

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 Introduction

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) contracted the Umhlaba Consulting Group (Pty) Ltd. in November 2007 to undertake a review of experiences of emerging farmer support programmes. The project team included specialists from the Umhlaba Consulting Group, the Fort Hare Agricultural and Rural Development Research Institute (ARDRI) and Phuhlisani Solutions. The primary purpose of the assignment was to inform the upcoming FAO supported pilot projects which aim to improve support to smallholder farmers in the South African land reform context. The work was undertaken in close collaboration with FAO and the National Department of Agriculture. The assignment included: a review of land reform and agricultural development initiatives in South Africa focussed on emerging farmers¹; the study of six relatively successful cases of farmer support within the land reform context; and an analysis leading to recommendations for implementation in the future FAO-funded pilot initiative.

2 Literature Review of Farmer Support Programmes

The literature review assessed land reform policy, implementation and support programmes as well as documented experiences of establishing new farmers in South Africa. Programmes reviewed include the Settlement Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG), the Land Re-distribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) instrument, Farm Equity Schemes, Municipal Commonage Programmes, Land Restitution and the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP).

The review also explored historical experiences of establishing settler farmers and recent experiences of establishing new black farmers. Best practices were synthesised from the review and then compared with international best practice experiences.

The reports that were reviewed revealed major challenges. These included a high proportion of dysfunctional land reform projects associated with internal conflict, loss of interest among beneficiaries and beneficiary defection, deterioration of farm infrastructure, limited production and marketing, poor business plans, low levels of experience, financial problems and insufficient emphasis on institutional design. Indications were that achievement of success in South African land reform was most likely when farmers had:

- internalized their business plans;
- all the skills necessary to implement their business plans;
- the physical and natural resources required for the implementation of their plans;
- access to inputs and output markets; and
- a voice in determining policy issues that affect them.

International experience has identified several best practices in terms of policy and legislation. Comparison of South Africa's land reform policy and legislation, including

¹ At the time of publication, the Government of the Republic of South Africa was referring to these farmers as "smallholder farmers".

the application of the rule of law, shows that South Africa meets global best practice guidelines in these two domains. Globally, land and agrarian reform programmes have taken time (one or more decades) and have been costly to implement. This also applies to South Africa, primarily as a result of the application of the "willing buyer – willing seller" principle in the general context of rising land prices.

International experiences emphasize that the provision of access to land is not the only way to promote economic development in rural areas and to reduce poverty among the rural population. The review of South African experiences shows that the impact of land reform on rural economic development and poverty reduction has been rather limited. Moreover, experiences from the Western Cape Province suggest that participation of rural people in economic activity that is located upstream of primary production has better potential to rapidly reduce poverty than participation in primary production itself. International experience shows that access to land must result in tangible improvements in the livelihood of beneficiaries within a fairly short period of time to avoid beneficiary defection. The high defection rates in South African projects, where tangible benefits remained limited or absent for several years, confirmed the international experience.

It is the international experience that progress in land and agrarian reform has been most rapid when the population of beneficiaries consisted of former tenants, and more slowly when the beneficiaries consisted of former farm workers. Of all the factors known to affect progress and success in land and agrarian reform, the particular characteristics of South African land reform beneficiaries is arguably the most challenging. The political history of South Africa effectively destroyed African tenancy on white-owned commercial farms and severely eroded African peasant traditions that existed in the former homelands. As a result, South Africa largely lacks the type of beneficiaries who have been shown internationally to be ideally suited for participation in land and agrarian reform programmes. The South African experience with farm workers and land reform has been similar to the international experience.

Experience, both local and international, stresses the importance of beneficiaries organizing themselves and taking control of their own development. This reality needs to be acknowledged politically and fiscally. Land and agrarian reform should address historical discrimination as far as land is concerned, and it should also address the effects of discrimination on the way in which black people had to structure and re-structure their livelihood in order to survive.

International experience does not provide evidence that collective arrangements in land reform projects should be avoided but warns against making collective arrangements a permanent feature. For the transition from collective to individual to occur smoothly, the rights of individuals must be clearly spelt out at the start of projects, even when the project is structured as a collective during the initial phase. There is also a need for a rational system of individual economic incentives in land reform projects. Ambiguity in the rewarding of individual productivity has been shown to damage land reform, as is reflected in the poor results from most experiences with collective farming. Local experiences have resulted in many questions about the desirability of using a collective approach to land reform. However, the principal reason for many of the difficulties experienced in collective projects appears to be inadequacies in formulating the rights (and obligations) of individuals and the lack of attention to clearly defined arrangements governing individual economic incentives.

Deciding on the size of holdings has important implications for the number of beneficiaries who can be assisted and the impact of the reform programme on the degree of poverty reduction. Global experience does not support the use of the concept of the 'economically viable farm unit' when deciding on the size of holdings.

Instead, it recommends the use of a flexible approach that takes into account local social and economic circumstances. In terms of farm size evolution, international experience has shown that land sales markets are much less effective than land leasing or sharecropping markets in providing access to (additional) land among the poor. Historically, South Africa has made considerable use of the economic farm unit approach in projects that involved the settlement of new farmers. Where land was held by individual title, as has been mostly the case for white farmer settlements, the historical trend has been towards the enlargement of land holdings. On black settlement schemes, scale enlargement has not occurred in any major way for reasons not yet well understood. The practice of renting land is not really common in black smallholder settings, not because of a lack of demand for land but because of barriers that restrict supply. The tenure arrangements that applied on black settlement schemes have been an important reason for the holding size remaining static and for the general absence of land rental markets, but there are indications that other factors may also play a role.

Global experience shows that land and agrarian reform programmes are highly complex and demand a high degree of capacity among the agencies that implement these programmes. Capacity determines what is feasible, and governments should not pass legislation when there is no capacity or resources to implement the legislation. Two broad domains of capacity are critical in the provision of support to land and agrarian reform, namely:

- capacity to administer land; and
- capacity to support the establishment of new farmers.

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

- institutional innovation in rural financial markets, particularly in market-assisted land reforms;
- facilitating access to credit, technology, financial and farm management skills and marketing information; and
- facilitating linkages with the private sector.

Structurally the support services need to be well coordinated and integrated to achieve maximum benefit. The South African experience with the provision of support to land and agrarian reform has been a major learning curve, which has resulted in the development of several new approaches to improve effectiveness, including area-based plans (ABPs) and the Settlement and Implementation Support Strategy (SIS). The different spheres in which support was shown to be inadequate corresponded with those identified as being important internationally.

3 Illustrative Case Studies

Six case studies were purposefully selected from a shortlist of eleven cases, to illustrate and provide perspective to the findings from the South African and international literature review. All of the cases had elements of success and sustainability. A summary description of the cases is presented in Table 3.1 overleaf. Analysis and recommendations were achieved from a series of workshops with the Department of Agriculture, FAO and the review team.

Table 3.1 **Summary of Selected Cases**

Case No.	Name of group and location	Number in group and size of land	Productive activities on farm	Nature of ownership of enterprises	Tenure arrangements	Spread of purpose of production
1	eMpingisweni, KwaZulu Natal	342 households, and about 1500 people. Not all returned to the land yet. Farm size 6000 ha.	• 400 ha irrigated crops – maize, dry beans, potatoes, tomatoes, wheat • Timber farming • Nguni cattle development and ranching • Leasing land out to other company for green bean cultivation • Household cultivation and livestock. • There is a business plan but not adhered to.	Joint venture between Trust and Magungwane Farming Pty Ltd. Individuals have land rights to productive plots assigned through joint Trust/traditional leadership agreement.	Main activities under a PTY company of which the community Trust is part owner. PTY leases land from the community. Management includes Trust leadership. Unclear as to benefit for households. Households access land for their own farming purposes. Limited support from DLA for land management – chieftainship based and works well.	Distinct divide between household and company production. Limited links though joint marketing, etc. Trust does perform a role of credit to households for production.
2	Noku Development Trust Mpumalanga	411 households and about 1700 people. Farm size is 150ha with 140 ha of grazing and 30 ha of bush and wetland.	• Irrigation on 75 ha • Recently, cattle feedlots • Mix of crops including lucerne, beans and maize	The Trust owns and delegates management of the farming enterprise to a paid farm manager – thus separating the administrative and farm management institutional elements.	No tenure arrangement that separates the farm enterprise land-use from the Trust. This has resulted in substantial transaction costs (time and negotiation) on an ongoing basis for those farming the irrigation land.	The mixed farm operation is successful, profitable and has seen sustained growth over the 11 years. While a de-jure collective farming entity (the Trust) it is de-facto run by the farm manager, who makes farming decisions largely independently for the benefit of himself and 40 workers.
3	Basotho Letjabile. Near Wesselsbron, Free State.	9 families, 36 people. Ex-farmworkers of the commercial farm. Close knit group who have lived together for 30 years. 1350 ha.	• 130 ha with white & yellow maize, sunflowers • Cattle • Other stock – pigs and chickens but limited numbers • Small-scale vegetable production • Currently making a profit but gross margin less than surrounding commercial farmers.	Collectively owned enterprise – legally set up as a Trust. Well functioning, close knit group.	Most production is done collectively by owners. Cattle are held collectively and are held individually (the individual holdings are strictly controlled). Small-scale vegetables produced collectively for food security. Individuals have rights to individual production plots.	Both collective production and individual production takes place, although it appears that most effort is put into collective. Distinct divide between individual and collective – with strict controls on individual stocks.

Case No.	Name of group and location	Number in group and size of land	Productive activities on farm	Nature of ownership of enterprises	Tenure arrangements	Spread of purpose of production
4	Prince Albert Commonage – Treintjiesrivier, Western Cape	Commonage land so number of individuals shifts – currently in the order of 75 men and women. Size is 5580ha.	• Extensive Sheep farming – carrying capacity of 600 in total • Onion seed • Cabbages • Lucerne • Pigs	The various enterprises include individuals operating on their own, as well as groups engaged in a number of cooperative enterprises.	The land is owned by the municipality – acquired through a DLA grant. The land is leased to the Farmers Association and with no support from the municipality, the farmers association is managing tenure arrangements amongst the members. Individuals access land for specific purposes and are required to respect other users rights).	Most of the enterprises form only part of the livelihood strategies of the users. Given the high unemployment in the group, much of the activity on the farm is the only non grant livelihood opportunity that the farmers have.
5	Melkkrail / Heiveld Northern Cape	26 families living communally in de-facto shared ownership, but on land formally owned by only 7 of the families with undivided shares.	• Communal wheat field • Communal rooibos field • Private plots for houses with home vegetable gardens	Verbal permission is granted through familial lines to gain access to residential plots. Farming of wheat and rooibos is done collectively.	Tenure is unclear from a legal and institutional perspective, but the perception of the 26 families is that they have secure tenure, evidenced by their occupation of the land and individual residences built on the land.	Production of commodity crops (wheat and rooibos) is done in collaboration with a larger cooperative (Heiveldt) comprising other farms, with a total of 51 members. Local production includes subsistence small livestock and vegetables.
6	Opperman's Gronde Free State	Restitution claim of 900 families. Total area 34,000 ha. Extensive livestock farms apportioned at 260 ha. Irrigation farms of 10.5 ha per irrigation beneficiary (total of 42 beneficiaries)	• Extensive sheep farming with carrying capacity of 13 ha per small stock unit. • Intensive irrigation farming of 210 ha, mainly of potatoes and maize.	Independent ownership of separate farming enterprises by discrete groups. The irrigators formed a separate company and have a joint-venture arrangement with a commercial farmer. All irrigation land is farmed as a unit by the joint venture under a dedicated separate company.	Detailed institutional plan which allows the irrigation beneficiaries secure tenure through a formal lease for 10 years. The joint venture then leases from the irrigation beneficiaries.	The irrigation production model is a high-tech, mechanized one, with minimal direct involvement in farming decision-making of the irrigation beneficiaries. There is high dependency on the commercial partner. Primary return is a cash one, effectively through a shareholding.

4 Case Study Analysis

The cases studies provided a wide representation in terms of regional spread, institutional structuring, land tenure arrangement and enterprise type (cropping and animal production). These fit into three typologies, which are verified by the review and from team experience, and are considered to apply more broadly to the South African situation. These typologies are useful in that they can inform how the best practice recommendations that follow can be applied in reality. The typologies and selected characteristics are shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Characteristics of Land Reform Enterprise and Institutional Typologies

Categorisation	Description	Success Factors	Concerns Raised
Centralized / Professionalized Management under Beneficiary Oversight. (eMpangisweni and Oppermans Gronde cases)	This is a model of commercial farming production with a contracted farm manager operating under a 'Board of Directors' (the beneficiaries). There is separation of farming from landholding & non-commercial aspects of land reform programme.	- Financial returns at expected commercial levels - High levels of grant/loan financing and investment - Commercial vision, orientation and management - Good management relationships	Lack of beneficiary empowerment, with role largely relegated to labour; the rate of return on the financial investment and the ability to replicate such a model on a mass scale; the success factors largely rest on the success of the non-beneficiary partner. This generic model fails to achieve the core land reform objectives of establishing black farmers and initiating agrarian reform.
Group-run enterprises, with management vested within a beneficiary-run committee. (Noko and Basotho Letjabile cases)	The farming operations are beneficiary-run, with either a representative operational structure or by a delegated group or individual operating with a degree of autonomy from the larger group.	- Achievement of financial returns for participants - No project-threatening debt - Leadership – stable, dynamic, vision - Package of support services with facilitative support	This perhaps the most pervasive of approaches adopted in land reform in the last ten years. It is widely criticized as it is based on group initiatives that have a poor rate of success. A common thread is the division between the core participating group, who benefit directly, and the inability to deliver benefits to the larger group of non-participating beneficiaries.

Categorisation	Description	Success Factors	Concerns Raised
Individual enterprise management, with common association and shared resources. (Prince Albert and Melkraal cases)	Scenario of land being centrally owned, but farming takes place through separate enterprises. Different land owning models (public/private).	▪ Clear access rights to resources ▪ Basket of support services which match enterprise needs ▪ Cohesive association among farmers supported by facilitator ▪ Farmers' enterprises linked to their previous experience ▪ Link to specialist markets have boosted returns.	Weak land management structures resulting in land rights confusion; lack of infrastructure management and lack of enforcement around land use agreements; lack of business experience and skills among the farmers; lack of individual tenure/ownership, creating problems in accessing credit.

5 Recommendations for Best Practice

On the basis of the case study analysis, the South African programme review and the international review, a set of recommendations for best practice has been synthesized. These are discussed under the key stages that are apparent in land reform and the establishment of new farmers, namely; beneficiary selection, enterprise and transfer planning, and post-transfer service and support. Evidence shows that success is more likely when each of these stages receives due consideration.

5.1 Beneficiary selection

The review suggests that beneficiary selection is the major challenge facing the land and agrarian reform programme in South Africa. The more successful beneficiaries either had previous personal experiences in small-scale commercial agriculture as managers and decision makers (i.e. not just as farm workers), or had relied mainly on small-scale agriculture for their livelihood. Rarely have groups of land reform beneficiaries met this profile. Instead, project beneficiaries have tended to be rural dwellers with various livelihood strategies in which agriculture had a limited role or no role at all. This places a burden on providing comprehensive skills training and increases the likelihood of inactivity and even defection among beneficiaries in group projects. Calls for the shift from the group approach to the individual approach in land reform must be understood in this context. Comparative international experience places some responsibility on a peculiar characteristic of South African history. In the mid-20th century, African tenancy on white-owned commercial farms was terminated and this, along with Betterment² in the homelands, severely eroded African peasant traditions. South Africa largely lacks the type of beneficiaries who have been shown internationally to be ideally suited for participation in land and agrarian reform programmes. Beneficiary selection demands more rigorous attention to achieve increased success rates.

5.2 Enterprise planning

The review showed that best practice in enterprise planning to achieve productive use of the land required a systematic process following a series of steps and a significant level of evaluation expertise. This includes: observation of farming systems surrounding the project which reflect adaptation to agro-ecological and market conditions; land suitability assessments; identification of opportunities to modify elements in the farming systems (notably where capital can be replaced with labour, which is one of the potential strengths of smallholder agriculture); assessment of economic viability in relation to variable markets; evaluation of infrastructure resources and related funding; assessment of existing technical and managerial capability of the new farmer; access to training and technical support needed; and a proposed farm plan that provides the new farmer with a benefit stream within a short period of time and is appropriate to the beneficiary farmer's capacity (both skills and resources).. International experiences emphasizes that the provision of access to

² Betterment was a state intervention that was initially aimed at conserving the resource base in the Native areas, later called homelands, where African people had the right to hold land. Measures included forced livestock reduction, the establishment of fenced grazing camps and rotational resting and contour banks on arable land. Second-phase betterment involved alteration to settlement patterns and land use. Villages replaced dispersed settlement and the available land was subdivided into arable, residential and grazing. Several case studies have shown that these changes had a negative effect on farm production.

land is not the only way to promote economic development in rural areas. The limited impact of South African land reform on rural economic development leads to a similar conclusion. Participation of rural people in economic activity that is located upstream of primary production has better potential to rapidly reduce poverty than participation in primary production itself. International and South African experience show that access to land must result in tangible improvements in the livelihood of beneficiaries within a fairly short period of time to avoid beneficiary defection. To achieve this, the enterprise plan must present a rational and explicit system of individual economic incentives.

5.3 Transfer planning and institutional design

The following best practice guidelines for the development of land use and management institutions were identified:

- i) The form of the institutions (land holding and land management arrangements) must be determined by the function (intended use of land such as residential development, crop and/or animal production). Individual and collective modalities must be clearly addressed. International experience stresses that while collective arrangements can be appropriate, these should not be made a permanent institutional feature within reform, and the rights of individuals must be clearly spelt out when the project is structured as a collective.
- ii) Land use planning and establishment of institutions must precede occupation/use. International experience shows that land sales markets are much less effective than land-leasing or sharecropping in providing access to land among the poor, and a flexible approach to size of holdings is needed. Evidence does not support the idea of an 'economically viable farm unit' but instead recommends the use of a flexible approach to farm size (which is anyway implicit in a farm-rental market) that takes into account dynamic local social and economic circumstances.
- iii) The administration system of land rights of individual beneficiaries, or sub-groups within the larger group, must be explicitly set out for the land to be optimally used in different ways.
- iv) The terms and conditions for land use (residential, arable and grazing) are different and must be spelt out clearly. This may require that different legal entities be established.
- v) Tenure systems require ongoing maintenance and administrative support, for example to take care of exits and new entries. Currently there is no government department that carries this mandate.

5.4 Post-transfer service and support

The availability of a comprehensive network of expertise to support the full range of issues that arise in land and agrarian reform is expected to enhance success. The land and agrarian reform programme has evolved in response to identified weaknesses, making available a much wider range of support services which address critical elements of the process. However, these government services and funding mechanisms must be adequately coordinated to maximize gain. Dedicated land reform units at district level are one mechanism to that could improve coordination and support.

5.5 International perspective on South African land reform and farmer support policy

A review of South Africa's land reform policy and legislation, including the application of the rule of law, shows that South Africa meets global best practice guidelines in these two domains. Globally, land and agrarian reform programmes have taken time (one or more decades) and are costly to implement. Fiscal reform needs consideration in South Africa because historical discrimination extends beyond land to how black people had to re-structure their livelihood in order to survive. Globally, experience shows that land and agrarian reform programmes are highly complex and demand a high degree of capacity among the agencies that implement these programmes. Experience suggests that governments should not pass legislation when there is no capacity or resources, both to administer and to support new farmers, to implement the legislation. Finally, the South African land and agrarian reform experience has been an evolutionary one aimed at improved effectiveness; reassuringly, policy changes have corresponded with those identified as important internationally.

6 Opportunities for the FAO-funded Pilot Programme

The team has identified five opportunities that are well-suited for inclusion in the FAO-supported pilot programme. The current policy dynamics in South Africa present a strong case for taking these opportunities to implementation.

6.1 Current policy dynamics

Agrarian reform in South Africa is currently going through a substantial period of flux. There is a Ministerial drive for collaboration between the departments of Land Affairs and of Agriculture at national and provincial levels and important concurrent policy development. Identification of opportunities for the pilot programme must take careful account of these (and future) key areas of change:

- **The Settlement and Implementation Support Strategy (SIS)** adopted by the Department of Land Affairs in February 2008 and which looks at: functional and spatial integration, rights and institutions, human settlements and integrated natural resource management, livelihood security and enterprise development. This is a complex but essential mix for successful development.
- **The Area-based Planning (ABP) process**, which identifies the needs in a district and strives to ensure that various role players plan and budget jointly. Such plans are in the process of being developed for every municipal district in the country.
- **The Land and Agrarian Reform Project (LARP)**, an outcome of the Leadership Alignment process, and aims to integrate the SIS Strategy, the ABP processes, agricultural developments and the LARP. This is being rolled out by the national Department of Agriculture and will have impacts on the provincial offices of the Department of Land Affairs and the Department of Agriculture.
- **Changes to the Land Re-distribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) grants**, which should provide substantial increases (previously R20,000 to R100,000 per person and now R111,152 to R430,857 per person).
- **The Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS)**, recently implemented by the Department of Land Affairs, introduces a new process of land acquisition in which the Department would acquire and hold the land for a period and the beneficiaries would lease the land from the Department. Emerging farmers can then access land as they need and are not dependent on large numbers of

people, who may not be interested in farming, to access grants and land in a situation of relatively lower risk.

6.2 Opportunity 1: Incubator approach using commonage, PLAS or communal land

It is proposed that the pilot should identify groups of farmers or individual farmers that acquire land through the Department of Land Affairs' commonage programme, through their PLAS programme or through accessing currently unused communal land. The farmers do not become owners but lease the land and are encouraged to develop their farming skills in conditions of reduced risk. Enterprise growth can then lead to additional land acquisition. It could be that the farmers could graduate from using commonage land, to using PLAS land (as is anticipated in the Prince Albert case study). In these conditions, the individuals are exposed to the important issues of membership of a group (even if their actual enterprise is an individual one), the need to clarify and adhere to rights, and the importance of developing clear tenure arrangements on both the land and in the businesses (if these are group-owned businesses). Farmers can be supported by a spread of service providers or partners with regard to the business development aspects, including farm management, administration and finances.

6.3 Opportunity 2: Identify and support farming project 'Dynamizers'

A common factor which enhances the success of enterprises is the involvement of a 'motivator' or 'activist' within the beneficiary group – even when the enterprises are individually driven.

This is a project-level activist who drives the objectives of a single group of land-reform beneficiaries forward. It is proposed that this 'Dynamizer' role be formalized in the pilot programme. The proposed name is taken from the Mozambican post-independence experience where Frelimo (The Mozambican Liberation Movement) successfully tasked Dynamizers to motivate people in a locality on development issues. The Dynamizer works at ground level with the emerging farmer – mobilizing the group around joint and individual activities; acting as the spokesperson in negotiations while motivating others to develop their negotiation skills. It is anticipated that such a person would need to have a vested interest in the group and the outcome of its initiatives –as a result of a financial interest, a relationship, or from a political, social or other commitment perspective. The skills and attributes of such Dynamizers are diverse and will require definition in the pilot process, along with the design of an appropriate training and/or mentorship programme.

6.4 Opportunity 3: Agrarian Reform Coordinators

The current land reform experience in most parts of the country is that service delivery is generally uncoordinated and a "silo-approach" prevails. Through a piloting process, there is a need to define the role of an Agrarian Reform Coordinator. This is a person who works at a district or local municipality level with a number of beneficiary groups and is pivotal in networking to ensure coordination and collaboration between role players, government and the private sector. The aim is to ensure that a coordinated basket of services is provided according to the ABP or LARP plan for the area. The Coordinator requires knowledge of land reform and farmer establishment processes in general, and must have clarity about the farming opportunities in that area. The Coordinator must be located so that he or she has access to strong agricultural economic expertise and is able to respond quickly to the developments amongst emerging farmers in the area. Streamlining of bureaucratic processes as well as compliance of role players and service providers needs to be piloted. The Coordinator could be located in the district Department of Land Affairs or Provincial

Department of Agriculture (PDA) in the district, or could be outsourced to the private sector. Where applicable, the Coordinator could be located in the 'One-stop Shop' (see Opportunity 5).

6.5 Opportunity 4: Occupational training and accreditation for Agrarian Reform Coordinators

Skills shortage in South Africa is a priority development issue nationally. The skills needed for the proposed Agrarian Reform Coordinators cut across a range of social science, agricultural and project management disciplines. This cross-sectoral character is not covered by any one existing current educational curricula, and those with suitable skills will be in short supply. While outsourcing may be a practical short-term solution, there is a need for a longer-term approach that ensures government capacity, given that agrarian and land reform are expected to extend beyond the next decade. This leads to the proposal for an occupational development component in the pilot programme, covering role definition and curricula development. In 2008, the National Qualifications Framework in South Africa was expanded to include a 'Trades and Occupations' component under the Quality Council for Trades and Occupations (QCTO). This is a major national accreditation initiative driven by the Department of Labour. It is in response to calls from workplace leaders in government and the private sector for graduates to be more appropriately trained for a specific role in the workplace, rather than the generalized theoretical training that requires extended on-the-job training. The process of defining an 'occupation' within the QCTO is demand-driven. Where an industry sector or government department sees a need for an 'occupation', they work with the Department of Labour to set up expert advisory committees, and define roles, skills levels and course curricula. Training can be embedded in existing courses (agricultural colleges or universities) or can be stand-alone certificate and higher-diploma to degree level. A long-term view of land reform demands an emphasis on training, and the pilot programme can initiate this key element.

6.6 Opportunity 5: Development of the "One-stop Shop" concept

In the 1990s, the concept of locating all services related to land, and particularly agricultural development, in one location received limited attention within the National Department of Agriculture. In 2005, it was developed further but still remained a draft idea. More recently, it has found its way into the LARP document of 2008. While it is still not clearly defined, it is presented as the institutional level of government service delivery that is closest to beneficiaries and draws on a wide range of players. The concept has substantial promise to locate a full basket of services needed by emerging farmers in one place, but needs to be further developed, implemented at pilot level and evaluated.

This pilot stage opportunity has overlap with others presented earlier, in that the Agrarian Reform Coordinator is a strong candidate to head the One-stop-Shop, and the Dynamizers could be located within it (if Dynamizers are employed and not project members). The Department of Land Affairs has recently accredited 30 organizations nationally to be "strategic partners" in land reform delivery and it could be that a "strategic partner" takes on the responsibility of setting up and managing a "one-stop shop". Given the increasing importance of ABPs and the LARP in land reform and agricultural development, developing the one-stop shops would be a significant contribution that the FAO-funded pilot programme could make to sustainable agrarian reform in South Africa.