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Executive summary

Introduction

ES1 This report presents the findings of the final evaluation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) project GCP/RAF/412/SAF, *Capacity-building for South African Professionals in the Field of Agriculture and Food Security (with initial emphasis on International Development Cooperation)*.

ES2 The project had two components: i) to capacitate South African professionals in those areas where skills are underdeveloped (e.g. management of international development cooperation, aquaculture, forestry resources and agricultural reform), conduct food security analysis and develop a sector transformation plan; and ii) to support emerging smallholder farmers through the delivery of training and technical support.

ES3 The purpose of this evaluation was to analyse FAO’s assistance to the Government of South Africa and the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF). The evaluation highlights the results of each of the project components, as well as the causes for successes and failures, over the entire period of project implementation (2007-2016). The evaluation team consulted key project informants from government, academia, development partners, private sector and other non-state actors at national and provincial levels. The evaluation team visited each of the three provinces involved in the project: Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga.

ES4 The evaluation had three primary objectives. First, it aimed to evaluate the strategic relevance of the project given the South African social and political context, and to what extent the project design benefited from the Mid-term Review. The second objective of the evaluation was to assess the contribution of the South African capacity development (CD) project in terms of enhanced capacities of beneficiaries at national, provincial and local levels. The third objective of the evaluation was to evaluate the sustainability mechanisms incorporated into project design and implementation, and to assess the extent to which project gains will be sustained following project closure.

ES5 Qualitative methods were used to gather information and respond to the evaluation question on the strategic relevance of the project, and to determine whether the project responded to the needs of the South African country context. A desk review of relevant policy and project documents was undertaken, which assessed the project’s alignment with national political priorities in the areas of international aid management, agricultural development and support to smallholder farmers. Modifications to project relevance and design were also assessed based on recommendations made by the Mid-term Review in 2010, following which the project underwent structural changes. To answer the questions on project contribution and sustainability, qualitative and quantitative methods were used, including analysis of agricultural and smallholder development trends. Findings were triangulated through a mix of document review and stakeholder interviews, as well as national policy and statistical analysis.

ES6 South Africa is characterised by a dual economy: the first dimension is dominated by commercial farmers who contribute to formal and established markets; the second is characterised by the less developed or industrialised smallholder producers, including subsistence farmers who have limited access to resources. The main challenges for smallholder farmers include agro-ecological zones with low agricultural potential, low access to land and water, lack of market access, lack of technology, and lack of capital and business skills, among other constraints. Poor crop yields and soil degradation are characteristic of South African smallholder farms.

ES7 Post-apartheid policy interventions and fiscal spending in South Africa are geared towards supporting emerging farmers – predominantly new black entrants into the farming

---

1 See Appendix 3 for further information.
sector. Policies include the Strategic Plan for Agriculture of 2001, the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment in Agriculture, land reform programmes and the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP). The post-apartheid policy had organized many smallholder farmers into cooperatives. The capacity development project was intended to complement this policy by providing the necessary training to make farms viable enterprises.

Findings

ES8 The evaluation findings are summarized below under the corresponding evaluation questions.

To what extent was the project’s strategic relevance and design enhanced following the Mid-term Review? In particular, was the project aligned with South Africa’s priorities in international development and policy supporting smallholder farmers?

ES9 The project made efforts to adapt to South Africa’s shifting priorities by refocusing the project from regional to national capacity development under Component I. More could have been done to evaluate interest at the individual level for project trainings, and the lack of a proper needs assessment limited the relevance of the project activities to shifting national needs.

ES10 Project activities under Component II were aligned with the national development priorities in the area of support to smallholder farmers, in particular the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme. The project adapted to institutional changes at country level, as the government counterpart department transitioned into the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. Furthermore, improvements in project design and management were implemented following the Mid-term Review recommendations.

ES11 However, there remains limited evidence that Components I or II were designed and implemented based on an adequate and timely needs assessment.

To what extent has the project supported the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and developed capacities to manage development assistance cooperation effectively?

ES12 FAO successfully applied its core competency as a facilitator, bringing government and academic parties together to broker the establishment of the Institute for Development Assistance Management (IDAM). The institute has since become a flagship initiative.

ES13 The establishment of the Institute for Development Assistance Management suffered many delays. More could have been done to evaluate interest in the institute in advance, with a view to building engagement of potential beneficiaries. The successful establishment of the institute is poised to support capacity development in key technical areas in a systematic, structured manner. As the Institute for Development Assistance Management is in its infancy, it remains to be seen how effective the institute will be and if the sustainability mechanisms in place will ensure its financial viability.

Have technical capacities in the areas of agriculture, aquaculture, forestry and food and nutrition security increased?

ES14 Training provided to DAFF officials at the central and decentralized levels was ad hoc. Due to a lack of sectorial focus, the resources needed were not available and capacities were not developed in accordance with demand, or in a holistic and sustainable manner.

ES15 Although trainings were delivered at the individual level, efforts focusing on institutional and enabling environment levels of capacity development could have contributed to a more holistic approach as well as improved sustainability. Institutional buy-in, based on
the priorities of key individuals, was also pivotal to success. In the absence of clear priorities, the sector transformation plan was not a well-defined output; thus, its contribution was limited.

To what extent were project design and implementation gender sensitive?

ES16 As men tended to occupy jobs in the mines, and in the cities and towns as migrant workers, more women than men were engaged in farming than usual, especially on smallholder farms. The project beneficiaries included women, and in one instance support was provided to an all-female cooperative. On formerly white-owned lands, there were usually at least as many men as women. More could have been done to incorporate gender dimensions beyond the inclusion of women in project activities. Gender indicators and context-sensitive empowerment objectives were not mainstreamed adequately into project documents or the logical framework.

To what extent were the technical capacities of smallholder farmers increased?

ES17 The skills audit report identified the skills gaps in KwaZulu-Natal. However, largely due to the poor timing of the training needs assessment study, there is limited evidence that the capacity development gaps identified were addressed during the lifespan of the project. Although field visits by the evaluation team in 2016 indicated little improvement since the skills audit, during the evaluation field mission several women’s groups supported by the project in KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga reported an increase in their technical production capacity (for example, in broilers, layers and vegetable production). The capacity development of farmers, however, remained overshadowed by broader organizational challenges inherent in communally owned farms, including protracted internal conflicts within beneficiary groups.

ES18 There was an emphasis on primary production, with limited focus on the development of market linkages. The lack of business-oriented training for beneficiaries negatively impacted the financial viability of the farms.

To what extent are government staff and institutions capable of continuing project activities in an effective, efficient and sustainable manner?

ES19 The Institute for Development Assistance Management has the institutional and financial support to propel project objectives into the future. While it is too early to identify tangible results, the institute is poised to develop individual capacities of South African professionals in the long-term.

ES20 Although the project endeavoured to engage agricultural extension advisors at the municipal level, the engagement mechanism at higher municipal and provincial levels did not enable planning to benefit from bottom-up insight, and contextual realities and limitations were often underestimated. In the case of Component II, the continuation of project activities among beneficiaries is not guaranteed. Many continued to rely heavily on external financial assistance, in the form of free resources and materials from the government and FAO. Moreover, the effectiveness of the handover process at provincial level was limited.

ES21 The project lacked a holistic and sustained approach to deliver financial and human resources to specific areas. This reduced the sustainability of project gains in the areas of technical skills enhancement. Delivery of technical skills was often not accompanied by the necessary functional skills, particularly management skills at the individual and group levels.

ES22 Apart from engaging the provincial hosting institutions, namely the department of agriculture at provincial level, the project did not implement a coherent partnership strategy which could have provided the mechanisms to capitalize on project gains. There was a need to mobilize the inputs of other stakeholders from state to non-state actors, in order to complement the FAO capacity development initiatives.
Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions

ES23 The three levels of capacity development (capacity development of individuals, organizations and in the enabling environment) were identified as central to the development process. Capacity development of individuals entails training and equipping the individuals with skills in specific areas through formal and informal means. Organizational capacity development implies the strengthening of knowledge and skills, beyond the individual, through a system approach. Capacity development in the enabling environment involves strengthening the broader development context for improved management of change. Although the project was not evaluated against the FAO CD framework, the findings are categorized within each level for the benefit of analysis and narrative.

Capacity development of individuals

ES24 Despite the ad hoc nature of most trainings, the project succeeded in supporting the short-term capacity development outcomes of individual beneficiaries. The project included various modalities to support technical skill development of beneficiaries within the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, as well as project sites. While more could have been done to evaluate the staff’s interest in technical trainings, there was general satisfaction with the Institute for Development Assistance Management’s course content, as well as the future prospects for management of international development cooperation in the food security and agricultural sector.

Organizational capacity development

ES25 Effective support for most of the beneficiaries relied on management and organizational arrangements based on the cooperative model. As a key structure that supports the beneficiaries, DAFF’s organizational capacity development was not given proper attention in the project design (Component II). Most beneficiaries were not familiar with the way cooperatives’ work, despite efforts made under the Cedara Agricultural Training Institute supported the Farm Together Training Programme and other initiatives. There was a lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities at many project sites, specifically in relation to the operations of the groups. This points to the insufficient support to capacity development at the organizational level, as more could have been done to support management among beneficiary groups, including strategic leadership and clear reporting mechanisms – pre-conditions for effective technical delivery.

Capacity development in the enabling environment

ES26 There was a lack of policy level clarity regarding what kind of support mechanisms or structures were needed for productive enterprises, as well as for poverty reduction, livelihood improvement, food security and cooperatives. Poverty reduction objectives have more linkages with social protection interventions, and the support for productive enterprises to viable small and medium enterprise and value chain development. Although policy issues were not a major focus of the project, they were important to achieving the project outcomes. This lack of clarity negatively affected the project’s relevance to the agricultural development needs of South Africa. The inputs required to provide sustainable support for capacity development of smallholder farmers in South Africa reside in an upstream national policy level perspective, beyond the existing FAO project mandate as it was designed.

Gender

ES27 Gender equality is a major policy issue in South Africa. The project enabled the inclusion of both women and men in the selection of beneficiaries at the project sites, with gender equality receiving some consideration at the planning, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) stages, as reflected in the monitoring and evaluation reviews. More could have been done,
however, to strengthen analysis of gender equality at the design and implementation stages, taking into account the socio-economic realities of female smallholder farmers in South Africa through a dedicated context analysis.

**Partnerships**

**ES28** The need for a clear partnership strategy is central to the progress and sustainability of capacity development objectives. Such a strategy must move from formal policy endorsement within organizations to practical action, which is adequately monitored to reach implementation and performance goals. For Component I, FAO brought multiple stakeholders together to ensure the establishment of the Institute for Development Assistance Management. For Component II, however, there was no evidence of joint planning and implementation with the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme, or of joint monitoring and evaluation with the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. There was also no evidence of a strategy to forge deeper forms of collaboration with other national and international stakeholders and partners, for collaborative planning and implementation. This represents a missed opportunity to forge stronger linkages with CASP and other government programmes, such as the KwaZulu-Natal Agribusiness Development Agency and those in Mpumalanga, and other stakeholders at the national level, including United Nations agencies, civil society and the private sector.

**Support to agricultural value chains**

**ES29** Within the context of the beneficiary groups, cooperatives were largely seen as poverty alleviation and livelihood strategies for the poor, not as avenues to create sustainable employment for rural households through small and medium enterprise development. The project focused on technical skills necessary for primary production. This approach has its merits in view of the well-documented production challenges facing smallholder farmers in South Africa. However, functional skills were required to create the necessary market linkages, knowledge and understanding of value chains, and the ability to adapt to technical challenges. Beyond support to primary production, the strengthening of the technological capabilities of smallholder beneficiaries through value chain development is key to the success of interventions centred on capacity development in the context of the Republic of South Africa (RSA). These capabilities include production management (primary production), infrastructure, inputs and marketing capacity development. While the project made some headway, more support was needed to ensure systematic mentoring of emerging smallholder farmers on diversified agri-business value chains, including in primary production.

**Sustainability**

**ES30** There was a notable dependency on provision of inputs from government and FAO, as technical training and infrastructure support for beneficiaries was provided in an ad hoc and unsustainable manner. This produced limited long-term results for rural communities. The project was unable to develop and implement an effective exit strategy. The handover process at provincial and municipal levels had limited effectiveness, and in the absence of dialogue on the sustainability of the projects some of the major commitments were not concluded before project termination. When the project was terminated, there was an impression that senior managers in provincial governments needed to be engaged in accordance with the norms of concluding such projects. This was also central to post-project phase follow-ups, which senior provincial managers needed to support fully, particularly since there were resource implications associated with the new phase. For example, it was evident that some issues related to conflicts within the beneficiary groups required action beyond the capacity of the project management to handle. These issues had implications on project sustainability.

**ES31** Despite a concerted effort by the project to adopt a strategy of combining capacity development training and infrastructure inputs, the operations of most smallholder farming groups continued to face viability concerns. Looking ahead, there was a significant need for the adoption of more business-like approaches and models, and lessening of unsustainable dependency of beneficiaries. Such dependency disempowers the groups
that are meant to be empowered for socio-economic progress and transformation. The lack of viability of many of the operations led to increased debt burdens against a background of a dwindling working capital base.

ES32 Due to the absence of a results-oriented monitoring system, support was needed to establish an accountable management and governance structure. At every level, the project structure required clearer motivation or rewards for good performance and penalties for poor or non-delivery of desired outcomes.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The FAO Representation in South Africa (FAOZA) to support the Republic of South Africa in the development of coherent policy to accompany capacity development activities in the smallholder farming sector.

ES33 In order to improve the smallholder farming sector, policy support in similar projects should complement capacity development trainings and other assistance, including targeting support to viable smallholder agricultural enterprises or those that offer higher transformational prospects. Currently the policy framework appears to be more favourable to the large-scale commercial sector, despite the existence of land reform measures that have allocated land to commercial farm workers through a government land reform programme.

Suggested action

- Provide technical support to the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries to differentiate policies regarding poverty reduction, community livelihoods and social welfare, from policies targeting support for productive agri-business and market-linked enterprises.

Recommendation 2: FAO should support the Republic of South Africa to clarify the role of strategic partners as mentors in future capacity development projects with smallholder farmers. More support is needed to ensure systematic mentoring of emerging smallholder farmers on diversified agri-business value chains, including in primary production.

ES34 There is a need for clarity among both the mentors and the beneficiaries regarding the mentorship arrangements. A more targeted government programme of inclusive intervention and partnerships for mentorship of smallholder farmers, including personnel from the private sector.

Suggested actions

- This could involve a more sustainable approach on mentorship of emergent black commercial and smallholder farmers, placing mentors on farms for two to three years, to help farmers become viable commercial farm producers.
- Performance-centred monitoring and evaluation of those mentors supporting smallholder farmers to accompany such activities, including their accreditation.

Recommendation 3: Future FAO-South Africa capacity development efforts and similar projects should adopt a holistic approach, in line with FAO’s corporate strategy for capacity development, including individual trainings complemented by support to the organizational and political levels. The approach should align with FAO’s strategic programming at the corporate and national levels, as well as national priorities for capacity development.

Suggested action

- Before engaging in future collaborations, FAOZA should ensure that the project design is adequately informed by a thorough needs’ assessment, as well as the socio-economic and political realities of the beneficiaries and key stakeholders documented.
Recommendation 4: With support from headquarters, FAO-South Africa should review its partnership strategy for future capacity development efforts in South Africa to maintain the sustainability of project gains, increase national ownership of results, and ensure the project’s continued relevance with emerging priorities in the agricultural development sector. FAO project management should identify all potential actors, and facilitate coordinated actions including joint planning, monitoring and evaluation of capacity development projects.

Suggested actions

- With other UN agencies: the Institute for Development Assistance Management can create relationships with UN agencies that have experience in managing development cooperation. FAO could also leverage support and strengthen linkages with other UN agencies – such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, UN Women and other multilateral organizations – to scale up opportunities for small enterprise development, increase participation by women and youth, and improve linkages between FAO and the private sector.
- National research centres can provide additional technical support to smallholder farm sites, and the strategic selection of civil society organizations can help to ensure the capitalisation and continuation of project gains.
- The private sector can be a source for mentors to provide support to emerging farmers in value chain development.
- Extend the partnership with the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries to include joint monitoring and evaluation.

Recommendation 5: More accountable governance and management structures should be included by FAOZA in similar capacity development projects, including provisions for results-based M&E.

ES35 Emphasis should be placed on developing adequate project management structures, guided by a strong Management Committee and Project Steering Committee (PSC). Incentives must be provided to ensure the recruitment and stability of competent staff, in order to avoid high staff turnover.
1. Introduction

1.1 Evaluation purpose

This is the final evaluation of the project GCP/RAF/412/SAF, *Capacity-building for South African Professionals in the Field of Agriculture and Food Security (with initial emphasis on International Development Cooperation)*. The project began in January 2007 for a period of five years, but after several no-cost extensions project activities were continued until the final quarter of 2016. The Republic of South Africa (RSA) was both resource partner and recipient of technical support, and the total budget of the project was for USD 9,863,346. The project had two components. The first was to capacitate South African professionals (in the areas of scarce skills, namely management of international development cooperation, aquaculture, forestry resources and agricultural reform), conduct food security analysis, and develop a sector transformation plan. The second component aimed to support emerging smallholder farmers through delivery of training and technical support. The purpose of this evaluation was to analyse the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations’ (FAO’s) assistance to the Government of South Africa and the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF).

2 Capacity development of national governments is a core function of FAO, and the primary purpose of the evaluation is to draw lessons with a view to informing future cooperation between FAO and the Republic of South Africa, specifically through enhancing cooperation with DAFF. The evaluation also looks at the extent to which the project benefitted from a revised capacity needs assessment following the Mid-term Review.

3 The intended users of the evaluation are the FAO Representation, FAO Sub-regional Office for Southern Africa, programme staff at FAO headquarters, as well as government personnel within DAFF at the national and provincial levels. The evaluation will also be of interest to the Department of International Relations and Cooperation, the International Development Cooperation Unit in the National Treasury and the United Nations Country Team in South Africa.

1.2 Evaluation scope

The evaluation covers the entire period of project implementation, 2007–2016, identifying results of the aforementioned project components, as well as causes for success and failure. The evaluation team consulted key project informants, from government, academia, development partners, private sector and other non-state actors at national and provincial levels. The evaluation team was able to visit the three provinces involved in the project, which are Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga.

1.3 Evaluation objectives

The evaluation had three primary objectives. First, it aimed to evaluate the strategic relevance of the project given the South African social and political context, and to what extent the project design benefited from the Mid-term Review. The following question corresponds to this objective:

- To what extent did the needs assessments inform project design? To what extent did adjustments to project design following the Mid-term Review increase the project’s relevance to beneficiaries?

The second objective of the evaluation was to assess the contribution of the South African capacity development project in terms of enhanced capacities of beneficiaries at national, provincial and local levels. The following questions and sub-questions correspond:

- Has the project strengthened capacities of stakeholders at national and decentralized levels to implement development assistance cooperation projects effectively?
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a. To what extent has the project supported DAFF and developed capacities to manage resources in the areas of aquaculture, forestry and food and nutrition security?

b. To what extent has the project developed policy and strategy to support the needs of emerging farmers in the Republic of South Africa? Have the technical capacities of smallholder farmers increased? Is there potential for expanding the national programme to support emerging farmer development?

c. Were gender equality considerations reflected in project objectives and designed to address the needs, priorities and constraints of emerging women farmers, beyond the identification of beneficiaries to affect outcomes for women?

7 The third and final objective of the evaluation was to evaluate the sustainability mechanisms incorporated into project design and implementation, to assess the extent to which project gains will be sustained following project closure. The following questions correspond:

• To what extent are the project’s effects likely to continue beyond project closure?

a. To what extent are government staff and institutions capable of continuing project activities in an effective, efficient and sustainable manner?

b. Is there a plan in place to move the pilot project of support to smallholder farmers forward?

1.4 Methodology

8 Qualitative methods were used to gather information and respond to the evaluation question on the strategic relevance of the project, and to determine whether the project responded to the needs of the South African country context. A desk review of relevant policy and project documents was undertaken, which assessed the project’s alignment with national political priorities in the areas of international aid management, agricultural development and support to smallholder farmers. Modifications to project relevance and design were also assessed following the recommendations made by the Mid-term Review in 2010, following which the project underwent structural changes.

9 To answer the questions on project contribution and sustainability, qualitative and quantitative methods were used, including analysis of agricultural and smallholder development trends. The policy analysis of the smallholder farmers sector benefitted from an issue area mapping, included in Appendix 1 to this report.

10 The evaluation adhered to the United Nations Evaluation Group Norms and Standards. The evaluation adopted a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered underpinned the validation findings presented in the evaluation report. Findings were triangulated through a mix of document review and stakeholder interviews, as well as national policy and statistical analysis.

11 The evaluation team spent three weeks in South Africa gathering primary data during the data collection phase. This included key informant interviews with FAO programme staff, government staff in DAFF at the national and provincial departments of agriculture, personnel from United Nations agencies, civil society and other local development organizations. Field missions to 12 smallholder farmer support project sites and the site of the Institute for Development Assistance Management (IDAM) were carried out in the regions of Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga. Focus groups were conducted with female and male beneficiaries. Interviews with internal and external stakeholders at national, sub-regional and global levels were supported by checklists and interview protocols (see list of people consulted in Appendix 5). The protocols for interviews were developed prior to field visits on the basis of the stakeholder mapping and following preliminary trials by the evaluation team.

2 http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21
12 To evaluate progress made under Component I, specific capacity development of DAFF personnel, the evaluation examined the skills developed to manage international aid projects. This included analysing the pre- and post-intervention period in order to identify changes, positive and negative, and identify the specific contribution of FAO to change the capacity of professionals in DAFF. This exercise was carried out in conjunction with the assessment of achievements as outlined in the project’s intended outcomes and relevant outputs.

13 In Eastern Cape, government officials and academic personnel involved in establishing IDAM were interviewed individually and through a focus group discussion. The project sites visited were selected in consultation with the FAO country office and DAFF based on feasibility and the availability of stakeholders to interview.

14 Although many staff were no longer active in programme activities due to turnover among human resources, when possible former personnel were interviewed to assess capacity development among DAFF staff under Component I of the project.

15 To examine results achieved under Component II, field-level data was gathered from two provinces via focus groups and interviews with individual and group beneficiaries. The identification of the projects to visit took a consultative approach, making use of primary research in the form of farm visits and interviews with project beneficiaries, project management and service providers. Approximately 250 projects’ participants were consulted during on-site project visits at the 12 identified smallholder farmer project sites.

16 The evaluation process also included inputs from a national evaluation counterpart, specifically members of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) unit within the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. DAFF has conducted its own monitoring of project sites over the duration of the project. The FAO evaluation team benefited from the insights of the DAFF M&E reports, as well as the structured consultation during various phases of the evaluation with DAFF officers. Collaboration with DAFF counterparts aimed to increase ownership of the evaluation process and increase utility of results to inform future FAO-DAFF collaboration. DAFF officers refrained from participating in evaluation interviews, however, so as not to compromise the credibility and independence of the findings.

17 Data analysis was conducted periodically during the main evaluation phase. Following the collection of all field level data, the evidence was analysed and preliminary findings underwent a period of triangulation and validation. The evaluation benefited from the review of a Quality Assurance Adviser, who advised on the contextual relevance and participated in the validation of findings. These findings were then used to draft the evaluation report.

1.5 Limitations

18 There were a number of risks and limitations considered in the evaluation. The project experienced staff turnover, both within the FAO country office and within DAFF. Staff turnover occurred at both senior and middle management levels, with negative consequences on institutional memory for the capacity development intervention. There was limited institutional knowledge of personnel from FAO and DAFF, as many interviewed were not familiar with the project from the outset due to turnover. As a result, the evaluation interviewed many personnel with limited knowledge of the project background and some areas for which information was required.

19 A second limitation of the methodology was that although it was proposed that non-beneficiary groups be interviewed to compare qualitative findings from beneficiary groups, this was not implementable on the ground due to a lack of access. Long project duration meant that many beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries with whom comparisons could be drawn explained difficulty in accessing these populations.

20 In addition, a questionnaire for beneficiaries was drafted, including DAFF personnel who benefited from capacity development trainings and exchange programmes. However, the response to the questionnaire was low, resulting in limited statistical significance, and hence it was not used for the data analysis.
2. South African context and project background

21 South African international engagement in development cooperation at the regional level is pursued primarily through the African Agenda whose objectives are to promote development, contribute to the resolution of conflicts, and to build an environment in which socio-economic development can take place. The project was initially of regional scope, reflecting its larger aspirations to support the capacity development of South African professionals to effectively design and implement international development assistance in Africa, specifically in the Southern African region. Following the Mid-term Review, the project was reoriented to have a more national focus, which is reflected in the revised logical framework.

22 The context of agricultural development as it pertains to smallholder farmers is a complex issue in the sub-region, and in South Africa in particular. South Africa is characterised by a dual economy: the first dimension is dominated by commercial farmers who contribute to formal and established markets; the second is characterised by the less developed or industrialised smallholder producers, including subsistence farmers who have limited access to resources. The main challenges for smallholder farmers include: location in agro-ecological zones with low agricultural potential, low access to land and water, lack of market access, lack of technology, and lack of capital and business skills, among other constraints. Poor crop yields and soil degradation are characteristic of South African smallholder farms.

23 Post-apartheid policy interventions and fiscal spending in South Africa are geared towards supporting emerging farmers – predominantly new black entrants into the farming sector. Policies include the Strategic Plan for Agriculture of 2001, the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment in Agriculture policy, land reform programmes and the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP). The policy had organized many smallholder farmers into cooperatives, and the capacity development project was intended to complement this policy by providing necessary training to make the farms viable enterprises.

24 The project began in 2007. During this time two emergency projects were ongoing, OSRO/RAF/403/SAF and its successor OSRO/RAF/510/SAF, for which the Republic of South Africa was a donor. The projects aimed to strengthen livelihoods through food and nutrition security in vulnerable Southern African development countries from 2004 to 2008, for a combined budget of USD 20 million. The experience with these projects highlighted the overall need for South Africa, in particular the former Department of Agriculture (currently the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries), to develop its capacity in soft skills to manage international development assistance, as well as strengthen capacity in the technical areas related to such projects. South Africa’s motives to engage in development cooperation with Southern African Development Community (SADC) countries were motivated by humanitarian concerns, socio-economic stability and ensuring regional markets for South African products, as well as increasing cooperation to reduce and prevent transboundary animal diseases. However, the project was conceived on the assumption that in order to pursue its agricultural development objectives, the functional and technical capacities of South African agricultural professionals would need to improve.

25 The second component of the project was domestically focused, with the objectives of supporting South Africa in its aim to support smallholder farmers. At the beginning of the project in 2007, the outputs and activities of this component had not been elaborated. Following the Mid-term Review, the second component was focused on complementing smallholder support interventions. Whereas the government would provide infrastructure, the capacity development project was to provide training support in technical areas to the same smallholder farmers supported through the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme.

26 The long duration of the project implementation witnessed not only turnover in human resources but also a restructuring of the Department of Agriculture into the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. A Mid-term Review for the project was conducted in 2010. At that point, little progress had been made on either component. The Mid-term Review issued several recommendations with implications for the design and
management of the project. These included additional technical oversight, in the form of a Senior Technical Adviser to provide leadership, and a Technical Working Group to provide technical oversight. These recommendations were accepted and the project underwent modifications.
3. Evaluation questions: Findings

3.1 Strategic relevance and project design

To what extent was the project’s strategic relevance and design enhanced following the Mid-term Review? In particular, was the project aligned with South Africa’s priorities in international development and policy supporting smallholder farmers?

Main findings

The project made efforts to adapt to South Africa’s shifting priorities by refocusing the project from regional to national development under Component I. More could have been done to evaluate interest at the individual level for project trainings, and the lack of a proper needs assessment limited the relevance of the project activities to shifting national needs.

Project activities under Component II were aligned with the national development priorities in the area of support to smallholder farmers, in particular the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme.

The project managed to adapt to institutional changes at country level, as the government counterpart department transitioned into the Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries. Furthermore, improvements in project design and management were implemented following the Mid-term Review recommendations.

However, there remains no evidence that Components I or II were designed and implemented based on an adequate and timely needs assessment.

Following the Mid-term Review, the programme was redefined around two outcomes and nine outputs. The final evaluation uses the revised logical framework as a guide to track project achievements. Prior to 2010, project management was left mostly to the National Project Officer. In 2011, a senior manager was hired to coordinate the project.

The project governance mechanism included a national steering committee, chaired by the DAFF Deputy Director-General and co-chaired by the FAO Representative. Similarly, there were committees at the provincial level. The evaluation team gathered evidence of committee meetings in which FAO participated in KwaZulu-Natal. The Mid-term Review highlighted that the project suffered a lack of oversight, specifically insufficient technical capacities of management personnel. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings were senior level and often difficult to convene, as they were chaired by the DAFF Deputy Director-General whose availability was limited. The limited number of PSC meetings negatively impacted project oversight.

An additional oversight mechanism, the Technical Working Committee, was initiated to provide the missing technical oversight. However, the effectiveness of the Technical Working Committee was limited by a lack of continuity among personnel who attended the committee meetings. The arrival of the Senior Technical Project Manager increased progress towards achieving the planned activities. Furthermore, the composition of the committees was expanded to reflect the revised organizational structure of DAFF beyond agriculture to include forestry and fisheries.

The initial project activities were aligned with South Africa’s regional priorities such as expanding its role as a donor in the sub-region, particularly in line with the African Agenda which elaborates guidelines for South African development cooperation. Aid management was a priority for DAFF in view of South Africa’s commitment to promoting the African Agenda, and considering that it is the technical arm of the Government focused on food security and agricultural development issues. The funds to implement

3 Prior to 2007, South Africa’s foreign policy included entering into bi-national agreements with African countries which included trade as well as development cooperation. South Africa did not position itself as a donor, but rather as a partner. The development cooperation was primarily in the form of technical assistance, and funding was available through the African Renaissance and International Cooperation Fund managed by the National Treasury.
the objectives in the African Agenda were financed through the African Renaissance and International Cooperation Fund, under the supervision of the Department of International Relations and Cooperation. The department established the South African Development Partnership Agency (SADPA), which is not yet functional, to implement development cooperation. DAFF was to take the lead in management of international development assistance in food security and agriculture, in close liaison with the Department of International Relations and Cooperation.

31 The updated logical framework maintained that the project should have sub-regional impact. The regional focus shifted to developing national capacities in response to transboundary animal and plant disease control, disaster preparedness and emergency response, and sanitary and phytosanitary policies. At the Southern African Development Community level, the project carried out cross border training for 11 SADC countries in aquatic issues. However, an updated needs assessment was never carried out following the Mid-term Review.

32 Outcome 2 of the project is highly aligned with national agricultural development objectives, particularly policies in the area of smallholder development. The current Agricultural Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment in Agriculture policy of 2003 is aimed at supporting the emerging sector, and the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme is the implementation mechanism for Agricultural-Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment in Agriculture. CASP\(^4\) is one of the new policies largely linked to the formal land reform processes.\(^5\)

33 While support to development of the smallholder sector is needed in South Africa, the project should have invested more in understanding the dynamics of the smallholder farming sector, links with value chains and a contextual analysis of the existing constraints.\(^6\) Challenges are rooted in the broader development context of a dual agricultural sector, where support to the sector tends to be fragmented and uncoordinated, with weak complementary policy frameworks to the National Development Plan and employment creation opportunities.

34 Currently, practices and approaches adopted in agriculture, social and economic development and government education departments are not adequately supportive of the holistic measures needed to address complex South African farming problems, especially pertaining to smallholder farmers. Coordination among stakeholders has been cited as a challenge in the implementation of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme. Funds reside with the provincial departments of agriculture once received from the National Treasury, while land reform is administered by the national Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. This department has provincial offices that report to the national department. The coordination of planning and implementation is complex and often resulted in poorly timed planning and execution of projects. The implementation challenges of CASP were not reflected in the subsequent design of the project’s support to smallholder farmers.

35 A full skills audit was required prior to implementation of project activities for Component II. A belated skills audit was done for KwaZulu-Natal, covering about 50 percent of the project sites. No skills audit was done for the other pilot province, Mpumalanga. In the case of KwaZulu-Natal, the skills audit was concluded in September 2014, toward the

---

4 One of its objectives is to promote economic transformation in order to enable meaningful participation of black people in the economy. This policy requires smallholder (often untrained and poorly-resourced) farmers to form partnerships with established commercial farmers as mentors, termed “strategic partners.”

5 The CASP role in supporting the broader agricultural development strategy for smallholder farmers is undertaken through 6 strategic pillars. The six pillars of CASP include: i) information and technology management, ii) technical and advisory assistance, and regulatory services, iii) marketing and business development, iv) training and capacity building, v) on/off farm infrastructure and product inputs, and vi) financial support.

6 Dualism in South Africa has a historical context of existence of a large scale, technologically advanced agricultural sector, mostly dominated by White farmers, and a smallholder and emerging farming sector, dominated by Blacks. The former has continued to enjoy strong post-apartheid national policy support. The latter has not and emerging farmers are located in resource constrained regions, with low agricultural potential, poor soils, over-reliance on rained farming characterised with erratic rainfall and low investment in infrastructure. The inputs and pre-requisites that are central to successful agricultural production and marketing are largely missing in the smallholder farming sector.

7 Ibid. Agriculture is a concurrent competency (shared by national and provincial governments). There is often confusion regarding roles and mandates of the different spheres of government. In terms of horizontal coordination, departments are cluster to pursue common priority outcomes.
36 From a design standpoint, the project overlooked contextual constraints in smallholder farmer value chain development, and mechanisms to improve the technological capability within the sector. This resulted in a lack of technical and functional skills. Functional issues involve organizational leadership, management and other human dynamics, such as capacity to take collective action that results in increased returns to labour. Specific structural challenges included a lack of access to working capital to sustain a supply of inputs, such as stock feed and other essential materials for scaling up small business operations for markets with large purchase orders.

3.2 Development of government capacity

To what extent has the project supported the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and developed capacities to manage development assistance cooperation effectively?

Main findings

FAO successfully utilized its core competency as a facilitator, bringing government and academic parties together to broker the establishment of the Institute for Development Assistance Management. IDAM has since become a flagship initiative.

The establishment of IDAM suffered many delays, and more could have been done to evaluate interest in the institute in advance, with a view to building the interest of potential beneficiaries and establishing a solid base of beneficiaries.

The successful establishment of IDAM is poised to support capacity development in key technical areas in a systematic, structured approach. As IDAM is in its infancy, it remains to be seen how effective the institute will be and if the sustainability mechanisms in place will ensure the financial viability of IDAM.

37 Following the Mid-term Review, the question remained whether strengthening DAFF’s capacity in aid management was still a priority, and, if so, in which areas is capacity strengthening needed. In 2008, after activities for the capacity development project commenced, the two emergency projects for which South Africa was donor came to end and were not renewed. It seemed overall interest for the building capacity to manage international aid was low among personnel.

38 The primary activity for increasing capacity to manage international aid was the establishment of the Institute for Development Assistance Management, with strong links in support of the South African Development Partnership Agency. SADPA aims to enhance technical assistance and support to other countries. The Department of International Relations and Cooperation envisions that SADPA will be the leading government agency responsible for channelling aid, assistance, and support from South Africa to other African states. This agenda is in line with IDAM’s strategic purpose: to develop a cadre of competent DAFF officials with increased knowledge and skills for more effective management of South Africa’s aid resources. The primary objective of IDAM is to capacitate government, non-governmental organizations and the private sector to implement aid cooperation projects effectively. The initial focus is on the agricultural sector, with the potential to expand to other sectors. IDAM is jointly managed by the Department of Public Administration and the

---

8 Aide Memoiré: Consultative Meeting Between the Department of Agriculture, Forestry Fisheries (DAFF) and FAO On Advancing Implementation of Project Capacity Building for South African Professionals in the Field of Agriculture and Food Security (GCP/RAF/412/SAF) Agriculture Place, Pretoria. (September 21, 2010)

9 MTR, 2010.

10 Under the Department of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO), SADPA will complement South Africa’s foreign policy objectives through a structured and coordinated development programme aimed at advancing Africa’s development agenda.
School of Agriculture and Agribusiness at the University of Fort Hare. The Advisory Board will provide strategic guidance and ensure alignment with national policies, including DAFF, FAO and other strategic partners.

39 An IDAM curriculum development workshop brought together regional scholars and practitioners to develop three short accredited courses, including development aid management, food security and the political economy of development aid.

40 The University of Birmingham’s Governance and Social Development Resource Centre has signed a cooperation agreement with IDAM to promote staff exchange, while also providing operational guidance. The centre will support IDAM during the early stages by providing assistance in knowledge management. IDAM is expected to bring well-known academics, experts or practitioners in the field, including former diplomats and/ or development cooperation officials, who will add value to IDAM’s delivery of course materials for this new institution.

41 The first IDAM cohort of 15 students was to start in June 2016. However, since IDAM is targeting people who are already working, it was observed that it would be very unlikely to have the first cohort ready by June 2016. Stakeholders from DAFF showed interest in being the first cohorts at IDAM.

42 At the time of the evaluation period, key posts in the institute were still vacant. However, the evaluation team understands that key positions which were vacant at the time of the evaluation had since been filled. Progress toward the full establishment of IDAM was well underway.

43 DAFF and University of Fort Hare stakeholders highlighted the role played by FAO in making IDAM a reality. FAO procedures were perceived by government stakeholders to be less administratively cumbersome than DAFF processes. Furthermore, FAO acted as a facilitator between the University of Fort Hare and DAFF, successfully moderating the relationship to achieve the establishment of IDAM despite longer periods of delay in project activities.

44 It remains to be seen, as IDAM is in the early stages, whether it is the most effective mechanism to support South Africa’s process of managing international development assistance.

45 IDAM has the ambition and institutional support to expand both its technical areas and geographical coverage. The institute would be financially supported by DAFF for the first five years. After this, IDAM was set to implement a resource mobilization plan, as detailed in its marketing strategy. IDAM plans to ensure sustainability by charging fees and by advertising through the IDAM website and national newspapers. IDAM is also exploring the availability of scholarships and grant funding through local and international development partners.

46 IDAM has been structured to be a regional institution that will be enrolling Southern African Development Community staff as students in the future. Discussions with IDAM management indicated that the institution would start by targeting South African and SADC candidates. Starting from the third year, IDAM will cover the rest of Africa and the BRICs. However, there is currently no awareness raising or advertisement being done at the regional level. The Kingdom of Lesotho was visited as part of the IDAM Sustainability Model assignment (5-7 June 2013) to meet with bilateral, multilateral and Government of

---

11 In the present arrangement, IDAM will work in close collaboration with the University of Birmingham’s centre for Governance and Social Development Resource Centre. This international collaboration is aimed at giving credence and stature to IDAM. During a visit to IDAM at the University of Fort Hare (UFH), the evaluation team was briefed that the University of Birmingham will also have representation on the proposed IDAM Advisory Board, which is expected to be represented by officials from key stakeholders, including National Treasury, DIRCO and Provincial Governments. The ambitious plan is to allow for gradual growth of the Board to eventually include representation from SADC countries. This will ensure that needs of the region are addressed and that the Institute is not South African dominated. The Department of Public Administration at Fort Hare will appoint an Administrator and support staff to be responsible for day-to-day activities.

Lesotho officials, and the Republic of Malawi was visited (23-26 July 2013) as part of the needs analysis for IDAM in South Africa.

Lastly, there was little evidence that IDAM was informed by partnerships with other United Nations agencies, which could have been included in the Advisory Board. This was a missed opportunity. In addition to the “Delivering as One” United Nations goal, incorporating partnerships into the design of IDAM could have been an additional mechanism through which IDAM could ensure sustainability of capacity development efforts.

3.3 Capacities in technical areas

Have technical capacities in the areas of agriculture, aquaculture, forestry and food and nutrition security (scarce skills) increased?

Main findings

Training provided to DAFF officials at the central and decentralized levels was ad hoc. Due to a lack of sectorial focus, the resources needed were not available and capacities were not developed in accordance with demand, or in a holistic and sustainable manner.

Although trainings were delivered at the individual level, more efforts could have focused on the institutional and enabling environment levels of capacity development. This could have contributed to a more holistic approach as well as improved sustainability. Institutional buy-in, based on the priorities of key individuals, was also pivotal to success. In the absence of clear priorities, the sector transformation plan was not a well-defined output; thus, its contribution was limited and the plan should be revised.

The project endeavoured to increase the technical skills of DAFF personnel through a number of training modalities in the areas of scarce skills: sectors including climate change, aquaculture, agriculture, forestry and food security assessment. Technical capacities were increased through academic courses, workshops, international exchanges on agrarian experiences and technical and policy support.

During the project’s lifetime (2007-2016), DAFF had five different Director-Generals (the most senior position in the department) and four Deputy Director-Generals. Changes in administration often reoriented project objectives and the project funds allocated to achieve these. One consequence of shifting priorities was a lack of concentrated financial and human resources delivering technical training in designated areas, which led to an overall dispersion of efforts and lack of concrete results. This was at times exacerbated by changes in the FAO Representative at the country level.

3.3.1 Aquaculture

The transboundary movement of fish and fish products remains a major threat to the sustainability of aquaculture development in the region. At the same time there is increasing urgency to conserve the diversity of natural ecosystems in the region, many of them supporting significant artisanal fisheries and often at the interface with aquaculture development. The spread of epizootic ulcerative syndrome within the region since 2007 has illustrated the vulnerability of Africa’s aquatic ecosystems, and the urgent need for training in aquatic animal diseases. The training of the Southern African Development Community participants described below is in line with what the South African government had envisaged to support the capacities of other African countries.

FAO and Rhodes University partnered to train 25 veterinarians from 11 SADC countries. The purpose was to build capacity among state veterinarians for dealing with aquatic animal health in SADC countries, ultimately improving biosecurity governance in the aquaculture sector to support growing aquaculture industries where high-value aquaculture products are to be exported. Out of 25 individual beneficiaries, ten veterinarians were from South Africa. Rhodes University facilitated two aquatic animal health courses in July 2012.
With support from FAO Rome-based experts, the training covered: i) governance (policy and regulatory framework, and enhancing compliance with regional and international frameworks); ii) targeted capacity development to improve delivery of aquatic animal health services to the aquaculture sector, especially small-scale producers in the areas of diagnostics, surveillance, risk analysis, emergency response and contingency planning, good bio-security and husbandry practices; iii) aquatic animal health information systems, research, disease impact assessments and reference laboratory/laboratories; iv) regional cooperation and networking.

A test to evaluate the effectiveness of the course in enhancing the participants’ knowledge was administered. The course content and general experience were rated highly by all participants. The lowest score was for accommodation and travel (78%). Participants appreciated the relevance of the theory portion of the course, however, they felt that more time could have been spent on practical/laboratory sessions. Some participants needed more sessions related to aquaculture principals, as this was their first exposure to aquaculture. Participants requested follow up aquatic animal health courses to continue increasing the capacity of state veterinarians and to ensure continuity in capacity development. 

At a Regional Workshop on Improving Aquatic Animal Health Management and Strengthening Biosecurity Governance in Africa, FAO and Rhodes University jointly developed course curricula for training participants from SADC member states. The project supported DAFF officers in developing the aquatic animal health National Strategy, and designing a surveillance programme for aquatic animal diseases and pathogens. The output of the training was a draft Regional Aquatic Biosecurity Strategy for SADC, which is being adopted by some SADC member countries as part of the implementation of a regional strategy on aquatic biosecurity.

3.3.2 Technical training in forestry

One DAFF officer attended a remote sensing training in Rome in March 2014, and also participated in the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) training. Four additional officials (one each from DAFF, Eastern Cape, Mpumalanga and KwaZulu-Natal, departments of agriculture) attended training in Rome on REDD+ in developing countries.

3.3.3 Exposure to agrarian reform and farmer support

FAO reported difficulties with the implementation of study tours, placements and fellowships. In its early stages, it was reported that fellowships, study tours and young professional placements were affected by low numbers of applicants, and often did not meet the minimum standards and requirements. There was, however, inclusion of Risk Analysis and Control (plant and animal health) and exposure to the Codex Alimentarius (food standards) and to the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) as part of the objectives of the study tours. DAFF was tasked with the responsibility of adding more technical areas in the placements. DAFF maintained that the focus should be on in-country training, by mobilizing qualified trainers from within and outside South Africa.

Nonetheless, the project conducted several tours to the Federative republic of Brazil, the Kingdom of Thailand, the French Republic and the Kingdom of Denmark to expose DAFF staff to different methods of agrarian reform and farmer support. One former Associate Professional Officer who benefitted from a placement in Addis Ababa, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, was later hired by FAO as a project coordinator in Mpumalanga. Other training and study tours for government officials and participants from farmer organizations are presented in Table 1.

---

14 Status report on DAFF-FAO Capacity-building for South African professionals in the field of agriculture and food security (GCP/RAF/412/SAF), May 2014.
57 Workshops in August 2011 allowed two experts, one Filipino and one Brazilian, to present experiences on agrarian reform from their respective countries. The workshops were attended by 43 participants, including officials from the Departments of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries, Rural Development and Land Reform, and Water Affairs. Participants included the Land Bank, Agricultural Sector Education and Training Authority, and provincial officials involved in the implementation of the capacity development project.

Table 1: Capacity development training type/tour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training type/tour</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APO/YPO</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD+ training Rome</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand study tour</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark study tour</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France study tour</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58 Interviewees indicated appreciation of the workshops insofar as they presented relevant strategies. Topics ranged from: i) the Zero Hunger Program in Brazil; ii) the coordination mechanism of the Philippines; iii) the credit programme in Brazil; iv) the compulsory acquisition and valuation formula of the Philippines; v) the organizational maturity assessment and community level of development assessment methodologies in the Philippines; vi) the extension approach in Brazil; and vii) the participatory area-based planning in the Philippines.

59 In-country, the project trained 100 officers in: i) climate change adaptation and mitigation; ii) disaster risk management; and iii) remote sensing. A week-long module of training on the use of climate information for agricultural decision-making was offered by the University of the Free State for KwaZulu-Natal province staff in June and July 2013.

60 Training in customer care was piloted in all project sites in 2011 and 2012, and was then extended in 2013 to all nine provinces, aiming to train 444 officers (300 extension officers and 144 forestry officers). The objective was to capacitate officers who did not benefit from training in the first two rounds, while also including officers in the forestry branch of the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF). DAFF reports mention that the training was implemented in November 2013 and completed in January 2014.

61 DAFF reports indicate that training in climate-smart agriculture was conducted in both KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga. Officials from the respective colleges and officials from the province attended the training. The climate-smart agriculture training was conducted at Cedara College of Agriculture in KwaZulu-Natal and Lowveld College of Agriculture in Mpumalanga.

62 Although the mix of capacity development modalities was welcomed by many beneficiaries, there was a lack of systematic strategy to achieve the objectives. Targeting for personnel to receive training was not clear and no systematic pattern could be discerned. The flexibility of the FAO administrative procedures necessary for using the project funds to train DAFF personnel, coupled with the lack of focus ultimately, worked against the achievement of sustainable capacity development goals of the project.

3.3.4 Food security measurement and policy development

63 FAO and DAFF meetings were attended by local, regional and international organizations to support capacities in this area. However, the evaluation team did not see evidence corroborating activities in this area.
3.3.5 Sector transformation plan

A clear definition of a sector transformation plan was lacking in the project documents as well as in the revised logical framework. There were no documented activities towards achieving this output.

3.4 Gender targeting

To what extent were project design and implementation gender sensitive?

Main finding

The project beneficiaries included women, and in one instance support was provided to an all-female cooperative.

Gender dimensions beyond the inclusion of women in project activities was not shown. Gender indicators and context-sensitive empowerment objectives were not mainstreamed adequately into project documents or the logical framework.

Women are responsible for most of the productive activities in farming and in the household; the lack of attention to their empowerment results in serious time poverty among women. The feminization of smallholder and subsistence farming is also closely linked to the domestic chores that culturally women are responsible for, especially in the rural areas. These factors limit the ability of female smallholder farmers to extend their farming activities beyond the household. In addition, women’s access to information is generally limited, as well as other resources that could be used to enhance their livelihoods and improve household food and nutrition security. Market access activities for smallholder female farmers often involve travelling to distant places to sell produce. This travel was not always feasible for women given contextual constraints, such as safety considerations.

Table 2: Gender equality in the capacity development project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mpumalanga</th>
<th></th>
<th>KZN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage beneficiaries consulted by gender</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of women in management committee (for projects)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural advisors (to project sites)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated from CD, SA, field visit data, May 2016

Beneficiary respondents included a high number of women, which reflects the proportionately larger number of female beneficiaries for the capacity development and training project than men.

The project design included gender specificities, as is the norm for similar projects. Such domestic agricultural development projects have a high percentage of women beneficiaries by default, as the men are often migrant workers elsewhere. It seemed that the high level of participation by women at most of the project sites was deemed a reasonable indicator for gender equality. The need to look beyond the number of women participants remained, however. Moreover, the project design and implementation did not adequately address gender equality and women’s economic empowerment. More gender equality needs-based training and better targeting could have been employed.

Thamaga-Chitja 2012.
3.5 Development of smallholder capacities

To what extent were the technical capacities of smallholder farmers increased?

Main findings

The skills audit report identified the skills gaps in KwaZulu-Natal. However, largely due to the poor timing of the training needs assessment study, there is limited evidence that the capacity development gaps noted were addressed during the lifespan of the project. Although field visits by the evaluation team in 2016 indicated little improvement since the skills audit, during the evaluation field mission several women's groups supported by the project in KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga reported an increase in their technical production capacity (for example, in broilers, layers and vegetable production). The capacity development of farmers, however, remained overshadowed by broader organizational challenges inherent in communally owned farms, including protracted internal conflicts within beneficiary groups.

There was an emphasis on primary production, with limited focus on the development of market linkages. The lack of business-oriented training for beneficiaries negatively impacted the financial viability of the farms. Many continued to heavily rely on external financial assistance, in the form of free resources and materials from the government and FAO.

Component II of the project aimed to increase the technical capacities of smallholder emerging farmers, who were new recipients of land allocated under the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme. Figure 1 shows the relative importance of different sub-components of the total costs for a land reform project in South Africa.

Depending on the livelihood selected, capacity development and training constitutes roughly 10-15 percent of the cost. Other key costs that ought to be factored in the context of success of new farms include housing, resettlement, start-up grants, inputs, tools and equipment, farm development overhead costs, and management of the land reform programme. If major challenges are encountered with other cost items, the effects on capacity development and training are substantial in terms of the ability to realize the desired outcomes. This suggests the importance of other support services, apart from capacity development and training.

In the context of the project, training was conducted in partnership with the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development in KwaZulu-Natal, and the Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Land and Environmental Affairs in Mpumalanga, together with FAO and DAFF, to deliver multi-disciplinary training. This was confirmed by field visits to project sites.

Figure 1. Illustrative costs of a typical land reform project in South Africa (apart from capacity development and training and advisory support)
Trainings were conducted in the areas of crop production, horticulture, broiler and layers production and animal husbandry. Field visits indicated that the training, especially in crop and livestock production was appreciated by and useful to beneficiaries. The training had direct practical relevance in the management of various enterprises of beneficiary smallholder farmers. However, support was not based on a thorough needs assessment. In KwaZulu-Natal, a skills audit undertaken was only concluded in September 2014, towards the project closure period.

Table 3. Capacity development/training undertaken with smallholder farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of training provided</th>
<th>Estimated percentage of targeted beneficiaries in pilot project site reached with training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm together training: record keeping, business skills, entrepreneurship, conflict resolution, setting up contracts</td>
<td>KZN 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mpumalanga 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock, poultry, broilers, goats, layers and piggery</td>
<td>KZN 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mpumalanga 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business plan development*</td>
<td>KZN 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mpumalanga 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop, horticulture production</td>
<td>KZN 2 beneficiary representatives per project site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication technology training (provided through UN Women’s support)</td>
<td>Mpumalanga 2 beneficiary representatives per project site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ET field visit estimates, May, 2016

*Initial appreciation in business management was undertaken with project beneficiaries, but not sustained to the point of business plan development and implementation.

Project review reports (2015, 2016) indicate that 1,926 people were trained in areas including technical production skills, business management and group formation related courses, such as conflict resolution. However, the quality and depth of the training provided, and how useful beneficiaries found them, varied. There was no documentation to verify if the training was provided. Table 3 above shows capacity development/training undertaken with smallholder farmers.

Farm together training

Farm Together Training was a 4–6 week capacity development and training programme for farmers. It was highly interactive and involved substantial on-site work by farmers, including 30 percent theory and 70 percent practical application of the lessons. In KwaZulu-Natal, the training was provided by Cedara College and a department of provincial government. In Mpumalanga, the Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Land and Environmental Affairs engaged with the project and farmers. The programme took place between 2012 and 2013 and was highly appreciated by beneficiaries.

Over 200 government officials, including frontline extension agents, were reportedly trained in various aspects of farm business development.17 The training could not be verified quantitatively and qualitatively in the absence of monitoring reports, disaggregated data or progress reports on the capacity development implemented. The project review documents further stated that “it is expected that more farmers in the local communities will benefit through knowledge diffusion as other farmers learn from the ones that were trained at various sites in the pilot project”. The Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Land and Environmental Affairs and Cedara’s Further Education Training section collaborated to provide different types of basic and advanced training under the Farm Together Training Programme.

Vegetable training and other kinds of training in crop production and animal husbandry aspects were provided to farmers on the project sites. In collaboration with the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, FAO convened enterprise information days in

17 A detailed breakdown of the quality and content of the training provided was not available.
Mpumalanga province support centred on broiler production, layers, vegetable and crop production to improve food and nutrition security as well as rural incomes for emerging farmers. There was no proper skills audit done, and support was provided largely based on the perceptions of service providers rather than a skills gap assessment. The perceptions regarding the capacity development support were largely derived from a general understanding of what smallholder farmers required to engage in farming activities. This was different from an approach that sought to first identify what capacity development priorities and skills gaps existed on the basis of specific requirements of the beneficiaries.

“We need pamphlets, booklets and a lot more simplified information packaged to help us to help farmers, possibly in vernacular.... We do not need to just come back with big files which we cannot open and use to help farmers.... Lecture notes alone are challenging enough in volume.” Beneficiary

Except in a few cases in both provinces, there was insufficient evidence that smallholder farmer beneficiaries who received trainings in various technical areas were able to use them to improve project management and performance. The underlying factor for this is rooted in constraints that are not technical, but rather overarching challenges linked to internal conflicts and other organizational bottlenecks that negate smallholder farming at the project sites. During the evaluation field mission, there were reports of protracted confrontations within many of the beneficiary groups, including conflicts that had remained unresolved for a long time. The challenges cited in this case were raised with key staff of provincial and local governments. In order to resolve the conflicts, sustained engagement was needed, involving further capacity development and training in governance and conflict management.

Concerning the structure of organization of the FAO/DAFF projects, there were challenges of working and collaborating effectively as a group in primary production, with a ‘free-rider’ mentality being rife in many cases. Poor management and technical capacity of cooperatives was also found to be problematic for smallholder farmers’ institutions. Combining communal sharing and working models with profit oriented business may adversely affect market access for smallholder farmers. Socio-economically, most smallholder farmers in South Africa are poor, less educated and reside in rural communities with less developed infrastructure, which places them in the so-called second economy.

The KwaZulu-Natal skills audit report pointed out that smallholder farmers in the pilot sites in the region faced technical, management, institutional and legal challenges. Social challenges encountered include protracted internal conflicts and/or infighting.

This was confirmed during the field visits, with members of the beneficiary groups polarised at four project sites. As a result, social and political differences surfaced within many of the groups whose members were supposed to cooperate on decisions and actions linked to various initiatives. Many cooperative beneficiaries were also unaware of how cooperatives functioned. The cooperatives model was being advocated without any real understanding among officials about how cooperatives should be structured and function. This approach

---

18 Soft skills incorporated training which is not technical, but linked to organizational, human resources and conflict management. The existence of incidences of internal conflicts in the farmer groups, however, indicate that the training was not adequate; more needed to be done, maybe beyond the scope of the project.

19 Gadzikwa et al. (2006).

20 ‘Free riders’ in this case are beneficiaries, mostly in a group, who seek to be rewarded for what they have invested in to be realized.

21 Thamaga-Chitja et al. 2011.

is understood to be supply-driven, explaining why there is a very high failure rate of cooperatives in general, within the development context of the country. Necessary training on how to run a cooperative was not included.

80 The model of support to primary producing cooperatives and dry-land farming activities was problematic, as risks such as erratic rain due to climate change continued to negatively impact productive systems. In an attempt to manage some of the risks, the project supported some of the farmer groups at two project sites to access water, through advocacy and lobbying of provincial government authorities. Some of the efforts yielded results, with some communities being able to access water for productive purposes. However, because of limited resources at provincial and national levels, not all disadvantaged farmers in need could be assisted.

81 Half of beneficiary groups indicated difficulty in penetrating high value markets. Reasons cited for the unpreparedness of the cooperatives and farmer groups to make headway in the marketplace included strict phytosanitary, quality, health and hygiene standards required by commercial marketing outlets, such as supermarket chains and other large private and public institutional customers, such as hospitals and schools.

82 There was also a lack of systematic mentoring of emerging commercial and smallholder farmers on diversified agri-business value chains. The lack of viability of many of the operations led to increased debt burdens against the background of dwindling working capital base. Many of the project sites have a similar tale of obstacles to progress, limiting the effectiveness of the capacity development training.

83 At the level of each farm, management and organizational structures were compromised by other issues over which the project had little or no control. Many group-based beneficiaries of land reform were known to have interests or were engaged in other economic opportunities, besides farming. For example, not all the Farm Together Training Programme beneficiaries were truly interested in farming, with others having stakes on the farms while fully employed elsewhere, in the light of low viability of the farms, with little or no significant incomes generated. Another issue was that grouping varied individuals together to manage one farm on a viable basis, when some of them worked as farm workers and not as farm owners; the lack of distinction proved to be a source of conflict of interests.

84 In many cases, smallholder and emerging farms were managed by people who lacked the requisite technical and managerial skills. In most cases, production and business plans were lacking; when they were reported to be in place, this could not be verified through the site visits.

The KwaZulu-Natal skills audit report points out that “in most cases, specialised technical skills enabling the conduct of activities relating to mechanised farm, farm machinery and equipment operation, calibration of equipment or setting out and making use of the irrigation equipment were not available” (KZN, Skills and Audit Report, 2014).

85 The lack of the much needed technical, organizational and management skills linked to production activities reduced the optimisation of resources and resulted in a lack of profitability or viability of many of the farm sites. This partly explains the rapid decline of active membership of cooperatives at most project sites, in both KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga, with membership levels well below those recorded by FAO progress reports.

86 Due to a lack of progress in the group projects, many beneficiaries were demotivated, resulting in a high dropout rate. Many of the members had become inactive in the cooperatives, while others abandoned cooperatives that did not demonstrate progress and had a perpetual dependence on outside funding.

87 FAO has developed a smallholder farmer development model, which the evaluation team was informed has been used to a limited extent as an advocacy tool to inform a policy development process initiated for smallholder farmers.
There is evidence, however, that most project sites visited by the evaluation team faced challenges in terms of achieving tangible progress and success as viable business undertakings. Thus, the effectiveness of the smallholder farmer development model as a tool to engage the Government of South Africa in the new policy formulation process remained to be validated.

### 3.5.1 Business acumen

There was no evidence of use of business plans that accounted for the beneficiaries’ support structures, internal group dynamics and conflicts, which often caused insurmountable challenges to managing the farms. This was due to the inability to use business plans as effective tools to advance the farming enterprises at the various project sites.

There was limited focus in the trainings on how sustainable enterprises should be developed; these trainings should have been complemented with external project partners. The potential role of partnerships, in particular those with comparative capacities and strengths in enterprise development, was not articulated adequately within the context of the capacity development project.

### 3.5.2 Provision of infrastructure and other support

In line with the revised logical framework, annual plans were developed that included infrastructure provision. Infrastructure support and capacity development training was provided to the smallholder project sites to varying degrees. Some senior staff within the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, who joined the project later, regarded this type of intervention as an unapproved support since the original project concept did not involve infrastructure support. Apart from the argument based on deviating from the original understanding of the project, there were no other grounds stated for lack of support within DAFF, as this pertained to infrastructure support. In principle, the project had synergies with the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme, the government mechanism of delivering infrastructure, while FAO was supposed to provide capacity development training assistance.

Between 2011 and 2015, project sites were provided with a range of inputs to facilitate the production of a variety of inputs for crop production. These inputs included fertilizer, land preparation services, seeds, improved seedlings, supply of stock feeds for livestock production, fencing materials, irrigation equipment, aspects of technical management of small scale irrigation schemes, post-harvest storage, provision of cold rooms and freezers, and equipment for a tanning enterprise.

In KwaZulu-Natal, animal health measures were undertaken including the distribution of vaccines to control a deadly goat heart water disease for the Ubumbano Goat Project. The goal was to ensure that Ubumbano farm obtained certification for Good Agricultural Practices to ensure entrance into the export market. As of May 2016 the support had yet to result in the envisaged Good Agricultural Practices certification. However, by mobilizing the relevant marketing authority, the Perishable Products Export Control Board certification services, it is evident that the beneficiaries were provided with clear information and goals to accomplish the certification. With the FAO project ending, what was not clear is whether the beneficiaries were able to sustain the effort to continue the Good Agricultural Practices audit without additional assistance.

The infrastructure support provided by FAO was useful and seemed well coordinated with the efforts of the provincial departments of agriculture. The provincial support structures acknowledged FAO’s value added support, against the background of challenges faced with CASP support. However, the lack of clarity on the roles and responsibilities inherent

---

[23] Adopting Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) certification is one way growers can verify their production and handling practices are in accordance with recommended international safety guidelines. To become GAP-certified a farm must prepare for and pass a GAP audit. Good Agricultural Practices are “practices that address environmental, economic and social sustainability for on-farm processes, and result in safe and quality food and non-food agricultural products” (FAO COAG 2003 GAP paper). The four ‘pillars’ of GAP (economic viability, environmental sustainability, social acceptability and food safety and quality) are included in most private and public sector standards, within the competitive international export marketing system.
in the FAO-DAFF partnership proved to be a source of conflict, ultimately hindering progress towards a mutually satisfying partnership.

### 3.6 Sustainability

To what extent are government staff and institutions capable of continuing project activities in an effective, efficient and sustainable manner?

IDAM has the institutional and financial support to propel project objectives into the future. Although it is too early to identify tangible results, the institute is poised to develop individual capacities of South African professionals in the long-term.

Although the project endeavoured to engage agricultural extension advisors at municipal level, the engagement mechanism at higher municipal and provincial levels did not enable planning to benefit from bottom-up insight, and contextual realities and limitations were often underestimated. In the case of Component II, continuation of project activities among beneficiaries is not guaranteed. Moreover, the project did not formulate a proper handover process at provincial level.

The lack of a holistic and sustained approach that delivered a concentration of financial and human resources to specific areas reduced the sustainability of project gains in the areas of technical skills enhancement. Delivery of technical skills was often not accompanied by the necessary functional skills, particularly management skills at the individual and group levels.

Apart from engaging the provincial hosting institutions, namely the department of agriculture at provincial level, the project did not implement a coherent partnership strategy which could have provided the mechanisms to capitalize on project gains. There was need to mobilize the inputs of other stakeholders from state to non-state actors in order to complement the FAO capacity development initiatives.

The package of resources and inputs required to provide sustainable support for capacity development of smallholder farmers in South Africa were from an upstream national policy level perspective, beyond the mandate of the existing FAO project as it was designed.

#### 3.6.1 Exit strategy

The project encompassed a cocktail of infrastructure support, capacity development and training targeted at smallholder beneficiaries. Many activities for the project started quite late, close to project closure, and some commitments commenced by FAO were not successfully concluded before the project ended. One example relates to the Siyaphambili Tannery project in KwaZulu-Natal, activities which were delayed for almost three years. At the time of the evaluation, the project had only recently secured funding to commence operations. As of project closure, the role of FAO remained unclear, yet the beneficiaries and key partners expected FAO to continue with its training assistance support. There was a notable absence of formal dialogue, characterised by inadequate communication between the key stakeholders involved on the way forward.

#### 3.6.2 Partnerships

The following partners were implementing partners: the Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Land and Environmental Affairs for Mpumalanga, the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, and the Department of Land Affairs for KwaZulu-Natal, Cedara, Agricultural Research Council, the Agribusiness Development Agency on agro-processing advice, UN Women on information and communication technology training, some large scale commercial farmers, TechnoServe, and others. In Mpumalanga, the Perishable Products Export Control Board was mobilized through the project to facilitate certification of smallholder farmers to penetrate the export market. In KwaZulu-Natal, the Perishable Products Export Control Board support activities to fast track certification services for Coromandel farm, with a total area of over 5,000 hectares of land.

24 However, because of capacity challenges linked to capital and the available human capital resource, the beneficiary farmers were only utilising about 50 percent of the land allocated to them. The rest of the land had been leased to an individual private commercial farmer.
There were challenges in the area of coordination of partnerships, with communication constraints encountered between project officers and technical experts, between provincial and municipal authorities and between cooperating partners. Communication from central levels to provincial and local levels was limited. For example, there was low visibility of the FAO project, in the absence of alignment with interventions such as CASP and other publicly supported initiatives. At field level, there was no strategy to forge deeper forms of collaboration in the project for joint planning and implementation of projects to enable mobilization of other key complementary inputs to the FAO capacity development initiatives.

Sustaining dialogue, communication and information exchange at senior management level in partner institutions was made more challenging because of the governance structure. While the Technical Working Group was functional, with the convening of regular meetings during the greater part of the project implementation period, the Project Steering Committee was not as effective. There was no predictable pattern of convening of Project Steering Committee meetings, when meetings did materialize, they were held too far apart. The Project Steering Committee would have been the starting point to ensure effective joint planning, monitoring and evaluation, including the following up of key partnerships down to provincial level. The reality was that communication was lacking between national headquarters and senior managers at provincial level, in particular department heads.

Buy-in from all stakeholders through the adoption of a ‘people-centred approach’ could have been stronger, specifically systematic consultations with potential partners on the ground, including state and non-state actors. Apart from dealing with DAFF, provincial level structures and project beneficiaries, there was no proactive approach to mobilizing other stakeholders in support of the project objectives. This was needed in order to deal with issues beyond capacity development, such as coordination, managerial concerns and contextual bottlenecks.

During project implementation, FAO worked with a number of United Nations agencies to varying extents. For example, through the United Nations Country Team management forum, UN Women was selected for the provision of information and communication technology support to farmer beneficiary groups. The support involved information and communication technology training to youth representatives of project groups and provision of laptops to all of the groups involved. There was scope to explore deeper forms of cooperation with other international and United Nations agencies, such as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and UNDP in micro, small and medium enterprise development and value chain development.

Overall, there has not been a conscious effort by the project to mobilize a critical mass of partnerships, in a strategic manner, in support of the development of value chains managed by project beneficiaries.

3.6.3 Monitoring and evaluation

The project lacked its own monitoring and evaluation component for proper performance tracking. It relied on DAFF’s M&E system and there was a lack of evidence that showed the monitoring data was used to steer the project. There is also no evidence to suggest that DAFF reports were systematically shared with FAO, with feedback given. The Mid-term Review 2010 reports that a consultant was hired in October 2007\(^{25}\) and produced a proposal for an M&E system, but there were no reports of follow-up activities; neither is there any indication that critical M&E issues were adequately addressed.

Project officers provided oversight for the project, collaborating with provincial level structures in the provision of capacity development support. The project officers gathered valuable information from the project sites, and the prepared reports were shared with FAO in Pretoria on the status of the project sites. The generated data and the reports captured the prevailing situation within the projects. However, some project sites exhibited more challenges and setbacks than indicated by the reports, particularly those associated with internal social conflicts and organizational management. Apart from support for technical training, support was also meant to include business management and bookkeeping, improved records for progress reporting, and support to farmer-to-farmer learning through exchange of ideas. Development of complementary capacities of the beneficiaries was therefore seen in the project context to be pivotal to the delivery of results.

\(^{25}\) Ms Marlene Roefs of Social Dimension to Design Monitoring and Evaluation Framework at a cost of R164, 160.00 in October 2007.
In recent months, the project team prepared a Lessons Learned Report and other project monitoring reports. Following the many challenges encountered in the project, this need for the project M&E was highlighted recently in the final FAO/DAFF report, which recommended models and instruments for South Africa smallholder farmer capacity development.
4. Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions

105 The three levels of capacity development (capacity development of individuals, organizations and in the enabling environment) were identified as central to the development process. Capacity development of individuals entails training and equipping the individuals with skills in specific areas through formal and informal means. Organizational capacity development implies the strengthening of knowledge and skills, beyond the individual, through a system approach. Capacity development in the enabling environment involves strengthening the broader development context for improved management of change. Although the project was not evaluated against the FAO CD framework, the findings are categorized within each level for the benefit of analysis and narrative.

Capacity development of individuals

106 Despite the ad hoc nature of most trainings, the project succeeded in supporting the short-term capacity development outcomes of individual beneficiaries. The project included various modalities to support technical skill development of beneficiaries within the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, as well as project sites. While more could have been done to evaluate the staff’s interest in technical trainings, there was general satisfaction with the Institute for Development Assistance Management’s course content, as well as the future prospects for management of international development cooperation in the food security and agricultural sector.

Organizational capacity development

107 Effective support for most of the beneficiaries relied on management and organizational arrangements based on the cooperative model. As a key structure that supports the beneficiaries, the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries’ organizational capacity development was not given proper attention in the project design (Component II). Most beneficiaries were not familiar with the way cooperatives work, despite efforts made under the Cedara Agricultural Training Institute supported the Farm Together Training Programme and other initiatives. There was a lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities at many project sites, specifically in relation to the operations of the groups. This points to the insufficient support to capacity development at the organizational level, as more could have been done to support management among beneficiary groups, including strategic leadership and clear reporting mechanisms – pre-conditions for effective technical delivery.

Capacity development in the enabling environment

108 There was a lack of policy level clarity regarding what kind of support mechanisms or structures were needed for productive enterprises, as well as for poverty reduction, livelihood improvement, food security and cooperatives. Poverty reduction objectives have more linkages with social protection interventions, and the support for productive enterprises to viable small and medium enterprise and value chain development. Although policy issues were not a major focus of the project, they were important to achieving the project outcomes. This lack of clarity negatively affected the project’s relevance to the agricultural development needs of South Africa. The inputs required to provide sustainable support for capacity development of smallholder farmers in South Africa reside in an upstream national policy level perspective, beyond the existing FAO project mandate as it was designed.

Gender

109 Gender equality is a major policy issue in South Africa. The project enabled the inclusion of both women and men in the selection of beneficiaries at the project sites, with gender equality receiving some consideration at the planning, monitoring and evaluation stages, as reflected in the monitoring and evaluation reviews. More could have been done, however,
to strengthen analysis of gender equality at the design and implementation stages, taking into account the socio-economic realities of female smallholder farmers in South Africa through a dedicated context analysis.

Partnerships

110 The need for a clear partnership strategy is central to the progress and sustainability of capacity development objectives. Such a strategy must move from formal policy endorsement within organizations to practical action, which is adequately monitored to reach implementation and performance goals. For Component I, FAO brought multiple stakeholders together to ensure the establishment of the Institute for Development Assistance Management. For Component II, however, there was no evidence of joint planning and implementation with the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme, or of joint monitoring and evaluation with the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. There was also no evidence of a strategy to forge deeper forms of collaboration with other national and international stakeholders and partners, for collaborative planning and implementation. This represents a missed opportunity to forge stronger linkages with CASP and other government programmes, such as the KwaZulu-Natal Agribusiness Development Agency and those in Mpumalanga, and other stakeholders at the national level, including United Nations agencies, civil society and the private sector.

Support to agricultural value chains

111 Within the context of the beneficiary groups, cooperatives were largely seen as poverty alleviation and livelihood strategies for the poor, not as avenues to create sustainable employment for rural households through small and medium enterprise development. The project focused on technical skills necessary for primary production. This approach has its merits in view of the well-documented production challenges facing smallholder farmers in South Africa. However, functional skills were required to create the necessary market linkages, knowledge and understanding of value chains, and the ability to adapt to technical challenges. Beyond support to primary production, the strengthening of the technological capabilities of smallholder beneficiaries through value chain development is key to the success of interventions centred on capacity development in the context of the Republic of South Africa. These capabilities include production management (primary production), infrastructure, inputs and marketing capacity development. While the project made some headway, more support was needed to ensure systematic mentoring of emerging smallholder farmers on diversified agri-business value chains, including in primary production.

Sustainability

112 There was a notable dependency on provision of inputs from government and FAO, as technical training and infrastructure support for beneficiaries was provided in an ad hoc and unsustainable manner. This produced limited long-term results for rural communities. The project was unable to develop and implement an effective exit strategy. The handover process at provincial and municipal levels had limited effectiveness, and in the absence of dialogue on the sustainability of the projects some of the major commitments were not concluded before project termination. When the project was terminated, there was an impression that senior managers in provincial governments needed to be engaged in accordance with the norms of concluding such projects. This was also central to post-project phase follow-ups, which senior provincial managers needed to support fully, particularly since there were resource implications associated with the new phase. For example, it was evident that some issues related to conflicts within the beneficiary groups required action beyond the capacity of the project management to handle. These issues had implications on project sustainability.

113 Despite a concerted effort by the project to adopt a strategy of combining capacity development training and infrastructure inputs, the operations of most smallholder farming groups continued to face viability concerns. Looking ahead, there was a significant need for the adoption of more business-like approaches and models, and lessening of unsustainable dependency of beneficiaries. Such dependency disempowers the groups
that are meant to be empowered for socio-economic progress and transformation. The lack of viability of many of the operations led to increased debt burdens against a background of a dwindling working capital base.

Due to the absence of a results-oriented monitoring system, support was needed to establish an accountable management and governance structure. At every level, the project structure required clearer motivation or rewards for good performance and penalties for poor or non-delivery of desired outcomes.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The FAO Representation in South Africa to support the Republic of South Africa in the development of coherent policy to accompany capacity development activities in the smallholder farming sector.

In order to improve the smallholder farming sector, policy support in similar projects should complement capacity development trainings and other assistance, including targeting support to viable smallholder agricultural enterprises or those that offer higher transformational prospects. Currently the policy framework appears to be more favourable to the large-scale commercial sector, despite the existence of land reform measures that have allocated land to commercial farm workers through a government land reform programme.

Suggested action

• Provide technical support to the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries to differentiate policies regarding poverty reduction, community livelihoods and social welfare, from policies targeting support for productive agri-business and market-linked enterprises.

Recommendation 2: FAO should support the Republic of South Africa to clarify the role of strategic partners as mentors in future capacity development projects with smallholder farmers. More support is needed to ensure systematic mentoring of emerging smallholder farmers on diversified agri-business value chains, including in primary production.

There is a need for clarity among both the mentors and the beneficiaries regarding the mentorship arrangements. A more targeted government programme of inclusive intervention and partnerships for mentorship of smallholder farmers, including personnel from the private sector.

Suggested actions

• This could involve a more sustainable approach on mentorship of emergent black commercial and smallholder farmers, placing mentors on farms for two to three years, to help farmers become viable commercial farm producers.
• Performance-centred monitoring and evaluation of those mentors supporting smallholder farmers to accompany such activities, including their accreditation.

Recommendation 3: Future FAO-South Africa capacity development efforts and similar projects should adopt a holistic approach, in line with FAO’s corporate strategy for capacity development, including individual trainings complemented by support to the organizational and political levels. The approach should align with FAO’s strategic programming at the corporate and national levels, as well as national priorities for capacity development.

Suggested action

• Before engaging in future collaborations, FAOZA should ensure that the project design is adequately informed by a thorough needs assessment, as well as the socio-economic and political realities of the beneficiaries and key stakeholders documented.
Recommendation 4: With support from headquarters, FAO-South Africa should review its partnership strategy for future capacity development efforts in South Africa to maintain the sustainability of project gains, increase national ownership of results, and ensure the project’s continued relevance with emerging priorities in the agricultural development sector. FAO project management should identify all potential actors, and facilitate coordinated actions including joint planning, monitoring and evaluation of capacity development projects.

Suggested actions

- With other UN agencies: the Institute for Development Assistance Management can create relationships with UN agencies that have experience in managing development cooperation. FAO could also leverage support and strengthen linkages with other UN agencies – such as UNDP, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, UN Women and other multilateral organizations – to scale up opportunities for small enterprise development, increase participation by women and youth, and improve linkages between FAO and the private sector.
- National research centres can provide additional technical support to smallholder farm sites, and the strategic selection of civil society organizations can help to ensure the capitalisation and continuation of project gains.
- The private sector can be a source for mentors to provide support to emerging farmers in value chain development.
- Extend the partnership with the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries to include joint monitoring and evaluation.

Recommendation 5: More accountable governance and management structures should be included by FAOZA in similar capacity development projects, including provisions for results-based M&E.

Emphasis should be placed on developing adequate project management structures, guided by a strong Management Committee and Project Steering Committee. Incentives must be provided to ensure the recruitment and stability of competent staff, in order to avoid high staff turnover.
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5. Lessons learned

This capacity development project represents a unique learning opportunity for DAFF, FAO South Africa and FAO headquarters. As capacity development is core to FAO’s mandate, the Organization is well placed to support South Africa, a middle income country seeking to develop national technical capacities. The followings sections describe lessons learned to inform future cooperation between FAO and South Africa, for which capacity development remains a priority area.

Linkages with regional and continental initiatives

FAO remains well positioned to facilitate regional and international agricultural sector development through strengthened technical assistance support centred on agro-processing and value chains. For example, FAO can draw on Ethiopian experiences in local leather manufacturing and other innovative opportunities. In line with needs of the project sites, large sub-components of the capacity development and training for Component II supported the production of dryland crops. This has been marked by erratic, inconsistent output and low yields due to repeated droughts, highlighting shared regional and continental challenges of rain-fed farming and insufficient irrigation infrastructure. Climate change effects and droughts have also posed a major challenge for South Africa, especially among emerging and smallholder farmers.

Clarify the role and responsibilities of the FAO-South Africa partnership

In such joint projects, where the government is both resource partner and recipient of support, there is a need to clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities of each party before launching project activities. This would prevent overlap or duplication of activities and streamline implementation.

Communicate the value of FAO technical assistance support

FAO should reassess its value added as a Technical Adviser, taking into account that South Africa is a middle income country with unique challenges in the sector. FAO’s comparative advantage lies in its technical expertise in agricultural development, and capacity to support government objectives at the local, national and international levels. More than a service provider, FAO should better communicate the range of support it can offer South Africa. Future support could benefit from an in-depth context analysis of the particularities of agricultural development in South Africa.

Capacity development based on proper needs assessments

Ensure needs assessments and feasibility studies precede each capacity development intervention. In future initiatives, there should only be support for projects with good prospects for success, after a careful and thorough screening of beneficiaries and assessment of needs. The process of determining the feasibility of project sites should benefit from an independent analysis.

Social cohesion of beneficiary groups

At the community level, sustained efforts to increase social cohesion among smallholder farming communities, organizational management structures and accountability proved to be key determinants to progress, without which the capacity development and training provided to beneficiary groups and cooperatives did not yield the desired results.

To address social facilitation challenges, in particular conflicts within beneficiary groups, and the need for improved soft skills within the project approach, future support should
include a component on social mobilization and participation. FAO should mobilize organizations with comparative advantages and competencies in developing soft skills designed to address community, social, cultural and political group dynamics, and governance structures at the farmer group level.

FAO leadership at the country level

As has been highlighted in other evaluations, strategic leadership can be pivotal for attainment of project results. For this particular project, stakeholders often highlighted the positive impact upon the arrival of the FAO Representative in 2013, following which project activities gained momentum and were eventually achieved.
### Appendix 1: Key issues area mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Binding constraints</th>
<th>Outcome/Result</th>
<th>Recommended action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Key policies such as CASP does not support all categories of entrant farmers, but focuses on land reform beneficiaries, and lack of framing to the low asset base of most smallholder farmers. Further poor coordination leading to absence of synergy with other policy measures. Agri-BEE needs partnerships that are out of reach for poorly educated smallholder farmers to meet the prescribed scorecard.</td>
<td>Those who need assistance most, especially at subsistence level are not allocated for by CASP. The uncoordinated support impacts negatively on funded farmers and on National Treasury finances. The poor coordination results in the funded farmers not realizing sustainable livelihoods and market participation; disconnect between small and big business, including with small rural enterprises; including with overall agri-business support structures, public and private; low or lack of value addition to primary products.</td>
<td>Market-led agri-business value chain development services, from production management to marketing, innovative agricultural extension advisory services can be used as a social protection instrument against lack of information and knowledge on value chains; facilitate linkages between established commercial farmers and developing smallholder farmers to enhance BEE for mutual benefit. Centralised, better coordinated service delivery with respect to CASP should be considered for better return for state and farmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td>Poor, less educated reside in rural communities, with less developed infrastructure.</td>
<td>Unsustainable livelihood options limited by poor skills, resulting in poor well-being and less productive community and its individuals.</td>
<td>Well-conceived Social Protection (SP) can provide services and cash transfers to support basic needs, including sanitation, roads, housing and water. SP services can further strengthen access to key assets, such as quality education and healthcare. In such communities, people would be capacitated to exercise agency in pursuing long term goals linked to agriculture, value chain development and accessing markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>With more than 80 percent of productive land still in hands of minority group, lack of access to land, unfavourable tenure laws and policies persist.</td>
<td>Lack of access to key productive asset by large numbers of smallholder and potential/emergent black commercial farmers.</td>
<td>Decisive/bold steps on agrarian reform, land redistribution, engendered approach, taking cognisance of the needs of the youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro-climate climate change</td>
<td>Inferior agro-ecological regions, leading to poor yield for smallholder farmers.</td>
<td>Poor yields and poor incomes, including limited food and nutrition security.</td>
<td>Disaster risk management, irrigation infrastructure development, improved extension services, appropriate technology suited to agro-climates may lead to improved yields and incomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Binding constraints</td>
<td>Outcome/Result</td>
<td>Recommended action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to markets, inputs and credit</td>
<td>Poorly developed roads, costs of finding and bargaining with buyers, lack of access to appropriate and timely inputs, limited or no credit provision.</td>
<td>The costs of market transactions limits income generation; lack of targeted, sustainable input schemes; absence of credit leads to vicious circle of low productivity and low returns to labour.</td>
<td>Public works programmes should be deliberately linked to smallholder farming areas, and integrated development planning should be incorporated into smallholder farming infrastructure; marketing strategies targeting the poor; innovative, inclusive input and credit schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Women’s time poverty resulting from multiple roles, stereotypes of gender-based work, verbalized rules on how to behave, forbidding access to resources.</td>
<td>Overstretched time allocations results in tasks not being performed well, thus impacting the households and out of households key roles such as childcare and marketing of produce, loss of opportunity, access and food insecurity.</td>
<td>Change of gender based roles through engaging concerned institutions to foster new perspectives to work and gender equality women empowerment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: logical framework for capacity development of South African professionals project

### IMPACT

At inception the project had two envisaged impacts as follows:

A. Contribute to effective management of Government of South Africa’s International Development Cooperation (“aid”) programme (later called Component I),

B. Improved mechanisms for government smallholder farmer (formerly disadvantaged farmers) capacity development (later called Component II).

As the project evolved, more impact areas emerged as follows:

C. To transform the agricultural sector through improved capacities and technical skills and for officials in the Area of Scarce skills

### Project Outcomes (consolidated)

A. Improved Capacities and technical skills and for officials in the Area of Scarce skills namely *inter alia* aid management, Aquaculture, Forestry, Agrarian reform and farmer support, Food security and Nutrition, customer care, and climate smart agriculture

B. Improved mechanisms for government smallholder farmer (formerly disadvantaged farmers) capacity development (later called Component II).

### Outcome statement 1

Improved Capacities and technical skills and for officials in the Area of Scarce skills namely *inter alia* aid management, Aquaculture, Forestry, Agrarian reform and farmer support, Food security and Nutrition, customer care, and climate smart agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator*</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of the Institute for Development Assistance Management.</td>
<td>• No institute which deals with development assistance management</td>
<td>• To establish a vibrant Institute of development assistance management by the end of the project NTE</td>
<td>• Project documents, Course materials, • Institution structures; • Institution infrastructure • Launch report • Initial enrolment</td>
<td>MoUs, between DAFF and Selected University approved All government stakeholders actively participate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutional Strengthening and capacity development in Aquatic Animal Health in South Africa and beyond | • Weak capacity on issues of aquatic animal health • No regional biosecurity strategy • No national strategy on biosecurity | • Aquatic animal health (AAH) courses • self-assessment survey questionnaire on capacity and performance • Regional aquatic animal health strategy by end of project • Regional Workshop on Improving Aquatic Animal Health Management, and Strengthening Biosecurity Governance in Africa • technical guidance to DAFF officers on development of AAH National Strategy, design of surveillance | • Project documents, • Workshop reports • Strategy documents | All government stakeholders actively participate |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing capacities for forestry resources management</th>
<th>• DAFF has no capacities and skills in remote sensing, Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+)</th>
<th>• Training in remote sensing and Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+)</th>
<th>• Project documents, • Training reports</th>
<th>All government and other stakeholders actively participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved capacities in agrarian reform, farmer support and customer care</td>
<td>• Limited experiences and exposure to international Experiences in Agrarian Reform, customer care, Farmer Support</td>
<td>• Training workshops on international experiences • customer care training • exchange visits organized to selected countries</td>
<td>• Project documents, • Training reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacities in food and nutrition security measurement, and policy development</td>
<td>• Limited experiences and exposure to international Experiences in food and nutrition security policy development</td>
<td>• Workshops supported • Technical assistance and policy process backstopping provided • Food security measurement piloted</td>
<td>• Project documents, • Training reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for transforming the sector developed</td>
<td>• Currently no plan for transforming the sector</td>
<td>• Design of sector transformation strategy</td>
<td>• Project documents, • Training reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACTIVITIES AND DESCRIPTION FOR OUTCOME 1

#### Output 1 Establishment of the Institute for Development Assistance Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES for achieving output 1</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop and sign an LOA between the Food and Agriculture Organization and a selected University for establishment of the institution</td>
<td>Letter of agreement with all activities, outputs and budget allocations and deliverables for establishment of the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A project Implementation steering committee was established</td>
<td>Committee to establish the institution’s corporate identity, a program of launch of the institution and a proposed budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop a sustainability plan for the institution.</td>
<td>Develop and endorse upon presentation to the Project Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop training course materials</td>
<td>Development and accreditation of courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Establish the institution’s operational structure</td>
<td>With marketing and communication plan, reference group, board of governors etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Develop the marketing and communication Plan for the institution</td>
<td>As part of operational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Establish the institution’s Board of governors</td>
<td>As part of operational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish the institution’s management and staff structure</td>
<td>As part of operational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Establish Technical Reference Group</td>
<td>As part of operational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Establish the institution’s website</td>
<td>Normal website with key features of the institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Output 2
**Institutional Strengthening and capacity development in Aquatic Animal Health in South Africa and beyond**

**ACTIVITIES for achieving output 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Carry out Two aquatic animal health (AAH) courses (introductory and advance courses)</td>
<td>Develop course curricula, accredit and organize training workshops with participants from the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct a self-assessment survey questionnaire on capacity and performance on AAH</td>
<td>Design and administer questionnaire and analyze survey data across countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Carry out Regional Workshop on Improving Aquatic Animal Health Management, and Strengthening Biosecurity Governance in Africa</td>
<td>Plan and organise workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provided technical guidance to DAFF officers on development of AAH National Strategy, design of surveillance programme for aquatic animal diseases, national pathogen</td>
<td>Ongoing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Drafting of Regional Aquatic Biosecurity Strategy for the Southern African</td>
<td>Terms of reference and drafting process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 3
**Developing capacities for forestry resources management**

**ACTIVITIES for achieving output 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Training in Remote sensing</td>
<td>Seconded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training in Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+)</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 4: Exposure on Agrarian reform and farmer support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Two-day Workshop on International Experiences in Agrarian Reform and Farmer Support</td>
<td>Experts to be brought in to share experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Two experts from Brazil and the Philippines respectively, shared experiences in agrarian reform in their countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exchange visits to Brazil and Russia</td>
<td>Officials from DAFF to travel for training on REDD+ and National Forest Monitoring System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Training in customer care</td>
<td>Training workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Training in climate smart agriculture</td>
<td>Training workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 5
**Capacities in food and nutrition security measurement, and policy development enhanced**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Technical Capacity Support to ongoing Food and Nutrition security development</td>
<td>Ongoing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Technical Capacity Support to the stakeholder consultation process</td>
<td>Multi-stakeholder consultation workshops process supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support to capacities in food security measurement and monitoring</td>
<td>Support to Food Insecurity Experience Scale in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support to food security assessment</td>
<td>Support to FSN assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 6
**Sector transformation plan developed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Design and develop a sector transformation plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 2

Improved mechanisms for government smallholder farmer (formerly disadvantaged farmers) capacity development (Component II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator*</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder mapping, capacity needs and skills audit done in selected provinces</td>
<td>• No stakeholder mapping analysis • There are no baselines • Skills gaps unknown</td>
<td>All stakeholders mapped Baselines done in all the selected pilot sites in the selected provinces Skills audit carried out to identify skills gaps</td>
<td>Project documents, databases created, baseline report</td>
<td>All government stakeholders actively participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate infrastructure and start up equipment provided to the selected projects</td>
<td>• New farmers have no equipment and appropriate infrastructure to kick start production</td>
<td>Various type of capital and operational inputs provided to farmers to kick start production</td>
<td>Project documents, databases created, baseline report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training provided to pilot sites and Business plans and project plans developed with the farmers at pilot sites</td>
<td>• Farmers lack specific skills • Farmers do not have business plans</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary training provided to all pilot sites based on audit skills All pilot sites to have business plans</td>
<td>Project documents, Training databases created, baseline report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output 1

Outcome Statement : capacity needs and Stakeholder mapping done in selected provinces

ACTIVITIES for achieving output 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mapping of stakeholders and identification of suitable pilot sites for implementing targeted capacity building activities</td>
<td>Stakeholder analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>Dissemination and consultation workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Skills audit conducted</td>
<td>A study to give a picture of the skills of the project beneficiaries in particular smallholder farmers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output 2

Appropriate infrastructure and start up equipment provided to the selected projects

ACTIVITIES for achieving output 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Provide appropriate capital and operational resources to selected pilot sites to kick start production activities</td>
<td>Smallholder farmers to receive various forms of support in form of production inputs, equipment and infrastructure to kick start productive activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output 3

Multidisciplinary Training provided to pilot sites

ACTIVITIES for achieving output 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Deliver a multidisciplinary training programme based on the skills requirements</td>
<td>In line with capacity needs assessment and skills audit provide specialised multidisciplinary training to identified stakeholders at pilot sites including smallholder farmers, extension officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Facilitate development of business and project plans as part of operationalising training and skills acquired</td>
<td>Pilot sites facilitated to develop business plans for their projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: South African agricultural support to smallholder farmers

The following is a context analysis of the smallholder farmers’ situation in RSA. The figure below shows the distribution of 3 million South African households involved in agricultural activities by province. The 3 million largely rural farmers are engaged in production for household food security, not for the market.

Dualism in South African agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. farmers</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial farmers (mainly White, very small number of Blacks)</td>
<td>300 000</td>
<td>National food security/international trade (supplying 90 percent of marketed output)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small scale farmers (mostly former homelands)</td>
<td>300 000</td>
<td>Local food security, relatively little marked surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural households, backyard gardeners (micro-scale)</td>
<td>3 000 000</td>
<td>Household food security, subsistence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Free State Agriculture Land Audit, 2014
### Land ownership in South Africa (2014)

#### Land ownership by type of farm, South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White +White share</th>
<th>Black private portions</th>
<th>Black land reform</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Foreign</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>10 782 757</td>
<td>207 304</td>
<td>248 511</td>
<td>157 613</td>
<td>3,407</td>
<td>945 430</td>
<td>12 375 021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha (%)</td>
<td>87.13</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land portions</td>
<td>38 932</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1 339</td>
<td>3 864</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>6 634</td>
<td>51 856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portion (%)</td>
<td>75.08</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Free State Agriculture (Jack Armour), June 2014


Socio-economically, most smallholder farmers in South Africa are poor, less educated and reside in rural communities with less developed infrastructure which locates them in the so-called second economy (Jacobs 2008). In rural areas, almost all the land is communally owned and administered by a Traditional Authority, mainly for subsistence purposes. The communal ownership of land in these areas tends to diminish its commercial value.
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