970</td>
<td>1483213</td>
<td>1610238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>501449</td>
<td>547236</td>
<td>578830</td>
<td>541811</td>
<td>613153</td>
<td>656774</td>
<td>755285</td>
<td>821502</td>
<td>860872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPU</td>
<td>132792</td>
<td>174210</td>
<td>193329</td>
<td>276678</td>
<td>288154</td>
<td>377862</td>
<td>379868</td>
<td>564750</td>
<td>489054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>23129</td>
<td>34999</td>
<td>51792</td>
<td>61043</td>
<td>72217</td>
<td>110815</td>
<td>118752</td>
<td>171935</td>
<td>169082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW²</td>
<td>195901</td>
<td>134845</td>
<td>219613</td>
<td>240250</td>
<td>430938</td>
<td>417348</td>
<td>436168</td>
<td>510669</td>
<td>540384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>50830</td>
<td>72396</td>
<td>71820</td>
<td>84729</td>
<td>108712</td>
<td>128642</td>
<td>155337</td>
<td>184985</td>
<td>209849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1858264</td>
<td>2105304</td>
<td>2348092</td>
<td>2585800</td>
<td>3236923</td>
<td>3530735</td>
<td>3757955</td>
<td>4606066</td>
<td>4857916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Figures for 2004-2009/10 are audited figures; figures for 2010/11 and 2011/12 are unaudited completed expenditure; and figures for 2012/13 are estimated projections.

2 The North West budget is a single line entry for ‘agriculture’ for the first three years shown in the table; thereafter the figures are presented as ‘agricultural support’ and ‘agricultural district services’ – but are here aggregated.

What is immediately apparent is the wide disparity of funds allocated. Hall & Aliber (2010) from PLAAS raise this plus other concerns about extension:

> However, dramatic increases in budget allocations to agriculture over the past five years have made little dent in the chronic problem of under-investment in small-scale (i.e. black) agriculture in South Africa. This is because of huge
numbers of people engaged in agriculture, mostly on a small-scale, often part-time, and largely with little or no interaction with the official programmes ostensibly there to help them. The still largely white commercial sector also gets little support. Rather, the dearth of support for small-scale farmers is the product of funnelling available resources to ‘emerging’ and ‘commercialising’ small- and medium-scale black farmers. This strategy of ‘picking winners’ coincides to a large degree with the focus on beneficiaries of one particular land reform programme that was initially designed for precisely the purpose of creating a black commercial farming class: the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) programme.

The reality is that supporting small-scale farmers is difficult and labour-intensive. While there is definitely a need for increased capital expenditure, doing this well requires attention to equity in distributing scarce funds, as well as time, cogent planning, and perhaps more patience. On the other hand, the fact that CASP is dependent on extension services, while extension services reach too small a share of small-scale farmers, means that CASP is almost structurally unable to reach large numbers of small-scale farmers. And yet, despite absorbing a very large share of provincial agricultural expenditure, extension reaches limited numbers of agriculturalists — and the quality of extension advice is also uneven and reportedly poor in some cases. Doubling the extension corps would still result in an inadequate extension corps, reaching only a minority of agriculturalists, and it would cost more than the State is probably prepared to commit.

It appears that the National Department of Agriculture is aware of the limitations of the provincial extension services and of the limited success of extension efforts to date. The DAFF is aware that, “Beneficiaries of government interventions invariably identified extension and advisory service as the weak link militating against the full impact of government agricultural programmes in the past” (DAFF 2011).

As a part of the on-going process of creating policy the DAFF has taken several steps both to understand the situation on the ground (from the perspective of farmers and well as the perspective of extension workers) and to create a common basis from which all extension services could operate and against which they could evaluate themselves.

The DAFF identified a number of shortfalls in the extension services throughout the country:

- Lack of a national framework for extension and advisory services created confusion over the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders on service delivery;
- Previous constructs for extension excluded important, critical but often unrecognised services rendered by subject matter specialists, veterinary surgeons, animal health technicians, agribusiness advisors, consultants, Non-Governmental Organisations, etc.; and
- The general failure of extension to effect any meaningful or sustainable improvement to the lot of the majority of land users.

There was a need to:
• Improve the efficiency, relevance and cost effectiveness of publicly funded agricultural extension and advisory services;
• Promote a participatory approach to agricultural extension and advisory services, and to recognize the entire spectra of participants in the provision of agricultural services;
• Promote and implement the value chain approach to ensure holistic support services; and
• Position extension to contribute to government’s response to priority issues such as food security, poverty alleviation, food safety, economic growth and environmental conservation.

In 2003, the then NDA commissioned the drafting of Norms and Standards for Extension. In it the NDA declares its philosophy about and definitions of agricultural extension; these are captured here en toto for ease of reference.

“In general, extension refers to a systematic process of working with farmers or communities to help them acquire relevant and useful agriculture or related knowledge and skills to increase farm productivity, competitiveness and sustainability. In practice it is a continuum, ranging from the narrow technology transfer that brings changes in farming practices without taking into account the overall societal perspectives, to advisory, education and human development where it takes on critical public priority issues (e.g. food security, poverty alleviation, environmental degradation and social equity).

The advisory service, which is very much part of extension, is normally provided by subject matter specialists, private organisations or firms to support commercial interests. It is commonly practised where agriculture is highly commercialised or farmers have attained a high degree of competence and are able to articulate their demand for services and approach extension officers or advisors for advice”.

Extension thus framed is expected to attain the transformational goals in agriculture through:

• Improved access to agriculture support services (information, finance, inputs, regulatory services, technical expertise, markets, etc.) which will create an enabling environment for improved agricultural productivity;
• Endowing farmers with skills and knowledge for ensuring sustainable resource management;
• Facilitation of access to new technologies and awareness thereof;
• Enhancement of communication channels with farmers and farmer organizations, mentors and advisors.
• Advisors, extension agents/officers and mentors should therefore be trained to pro- vide these clients with support envisaged under the six pillars of CASP, viz. Information and Knowledge Management; Technical and Advisory Assistance; Regulatory Services; Training and Capacity Building; Marketing and Business Development; On- and Off-farm Infrastructure.
Beyond the above explanations, the Norms and Standards include clear statements of guiding principle, the first three being:

**Norms and Standards principles for extension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Norm</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand-driven</td>
<td>Extension must respond to targeted potential entrepreneurs/farmers' needs while maintaining professional standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>Advice and technologies must be applicable within the opportunity realm of resources and market environment of the clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralistic, flexible and coordinated</td>
<td>As many service providers as possible should be encouraged to become involved and contribute towards agricultural development. The extension and advisory services must be sufficiently flexible to respond to the miscellaneous and ever-changing needs occasioned by changing socio-economic environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Norms and Standards clarify that no single approach to extension is the ‘correct’ approach and suggest four approaches to be chosen based on appropriateness:

- Technology transfer
- Participator approach
- Advisory approach
- Project approach

In terms of the capacity of extension workers to deliver on all that is expected, the following is proposed:

**Norms and standards for capacity of extension workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>Standard: Able to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Orientation and Customer Focus</td>
<td>Deliver services effectively and efficiently in order to put the spirit of customer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Exchange information and ideas in a clear and concise manner appropriate to the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Plan, manage, monitor and evaluate specific activities in order to deliver the desired outputs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
<td>Promote the generation and sharing of knowledge and learning; includes competence in a particular specialized field of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery Innovation</td>
<td>Explore and implement new ways of delivering services that contribute to the improvement of productivity of the farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving and Analysis</td>
<td>Systematically identify, analyse and resolve existing and anticipated problems in order to reach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Honesty and Integrity
Display and build the highest standards of ethical and moral conduct

People Management and Empowerment
Manage and encourage diverse groups of people, and provide leadership

In facilitation of the above capacity, the following standards are set for different levels of extension workers:

**Titles and qualifications for extension workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested titles</th>
<th>Educational qualifications (minimum requirements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Community Worker</td>
<td>Standard 10  (Grade 12) + in-service training in agricultural studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Development Officer</td>
<td>Standard 10  (Grade 12) + 3 or more years post matric agricultural diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Advisors</td>
<td>B Tech/Bachelors/Hons degree in Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter Specialist</td>
<td>BSc (Hons) degree in Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Coordinators</td>
<td>Qualifications must be in accordance with the Public Service requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed extension worker: farmer ratios are as follows:

**Norms and Standards for extension ratios**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of operation</th>
<th>Nature of operation/farming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence and household</td>
<td>1:400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-commercial</td>
<td>1:250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market oriented and large scale commercial</td>
<td>1:500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, the Norms and Standards identified the “challenge” for agencies in the advisory service (e.g. ARC, subject matter specialists, private organisations or firms to support commercial interests) to deal with public priority issues, including poverty, food security, natural resource management and economic growth.

It is expected that these issues will be addressed through national strategic programmes such as LRAD, Integrated Food Security Nutrition Programme, CASP and Land Care. It is anticipated that these key programmes should be the main focus of both extension and advisory services.

To realise this objective, the government identified the need for total reorientation of agricultural extension services. Fundamental to this reorientation is the realisation that:

- The delivery system is the key to the transformation of the small-scale disadvantaged agricultural sector of South Africa, and
- Appropriate advice must be offered to farmers efficiently and regularly.
It is clear from the Norms and Standards that key focus for the extension and advisory services must be small-scale disadvantaged farmers and the efficient and systematic offering of advice. However, the Norms and Standards are silent on the range, scope and depth of advice except to indicate that advice and technologies must be applicable within the opportunity realm of resources and market environment of the clients and that extension staff must be well versed in agricultural production (scientific and technical expertise) and business (economics, marketing and financial management expertise).

The next major push forward toward appropriate extension policy was a study concluded by the then NDA in 2007, revealed the following:

- Currently there are about 2210 extension officers; the following table provides details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Number of Extension Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPU</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In terms of gender, about 1608 (73 %) are males and 602 (27 %) are females. Seven out of 9 provinces are male-dominated.
- The province of KwaZulu-Natal shows a commendable 50:50 gender split.
- Provinces with the highest number of extension officers are Limpopo (666), Eastern Cape (623) and KZN (360).
- Gauteng and Northern Cape have the smallest number of extension officers—29 and 23, respectively.
- Generally the provinces show a fair personnel distribution in the age groups 21 to 55 years.
- About 1 772 (80,2 %) of extension officers have a diploma qualification or lower. This is in contrast to norms and standards which require all agricultural advisors to be in possession of a degree qualification or higher. Only 438 (19,8 %) have a degree or higher qualification.
• There are fewer than 250 extension officers out of 2 210 who indicated that they were exposed to generic skills training in computer literacy, communication and project management. The majority of them indicated their involvement in projects related to the Comprehensive Agriculture Support Programme and LandCare.

• Provinces with a good racial mix are the Western Cape and Northern Cape. In all other provinces almost all the extension officers are Africans, who account for 92.57%.

• The population under the age of 35 is 20%. This reflects an acceptable staff replacement rate and organisational stability.

• About 75% of the officers are between salary levels 7 and 8, 15% is between salary levels 4 and 6, 8% between salary levels 9 and 10 and about 2% is above salary level 10.

• Males occupy more than 80% of management-related positions.

• In 7 out of 9 provinces, female extension officers are more educated than their male counterparts. It is only in Gauteng and Free State where male officials are more educated than their female counterparts.

• In terms of the technical skills programmes completed by the extension officers, 371 had completed a training programme in Animal Production, 241 in Crop Production, 124 in Horticulture, 148 in Business Management, 60 in LandCare and 15 in Mechanisation and Irrigation.

• A total of 55% officers serve 600 or fewer farmers per individual than is recommended in the norms and standards.

The foregoing sets the framework for examining the nine provincial extension services.

The following table provides some comparative figures. It shows the percentage of total extension workers allocated to province. This is then compared to the percentage commanded by each province of the total Farmer Support (Extension) Budget for the year in which the study was done (2006/7) as well as the projected budget for 2012/13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Number of Extension Workers</th>
<th>2006/7 Budget (R '000)</th>
<th>2012/13 Budget (R '000)</th>
<th>% of total EWs</th>
<th>% of total Budget</th>
<th>R1000/ EW</th>
<th>% of Total Budget</th>
<th>R1000/ EW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>365398</td>
<td>453879</td>
<td>28,2</td>
<td>15,6</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74628</td>
<td>286499</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>4093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65035</td>
<td>238059</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>8209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>727647</td>
<td>1610238</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>31,0</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>33,1</td>
<td>4473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>578830</td>
<td>860872</td>
<td>30,1</td>
<td>24,7</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>17,7</td>
<td>1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPU</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>193329</td>
<td>489054</td>
<td>8,3</td>
<td>8,2</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>10,1</td>
<td>2672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that while Limpopo has the highest percentage of extension workers, KwaZulu-Natal, at 31%, has the highest percentage of the total 2006/7 budget. That percentage increases to 33% of the 2012/13 budget. The Eastern Cape has 28% of the total extension workers, but only 15.6% of the 2006/7 budget and 9.3% of the 2012/13 budget. This confirms the concerns of Hall and Aliber (2010) of the disproportionate allocation of budgets to provinces.

4.2 **Extension recovery programme**

The third initiative taken by the National Department of Agriculture was to plot 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”:

1. **Ensure visibility and accountability of extension**
2. **Promote professionalism and improve the image of extension**
3. **Recruit extension personnel**
4. **Reskill and re-orientate extension workers**
5. **Provide ICT infrastructure and other resources**

4.2.1 **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.

4.2.2 **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.

4.2.3 **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
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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.

4.2.4 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.

4.2.5 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 programme as a result of the Extension Recovery Plan component of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme 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 wellbeing of farmers.

5 Public sector extension services
This section presents the structures of the extension services at National and Provincial levels. It also presents an abbreviated summary of the key areas of focus and action identified by each province. Information has been gleaned from provincial reports and websites, but individual citing is not given.

5.1 National structuring

The Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) four operational divisions (see Chart overleaf)

- Food Security and Agrarian Reform
- Agriculture, Production, Health and Food Safety
- Forestry and Resources Management
- Marine Fisheries and Coastal Management

Extension matters fall under the Deputy Director-General for Food Security and Agrarian Reform. It is referred to as Programme 3. This Division has three Chief Directorates:

- Food Security
- Sector Capacity Development
- National Extension Support Services

According to the current strategic plan for DAFF:

Programme 3 facilitates and promotes household food security and agrarian reform programmes and initiatives targeting subsistence and smallholder producers. It comprises three sub-programmes, namely Food Security, Sector Capacity Development and National Extension Support Services.

**Food Security:** The sub-programme provides national frameworks to promote the Sustainable Household Food Security Programme through improving the production systems of subsistence and smallholder producers in the agriculture, forestry and fishery sector to achieve food security livelihoods and facilitate the provision of inputs, implements and infrastructure support.

**Sector Capacity Development:** Facilitates the provision of agriculture, forestry and fisheries and training in support of sustainable growth and equitable participation in the sector. This will be achieved by facilitating and supporting education and training skills, promoting the development of centres of excellence on skills training and developing, managing and coordinating the sector transformation policy and strategy in line with the government objectives for the departments.

**National Extension Support Services:** Provides national extension policies, norms and standards on the transfer of technology. The sub-programme will provide strategic leadership and guidance for the planning, coordination and implementation of extension and advisory services in the sector. It will also provide leadership and strategic support in the implementation of norms and standards for extension.

A relevant strategic objective in the Chief Directorate is to provide leadership and support to research, training and extension in the sector.
For this, DAFF has identified three indicators and targets to be achieved over the next six years

**Targets and indicators for DAFF 2011-2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Producers completing training programmes</td>
<td>Coordinate training programmes for 15 000 smallholder producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate training programmes for 15 000 smallholder producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate training programmes for 15 000 smallholder producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate training programmes for 15 000 smallholder producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Agricultural Training Institutions (Green Paper)</td>
<td>7 of agricultural colleges transformed into ATIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 of agricultural colleges transformed into ATIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 of agricultural colleges (ATIs) operating as centres of excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 of ATIs establish a community outreach centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 of ATIs establish community outreach centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate the provision of comprehensive training extension and support</td>
<td>Evaluate Extension Recovery Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the extension recovery annual plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate the implementation of extension recovery annual plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate the implementation of extension recovery annual plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate the implementation of extension recovery annual plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop national extension policy</td>
<td>Coordinate the approval and implementation of national extension policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft a National Extension Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate the legislative process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a national council for extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.2 The Provinces**

**5.2.1 Eastern Cape**

Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

The core function of the Department is to facilitate agricultural production in the Eastern Cape through the provision of technical support to farmers and community based initiatives and the creation of a conducive environment for increased investment in agriculture. In many instances the Department will actively intervene and support initiatives in order to enhance the unique competitive advantages of our Province for the benefit of all. These interventions will be mainly directed at improving the quality of life of those operating in this sector and redressing the inequalities created by the past.

In an effort to achieve these ideas the Department will embark in a holistic development approach by participating in the formulation of integrated development plans (IDP’s) and other planning initiatives at local level and within the specified clusters in the Province. Co-operation with the National Departments will in all instances be mandatory.

The Department is also responsible for two agricultural colleges (Tsolo and Fort Cox); both are under review for reaccreditation.
5.2.2 Free State

Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

The following Directorates and sections are situated at Glen:

- Training,
- Farming Information,
- Farming System Research and Extension (FSRE),
- Agricultural Economics,
- Engineering Services
- Farm Section.

Extension services to farmers are rendered by the agricultural development districts. Services within the districts are so constructed that farming communities are also involved and co-responsible for agricultural development. Agricultural development committees identify and analyse problems, determine priorities, evaluate development projects and make appropriate decisions.

The collection of norms and production techniques on ecotope level, the composition of a macro soil plan for the Free State which is used for simulation models that can predict veld and crop production, crop estimates by means of simulation models in GIS environment, as well as irrigation scheduling are carried out on a continuous basis. Animal and pasture scientists are involved in different farming systems research projects aimed at the development of economic farming project practices for dairy and beef herds and wool and mutton flocks. Management systems for rabbit production also receive attention.

Agronomic research is aimed at the development of production practices which could stabilise dryland production. Priority is given to practices utilising rain effectively. Different irrigation methods are investigated within the recommended production systems.

Development projects are carried out by multidisciplinary teams within a holistic farming context. The projects are aimed at improving farm management and optimising agricultural products and resource utilisation. Irrigation farming and the effective utilisation of water are given priority. Irrigation services are rendered for each irrigation area.

Packages for various farming enterprises are compiled and revised on an on-going basis to provide farmers and interested parties with basic information as part of the technology transfer programme.

The Farming Information section is computerising the agricultural development districts in order to be able to use the GIS (Geographic Information System).

Two laboratories provide analytical services to farmers regarding feed and soil analyses. Training is given at Glen College of Agriculture (which is a tertiary education institute).
5.2.3 Gauteng

Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (GDARD)

GDARD’s mission is stated as unlocking the full potential of environment, agriculture and rural development to enhance the economic, ecological and social wealth of all the people of the Gauteng through:

- Improved access to affordable, diverse and nutritious food;
- Accelerated sustainable agrarian reform
- Champions of animal health and welfare in a cost-sharing/recovery model;
- Improved rural services and infrastructure to support sustainable livelihoods with respect to agriculture, environment, education, health, transport, and other forms of infrastructure and services;
- Rural job creation linked to skills development and promoting economic livelihoods.
- Sustainable management of natural resources by promoting conservation, better management of waste, reduce greenhouse emissions

According to its 2010-2014 Strategic Plan, GDARD is focusing on two key strategies:

- Ensuring vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security for all; and
- Ensuring the promotion of environmental integrity that supports human well-being and economic efficiency towards sustainable life.

The first of these strategies has the following objectives:
- Sustainable agrarian reform;
- Improved access to affordable and diverse food;
- Improved rural services to support sustainable livelihoods;
- Improved employment opportunities and economic livelihoods; and
- Enabling institutional environment for sustainable and inclusive growth.

The second of these strategies has the following objectives:
- Water resource protection;
- Reduced greenhouse gas emissions, climate change and improved air/atmospheric quality;
- Sustainable environmental management; and
- Protected biodiversity

Work in the department is organized around Agriculture and Food Security (AFS), Environment and Conservation (EC), and Rural Development (RD).

AFS provides services to various agricultural clients including business plan development and evaluations, market analysis and information dissemination, economic viability studies, entrepreneurship development, value adding to products and assistance with market research. The unit focuses on information dissemination around the key issues of the impact of climate change, the carbon footprint of the agricultural sector, carbon mileage as the latest non-tariff barrier to export, the food versus fuel debate, the water quality and quantity for the sector, bio-security concerns, the need for alternative energy sources, recycling, the growing importance of disaster mitigation and management and
the increase in occurrence of animal diseases linked to climate change. They seek to balance land protection with economic development.

EC appears effectively to be a regulatory service addressing the environment, nature conservation, pollution control, urban and rural development, as well as local government matters related to, among others, air pollution, municipal planning, noise pollution, refuse removal, refuse dumps and solid waste disposal. The focus is on implementation of sustainable development and developing appropriate responses to climate change challenges.

RD focuses on issues related to the increase in land reform beneficiaries in the province and concomitant post-settlement needs, the support services to all farmers in the province and ensuring that agriculture remains competitive and sustainable. Particular emphasis is place on building capacity in rural communities and among youth in particular.

5.2.4 KwaZulu-Natal

Department of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs

The mission of the KwaZulu-Natal Department of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs is to promote, in partnership with relevant role-players, a prosperous community through sound agricultural and environmental management practices.

This Department is committed to serve the agricultural community in KwaZulu-Natal. The main objective of the Department is to promote agricultural development, whether in the rural areas, where the main aim is to ensure home-food security and to stimulate job opportunities to improve the quality of life, or in the commercial sector, where the main aim is the production of food, fuel and fibre within an economic framework that is environmentally sustainable.

By means of its four chief directorates and eleven directorates, the Department did its utmost in diversifying the services it renders to people in KwaZulu-Natal. Services range from agricultural methods to environmental awareness programmes.

- **Corporate Support Services** renders services necessary for the management of the Department, including provisioning, transport, communication services, human resource management, computerisation support services, management advisory services and labour relations;
- **Financial Management** which provides budget, financial support, management services (payments, bookkeeping, voucher control and salary control), revenue, procurement and loss control;
- **Veterinary Services** in KwaZulu-Natal includes veterinary laboratory diagnosis, animal health, field services and veterinary public health. This Directorate controls the movement of meat from arrival to despatch within the precincts of all red meat, pig and poultry abattoirs.
- **Technology Development and Training** is responsible for formulating and generating technology required by the farming community and agricultural industry in KwaZulu-Natal. It is also responsible for formal training at Cedara and Owen Sitole colleges of agriculture, as well as non-formal training, thereby facilitating the training of farmers, advisors, industry personnel and Departmental
staff in the fields of agriculture, human resource development, computer science and literacy training of departmental staff.

- **Engineering and Soil Conservation** whose priority is the preservation of the soil as the most valuable natural agricultural resource. Subsurface drainage, soil conservation structures and to facilitate the development of agricultural infrastructure in both rural and commercial farming areas, are also part of the activities.

- **Agricultural Development Support Services** is responsible for the agricultural support services to the regions, which includes extension training, mobile video training, extension aids development, state land (management, maintenance and administration) and agricultural economics and marketing. The Home Economics sector caters for family management, home care, affordable home improvement, consumer education and promotion of viable home industries. Furthermore, the Directorate also renders assistance to cooperatives.

- **Environmental Management** is responsible for the environmental impact management. It provides integrated environmental management services, determines norms and standards and renders environmental audit and rehabilitation. It controls pollution and waste management, as well atmospheric and noise pollution.

- **Regional Services.** The Department supports decentralisation efforts to promote the participation of farmers in all magisterial districts. The ward extension officer reports to an agricultural district officer. A number of district officers form regions, four of which exist as directorates in the province. The North West region (Ladysmith), North East (Ulundi/ Eshowe), South West (Hilton), and South East (Pietermaritzburg/ Durban) regions have specialist advisers, home economic staff, soil conservation officers and engineering staff who are responsible for coordinated extension, rural development and RDP projects.

- **KwaZulu-Natal Nature Conservation Service** is a further function allocated to the Minister by the Cabinet. It is responsible for biodiversity conservation with the key focal areas being development of ecotourism, promotion of development needs of the people living adjacent to protected areas. It provides mechanisms whereby groups interested in conservation or the promotion of tourism in protected areas will have representation, resource management, promotion of educational programmes and scientific research. This service has managed to collect over R5 million through its visitors' levy, which has been banked in the KZN Community Trust and will be used for the development of projects identified by the community structure.

Training is given at both the Cedara and Owen Sitole colleges of agriculture (which are tertiary education institutes), with a non-formal training section responsible for the training of staff, farmers and agricultural labourers.

### 5.2.5 Limpopo
Department of Agriculture and Environment

Limpopo Province has a total surface area of 12.5 million ha, with a population of 5.1 million people, of whom approximately 519 000 are farmers. Women comprise 70 to 80 per cent of the agricultural sector.

This Province is divided into six regions with about 115 service centres and approximately 652 wards.

The mission of the Department of Agriculture and Environment in Limpopo Province is to contribute towards improving the quality of life in the Province through the provision of appropriate services and the promotion of socially just and environmentally sustainable development, based on agricultural and other natural resources.

The Limpopo Department of Agriculture (LDA) aims to strategically mobilise, distribute and utilise those resources equitably and efficiently to achieve the four mentioned Government objectives, by supporting the agricultural sector. The LDA has identified and adopted twelve key strategic programme priorities, which are in line with the overall priorities as contained in the revised Limpopo Growth and Development Strategy (LGDS) (2005) of the Limpopo provincial government. The twelve priorities are: Limpopo Department of Agriculture Priorities

1) Restructuring of State Assets to empower farmers, communities and workers through Revitalisation of Smallholder Irrigation Schemes (RESIS) as well as projects under the Agricultural Rural Development Corporation (ARDC).
2) Promotion and implementation of AgriBEE.
3) Development and implementation of succession planning based on youth infusion into the agricultural sector.
4) Promotion and development of appropriate research based production and value adding technologies for successful agri-businesses.
5) Redistribution of agricultural land, capacitating beneficiaries and promoting sustainable commercial enterprises.
6) Sustainable Graduating Poverty alleviation and household food security and nutrition strategies.
7) Promotion and establishment of reliable information and communication strategy through information technology for knowledge and information sharing.
8) Formation of farmer based commodity associations and other agri-business entities for farmer support to ensure full participation in local economic development opportunities.
9) Provision of appropriate advisory support to develop and strengthen capacity of commodity association and other farmer formations.
10) Promotion of sustainable natural resource utilisation and agricultural land use management.
11) Animal production and health to improve livestock and also control animal diseases.
12) Human Resource Development to increase knowledge, skills and competency of motivated officials

These programme priority areas encompass a strategy which targets different categories of clients in the farming community:
• The vulnerable;
• Subsistence communal farmers;
• Emerging farmers and SMME-type agribusinesses and;
• Commercial farmers.

The realization of the priorities requires strategic partnerships, commitment and dedicated mentorship from all stakeholders to succeed. The available resources within the LDA will provide solution to some of the challenges. However, other forms of support from partnerships will be required to enhance service delivery and to further push back the frontiers of poverty. In this regard the philosophy for sustainable development and service delivery in the Department is "Nothing about us, without us". Farmers must take this challenge and make the department to account. The department's strategic support to the agricultural sector is participatory and demand led/driven. It is supported by four key service delivery approaches:

• Municipality focused;
• Commodity based;
• Value chain analysis;
• Project based.

The Department consists of three chief directorates:

• The Chief Directorate Regional Services comprises three directorates:
  o Agricultural and Rural Development,
  o Regional Services and
  o Technology Development.

• The Chief Directorate Support Services consists of three directorates:
  o Agricultural Engineering,
  o Veterinary Services and
  o Administrative Services.

• The Chief Directorate Environmental Affairs has three directorates:
  o Resource Management [Southern and Western Region];
  o Resource Management [Northern and Lowveld]; and
  o Professional Services.

The Department is responsible for the Tompi Seleka and Madzivhandila colleges of agriculture which offer farmer training.

5.2.6 Mpumalanga

The Department of Agriculture in Mpumalanga has the following mission: The Department will meet the justifiable needs of the people by:

• Promoting sustainable agricultural development;
• Conservation of natural resources;
• Improving the living environment.

The Department has identified the following functions to achieve its mission:

• Agricultural training (formal and non-formal)
• Extension and advisory services
• Technology development and research
• Facilitation of agricultural community development and rural development
• Resource management
• Regulatory services
• Veterinary services
• Administration and liaison services
• Environmental management
• Environmental education
• Nature conservation.

Certain functions are carried out by the Mpumalanga Parks Board (Nature Conservation) and the Mpumalanga Agricultural Development Corporation (agricultural development) on behalf of the Department.

In order to carry out these functions the Department is following a decentralisation approach. Its head office is at Nelspruit. The Department has three directorates of Regional Services, with regional offices at Ermelo (Southern Highveld), KwaMhlanga (Northern Highveld) and Nelspruit (Lowveld).

_The Nooitgedacht Agricultural Development Centre_ at Ermelo and _Athole Experiment Farm_ near Amsterdam are responsible for need-directed technology development, mainly for the Highveld areas. A Farm System Research extension unit conducts on-farm research and mainly operates on small-farmer plots in the Lowveld Region.

The Agricultural Research Council makes an important contribution to intensive crop cultivation in the Lowveld area as well as summer grain, range and forage research in the Highveld areas. Resource Management and Planning, Agricultural Economics and Engineering Services are also components of the Directorate Technology Support Services.

_The Directorate Veterinary Services_, with its headquarters at Nelspruit, also operates on a decentralised basis. The Directorate has five sub-directorates:

• Veterinary Public Health,
• Veterinary Technical Support Services and
• Three regional components of Animal Health.

_The Directorate of Environmental Management_ is provincially responsible for the implementation of the National Environmental Management Act and for pollution and waste management.

_The Directorate Environmental Education_ presents environmental awareness courses and also manages several environmental education centres, five of which are residential centres. These five centres target learners from primary and secondary schools in the province and neighbouring provinces.

The Department also aims at establishing effective formal liaison and cooperation with all institutions involved in agricultural development in the province. These include the
national departments, the ARC, cooperatives, the private sector and tertiary training institutions. For this purpose it has the Mpumalanga Agricultural Advisory Council at provincial level, as well as regional and local agricultural development committees where these institutions and representatives of organised agriculture discuss matters of mutual interest. This cooperation will promote the optimal utilisation of available sources and knowledge.

Agricultural training is coordinated by the Lowveld College of Agriculture at Nelspruit. Apart from offering formal diploma courses in Plant Production and Extension, its non-formal component offers a large number of short courses, mainly for emerging farmers.

5.2.7 Northern Cape

Department of Agriculture and Land Reform

The vision for Agriculture and Land Reform is to establish a representative department that is innovative and promotes a diverse and competitive agricultural sector supporting the sustainable use of natural resources while following an integrated development approach.

The mission is to promote a vigorous, sustainable and wealth-creating agricultural sector through the rendering of agricultural support services and expertise to interest groups and individuals involved in agriculture, as well as to the consumers of agricultural products.

The Department has taken as its task to perform the following key services:

- Provision of support services to farmers, their advisers and other users of agricultural services
- Implementation of and advice to upcoming farmers on small-scale development projects
- Advisory services to the farming community for the sustainable use of natural resources
- Provision of post-settlement support to land-reform beneficiaries and support in the management of agricultural state land in the province
- Identification of agricultural research needs in the province, mobilisation of research partners; solicitation for funding of appropriate projects and participation in "on-farm" research
- Supplying training in agriculture and related fields, particularly in the areas of small-stock farming
- Control of animal diseases and the import and export of animals and animal products
- Promotion of proper standards of hygiene in the slaughtering of animals
- Services to protect, manage and promote the sustainable use of the biological diversity and habitats of the province
- The management, conservation and development of provincial nature reserves and other protected areas
• Development and management of tourism facilities in provincial reserves in cooperation with the Northern Cape Tourism Authority
• The management and protection of the physical environment of the province
• Provision of scientific support and associated services to enable the Nature Conservation Services to develop policy and reform its functions
• Rendering and promoting environmental education and communication.

Apart from Administration and Auxiliary Services, the objectives of the Department are organised into the following programmes:

• Agricultural Development;
• Veterinary Services;
• Conservation Management;
• Environmental Management; and
• Specialist Environmental Services.

Formal agricultural training for the Northern Cape and Eastern Cape areas is offered by the Grootfontein College of Agriculture which operates under the management of DAFF.

5.2.8 North West

The Department of Agriculture, Conservation, Environment and Rural Development (The Department of Agriculture and Rural Development)

The Department’s vision is to strive for sustainable use of natural resources for growth and development. Its mission is to provide natural resources management services and ensuring rural development. The Department organises its frontline work in agriculture around three key Chief Directorates:

• Rural Development and Agribusiness
• Agricultural Support Services
• District Services

District Services provides agricultural extension and environmental services to departmental client in order to ensure that there is sustainable management of resources, sustainable development and meaningful contribution to the economy of the North West Province. It operates in four Districts:

• Bojanala
• NgakaModiriMolema
• Dr. Kenneth Kaunda
• Dr. Ruth SegomotsiMompati

Agricultural Support Services provides agricultural support services to farmers through District Services in order to ensure that there is sustainable management of Agricultural
resources, sustainable agricultural development and meaningful contribution to the economy of the province. The programme comprises of the following sub-programmes:

- Veterinary Services
- Structured Agricultural Training
- Agricultural Economics

Rural Development and Agribusiness provides planning and coordination services to ensure sustainable and vibrant rural communities. The programme consists of the following sub-programme:

- Planning and Coordinates
- Cooperatives

### 5.2.9 Western Cape

Department of Agriculture

The Western Cape Department of Agriculture provides a wide range of development, research and support services to the agricultural community in the Western Cape.

The department's administrative headquarters is situated on the historic farm of Elsenburg in the Boland region. Elsenburg also accommodate new and commercial farmers at research farms, Further Education and Training Centres, extension offices, state veterinary offices and animal health technicians situated throughout the province.

About 45% of South Africa's agricultural exports move through the province and the value added in the sector amounts to more than R14 billion per annum.

The agricultural sector not only stimulates economic growth in the province, it also plays a major role in creating sustainable job opportunities.

The department's service area covers approximately 13 million hectares, of which 2 million hectares are under cultivation and 320 000 hectares are under irrigation.

The Western Cape Department of Agriculture has a direct or indirect influence on the production of wine, deciduous fruit, citrus, grain, fynbos, vegetables, ostriches, small and large stock, as well as milk and dairy products.

The Western Cape Department of Agriculture delivers the following broad range of services:

- Technology development (research) for the animal and crop producers in the Western Cape.
- Agricultural advice and guidance to the agricultural community and all users of natural resources.
- Agricultural infrastructure to qualifying farmers.
- Agricultural training, higher education as well as Further Education and Training.
- Conservation of natural resources.
Agricultural engineering services.
• Analytical services at our plant pathology and water and soil laboratories.
• Diagnostic and analytical services at our veterinary laboratories.
• Veterinary health services.
• Rural Development.

These services are delivered through seven programmes:

• Technology, Research and Development
• Sustainable Resource Management
• Veterinary Services
• Structured Agricultural Training
• Agricultural Economics
• Farmer Support and Development
• Rural Development

The Farmer Support and Development Programme encompasses the broad development agenda of the Department of Agriculture, meaning that the design and implementation are predominantly for supporting black farmers in the Western Cape Province but does not exclude the commercial sector. This support to beneficiaries ranges from land reform to institutional capacity building. Given that the predominant need for the development of an equitable and diverse agricultural sector has been identified, 80% of the budget will be utilised to build the capacity of the historically disadvantaged communities and individuals. The commercial sector employs more than 200 000 people and therefore 20% of budget will be allocated to support this sector.

The purpose of the programme is:

• To ensure sustainable support mechanism for new and established farmers (including land reform beneficiaries and farm workers).
• To measure the impact of interventions as delivered by the Programme.
• To leverage investment from the private sector and commodity groupings.
• To ensure quality and standards of service and advise to farmers.
• To ensure we assist municipalities and other government departments with the implementation of food gardens for communities and households.

The FSD programme provides extension, support and facilitation of training to farmers, with special emphasis on developing of emerging farmers, implementation of land reform programmes and agricultural rural development projects.

• Farmer Settlement: To support sustainable land and agrarian reform projects through the provision of planning and settlement support services.
• **Extension and Advisory Services:** To provide extension and advisory services to farmers to increase production for commercial markets.

• **Food Security:** To facilitate access to affordable and diverse food through agricultural projects to contribute to the Millennium Development Goals.

• **Casidra (Pty) Ltd:** To support the Department with project implementation and state farm management.

**Technology Research and Development:** The Programme, through its sub programmes: Research, Infrastructure Support Services and Information Services, renders a research, research support and information service to all stakeholders within the Province. In order to specifically support competitiveness and sustainable agriculture with cutting-edge technology, three centres of excellence, viz. Institutes of Animal Production, Plant Production and Resource Utilisation were established in 2004. Laboratory Services are also offered.

Research projects are executed within the six district municipalities. Research priorities are determined through active formal and informal engagements with industries, research peers and other relevant role players in agriculture.

Extensive research infrastructure including research farms and herds form part of the research effort. Centres of Excellence are operational at various research farms and brings the latest technology to farmers in that particular region.

Information Services is responsible for converting research results, as outputs from 180 research projects, into client-focused, user-friendly products, including hard and electronic products.

The main objectives of the programme are:

• To research, develop and adapt appropriate agriculture technology to enable agricultural producers to compete in the modern global economy and to solve production and marketing constraints.

• To transfer appropriate agriculture technology to farmers and other users of natural agricultural resources.

• To provide agro-economic information to serve as a basis for macro and micro economic decision-making.

• To convert the research rand into an information rand to the benefit to all producers in the Western Cape, irrespective of scale.

### 5.2.10 Summary Provincial Extension Services

The language and terms used to describe and define the work of the Provincial Departments of Agriculture are inconsistent. It is known from the statistical data presented earlier, that each Department has an extension service. But it is interesting to note that the extension service is often housed within a programme or unit that does not immediately suggest the core function is extension. Only Free State and Western Cape have units that carry the name or term ‘extension’. The table below gives an indication of the range and array of terms used to describe and ‘label’ the work carried out by the
Provincial Departments of Agriculture. The table is not meant to be definitive and is compiled solely from the information presented above. It is included simply to demonstrate the lack of coherence and ‘searching’ for meaning in the work being carried out.

Descriptive structures of identifying structures housing provincial extension services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPU</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rationale for the choice of terms used to describe extension in its service delivery structure is implicit in the documentation reviewed. One clarion point is that the Provincial Departments of Agriculture view extension as something more than merely sharing information and technology. They appear also to see agriculture in the wider context of rural development. Some (like North West) have specifically mentioned (and put a structure in place to support) agri-business.

There appears also an indication that the primary focus is on economically poor, resource-constrained land users (farmers), but in a mostly implicit (but occasionally explicit) paradigm that the ultimate objective is reaching the ‘status’ of a nebulously defined ‘commercial farmer’. It clearly raises the debate over the primary objective of extension – particularly in the South African context and its particular history around land and agriculture.

6 Private sector extension services

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 often manifests itself collectively and commodity-based agricultural support organisations are created. In South Africa there are numerous 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. The first table below lists some commodity-based organisations and the functions they undertake. 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.

The second table lists some private agricultural consulting agencies. The scope of their work is less defined, but gives an idea of the vastness of this potential resource for partnerships in extension.

**A selection of commodity-based organisations in South Africa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Banana Growers’ Association of South Africa</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Canned Fruit Producers’ Association</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3) Citrus Growers Association | • Gain, retain and optimize market access  
• Fund, control and implement research and development  
• Provide product and quality assurance  
• Engage with government and other stakeholders  
• Assist grower profitability and sustainability  
• Drive industry transformation  
• Facilitate efficient logistics |
| 4) Citrus Research International (Pty) Ltd (CRI)§ | • 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  
• Transferring research outputs to the intended users  
• Co-ordinating transfer of knowledge to the southern African citrus growers and their service agents |
| 5) Cotton SA | • Information services  
• Stimulating production and use of cotton  
• Research, quality standards and norms as well as training  
• Act as industry forum  
• Advisory body to various Government Departments  
• Overseeing Cotton Sector Strategy Plan  
• Small-scale cotton farmer development  
  - Training emerging and small-scale farmers  
  - Improving research and extension services and technology transfer |
<p>| 6) Deciduous Fruit Producers’ Trust (DFPT) | See FruitGro |
| 7) Dry Bean Producers’ Organisation (DPO) | No information available |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8) Forestry South Africa (FSA)    | • Represent growers of timber in South Africa  
• Promote the interests of all growers of all commercial tree species and to create unity of purpose amongst members  
• Promote the sustainable commercial production and utilisation of timber and forest  
• Promote the growth, development and well-being of the South African Forestry Industry  
• Promote policies and practices which support free competition and foster and encourage entrepreneurship and innovation  
• Promote, support and encourage education and training, research and development and technology transfer in the interests of members  
• Collect, analyse, exchange and disseminate information, literature and statistics relevant to the need of its members |
| 9) FruitGro                       | • Manage the research process for the fresh deciduous fruit industry  
• Direct and guide research to address industry needs  
• Facilitate capacity development  
• Transfer information and research results to growers |
| 10) Grain SA                      | • Provides strategic support to grain producers in South Africa to promote sustainable production and profitability  
• Extension related services:  
  – Production information  
  – Production environment information  
  – External information  
  – Input product information  
  – Marketing information  
  – Macro environment information  
• Farmer Development Programme to develop black commercial farmers |
| 11) Hluhluwe Pineapple Marketing Association | • Market and promote pineapples produced by members  
• Mouth-piece for/represent the members  
• Conduct pineapple research.  
No mention of formal extension function |
| 12) Milk Producers’ Organisation (MPO) | • Represents and empowers milk producers  
• Extension activities:  
  – Dairy information days  
  – Mentorship programmes  
  – Training and technology transfer for farm managers, emerging farmers and farm workers  
  – Conference and expos  
  – Advice and assistance to developing/aspiring milk producers |
| 13) National Emergent Red Meat Producers’ Organisation (Nerpo) | • Facilitate the empowerment of members to improve their social and economic well-being and to enable them to sustainably utilise market opportunities  
• Build institutional capacity  
• Commercialisation of the emerging sector by facilitating access to technical support, credit facilities and markets  
• Economic empowerment of members, youth and women through the creation of business opportunities within the supply chain |
| 14) National Ostrich Processors of South Africa (NOPSA) | • Promote the interests of the ostrich processing industry  
• Coordinate matters affecting the ostrich processing industry  
• Forum for dialogue amongst members and to promote dialogue between processors and producers  
No mention of any formal extension function |
**Agency** | **Description**
--- | ---
15) National Woolgrowers Association | - Increase the profitability of wool sheep farming  
- Producer-driven research into marketing with a section dedicated to new farmer development  
- Providing information to woolgrowers  
- Promotion of sustainable and profitable wool sheep farming  
- Focus on commercial farmers, communal farmers, and shearing
16) Red Meat Forum | - Determine industry policy, decides on strategy, guides and monitors progress of strategy  
- Liaise with all industry and state structures  
- Key focus areas:  
  - Animal Health and Bio Security  
  - Information gathering and dissemination  
  - Commercialising the Emergent Sector.  
  - Production improvement.  
  - Good Management Practices.  
  - Training
17) SA Canegrowers Association | - Represent 47000 private cane growers  
- Look after the interests of all private cane growers  
- Responsible for grower development and empowerment programmes  
- Collaborate with the South African Sugarcane Research Institute on extension and research and development issues  
- Provide economic and technical advice and support to the grower organisation structures as well as farm business advisory services to individual growers
18) SA Mango Growers Association | - Solve producer problems through research and facilitate communication between researchers and producers  
Does not seem to have a formal extension function
19) South Africa Avocado Growers Association | - Collect and distribute information about avocado production and marketing  
- Research into avocado production and marketing  
- Recommend quality requirements and the application thereof  
- Extension to farmers  
- Provide a discussion forum
20) South African Cotton Producers’ Organisation (SACPO) | See Cotton SA
21) South African Meat Industry Company (SAMIC) | - Ensure always 100% integrity beef, lamb and pork (refers to issues of fraud and collusion)  
- Independent ‘Brand’ auditing on Trademarks at farms, feedlots, abattoirs, and deboning plants and outlets  
- 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  
- Assessment of qualified meat classifiers  
- Independent inspections at all abattoirs, meat traders, imported meat and hide and skins plants  
- Hold and judge carcass competitions related to market requirements and consumer demands are  
No mention of formal extension function
22) South African Mohair Growers’ Association | - Promote mohair production and general farming of Angora Goats  
- Have farmer study groups
23) South African Nursery Association (SANA) | - Provide a professional national communication among Nursery businesses  
- Training in in displays and merchandising  
No mention of formal extension programme
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Description</th>
<th>Agency Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South African Ostrich Producers Organization</td>
<td>No information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Pork Producers Organisation (SAPPO) Coordinate and manage emerging pig farming projects countrywide towards becoming commercially successful Training, mentorship, advice and veterinary support for new producers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Poultry Association Promote and advance improvement of the poultry and all poultry-related industries Publish/Provide advice to producers Training programmes (target is not stated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Rooibos Council Advocacy and research, food safety, certification, and conservation agencies for the collective benefit of the industry No reference to formal extension function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Subtropical Fruits Growing Association Technical support and advisory services to its growers Funding of appropriate technical and market research Provision of relevant market information Local and export market development through generic promotion Liaison with government and other bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Sugar Association (SASA) Promote the global competitiveness, profitability and sustainability of the South African sugar industry Associated South African Cane Growers’ Association and the sugar milling companies undertake development projects and are involved in BBBEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASRI Extension Provides link between researchers and sugarcane farmers Offers a range of services including fertiliser advice, disease diagnoses and education courses Research on variety improvement, crop protection, crop performance &amp; management, systems design &amp; optimisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomato Producers’ Organisation (TPO) No information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VinPro Consultation services in viticulture, oenology, soil science, agroeconomy and general management BEE Advisory Service assists producers with strategic land reform, specialised project evaluation and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildliferanching SA Research and information sharing No mention of extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A selection of private agricultural (and related) consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) ABSi</td>
<td>AgriBusiness Systems international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Advance Seed Euro Africa</td>
<td>A South African based agricultural farming, processing and trading organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) AFMA</td>
<td>Animal Feed Manufacturers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Afri-Africa</td>
<td>A South African based group of agricultural consultants. Amongst other our fields of expertise include agricultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) AGFACTS</td>
<td>Information about agriculture and the agricultural machinery industry in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) AGIS</td>
<td>The Southern African Agricultural Geo-referenced Information System (AGIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) AGRA</td>
<td>An agricultural Co-operative and one of the main forces in the farming and agricultural sectors in Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Agri-IQ</td>
<td>Agricultural consulting, facilitation and management of farms Agricultural capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Agri-spot</td>
<td>Agricultural consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) AgriBrand</td>
<td>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) AgriBSA - Breedplan and Genestar South Africa</td>
<td>Provides Genestar and Breedplan solutions to the agricultural industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) AgriBudget</td>
<td>A farm management and planning tool towards success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Agricol Seeds</td>
<td>A seed company involved in various divisions in this field. With an extended network of branches and agents all over South Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Agricon Africa</td>
<td>For independent professional agribusiness consulting, project feasibility, land and enterprise development and farm supervision in Central and Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Agrisearch</td>
<td>Agricultural chemicals registration, consulting, agricultural research, crop trials, chemical trials, crop analysis, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Agro Organics</td>
<td>Suppliers of agricultural systems that promote environmentally, socially and economically sound food production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) ARS</td>
<td>Agri Risk Specialists, ARS, specialises in crop insurance and fulfils a leading role in the South African agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) B&amp;R VERSPREIDERS</td>
<td>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) BKB</td>
<td>South African leader in wool and mohair auctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Centre for Agricultural Management</td>
<td>Vermicompost courses and sell compost worms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Citrus Research International</td>
<td>Serves to clarify the different roles that CRI plays within the Southern African citrus industry and should aid technology transfer between these parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Coastal Farmer's Homepage</td>
<td>Supplies fertiliser, agro-chemicals, fuels, bulk animal feeds, hardware to the sugar farming industry and more recently to the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) May Agri Solutions</td>
<td>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Motheo Consultants and Project Management (Cc)</td>
<td>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) NRM Consulting</td>
<td>Helps clients with strategic advice in natural resources management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Potato Net</td>
<td>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) Schoeman En Vennote</td>
<td>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) Tammac Consultants Agricultural Consultants</td>
<td>Agricultural Consultants, Agricultural Management Consultants, Agricultural Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Wetland Consulting Services (Pty.) Ltd</td>
<td>Offers a specialised service in wetland and river consulting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 NGO sector extension services
South Africa has a long history of NGOs offering advice, support and other services to farmers and rural communities. Many of these were originally associated with anti-apartheid efforts. Others are connected to religious organisations. Still others are private trusts created to fulfil a perceived need. This review will (initially) list NGOs in three areas:

- NGOs dedicated to agriculture;
- NGOs dedicated rural development; and
- NGOs dedicated to land issues.

### NGOs focussing on agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) Abalimi Bezekhaya | - Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Environment, Rural Development, Skills Development, Monitoring and Evaluation  
- 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. |
| 2) African Centre for Biosafety | - Active in: Advocacy and Awareness, Agriculture and Food Security, Environment, Skills Development  
- 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. |
| 3) AgriAids | - Active in: Advocacy and Awareness, Agriculture and Food Security, HIV/AIDS, Skills Development  
- 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  
- Empower farm workers to be responsible for their own wellness, through implementing HIV and other life improving programmes on farms and farming communities |
- Promote sustainable community development through specialized research and collaboration with other stakeholders |
| 5) Association for Rural Advancement | - Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Land, Legal Services, Rural Development  
- 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 |
### Organisation Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6) Buhle Farmers’ Academy | • Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Economic Development, Skills Development  
• 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  
• Enable new and emerging farmers to establish themselves in viable farming businesses through effective skills training and support |
| 7) Enviro Solutions Centre | • Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Arts and Culture, Children, Environment, HIV/AIDS, Poverty  
• Support the development of environmental solutions that are financially viable, sustainable and accessible to everyone  
• 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 |
| 8) Fairtrade Label South Africa | • Active in: Advocacy and Awareness, Agriculture and Food Security, Rural Development, Labour  
• 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 |
| 9) Food and Trees for Africa | • Active in: Advocacy and Awareness, Agriculture and Food Security, Environment, Poverty  
• 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  
• Greening, environmental awareness and education towards happier people on a healthier planet |
| 10) Foodbank - Johannesburg | • Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Poverty, Welfare and Social Development  
• Food Rescue, Food Procurement Food Distribution, Community Development to promote development and not dependency  
• School feeding programme |
| 11) Grassland Society of Southern Africa | • Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Education, Environment, Research  
• 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 |
| 12) NEPAD Business Foundation | • Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Democracy and Governance, Economic Development, Infrastructure, Networking, Poverty  
• 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 |
| 13) Noah Community | • Active in: Agriculture and Food Security, Children, Early Childhood Development, Welfare and Social Development  
• 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 |
### NGOs focussing on rural development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1) Africa Co-operative Action Trust** | • Advocacy and Awareness, Entrepreneurship, Environment, Rural Development, Women  
• 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  
• Sustainable Agriculture Entrepreneurial Development Mainstreaming: HIV and AIDS Partnership Programme ABET and training modules development |
| **2) Association for Water and Rural Development (AWARD)** | • 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  
• 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). |
| **3) Bergzicht Training Centre** | • Early Childhood Development, Rural Development, Skills Development, Urban Development  
• 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” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4) Biowatch South Africa</td>
<td>• Advocacy and Awareness, Economic Development, Environment, International Relations, Poverty, Research, Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Border Rural Committee</td>
<td>• 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. The organisation will deliver this work through a value-driven and balanced institutional approach that seeks to: Maxmise accountability to communities. Ensure a high level of service through utilising various mechanisms for delivery (staff, partnerships and outsourcing). Harness the capacities of civil society. Realise a critical partnership with government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Built Environment Support Group</td>
<td>• Advocacy and Awareness, Economic Development, Environment, Housing, Rural Development, Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support the poor and vulnerable to access resources and increasingly gain control over their lives and destines, 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Bulungula Incubator (The)</td>
<td>• Education, Entrepreneurship, Health, Rural Development, Skills Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) CALEB</td>
<td>• Education, Gender, Human Rights, Rural Development, Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Centre for Rural Legal Studies</td>
<td>• Advocacy and Awareness, Land, Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Independent policy development body dedicated to the equitable distribution of power and resources in the rural areas of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Community Law and Rural Development Centre</td>
<td>• Advocacy and Awareness, Justice, Legal Services, Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Connect Africa</td>
<td>• Economic Development, Entrepreneurship, Information Communication Technology (ICT), Networking, Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12) Environmental Monitoring Group | • Advocacy and Awareness, Environment, Research, Rural Development  
• Climate Change Fair Trade Rural Development Water and Climate Change |
| 13) Hand in Hand South Africa | • Poverty, Rural Development, Skills Development, Urban Development, Welfare and Social Development  
• 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 |
| 14) Ithuteng Dipuo Foundation | • Arts and Culture, Children, Education, Poverty, Rural Development, Sport and Recreation, Youth  
• 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  
• Improve poverty, health and social development  
• Support sport development by cultivating awareness towards sport among the youth to become active in sport  
• Enhance community development  
• 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 |
| 15) Nkuzi Development Association - Polokwane | • Advocacy and Awareness, HIV/AIDS, Human Rights, Land, Networking, Policy, Research, Rural Development, Skills Development  
• Enable and support marginalised rural and peri-urban communities in exercising their land and related rights  
• Facilitate the acquisition of land and its productive and sustainable use |
| 16) Phakamani Foundation | • Entrepreneurship, Poverty, Rural Development, Women  
• 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. |
| 17) Rural Action Committee - Mpumalanga (The) | • Human Rights, Land, Rural Development  
• Works with disadvantaged rural and peri-urban communities to promote human rights, tenure rights and sustainable development in Mpumalanga  
• Farm Dweller Support Programme: providing para-legal and legal support to farm dwellers threatened with evictions Human Rights Awareness and Intervention Programme provides 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 | • Advocacy and Awareness, Human Rights, Land, Legal Services, Rural Development  
• 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  
• Provision of Legal Services for People From Farms  
• Monitoring of Public Service provision  
• Lobbying |
| 19) SaveAct | • Advocacy and Awareness, Health, HIV/AIDS, Rural Development, Skills Development, Women  
• Promoting Savings and Credit Groups as effective instruments for accessing financial services, building sustainable livelihoods, and empowering women and other vulnerable groups |
### Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20) Sinamandla | - Children, Economic Development, Rural Development, Women  
- 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 |
| 21) Siyakhula Trust | - Education, Rural Development, Skills Development  
- 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 |
| 22) Transkei Land Service Organisation | - Advocacy and Awareness, Agriculture and Food Security, Gender, Land, Rural Development  
- 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  
- 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 |
| 23) Umthathi Training Project | - Agriculture and Food Security, Arts and Culture, Children, Policy, Rural Development, Skills Development  
- Enable sustainable health by providing an integrated programme of capacity-building training and developmental education, in sustainable organic food production methods, health & nutrition education, income generation and to contribute to conservation by enhancing biodiversity  
- Agriculture Programme Community Development Programme Schools Garden Programme |

### NGOS Focusing on land issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Association for Rural Advancement</td>
<td>- See Agricultural NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Centre for Rural Legal Studies</td>
<td>- See Rural Development NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3) Development Action Group | - Housing, Land, Research, Urban Development  
- 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 |
| 4) Inkezo Land Company | - Economic Development, Entrepreneurship, Land  
- Sustainable sugar industry in South Africa ensured through diverse ownership of agricultural land under sugarcane by competent farmers |
Organisation | Profile
---|---
5) Nkuzi Development Association - Polokwane | • Advocacy and Awareness, HIV/AIDS, Human Rights, Land, Networking, Policy, Research, Rural Development, Skills Development • Enable and support marginalised rural and peri-urban communities in exercising their land and related rights • Facilitate the acquisition of land and its productive and sustainable use • 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
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 | • Funding and Grant-Making, Land • 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. • 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. • 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.
10) Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign | • Environment, Housing, Land, Welfare and Social Development • No additional information available

8 Other potential extension partners
Other potential extension partners include state-funded agricultural agencies, organised agriculture, universities, universities of technology and agricultural colleges. The tables that follow provide a brief overview of these institutions.

8.1 State-funded Agricultural Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgriTV</td>
<td>• TV programme adding value to the business of Agriculture; SABC 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Research Council (ARC)</td>
<td>• Agricultural Research through 11 research institutes • Training to address the information gap between R&amp;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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agri-Business</td>
<td>• Coordinates services provided by government and the private sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Agency (KZN) including:
- Capacity building, training, mentoring & skills development among black commercial farmers
- Technical support to black commercial farmers for business, technical, production, and marketing support
- Providing and developing infrastructure for commercial production
- Providing access to funding and resources
- Facilitating access to opportunities in the agribusiness value chain

8.2 Organised agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri-SA</td>
<td>• 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agricultural Farmers Union</td>
<td>• Mouthpiece of predominantly black small-holder farmers in South Africa. NAFU strives to actively promote the interests primarily of black farmers who are largely a disproportionately disadvantaged farming community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lobbies for policy reforms to level playing field; key areas: land acquisition, agricultural funding, market access and public policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lobby for the provision of appropriate services e.g. extension, marketing and credit to members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate the provision of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Empower women and young people so as to enable them to participate fully in farming activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 South Africa universities with agricultural degree and research programmes

While each of the following universities has programmes in agriculture, only a few have dedicated programmes in Extension. These are denoted with an asterisk (*)

Universities and their respective agricultural qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Qualifications Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo* (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretoria*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISA</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zululand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Have programmes dedicated to Extension (1) Extension offered at Masters and PhD only
8.3.1 Universities of Technology
The following five (5) universities of technology offer a range of qualifications in agriculture. They offer production related qualifications as well as agricultural management qualifications. The range of qualifications includes: Diploma (3-year), Bachelor of Technology (1-year post diploma), Master of Technology, and Doctor 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

8.3.2 Colleges of Agriculture
There are 12 agricultural colleges. Of these nine (9) offer higher education qualifications. In general, these qualifications are production related three-year diplomas in agriculture. Only the Cape Institute for Agricultural Training (CIAT) offers a named extension diploma. Cedara and CIAT 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.

### Agricultural Colleges and their respective qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Programmes offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Cedara (Kwazulu-Natal)</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Agric in association with UKZN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Cape Institute for Agricultural Training (Elsenburg)</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Agric in association with Stellenbosch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Fort Cox (Eastern Cape)</td>
<td>Farmer Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Glen (Free State)</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Grootfontein (Eastern Cape)</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Lowveld (Mpumalanga)</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Madzivhandila (Limpopo)</td>
<td>Farmer Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Owen Sitole (Kwazulu-Natal)</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Potchefstroom (North West)</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Taung (North West)</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Tompi Seleka (Limpopo)</td>
<td>Farmer Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Tsolo (Eastern Cape)</td>
<td>Farmer Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-house Extension Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Managed by DAFF
9 Agricultural education and training

(Adapted with permission from Worth 2009)

In 2005, the National Department of Agriculture (NDA) launched the National Education and Training Strategy for Agriculture and Rural Development in South Africa (known as the AET strategy) (Didiza 2005). This is a third key factor in the development of curriculum markers for Agricultural Extension education.

The AET strategy was the result of a consultative process engaging many stakeholders over a broad spectrum of agricultural sector. Farmers, State, private and NGO service providers, farm workers, agricultural colleges, universities as well as the formal structures governing the development of training and educational programmes (known as Sectoral Education and Training Authorities (SETAs)) were all engaged in the development of the AET Strategy (NDA, 2005).

The NDA (2005:5) noted that the AET Strategy “represents the first effort to address agricultural education and training holistically in a manner that engages all role players to develop and maintain an effective and well coordinated AET that is integrated at all levels and responding appropriately to South African Agriculture.” The AET Strategy for agricultural education and training should ultimately contribute to “effective agricultural and economic development” (NDA 2005: 13). A specific intervention called for in the AET Strategy is to “review the alignment of AET Curricula at all levels to support the development of effective agricultural science, agricultural practice and Agricultural Extension skills and expertise” (NDA, 2005:24). It further expresses a need for regular reflection and adaptation to meet changes as they arise in the agricultural sector (NDA, 2005: 14).

An integral part of the AET strategy is the articulation of key principles which should underpin, among other things, curricula (NDA 2005: 14):

1. “While the context for AET is improvement and increased sustainability of South African Agriculture, it is primarily a programme of Human Resources Development, which recognises the inherent nobility and dignity of every individual touched by AET, whether as a service provider or as its user

2. AET is committed to operating in a paradigm of continual partnership-based learning through a conscious linkage to research, education and extension (outreach), each informing and enhancing the other through a partnership between service provider and client, thereby promoting an active process of planning, action, reflection and learning

3. Planning and implementation of AET will take into consideration the practical reality that the more independent a farmer is, less intervention should be required/expected from the State and more support be provided by the private sector—the reverse is also true—underscoring the partnership relations

4. AET is committed to the principles of integrity, trustworthiness, but these are only measured by deeds rather than by words

5. AET should result in a wide range of developed human resources engaged at all levels of agriculture
6. *AET should be harnessed to deal with short, medium and long-term issues facing agriculture in South Africa, ranging from micro issues of household food security to international issues of global competitiveness of South African agricultural products.*

7. *AET should make a genuine contribution to the realisation of the strategic outcomes of the prevailing agricultural strategy.*

It is clear from the foregoing, that agricultural education and training is meant to include Agricultural Extension as an integral part of the educational and learning processes. Further, the AET Strategy specifically targets Agricultural Extension as a key competency and skill set needed to meet the demands of the agricultural development agenda as well as to integrate such issues as rural change, HIV/AIDS, and household livelihood systems (NDA, 2005). While it is beyond the scope of this paper, the AET Strategy suggests that agricultural economists, agricultural engineers and agricultural scientists all be equipped with “*The skill of engaging farmers, producers and small-scale value-Adders in technology development...*” (NDA, 2005:12).

One of the goals of the AET strategy is to “Ensure the alignment of AET curricula with urgent challenges facing South African agriculture” (NDA, 2005: 21). Further, it should deliver on “a wide range of developed human resources engaged at all levels of agriculture” (NDA, 2005: 4). Three key areas are identified as starting points to adjust the content of curricula at various levels to reflect these “urgent challenges” in the agricultural sector (NDA, 2005: 15):

- Sustainable development and land care;
- Food Security and water harvesting; and
- Rural wealth creation

Other skills which are specifically identified in relation to meeting the current agricultural agenda as a reflection of the current needs in the sector are (NDA, 2005: 12):

- Agricultural Extension;
- Sustainable livelihoods;
- Food security;
- Resource management;
- Agricultural law and policy;
- Land care; and
- Environmental management.

The policy later expands the list to include sustainable agriculture and sustainable development. These and the foregoing skills are specifically targeted for Agricultural Extension at both the service delivery level and the higher education level (NDA 2005).

Drawing on the foregoing, in addition to the particular range of learning that should be included in Agricultural Extension education curricula, the following qualitative elements give some direction to the method and ethos of learning adopted:
• Partnership-based learning;
• A conscious linkage to research, education and extension (outreach), each informing and enhancing the other through partnerships between service provider and client;
• An active process of planning, action, reflection and learning;
• Principles of integrity, trustworthiness, measured by deeds rather than by words; and
• Making a genuine contribution to the realisation of the strategic outcomes of the prevailing agricultural strategy.

Stemming from the AET strategy, a number of initiatives have been implemented. The DAFF commissioned series of studies into the operations of the 12 colleges of agriculture (11 of which are managed through provincial Departments of Agriculture. The aim was to determine the role these institutions could/should play in the overall effort to strengthen the agricultural sector. The end result is that the colleges are to be transformed into semi-autonomous training institutes operating under legislation that is currently being prepared. In the interim, the curricula at the colleges is being reviewed and the colleges are in the process of being reaccredited – part of which involves improving infrastructure. The overall process is being funded with CASP funds.

Another initiative is the review of the qualifications for extension officers. As is noted in the more recent documentation on the Extension Recovery Plan, a degree is preferred for entry level officers. Research conducted by UKZN found that few of the agricultural qualifications offered at South African higher education institutions include extension in their curricula – resulting in the situation where even if offers have degrees, they most likely do not have training in extension. This research as resulted in a number of universities reviewing their three-year Bachelor of Agriculture degrees to align them to an extension friendly curricula. The first of these new B Agrics was launched at UKZN, in 2010 and is taught in collaboration with Cedara College of Agriculture. The Cape Institute for Agricultural Training is currently reviewing its Stellenbocsh University accredited B Agric. And a new B Agric is being investigated to be offered collaboratively between Owen Sitole College of Agriculture and the University of Zululand.

Research is also being conducted into the offering of agricultural sciences at high school level. Concerns have been raised by two main facts: many (if not the majority) of the high school agricultural science teachers have never studied agriculture; and agricultural science has the highest failure rates of all subjects taken at matric (Kildane and Worth, 2012).

10 The Future of Agricultural Extension

As can be readily observed from the review of the myriad policies, the underlying aim of all government policy is to “bring the previously excluded black community into the mainstream economy.” It is the desire of the state that the majority of South African’s who have been excluded and who have been largely prevented from benefiting from the possibilities that the resources of the country create, be given a fair chance at prosperity. As complex as it is in the urban setting to achieve this, achieving it in the rural areas is
even more daunting and requires greater breadth of vision, coordination of effort and harmonisation of action.

What is also apparent is that 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 UKZN (Worth 2009), extension officers are not equipped to deliver on this agenda. Size alone is a problem as noted by Hall and Aliber (2010) – there is doubt that it would be practicable to hire sufficient numbers of capable extension workers. In addition to increasing the number of extension workers and ensuring that they are appropriately trained, it will require creative partnerships with other extension services providers and with farmers as they build capacity.

The FAO (2010) reminds policy-makers that when considering the content and structure of land and agrarian reform support the following should be borne in mind:

“Global experience shows that land and agrarian reform programmes are very complex and demand a high degree of capacity among the agencies that implement them. Capacity determines what is feasible, and governments should not pass legislation when there is insufficient capacity or resources to implement the legislation.

“Two broad domains of capacity are critical in providing support to land and agrarian reform: the capacity to administer land; and the capacity to support the establishment of new farmers.

“The capacity to administer land includes land surveying, titling and registration and land-use planning, land valuation and land taxation.

“The capacity to support the establishment of new farmers encompasses a wide range of support services that are needed to enhance the competitiveness and viability of the new farms that are being established. These include:

- Institutional innovation in rural financial markets, particularly in market-assisted land reforms;
- Facilitating access to credit, technology, financial and farm management skills and marketing information; and
- Facilitating linkages with the private sector (typically problematic because the private sector tends to be wary of entering into partnerships with new farmers or their organizations, preferring to deal with intermediaries instead). Support services can promote the broadening of linkages between new farmers and the private sector through market matching and agribusiness assistance to beneficiaries, consultations and dialogues, thus forging links between private entrepreneur-buyers and beneficiary producers.

“Global experience also shows that the support services need to be well coordinated and integrated to achieve maximum benefit. The ‘silos approach’ characterized by a series of different, disjointed (and sometimes conflicting) initiatives is inefficient and sometimes counter-productive. In line with the general global trend, several countries have adopted a decentralized approach to land administration with a view to empowering local institutions to respond to local needs. While placing services closer to citizens, these
approaches have also increased the need for capacity building at local levels in order for these services to be provided effectively."

The foregoing not only describes the kind and range of services that would be needed for successful execution of the intended strategy, but also the kind of knowledge and skills that extension workers would need to have.

10.1 Approaches to Agricultural Extension

(Adapted with permission from Worth 2006)

It is observed that there are two general schools of thought pertaining to extension. One school recognises extension primarily as technology transfer (TT). The other recognises extension as part of a human development programme (HD). It is essential for extension officers to know whether the aim is to develop agriculture or people. It is suggested that the TT school of thought assumes extension seeks to develop agriculture through people and that the HD school of thought assumes extension seeks to develop people through agriculture. Clarity is required as to whether extension is to be technology-centred or people-centred.

Röling (1995) identified three approaches to agricultural extension: linear models, advisory models and facilitation models. Linear models focus on technology transfer with extension officers being conduits to farmers. Advisory models remain technology based, but places greater onus on farmers for accessing information about technology and provides access to technical advice and support.

In contrast, facilitation models stress the engagement between and amongst researchers, extension officers and farmers in the pursuit of knowledge/technology development. In facilitation models, research develops principles of sustainable agriculture, the curricula for ‘discovery learning’ and learning tools (Röling, 1995). Farmers engage as partners in a learning process facilitated by extension officers.

Fulton et al. (2003) confirmed Röling’s (1990) and Röling and Engel’s (1991) assertions that the purpose of extension is to develop and enrich livelihoods. They further state that the focus of extension should be on rural people realising their full potential. Hanyani-Mlambo (2000) further noted the contribution extension makes as a catalyst to agricultural and rural development.

Literature reveals a wide range of opinions about the role of farmers in extension. On the one end, farmers are seen as recipients of extension. On the other end, farmers are seen as partners in extension. Petheram (1998) identified farmers as beneficiaries of extension. Duvel (2000) identified farmers as participants in extension. Schuh (2000) implied farmers are learners, arguing that education puts farmers in the position of being able to use their resources more efficiently. Roberts et al. (2002) recognised farmers as ‘co-learners’ in which role, gaining knowledge was expedited.

Swanson et al. (1997) suggested that extension should integrate technology transfer with human resource development; that farmers need to acquire skills beyond merely using a particular technology. They need to acquire skills that foster insight into problems
and alternatives. The skills required may vary from community to community, but extension clearly has a role in human resource development amongst farmers.

As set out in the table overleaf, extension can be grouped into a number of approaches which are differentiated by a range of characteristics:

- Purpose
- Source of Innovation
- Promoter’s Role
- Farmer’s Role
- Assumptions
- Supply/Demand
- Orientation
- ‘Target’

Using these determinants, it is useful then to organise extension approaches around four basic concepts:

- Linear approaches (Technology Transfer)
- Advisory approaches
- Facilitation approaches
- Learning approaches

The table briefly presents how these approaches compare to one another.
## Comparison of Extension Approaches Based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>EXTENSION MODELS/APPROACHES</th>
<th>Linear</th>
<th>Advisory</th>
<th>Facilitation</th>
<th>Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Production increase through transfer of technology Government policy</td>
<td>Holistic approach to farm entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Empowerment and ownership</td>
<td>Awakening desire and building skills in learning for advancement as jointly defined by partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Innovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside innovations</td>
<td>Outside innovations and by farm manager</td>
<td>Local knowledge and innovations</td>
<td>Synergistic partnership of farmers, researchers and extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoter’s Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extending knowledge</td>
<td>Providing advice</td>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>Promoting learning skills and facilitating partnerships for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmer’s Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passive: others know what is best Adopting recommended technologies</td>
<td>Active: problem solving Asking for advice Taking management decisions</td>
<td>Active: problem solving; owns the process Learning by doing Farmer-to-farmer learning</td>
<td>Considering all possibilities Contributing to own and others’ learning; partner in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research corresponds to farmer’s problem</td>
<td>Farmer knows what advisory services he needs</td>
<td>Farmer willing to learn to interact and to take ownership</td>
<td>Farmer less powerful in learning relationship; needs support in developing desire and skill to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply/Demand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Supply to evoke dynamic relationship of supply and demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Client and process and ‘right’ placement of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Target’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>Individuals Groups with common problems</td>
<td>Groups and organisations, interaction of stakeholders, networking</td>
<td>Farmers in context of a learning partnership Others in partnership in context of facilitated learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is now ‘correct’ approach. What is important is that the extension practitioner is reasonably well versed in each of the approaches and the methods they employ in practice. They need to know when which mode is appropriate for the farmer(s) with whom they are engaging. The choice is made, not on the basis of the extension practitioner’s preference, but based on what will most effectively position the farmer so that he is in command of the processes and factors that affect his farming operations and limit his choices.

10.1.1 Sustainable Livelihoods

Another facet to incorporate into the designing of extension is the Sustainable Livelihoods (SL) concept. SL provides a useful learning framework, and presents positive implications for extension. As noted previously, Röling (1990), Röling and Engel (1991), Scoones and Thompson (1994), the Neuchatel Group (1999) and Christoplos et al. (2000) each confirmed the relevance of a livelihoods or SL approach to extension. Applying SL to extension can assist farmers in moving from merely escaping poverty to helping them ‘thrive’ (Farrington et al., 2002). Applying SL approaches to realise improved assets, reduced vulnerability and prosperity, requires that all relevant role-players engage fully in the process.

10.1.2 The extension carousel

One of the challenges facing extension and extension practitioners is that they need to be flexible and agile in their work. Farming is not just about producing a product. It involves considerably more. Extension workers who have been trained in only production technologies will be very limited in their ability to assist farmers acquire the capacity to command whatever is affecting the operation of his farm. It is generally accepted that extension personnel need to have some technical production knowledge and skill – the level of specialisation is a subject of much debate. The FAO (2010) pointed out that extension workers need also have a good understanding of farm management. And of course they need to know about extension theory and practice. The following ‘carousel of learning’ is an attempt to capture this array of knowledge and skills.
The figure presents two fundamental aspects. The ‘stand’ represents the foundation of extension learning. It includes knowledge and skills in technology innovation and scientific enquiry, sustainable livelihoods and development concepts, reflection-based learning, systems thinking and targeted facilitation. The latter makes reference to the need for the extension worker to take an active (supply) role in foster the capacity to learn within the farmer – rather than leaving it to the farmer alone to find a way forward.

The following table presents a brief outline of the technical knowledge needed. This is divided into three areas: production, management and economics.
### Technical components of the Carousel of Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Area</th>
<th>Brief explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production</strong></td>
<td><strong>Functional knowledge recommended</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land</td>
<td>• Soil-plant and soil-animal relationships (e.g. productivity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Input Supply</td>
<td>• Land in society, economics and law (including land reform)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology</td>
<td>• Evaluation of technical options; Technology development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Infrastructure</td>
<td>• Basic infrastructural requirements; evaluation of infrastructure options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
<td><strong>Practical skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finance</td>
<td>• Profitability, Gross margins, Enterprise budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Markets &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>• Fundamentals of marketing, evaluation of marketing options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Practical skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information &amp; Skills</td>
<td>• Locating, assessing, generating information; Skills assessment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organisational Capacity</td>
<td>• Basic farm management (understanding the key element of farm management including diagnosis, planning, organising, implementing and monitoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Viability</strong></td>
<td>• Assess agricultural activities in terms of social viability/acceptability (including cultural heritage, labour law, other social and cultural regulations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>• Assess agricultural activities in terms of environmental viability/acceptability (including natural resource management, conservation, environmental law)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.1.3 Caveats

Designing an extension policy and preparing extension workers to implement must take into account the overarching context that – certainly in South Africa – an extension worker is going to operate within.

OCED (2006) expresses it as follows:

“... in a country like South Africa, higher economic growth is inconceivable without easing profound humanitarian problems, such as social divisions, illiteracy and low education levels, and HIV/AIDS. These problems are largely rooted in rural South Africa, and agricultural development has an important role to play in their resolution. This circular dependence between agricultural and economic growth on the one hand and human development on the other ultimately represents the most difficult challenge facing South Africa’s policy makers”.

In a similar vein, Nel and Binns (2000) urge that the ‘bigger picture’ not just be acknowledged but practically factored into the overall extension plan.

“Government plans to encourage community development and small-scale Black farmers (RSA, 1995) might well succeed initially, but could easily founder when emerging entrepreneurs and farmers try to sell their produce in a market geared towards organized farming and big-business interests. Extension support, advice and assistance with marketing are clearly essential to the success of emerging initiatives..... A key role exists for NGOs..., private business... or government to provide the vitally necessary facilitation and support to establish initiatives and assist them on the path towards sustainability” (Nel & Binns 2000: np).
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### Appendix

#### Timeline of SA agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Prior to 1600 | Livestock herding  
Some indications of cropping                                                                                                                                |
| 17th & 18th Centuries | - First trials on various crops such as wheat, oats and barley.  
- Stock-farming was started on a small scale with sheep and cattle bartered from the Khoikhoi  
- Systematic settlement of the country by independent white farmers  
- From 1688, French Huguenots established viticulture in South Africa.  
- From the middle of the 18th century a flourishing ostrich trade led to the first formal enclosures on farms. Since then it has become general practice to fence off pastures. |
| 1800-1825 | - Grazing became scarcer in the northeastern parts of the Cape Colony; farmers crossed the Orange River to find new pastures.  
- Quality of stock was improved and more types were bred.  
- Growing domestic market provided a strong incentive for a more diversified and profitable type of farming, especially to the benefit of viticulture and wool production.  
- Mutton-sheep farming was replaced by wool farming; by the middle of the 19th Century woolled sheep outnumbered mutton sheep.  
- First irrigation works erected and improved and a start was made in planting cultivated pastures on a larger scale.  
- African agriculturists came into contact with settler society including missionaries, markets and magistrates.  
- Expansion of the Cape colony into Xhosa territory led to black individuals and communities adapt traditional agricultural techniques to produce for commercial markets, to buy and improve land, and to experiment with new crops and commodities.  
- The ox-drawn iron plough brought new land into cultivation and increased crop size. |
| 1830-1890 | - Prosperous peasant class emerged in the Transkei, Ciskei and Basutoland.                                                                                                                                   |
| 1870 & 1880 | - Mineral revolution led gave African peasant producers opportunities such as sugar production in Natal and, in the Eastern Cape, the Orange Free State and Transvaal labour tenancy and sharecropping arrangements provided large numbers of peasants with a modest prosperity. A substantial proportion of white-owned land was occupied and farmed by black tenants and sharecroppers. |
| 1890s | - Emergence of upcoming class of black farmers and the ability of rural black communities to withhold labour from the mines, cities and farms annoyed colonial politicians and employers led to a series of laws designed to make it more difficult for African peasants to retain their independence.  
- Discovery of diamonds and gold led to greater demand for maize for black mineworkers.  
- Increased demand for meat, wheat, wine, tobacco, fruit, vegetables and dairy products.  
- Agricultural development reached the initial stage of commercialised farming. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1899-1902  | • 1899-1902 Anglo-Boer war led to serious set back to agricultural development; many farms were completely laid waste, only small numbers of livestock survived.  
  • Many farmers impoverished by subsequent drought  
  • Carrying capacity of veld reduced by trampling and denudation resulting in the invasion by prickly pear and jointed cactus of more than 2 million acres of land in the Cape Province.  
  • Maize farming expanded rapidly and land which had previously been only used for stock farming was put under the plough.  
  • Western Cape saw increase in wheat production and the importance of citrus, deciduous fruit and dairying.  
  • Increased importance of crop farming led to considerable improvements in soil cultivation and increased mechanisation.  
  Increasing degradation of the land and extensive soil erosion drought became regular and endemic. |
| 1911       | • Four colonial departments of agriculture joined together in a single Department of Agriculture (DOA) under General Louis Botha, Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture.  
  • DOA consisted of 18 divisions: Secretariat, Veterinary Services, Veterinary Research, Sheep and Wool, Dairying, Entomology, Grasses and Botany, Plant Pathology and Mycology, Tobacco and Cotton, Horticulture, Oenology, Chemistry, Publications, Co-operative Associations, Brand Marks and Fencing, Dryland Farming, Grain Inspection and Guano Islands. |
| 1912       | • First reorganisation of DOA; agricultural education transferred from Education to Agriculture; colleges of agriculture established at Elsenburg, Cedara, Potchefstroom and Grootfontein.  
  • Focus on agricultural education (main focus until 1924) |
| 1913       | • Natives Land Act prohibited the purchase or lease of land by Africans outside designated areas known as reserves, outlawed sharecropping in the Orange Free State, and led to Africans living on white-owned land becoming low-paid farmworkers rather than tenant peasants producing crops by using their own cattle and implements. |
| 1915       | • +/-3 million head of small stock were lost. |
| 1918-1930s | • Volume of agricultural production doubled but the gross value increased by only 45%; agricultural progress was seriously hampered by poor marketing conditions, low prices and drought. |
| 1919       | • Glen Agricultural College established |
| 1920-1950  | • Within the reserves the decline of African agriculture affected by problems of overpopulation and overstocking.  
  • Rural poverty became the norm and few peasant families could survive on their own production.  
  • Gradually African tenants and sharecroppers lost access to land as white proprietors capitalised their holdings.  
  • Western Cape viticulture became very successful; wine became the most important export product. |
| 1922       | • The need for local training of veterinarians was provided for in 1922 with the foundation of the Faculty of Veterinary Science in collaboration with the former Transvaal University College (later the University of Pretoria).  
  • Registrar of Cooperatives established. |
| 1924       | • DOA focus shifted to extension services; Extension division instituted to effect closer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liaison with the farming community and coordination with extension work of the colleges and divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DOA established its first project: Agricultural Demonstration Train that travelled around SA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Division of Animal Husbandry and Agronomy established; took over part of the work of Sheep and Wool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decided that the five colleges of agriculture should concentrate more specifically on the branches of farming predominating in their various service areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>• Farming began to diversify; maize exported more regularly and in greater quantities; livestock improvement progress considerably; agricultural research increased; better methods of soil cultivation were applied; fertilisers were used on a larger scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>• Stellenbosch Faculty of Agriculture amalgamated with Elsenburg College of Agriculture; transferred from Department of Education to DOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extension Division expanded to Division of Agricultural Education and Extension (DAEE); all agricultural colleges brought under DAEE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DOA Division of Publications put under DAEE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>• DOA Veterinary Research and Field Services amalgamated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>• DOA functions of Agronomy and Animal Husbandry were divided between the enlarged Division of Veterinary Services and Livestock Industry and the new Division of Botany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s &amp;</td>
<td>• DOA expansion included refinement of the plant industry functions; full divisions were established for Horticulture (including oenology and fruit inspection), Entomology, and Botany and Plant Pathology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>• Division of Animal Husbandry and Agronomy was revived and included Education and Extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 &amp; 1933</td>
<td>• Droughts led to SA’s worst economic depression; many farmers lost their land and moved to the cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>• State Advances Recoveries Act passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farmers’ Assistance Act passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>• Marketing Act passed to provide for the orderly marketing of products by control boards and the coordination of the economic interests of the different branches of farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• National Marketing Council introduced to investigate the existing and proposed control schemes and to advise the Minister on the marketing of controlled products to stabilise prices of and the more effective distribution of specific commodities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Weed Act passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>• Co-operative Societies Act passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1940</td>
<td>• Rapid development of agriculture, Land and Agricultural Bank of South Africa played a vital role in financing co-operatives and control boards. Price determination for agricultural products became a permanent feature and controlled marketing increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Pretoria transferred to DOA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>• Division of Soil Conservation and Extension (DSCE) established incorporating Extension and Soil and Veld Conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DSCE converted into the Division of Agricultural Education and Research including Pasture Research, Agronomy, Animal Husbandry, Extension; colleges of agriculture placed under this Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>• Soil Conservation Act passed emphasising the conservation and judicious use of the soil, vegetation and other natural resources. It provided for the planning of soil conservation districts and the conservation of catchment areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952/53</td>
<td>• The first post-war adjustments to DOA; Technical Services were divided into three main branches, with ten National Divisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1958 | • DOA divided into two separate state departments; Department of Agricultural Technical Services (DATS) and the Department of Agricultural Economics and Marketing (DAEM).  
• DATS focussed on agricultural production including research, agricultural education and extension and certain regulatory and control services.  
• Agricultural Economics and Marketing was responsible for agricultural economic policy, orderly marketing and controlled products, price determination, services to cooperatives, commodity inspection services, economic surveys of agricultural conditions, statistics and marketing research. |
| From 1960s | • Agriculture grew rapidly; expansion took place in all sectors. Farms were modernised and mechanised, and more scientific methods were adopted. Soil and Conservation Act provided farmers with financial and technical assistance for the construction of soil conservation and erosion control works. Many farmers began to realise the importance of conservation farming. |
• Activities included resource classification and mapping programmes, the delineation of fairly homogeneous farming areas, establishing of norms and broad soil-use planning. |
| 1962 | • Quarterly journal Agrekon established. |
| 1966 | • Agricultural Credit Act passed.  
• Led to establishment of the Agricultural Credit Board (ACB).  
• Department of Agricultural Credit and Land Tenure (DACLT) established.  
• Surveyors-General and the Deeds Office put under the control of DACLT.  
• DACLT responsible for disposal and alienation of State land and for the borrowing power of the Department of Water Affairs and of the Division of Soil Protection. |
| 1967 | • DAEM divided into two separate Divisions: Agricultural Production Economics (DAPE) and Agricultural Marketing Research (DAMR).  
• DAPE was responsible for research concerning farm problems and agricultural commodity surveys. Eventually DAPE divided its work into five main divisions: namely commodity research, the collection and processing of information, interdisciplinary research, agricultural economic extension and production economics services.  
• DAMR’s main task was investigating aspects concerning the use of, especially, uncontrolled agricultural products. The Statistical Services of the Department were also incorporated in this Division. |
| 1969 | • New Soil Conservation Act passed |
| 1970 | • Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act passed |
| 1976 | • Plant Improvement Act passed |
### Agricultural Extension in South Africa: Status Quo Report: Discussion document

**Date Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>• DOA restructured as Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (DOAF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>• Research Institute (Grain Crops) introduced; head office at Potchefstroom,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>• Fisheries transferred to Department of Environment Affairs; DOAF reverts to DOA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>• White Paper on Agricultural Policy (WPAP) published; drove optimum agricultural development; guidelines for a holistic, multilateral development and planning strategy,&lt;br&gt;• WPAP promised “new era” for agricultural,&lt;br&gt;• New political dispensation established “Own Affairs” departments. DATS became an Own Affairs Department: the Department of Agriculture and Water Supply, serving white farmers (this later changed to the Department of Agricultural Development). The House of Delegates and the House of Representatives (coloureds and Indians) had their own departments of agriculture, as did the homelands (for various black groupings). The previous DAEM was allocated to the Central Government and named the Department of Agriculture.,&lt;br&gt;• From 1984: gradual lifting of agricultural control and marketing schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>• Agricultural Research Act passed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>• Agricultural Research Council (ARC) established with the mandate of research, development and technology transfer. The twelve specialised research institutes of the Department of Agriculture were transferred to the ARC.&lt;br&gt;• Extension remained part of the Department of Agriculture.&lt;br&gt;• Three separate Houses in Parliament for different population groups and their “Own Affairs” departments were abolished; all agricultural functions returned to one Department of Agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>• National Strategy for South African Agriculture published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>• National Strategy for Agricultural Education and Training published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>• Norms and Standards for Agricultural Extension published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: [www.nda.agric.za/history](http://www.nda.agric.za/history) (ag service since 1910) [dates are approximate]

Post 2004 data added by S. Worth 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Act</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Fertilizer, Farm Feeds, Agricultural Remedies and Stock Remedies Act, 1947 (Act No. 36 of 1947)</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Animals Protection Act, 1962 (Act No. 71 of 1962)</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Fencing Act, 1963 (Act No. 31 of 1963)</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Plant Improvement Act, 1973 (Act No. 53 of 1973)</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 Liquor Products Act, 1989 (Act No. 60 of 1989) 1988
28 Onderstepoort Biological Products Incorporation Act, 1999 (Act No. 19 of 1999) 1999
30 Animal Health Act, 2002 (Act No. 7 of 2002) 2002
31 Animal Identification Act, 2002 (Act No. 6 of 2002) 2002
32 KwaZulu Cane Growers Association Act: Repeal Act, 2002 (Act No. 24 of 2002) 2002

Source: [http://www.nda.agric.za/](http://www.nda.agric.za/)

**Pending Legislation**

1. Plant Breeders’ Rights Amendment Bill.

2. Pound Bill.

3. Fertilizer and Feeds Bill.

4. Marine Fisheries Bill.

5. National Bill for Agricultural Training Institutes of South Africa.

**Types of Extension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of extension service</th>
<th>Origin or characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General national extension services</td>
<td>The standard approach to public sector extension with field advisory services provided free to farmers throughout the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General agricultural extension</td>
<td>The traditional form of extension dominant for the past 80 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of extension service</td>
<td>Origin or characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and visit extension (T&amp;V)</td>
<td>Debuted in the late-1960s as a reform of ineffective general extension services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic extension campaign (sec)</td>
<td>Methodology developed by FAO to systematically incorporating peoples' participation into a national extension programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension by educational institutions,</td>
<td>Especially for agricultural universities, can be the dominant approach to national extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly-contracted extension</td>
<td>Services provided by private firms or NGOs on contract to government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted extension services</td>
<td>Approaches that attempt to avoid the high recurrent costs by focusing either in terms of subject matter, clients, region, or time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized extension services</td>
<td>Focus efforts on improving production of a specific commodity or aspect of farming (e.g., irrigation, fertilizer use, and forest management).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based extension</td>
<td>Focus increased extension resources on a defined area for a specific time period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client-group-targeted extension</td>
<td>Focuses on specific types of farmers, usually on disadvantaged groups, e.g., small farmers, women, and minorities or disadvantaged ethnic groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer-led extension services</td>
<td>These approaches involve farmers in the work of extension drawing on producers' knowledge and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Animation rurale&quot; (ar)</td>
<td>Introduced in francophone Africa as a strategy to break the top-down pattern found in most development programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory extension</td>
<td>Harnesses farmers' own capacities to organize group meetings, identify needs and priorities, plan extension activities, and utilize indigenous knowledge to improve production systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming systems development extension</td>
<td>Requires a partnership between extension, researchers, and local farmers or farmer organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer-organized extension services</td>
<td>Completely planned and administered by producers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercialized extension services</td>
<td>These approaches rely on commercialized extension services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-sharing extension</td>
<td>May be incorporated into any of the other extension approaches by requiring farmers to share costs of services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial extension advisory services</td>
<td>Becoming more common as the rationale for free public extension services is questioned and farmers find they need more dependable or specialized services than are available from public extension agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agribusiness extension</td>
<td>Supports commercial interests of input suppliers and produce buyers who require or benefit from provision of sound extension services to support farm production and management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media extension</td>
<td>These approaches support other extension efforts or provide information services to a general audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media extension</td>
<td>Provides pure information services tailored to a wide audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated mass media</td>
<td>Links mass media information services with field extension agents or farmer-extensions to facilitate discussion and understanding of issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Alex et al (2001)