

## **CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY**

### **1.1. Introduction**

South Africa has a history of colonisation and apartheid, which has resulted in the majority of black people being dispossessed of their land and creating imbalances in terms of land ownership patterns. The demand for land formed a core part of the struggle for liberation in South Africa. During the negotiated transition to democracy, the land issue was extensively discussed. This resulted in the South Africa constitution (Act 106 of 1996, section 25) making it imperative that the state take reasonable measures to ensure equitable land distribution (RSA, 1997).

Dispossession and forced removal of African people under colonialism and apartheid not only resulted in physical separation of people along racial lines, but also extreme land shortages and insecurity of tenure for much of the black population (Lahiff, 2001). South Africa land reform programme has three sub- programmes namely, Restitution, Redistribution and Tenure reform (RSA, 1998).

The Restitution programme's aim is to restore land rights or provide other equitable redress to those unfairly dispossessed of their rights after 19 June 1913 (the date of the introduction of the Native Land Act 27 1913). Restitution is a rights-based programme to be implemented in terms of section 25 (7) of the constitution (RSA, 1997). The redistribution programme aims to achieve fair distribution of land in South Africa. It has been based on willing seller- buyer approach with the government providing discretionary grant to able black people to buy land. Initially redistribution targeted the poor, but over the years it has shifted to involve the provision of grants to any black people who wish to acquire land and it has put a lot of emphasis on establishing a class of black commercial farmers. Tenure reform aims to provide those living on other people's land with a legally secure system of land holding or, especially in the case of farm dwellers, at least procedurals and rights to avoid arbitrary evictions (RSA, 1998).

Beneficiaries of restitution settlement claims organise themselves and form a legal entity known as Communal Property Association (CPA), for the purpose of transforming and registering their restored land (RSA, 2006). The core function of a CPA legal entity is the holding of property in common trust and it must be registered in terms of the communal property Association Act 1996 (Act no 28 of 1996). This requires a land holding group to draft a constitution which sets out rules governing access to and management on jointly owned land (RSA, 1997).

A community, who gets the land back through restitution, should get support services so that agricultural projects must not collapse, but be sustainable. The Department of Agriculture and its major partners have reached agreement on a broad strategy for the agricultural sector in November 2001 that support services must be of primary importance to enhance equitable access and participation in the agricultural sector, improve global competitiveness and profitability as well as to ensure sustainable resource management and food security (RSA, 2005 & Hall, 2004).

The Department of Agriculture has demonstrated its awareness of this reality through various policy statements and recognises its responsibility for providing agricultural support service to the beneficiaries of agricultural programmes. Through the strategic Plan for the Department of Agriculture 2003 to 2006, the Department of Agriculture (DoA) has aligned its policies and strategies and has identified the Comprehensive Agriculture Support Programme as one of its key deliverables (RSA, 2004). The primary aim of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) is to make provision for support services for agricultural beneficiaries of land and agrarian reform programmes. The need for CASP follows the recommendations of the Straus Commission report, which recommended a financial Sunrise subsidies and the adoption of a sunrise package of enabling conditions for beneficiaries of land reforms (RSA, 2004).

## 1.2. Problem statement

Land activists and some academics have questioned the sustainability of the restituted settlement claims, due to lack of support services which will detrimentally affect the productivity of the project. Support services ,after settlement are required to sustain the farming activities and this support is required from a range of stakeholders so that the farms must be able to produce, thus able to create more jobs which in turn will reduce poverty.

However, lack of these support services such as financial support, extension advisory support, market access support and capacity building and skills transfer are a real threat in the sustainability of restituted land projects.

According to RSA (2007), repayment of loans is an enormous problem due to low returns mostly as a result of poor farm management and farming skills, however accessing of credit for people engaging in land enterprises that is held by a group or community is notoriously difficult. It is perceived that government post-settlement support programmes such as Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP), Micro-Agricultural Financial Institutions of South Africa (MAFISA), Mechanisation Revolving Credit Access Scheme (MERECAS) and Crop Production Input Support (LETSEMA) are not implemented effectively to assist the land restituted projects. It seems most of the restitution projects in South Africa rely on the government support in areas such as grant for sustenance. According to West Cape News (2010) the introduction of CASP and MAFISA (which provide micro- credit) yielded nothing as most of the restitution projects still do not receive any required support to use their land productively.

There is also the perception that the state intervention is not enough in improving market access which includes the provision of marketing infrastructure, market information and market research, as opposed to the recommendations of DBSA, (2005) which states that improving market access requires a range of State intervention.

Extension officers have to provide a multi-faceted support service to address the multitude of needs on land reform projects and must also be professional enough

(RSA,2007&Stevens,2007). However, there is a widely held perception that extension officers are not visiting the restitution projects to give advice and this has had a negative impact on the dissemination of required information.

### **1.3. Operational definitions**

1.3.1 **Land restitution** is the process of restoring land and providing other remedies to people dispossessed of their land by racial-discriminatory legislation and practices. Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No 22 of 1994 is to provide for the restitution of land rights in respect of persons or communities who were dispossessed under or for the purpose of furthering the objects of any racially-based discriminatory law (RSA, 1998).

1.3.2. **Communal Property Association (CPA)** is a legal entity which should be formed when a group of people want to keep and use land together as a group. The core function of a CPA legal entity must be the holding of property in common trust and it must be registered in terms of the Communal Property Association Act 1996 (Act no 28 of 1996 ).(RSA,1997). This arrangement enables groups of people to hold and manage their land jointly through a legal entity registered with the Department of Land Affairs. According to (RSA, 2006) beneficiaries of a restitution settlement claims can organise themselves to form a legal entity known as Communal Property Association.

### **1.3.3. Support services**

According to RSA (2005), support services in land and agrarian reform should finance bulk infrastructure like irrigation equipments, support and develop research, access markets, provide extension services and information, promote access to finance and +capacity building to land reform beneficiaries. For land and agrarian reform to grow, adequate funding is needed and the role of potential contribution of co-operatives in material development should not be overlooked in future.

#### **1.4. Aim of the study**

The aim of the study is to investigate support services rendered to land restitution claim settlement.

#### **1.5 Objectives of the study**

This study envisages achieving the following objectives:

1. To investigate the accessibility of financial support to beneficiaries of Masakona land restitution project;
2. To investigate the extent of extension and advisory support services Masakona land restitution project receives;
3. To investigate the accessibility of markets for Masakona land restitution project and
4. To investigate the level of capacity building and skills transfer to Masakona land restitution project beneficiaries.

#### **1.6 Key research questions**

1. What is the level of financial support from financial institutions to Masakona Land restitution project?
2. What is the extent of extension advisory services offered to Masakona land restitution project?
3. How accessible are market for the Masakona land restitution project?
4. What is the level of capacity building and skills transfer at Masakona land restitution project beneficiaries?

#### **1.7 Unit of analysis**

The unit(s) of analysis in my research was as follows:

1. Employed beneficiaries of Masakona land restituted project,
2. Masakona Communal Property Association (CPA) management committee members.
3. Extension officers from Limpopo Department of Agriculture servicing the restituted project

## **1.8 Significance of study**

The result of this research will give guidance to the Department of Agriculture and Land Affairs on the support services that should be rendered to restitution projects so as to ascertain whether more support is needed for the sustainability and productivity of restitution projects.

## **1.9 Research report outline**

The structure of this study will adhere to the following structure

Chapter 1 – This chapter comprised of the background to the study. It includes an introduction to the research, problems to be addressed, aims and objectives of the research project.

Chapter 2 - This chapter discusses literature review. It includes background of land reform in South Africa with particular reference to land restitution. It also includes support services on land restitution project.

Chapter 3 - This chapter details the case study

Chapter 4 - This chapter explains the research methodology and includes information on the data collection and interpretation procedures to be followed.

Chapter 5 - This chapter presents the research findings after the data analysis and interpretation is offered.

Chapter 6- This chapter is the conclusion of the study and recommendations based on the findings.

## **CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1. Background of land reform in South Africa**

In this chapter, the researcher is going to discuss the background of land reform in South Africa, land reform programme in South Africa and support services needed in restitution projects as well as challenges.

According to RSA (1998), apartheid policies pushed millions of black South Africans into overcrowded and impoverished reserve, homelands and township. In addition, capital-intensive agricultural policies led to the large-scale eviction of farm dwellers from their land and homes. The abolition of the racially-inclined Land Acts cannot redress inequities in land redistribution. Only a tiny minority of black people can afford land on the free market.

A Rural Development Programme (RDP) was introduced and some of its objective was to implement a fundamental land reform programme. This programme must be demand-driven and must aim to supply residential and productive land to the poorest section of the rural population and aspirant farmers (ANC, 1994)

As part of RDP`s comprehensive development policy, it must raise rural incomes and productivity, and must encourage the use of land for agricultural and, other productive or residential purpose. The land policy must ensure security of tenure for all South African, regardless of their system of land-holding. It must remove all forms of discrimination to women`s access to land (ANC, 1994).

According to Walker (2002), RDP would integrate growth, development, reconstruction and redistribution into a unified programme, through an infrastructural programme aimed at meeting people`s basic. This was the dominant discourse under which South Africa`s land reform programme was launched in 1994/95.

South African government was required by the 1996 constitution to undertake land reform for which government designed a programme soon after the end of apartheid in 1994 (Turner, 2001).

According to RSA (1996) chapter 2 Section 25 of the Constitution Act 108 of 1996 , the government is committed to reverse the effect of colonialism and apartheid by introducing land reform, and to bring about equitable access to all South African's natural resource.

- Subsection 5 notes that the state must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to foster conditions which enable citizen to gain access to land on an equitable basis.
- Subsection 6 states that a person or community whose tenure of land is legally insecure as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to tenure which is legally secure or to comparable redress. Subsection 7 states that a person or community dispossessed of property after 19 June 1913 as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices is entitled to the extent provided by the Act of parliament, either to restitution of that property or to equitable redress.

There are three types or legs of land reform programme, namely: land redistribution, land tenure and land restitution (RSA, 1997).

## **2.2 Land redistribution**

Land redistribution is focused on making substantial contribution to redressing the growth imbalance in land holding in the country by transferring areas of land from the privilege minority to the historical oppressed (Lahiff, 2001).

Land redistribution is guided by the Provision of Certain Land for Settlement Act No.126 of 1993 and enabling regulations that provide the legal basis for redistribution. This program encourages and supports black land ownership and rural economic development (Bourdeaux, 2009).



### **2.3. Land tenure**

Land tenure is being addressed through a review of present land policy, administration and legislation in order to improve security of all South African and to accommodate diverse forms of land tenure including different types of communal tenure. Laws were introduced after 1994 to give people (especially farm workers and labour tenants) security of tenure, over houses and land where they work and stay (RSA, 1998; Lahiff, 2001).

The legal basis of this program is the Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights Act No 31 of 1996. This program attempts to clarify and strengthen the tenure rights of farm workers living on privately-owned white farms and people living in former homelands (Bourdeaux, 2009).

### **2.4. Land Restitution**

Land restitution programme's aim is to restore land rights or provide other equitable redress to those unfairly dispossessed of their rights after 19 June, 1913 (Native Land Act 27 1913). Restitution is a rights-based programme to be implemented in terms of Section 25 (7) of the constitution (RSA, 1997).

The legal basis for restitution is provided by the 1993 "interim" constitution, section 25 (7) of the 1996 constitution, and the restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (as amended in 1997). This Act established a Commission on the Restitution of Land Rights (CRLR) under a Chief Land Claim Commissioner and four (later five) Regional Commissioners (RSA, 1997).

Restitution would need to address the legacy of forced removals, and the significance of land, not only as an economic asset but also a consultative element of identity, culture, history and tradition. Restitution of Land Rights Act 22 of 1994 (Restitution Act) is one of the first pieces of legislation passed by the Government of National Unity which came into power after the first democratic elections. It was expected to advance reconciliation

and historical justice by undoing some of the legacies of dispossession and the social upheaval it inflicted. However Hall (2004) states that there is little basis on which to judge how successful this has been. Instead, progress with restitution has commonly been measured by counting the number of claims that have been settled.

According to RSA (1997) the goal of the restitution policy is to restore land and provide other restitution remedies to people dispossessed by racially discriminatory legislation and practices, so as to provide support to the vital process of reconciliation, reconstruction and development. This is an integral part of the broader land reform programme and closely linked to the need for the redistribution of land and tenure reform. The Restitution of Land Rights Act, 22 of 1994 and the constitution provide a legal framework for the resolution of Land claims (RSA, 1997).

According to RSA (1998), forced removal in support of racial segregation have caused enormous suffering and hardship in South Africa and no settlement of land issue can be reached without addressing such historical injustices. The Interim Constitution provided a framework for the restitution of land rights, instructing the legislative to put in place a law to provide redress for the victims of acts of dispossession that took place after 1913, in the form of restoration of the land that was lost, or alternative remedies. Therefore, Parliament enacted the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 22 of 1994, creating the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights and the Land Claims Court (RSA, 1998).

Restitution provides for the restitution of land rights to persons or communities who were dispossessed of rights in land after 19 June 1913 in terms of a racially-based law or practices. A conservative estimate suggests that over 3.5 million black people, in rural and urban areas, were forcibly disposed of their land and homes during the apartheid era (Lahiff, 2001; RSA, 2005).

The CRLR was originally envisaged as an independent body, but it now falls under the control of the Department of Land Affairs (DLA), on which it depends for funds, administrative support, and research expertise and policy direction. A special court, the

land claims court, with powers equivalent to those of the High Court was also established to deal with land claims and other land-related matters (Lahiff, 2001).

One of the very first pieces of legislation that the new government promulgated was the Restitution Act No. 22 of 1994 as amended. The main aim of the Act was to provide for the restitution of land right to persons or communities dispossessed after 19 June 1913 as a result of past racial discriminatory laws or practices (RSA, 2003). The revised cut-off date for the lodgement of restitution claims was 31 December 1998 (Lahiff, 2001).

Since its establishment in 1994, South Africa's Commission Restitution of Land Rights has settled 74808 out of 79696 land claim lodged at a cost of R16 billion. 289 937 households and about 1.4 million individuals have benefited across the country. The remaining 4888 outstanding claims may be settled by 2010 (Masinga, 2008).

The restitution policy, as laid down in the Restitution of Land Rights Act No. 22 of 1994, only allows claims dating back to 19 June, 1913. This means that previous claim arising from colonization of and settlement in the country before 1913 will not be allowed; such claim include those from other people who lived in the country such as San, Strand lopers and others (Fourie, 2000).

The purpose of Land Restitution Programme is to restore land and provide other remedies to people dispossessed by racially discriminatory legislation and practices. This was to be done in such a way as to provide support to the process of reconciliation and development, and with regard to the over arching consideration of fairness and justice for individual, communities and the country as a whole. The government's policy and procedure for land claims are based on the provisions of the Constitution and the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 22 of 1994. Four aspects are elaborated in The White Paper as follows: qualification criteria, forms of restitution, compensation (for both claimants and land owners) and urban claims (RSA, 1998).

In 1995, the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights was established in terms of the Act to:-

1. Provide equitable redress and restoration to victims of dispossessions, particularly the landless and rural poor;
2. Contribute towards equitable redistribution of land in South Africa;
3. Promote reconciliation through the restitution process and
4. Facilitate development initiatives by bringing together all relevant stakeholders, especially the provincial governments and municipalities (Lahiff, 2001; RSA, 1997).

According to Chapter 2 Section 25 (property clause) of the Constitution Act 108 of 1996, the new ANC government should show commitment to reversing the effect of colonialism and apartheid by introducing land restitution, which is one of the three legs of land reform in South Africa. A restitution claim qualifies for an investigation by the commission on Restitution of Land Rights provided that the claimant was dispossessed of a right to land after 19 June 1993; as a result of racially discriminatory laws or practices, or was not paid a just and equitable compensation.

Claims arising from dispossession prior to 1913 may be accommodated by the Minister of Land Affairs in terms of preferential status in the Land Redistribution Programme providing that claimants are disadvantaged and will benefit in a sustainable manner from the ministerial support (RSA, 1998).

The state will compensate certain successful claimant in a just and equitable way where restoration of the land and other remedies are not appropriate. Land owner whose land is expropriated for the purposes of restoring land to successful claimants will be compensated in a just and equitable manner. The following are the forms by which land can be restituted (RSA, 2003):

1. Restoration of the land from which claimants were dispossessed;
2. Provision of alternative land;
3. Payment of compensation;
4. Alternative relief , comprising a combination of the above or
5. Priority access to government housing and land development programmes.

#### **2.4.1. Benefits received by restitution beneficiaries.**

According to RSA (2007), the majority of beneficiaries receive no material benefit from Restitution. The most striking finding from this research is that the majority of beneficiaries across all restitution projects reviewed have received little, if any, tangible benefit from restitution in the form of cash income or direct access to land. In most cases, rental income has not been passed on to members, nor would it have made any great material contribution to their livelihood, given the amount of the income in relation to the size of group. In most cases, a small sub-group of community members has benefited through access to employments, often as part of strategic partnership agreements and it appears that more highly educated members, and men, are most likely to reap these benefits.

#### **2.4.2. Challenges confronting restitution projects.**

Restitution projects are confronted by many challenges to their efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. The following are some of the challenges confronting the restitution projects:

1. Lack of technical skills (agriculture, land use planning commercial crop production, large-scale livestock farming, horticulture, game farming);
2. Lack of business skills (finance, marketing, risk management, entrepreneurship, business process mapping and modelling);
3. Lack of organisational skills (resource mobilization, co-operatives, roles and responsibilities, stakeholder commitments, joint venture, capacity building);
4. Lack of development planning skills (social facilitation, rural livelihood, project management, group dynamics, conflict resolution and rural development planning);
5. Lack of financial and financial management (from Land Bank and National Development Agency);

6. Beyond land reform, challenges include finding technologies and socio-economic frameworks that can spread all the rural opportunities more equitably and make them economically viable (Turner, 2001).
7. Weak and absent support system for agriculture and other land-based livelihood, together with limited access to input and output marketing. Amongst the consequences of this are under-cultivation and lack of interest in farming amongst the youth (Kepe, & Cousins, 2001).
8. Disputes amongst claimants or beneficiaries that threatened the viability of the projects settlement of claimants far from their farms, result in them losing interest in farming activities, and high absenteeism, forces reliance on farm managers running these farms (Parliamentary Monitory Group (PMG), 2010).

## **2.5. Communal Property Association (CPA)**

According to RSA (1997) **Communal Property Association (CPA)** is a legal entity which should be formed when claimants want to keep and use land together as a group. The core function of CPA as a legal entity must be the holding of property in common trust and it must be registered in terms of the Communal Property Association Act 1996 (Act no 28 of 1996 ).This arrangement enables groups of people to hold and manage their land jointly through a legal entity registered with the Department of Land Affairs. According to (RSA, 2006) beneficiaries of a restitution settlement claims can organise themselves to form a legal entity known as Communal Property Association (CPA).

Since land reform often involves people accessing land as a group, and communal tenure systems offer social and economic benefits, it was essential to provide an accessible system of group ownership for poor and disadvantaged communities. Communal Property Associations (CPA s) are a legal form of landholding, established in terms of the Communal Property Associations Act 28 of 1996, specifically for land reform purposes. This association is a mechanism to manage and resolve the tension between individual and group property rights. Land reform beneficiaries can form a CPA as a means through which they jointly hold and manage land in terms of a written

constitution and with democratic checks and balances. While the CPA itself owns the land, its members have procedural rights, for instance, to participate and vote at meetings and the CPA may also allocate substantive rights to individuals to use land and other resources (Hall, 2004).

The Communal Property Association (Act 28 of 1998) was designed to help any group of people to legally buy, keep and use land together as a group. The CPA is made up of members who have rights, and these rights can be to live on the land, to use other parts of the land and to use other properties that the CPA owns (RSA, 2006). The CPA Act requires the land holding group to draft a constitution which sets own rules governing access to and management of jointly owned land (RSA, 1997).

The Communal Property Associations Act, 28 of 1998, allows for communities to form juristic persons called "Communal Property Associations" (CPAs) and to hold and manage immovable property under a written Constitution. For example, households on hectares of land, of which the ownership vests in a CPA, should register the CPA at the Department of Land Affairs. Thereafter the CPA should form an internal committee to administer its affairs. The CPA's constitution will, among other things, prescribe how to acquire a household site in communal land held under a CPA; what the procedures for the alienation of the land are; regulate alienation of CPA property to non-members; describe the dissolution and liquidation of the CPA and give proxies (GhostDigest, 2008).

The proceedings of the national land summit held in Johannesburg in 2005 revealed that CPAs are not sufficiently equipped to deal with land use and planning, and therefore their capacitation should be vigorously facilitated so that they meet the desired standard (RSA, 2006).

Tribal officers, such as chiefs and headmen can also be members of a CPA. The CPA owns the land and as such it allocates unsurveyed sites to users, hence a beneficiary thereof is not an owner but a user, enjoying merely a personal right. The user may abandon a site and the CPA, as owner, may simply re-allocate it to the next beneficiary.

After such site has been re-allocated to the next beneficiary, the previous user may not claim it back unless the CPA decides otherwise (GhostDigest, 2008).

Once a CPA has been formed, common law principles prevail over indigenous law principles. However, if a CPA is formed in respect of state land and such land is under a tribal authority, the CPA must obtain certain consents from the tribal authority, if necessary. Household sites may not be alienated as separate entities. Where a CPA is registered in terms of section 8(3), it will be issued with a registration number and a certificate of registration (GhostDigest, 2008).

Thereafter the CPA may acquire immovable property, with relative powers to alienate. It is also possible to register a provisional CPA, in terms of section 5 of the Act. This will also be allocated a registration number, although the certificate that will be issued in this regard is a provisional community property association certificate. It is interesting to note that this type of CPA will not be able to acquire ownership of immovable property until registration has been finalised in terms of section 8. However, provisional CPAs may acquire a 12-month right to occupy and use land, which right shall not be alienated until registration of the CPA has been finalised (GhostDigest, 2008).

## **2.6. Support Services in agriculture**

According to RSA ((b), 2005) Commission 2 report on land restitution, sustainable development, and post settlement support should include pre-and post-transfer and should include:-

1. Provision of training, mentorship and other forms of capacity building;
2. Development of Small Medium or Micro Enterprises (SMMEs);
3. Development of bulk infrastructure in which the community is involved, and
4. Income from land must be used for development of the community



### **2.6.1. Post settlement support**

Centre for Development and enterprise (CDE ,2008) states that post settlement support from the government is weak to non-existent, and this causes a growing disillusion among a substantial percentage of the restitution beneficiaries, on the other hand, Alistair (2006) states that the experience in South Africa has shown that the direct transfers of land without sufficient post settlement support can lead to restitution failure that is a source of embarrassment to the government as well as a threat to its vision for development.

According to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), (2001), a strategy of support services in irrigation inputs, rural infrastructure, human capital and research and extension play a dominant role in influencing food supply and productivity growth on the other hand DBSA (2007) states that there is a need for all parties involved to co-operate and adopt a consistent approach to support land reform in South Africa. Technical assistants in areas such as human resource development, on how to identify, prepare, evaluate, finance, implement and manage development projects and programmes should be available. Banks will also provide support for the implementation of business plan and identify a mentor to oversee beneficiaries to ensure sustainability.

However Manyathi (2006) argues that municipalities which are also supposed to provide support to restitution projects to ensure of sustainable development are generally not playing any active and meaningful role in terms of planning and implementation. Restitution projects are not intergrated in their Integrated Development Plans (IDPs).

One role of the government in land and agrarian support is to finance bulk infrastructure like irrigation equipments, and to continue to support and develop research, markets, extension services and information. For land and agrarian reform to grow, adequate funding is needed and the role of potential contribution of co-operatives should not be overlooked in future (RSA (b), 2005).

Though land reform, beneficiaries are supposed to get support, however people disagree as to whether enough technical agricultural support is being offered to make land reform successful. With 45,000 commercial farmers occupying 86% of agricultural land, most of the government's extension services focus on commercial farmers instead of emerging farmers who require different type of support (Leland, 2007).

For land reform programme to be a success, both pre- settlement planning and post-settlement support are thus critical and however there remains ambivalence about the meaning, duration and degree of ongoing support, as the Department of Land Affairs (DLA) is insisting that it cannot keep on supporting the projects indefinitely (Hall, 2004).

Hall (2004) states that lack of support for beneficiaries after land transfer is widely known. Official surveys and independent research both indicate that land reform has produced limited tangible benefits for participants in terms of improved livelihoods and incomes, largely as a result of lack of post-settlement support.

Lack of post-transfer support is an overwhelming obstacle to production and marketing. This lack of support, even though support is specified as vital in the project plans, presents an overwhelming obstacle to production and marketing. Case studies demonstrate a lack of support for independent production by members of claimant communities particularly where members aim to produce for non-commercial purposes. This is often the outcome of a lack of land-use planning prior to transfer, which in turn may be due to the absence of an initial assessment of needs, skills, assets and priorities of members of the community or group acquiring the land (RSA, 2007).

According to De Villiers (2008) the main reason for inadequate impact on poverty alleviation through land reform is not the slow progress of land transfers, but rather the inappropriate settlement models and farming support programs. The implementation of the public-private partnership model can address some of the constraints confronting emerging farmers.

To achieve sustainable development through sustainable livelihoods, South Africa must greatly reduce poverty and inequality. It must build an adequate standard of living for its entire people, while sustaining or restoring the health of its ecosystem.

However, to reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development, South Africa needs to explore and promote smaller-scale, more economically competitive farming technologies that operate within the limits of the mostly fragile environment. There will be no point of achieving better rural land rights and access if farming ceases to be a viable livelihood. For agriculture to get working again, it needs to be internationally and locally competitive, it needs to be socially, economically, technically an economically efficient, providing quality livelihood to much larger numbers of people (Turner, 2001).

The government argues that South Africa's land reform programme is well-set to address the challenge of poverty reduction through sustainable development, but the available statistics show otherwise. Economic growth tends to be higher and more broadly shared when people have equitable and secure access to land (Deininger, 2003). Griffin, et.al.( 2003) adds that successful land restitution project contributes to rapid economic growth. Land restitution project has performed below target due to inadequate institutional capital, no financial resources, lack of appropriate agricultural support services and no co-coordination of efforts (OECD, 2006).

### **2.6.2. Challenges of post-settlement support in South Africa.**

Recent studies have shown that land restitution beneficiaries experience numerous problems regarding access to complementary services such as infrastructure support, farm credit, agricultural inputs, training extension advice and access to markets for farm outputs and ploughing services and also assistance with productive and sustainable land use (Hall,2004; HSRC,2003, Wegerif,2004). According to Jacobs (2003) land restitution in South Africa since 1994 has helped some rural poor people to gain access

to land for a range of purposes but land-based livelihoods strategies and support after land transfer has been neglected by the state.

Vink and Kirsten (2003) argue that land restitution beneficiaries and small scale farmers have been left alone struggling with access to services. Various academics have argued that the challenge for land restitution in South Africa is the absence of clear and coherent strategy on post-transfer support (Hall, 2003; Jacobs, 2003; Lahiff, 2000; Wegerif, 2004). Absence of post-settlement strategy has resulted in the Government getting private companies to assist communities to manage their farm in the name of strategic partners. Derman et al. (2006) have argued that strategic partnership arrangement is in simple terms privatization of post-settlement support.

DLA (2004) has identified issues such as the use of intermediaries in the process of land reform, design agents (consultants) involved in business planning and design of projects for the new land owners. Lahiff (2006) has amongst others identified inappropriate design of most land restitution projects as a weakness in South African land reform. The Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs has in November 2005 presented to Parliament information that 70% of land reform projects in Limpopo Province were dysfunctional. She found poor design, negative dynamics within groups and non-existent post-settlement support as major causes for this collapse of land reform projects. Hall (2003:) has also added that absence of post-settlement support has led to serious problems of the new owners of land being unable to use land as a basis for their livelihoods. She further identified institutional support to legal entities as another key area of support for land restitution beneficiaries.

Andrew et al (2003) have argued that weak institutional capacity and conflicts have a direct, debilitating impact on the ability of beneficiary groups to develop and implement land use management strategies and make productive use of their resources such as the acquired land. In Rural Restitution, Hall (2003: 16) argues that there are a lot of contestations on decisions on land use and how such decisions are made. In addition general problems regarding representations and feedback to the community in general,

and access issues have been seen as a problem for weak and dysfunctional institutions. A survey by DLA (1998) known as Quality of Life, has found out that, critical support services such as production loans, agricultural extension, infrastructure, and project management training were identified as being important for the sustainability of land reform projects. In similar veins Jacob (2003) identified key functional areas of support for land restitution beneficiaries; namely, extension services (farming advice), skills development and capacity building; including training and mentoring programmes, financial assistance in the form of grants and credit to assist with farming operations, infrastructure support such as irrigation and fencing, and access to markets ranging from local sales which are mainly informal to marketing arrangements with commodity organisations. Various studies have found that post-settlement support is a key weakness in South African land reform. A land rights NGO, Nkuzi Development Association undertook a plot project to do alternative approaches to land reform. In its Area Land Reform Initiative Report, Nkuzi (2003) argues for a need to shift from emphasis on pre-project planning to an integrated strategy for post-land transfer support, where pre-settlement and post-settlement planning becomes part of the implementation of land reform.

Nkuzi (2003) also argues that a critical challenge for post-settlement support is the co-ordination of services for land reform beneficiaries. The report argues for a need to decentralize roles and responsibilities to the local sphere of governance e.g. Municipalities for co-ordination of services. Various studies have also indicated that the problem in co-ordination stems from poor communication between the National Department of Land Affairs and the National Department of Agriculture, resulting in a rigid distinction between land delivery and agricultural Development (Jacobs 2003; Hall et al 2004).

The post-settlement challenge in land restitution is presented in this study as a critical issue that may potentially undermine the development goal of land restitution. It has been argued that land restitution is more than just restituting land but requires changes in the agrarian structure, improvement in production structures and power relations.

Speaking specifically for South Africa, post-settlement support has been identified as a critical gap in South Africa. A comprehensive integrated programme of land restitution is needed to ensure that the benefits of land restitution are realized by the majority of the beneficiaries.

Therefore, to address these challenges of restituted projects sustainability, the Department of Agriculture and Land Affairs and other private agencies have the following programmes to support land and agrarian reform projects beneficiaries.

## **2.7 Agricultural support services**

The success of agricultural projects can depend on access to different support services. A review of study by Hall (2004) suggest that support services such as financial support, extension support, market access and capacity building can serve as the pillars in determining the success of agricultural projects. Although there is a need for assessment of cases to solidify the fact, agricultural projects that have access to agricultural support services tend to realise success that those which do not have.

According to Burton & Rajalahti (2010), indicators are crucial in assessing the impact of agricultural support services provided to agricultural projects. Indicators are developed with overall purpose of determining or assessing whether specific improvement is been realised after implementation of agricultural support services. The indicators include improved access to financial (implements, mechanization and job creation), access to extension support (improved crop production owing to provided advisory services); access to market information (efficient product market); and capacity building (change in farmer's skills and knowledge).

### **2.7.1 Financial Support**

In this section, the researcher will review information about government financial support received by Communal Property Association for their land restitution projects and the impact of financial support to the restitution projects.

### **2.7.1.1 Credit facility or loan**

According to RSA (2007) current facilities do not provide a substantial loan facility for production capital, nor are there sufficient facilities to obtain credit at a level and rate that poor people can afford. Various strategies are needed to address this situation.

RSA(2007) states that while the need for collateral to secure loans is important, so, also the ability to repay loan, there is an enormous problem with repayment of loans due to low returns mostly as a result of poor farm management but also to the high-risk nature of agriculture in general. Access to credit for people engaging in enterprises on land that is held by a group or community is notoriously difficult. Mechanism to address this problem is to develop financial institutions like the Micro to Agricultural Financial Institution of South Africa (MAFISA), which is National Department of Agriculture (NDA) facility administered by the Land Bank. However, according to Umhlaba Rural Services (2006), the establishment of MAFISA is not of benefit to land restitution beneficiaries as the programme is not operational. It appears as if the programme is non-existent as land restitution beneficiaries are not benefiting through this scheme in order to increase crop production at their projects.

Commercial banks are however critical of parastatals offering lower rates than the private banks can afford and critics have at the same time criticised the Land Bank for expanding its commercial bank (mainly white farmers) instead of lending exclusively to black land reform farmers-a criticism dismissed by the Land Bank on the ground that it needs commercial accounts to remain solvent (Sibanda,2001).

However, Umhlaba Rural Services (2006) states that Land Bank has currently capped the facility at R25 000 and is acting as a poor custodian of the funding by reluctantly distributing such funding and not making land restitution beneficiaries aware of the funding. This means there are currently limited opportunities for land restitution beneficiaries having access to credit.

### **2.7.1.2. Comprehensive Agriculture Support Programme (CASP)**

According to RSA, (2006) CASP is one of the Department of Agriculture's vehicles for the provision of agricultural support to farmers. CASP was launched in August 2004 to dedicate funds made available by the National Department of Agriculture (NDA) to support land reform. A total of R750 million was earmarked for the CASP, spread over a three year period in increasing tranches. Funds were for training, technical advice, marketing and business development infrastructure, production inputs, and financial assistance. At a provincial level, a portion of the CASP funds has been set aside for land reform beneficiaries-between R10 million and R20 million per province- to be split between restitution and other land reform projects (Hall, 2004).

The aim of this programme is to provide post settlement support to the targeted beneficiaries of land reform and other producers who have acquired land through private means and are, for example, engaged in value-adding enterprises domestically or involved in export.

The chronic lack of support for beneficiaries after land transfer is widely acknowledged. The launch of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) in August 2004 marked the first dedicated funds made available by the National Department of Agriculture to support land reform. CASP is to fund training, technical advice, marketing and business development, infrastructure and production inputs (Hall, 2004).

Monitoring and evaluation during the post-transfer process is the responsibility of the Department of Land Affairs (DLAs) and the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) directorate. Their focus is on the key functional areas of support to land reform beneficiaries who are using the land for farming. According to RSA (2007) these areas are:

1. Extension services: Farming advice;



2. Skills development and capacity building: Variety of training programmes including management and mentorship programmes aimed at skills transfer;
3. Financial assistance: Grant finance, but mainly credit to assist with farming operations (or working capital);
4. Infrastructure support: Bulk on-farm infrastructure like irrigation and fencing and
5. Access to markets: Ranging from informal local sales of output to marketing arrangements with commodity organisations.

The primary aim of Comprehensive Agricultural Support Services ( CASP) is to make provision for agricultural support to targeted beneficiaries of the land and agrarian reform programme within the following six identified areas (RSA,2004):

1. Information and knowledge management;
2. Technical and advisory assistance and Regulatory service;
3. Training and capacity building;
4. Marketing and Business Development;
5. On- farm and off- farm infrastructure and production inputs and
6. Financial assistance (RSA, 2004).

CASP supports four different levels of clients within the farming continuum and these are: the hungry and vulnerable, subsistence and household food production, farmers (including beneficiaries of LRAD) and other strategic programme, for example, SLAG, restitution, redistribution, tenure reform, agricultural macro – system for the consumer (RSA, 2004).

While the primary responsibility for land reform rests with the DLA responsibility for a range of support functions and financial assistance rests with the National and Provincial Departments of Agriculture (Lahiff & Hall 2004).

Additional support offered by DLA includes the drafting of business plans, arranging training, making contributions towards the cost of training, assistance in marketing of

produce and arranging other support from the Department of Agriculture (DoA) like providing training, agricultural support services and technical opinions on proposed farm plans (Wegerif,2004).

In her budget speech at a National Council of Provinces (NCOP), Xingwane lamented that government is dealing with many teething problems ranging from administration of CASP fund, lack of harmony between LRAD and CASP mechanism and inadequate progress reporting by provinces (Xingwane, 2007).

According to RSA, (2004), one of the primary aims of CASP is to provide technical and advisory assistance and regulatory services. Monitoring is envisaged as a mechanism that can bridge the gap between the formal and informal economies and ameliorate the current dualism in agriculture in South Africa by an associated network of provinces of good services and social relations, narrowing the skill gap in farming and notable business skills.

According to Ramukosi (2011), only three restitution projects in Levubu were able to get CASP assistance where they were supplied with irrigation infrastructure such as pumps ,pipes and micro jets during 2008/9 financial year, whereas only two projects received assistance in 2009/10 financial year. It appears that the majority of land restitution projects have not yet received any assistant from this programme, thus hampering the development and smooth running of the projects.

### **2.7.1.3. Mechanisation Revolving Credit Access Scheme (MERCAS).**

LDA (2009) states that MERCAS policy of 2006 was formed so that the Limpopo Department of Agriculture (LDA), through Agribusiness unit provides support to farmers to acquire mechanization equipments. However In her 2007/08 Limpopo Agriculture Provincial Budget Vote, MEC Magadzi states that the Department has responded to calls by farmers to relook at the support for mechanization and as such the Department

has designed a Mechanization Revolving Credit Access Scheme (MERCAS) to effectively deal with traction power needs of farmers ( Magadzi, 2007).

MEC Magadzi further elaborated that the key tenants of this facility is that individual and legal agribusiness entrepreneurs are assisted to purchase mechanization package combinations (65 kilowatts tractor, plough, trailer, disk, planter and a diesel tank) and provided with operational costs for the first six months. However, each entity must prove committed support from farmers requiring traction services and repayment ability. The Department will support 50% of the mechanization package cost. The maximum subsidy of 50% is up to R200 000-00 (Magadzi, 2007). The facility will be operated with commercial banks and tractor manufacturers to ensure business and entrepreneurship accountability. The Department budgeted R20 million for the 2007/08 financial year and the facility was to be in operation from 1 September 2007 or earlier (Magadzi, 2007).

The Department of Agriculture through Minister Xingwana and her Limpopo Provincial colleague, MEC Magadzi, states that rural areas have the potential to produce food to feed the nation as well as export. The blame for not utilising the land was put on the lack of farm implements to work the lands. Owing to this challenge, the Minister praised the Limpopo Department of Agriculture (LDA) for having introduced the Mechanisation Revolving Credit Scheme (MERCAS) to assist farmers to acquire mechanisation units (Mabunda, 2008).

The MEC for Limpopo Department of Agriculture in South Africa Ms Dipuo Letsatsi – Duba handed over working tools to four land restitution projects on the 19th October 2010. The policy is aimed at supporting and assisting small holder farmers in need of traction power who are in crop production. Since the beginning of 2010, the MERCAS programme has benefited more than 64 restitution projects beneficiaries and farmers through the province. In the first quarter of 2011, implements were given to about 14 farmers, whereas 32 farmers benefited (Letsatsi-Duba, 2011).

However, it appears as if the scheme is still having some challenges as most of the restitution projects are unable to pay the other 50% as they do not have enough finance in their account to pay monthly instalment, though they are in dire need of the machineries.

#### **2.7.1.4. Crop Input Supply (LETSEMA)**

Though the Crop Production unit, the Limpopo Department of Agriculture provides crop production inputs for farmers and a Crop Inputs Supply Policy of 2007 was later formed (LDA, 2009).

According to Ramukosi (2011), reports show that 7 restitution projects in Levubu were each allocated with 300x50kg(L.A.N)fertilizers, 280x50kg(2.3.2)fertilizers, 50x50kg(KCL)fertilizers and 10x2Litres of weedcides during 2011/12 financial year through this programme. The allocation will increase by 10% in 2012/13 financial year.

It appears as if the budget for crop input is too little as compared to hectars of crops planted in each restitution project and as such there should be a significant increase in budget allocation to reduce the gap during the next financial year.

#### **2.7.1.5. Impact of financial support on land restitution projects**

A research report (Manenzhe, 2007) reveals that in the most land restitution projects, beneficiaries are heavily dependent on state support, both financially and otherwise. Particular needs of land restitution beneficiaries include credit and supply of farm inputs. There is little prospect of land restitution beneficiaries engaging in production for marketing without substantial assistance, and as such appropriate financial support from the state and non-state is needed. Agricultural production could probably be improved if financial support is provided. Ultimately in the presence of financial support, beneficiaries' livelihoods shall be improved.

Binswanger & Kinsey (1993) concur that agricultural growth cannot be achieved without farmers support such as grant funding, access to finance as well as credit. Manenzhe (2007), in his research done at Shimange also concurs that without accessing credit, beneficiaries are unable to afford production input and thus hampering their farming activities and disturbing their socio-economic activities. The research also reveals that through lack of finance production is not increasing because they are unable to purchase agricultural implements like tractors and irrigation equipments. Hall (2007), argued that there was no evidence of new jobs for land reform beneficiaries created, but few jobs have been preserved though many of them are casual or seasonal jobs due to lack of financial support.

In a research done at Makhutswe Joint Farming Venture Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism(LEDET) (2007) concur that if financial support is provided to the project, employment figures can be increased according to the need, but due to take of finance, employment will remain like that, thus hampering good production.

LEDET (2007) in a research done at Batamelang Makhutswe (PTY) LTD reveals that due to lack of financial support, there had been a decline in terms of the average net farming income. Existing infrastructure such as water supply dams, irrigation pipes and borehole are in a poor state. Permanent jobs have been lost and thus affecting production.

According to land reform in Zimbabwe (<http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title>) financial support is very crucial in farming production. Before 2000, farms in Zimbabwe were able to access finance, e.g. borrow money were necessary and purchase morden mechanized farm equipment to increase productivity on their farms. Since the drop in total farm output, production drops tremendously and even produced starvation and famine most crops for export have suffered severely. Due to financial support that the Zimbabwean farmers had, the country was once so rich in agricultural produce that it was dubbed the “bread basket” in Southern Africa but now it is struggling to feed its own population. About 45 percent of its population is considered malnourished.

Baloyi (2010) in his study done at Makuleke irrigation scheme argues that farmers were able to increase their production by accessing agric support services, assisting them with irrigation infrastructure, fencing, pump-house, fertilizer mixing machine, bulk water supply system and extension support services. More project beneficiaries including youth were then able to get employment and thus reducing poverty to the entire community. The project discussed is showing a positive impact in the agricultural industry since the production of potatoes in the Limpopo province is creating employment opportunities.

### **2.7.2 Agricultural extension services and advisory support**

In this section, the researcher will review information about agricultural extension and advisory support services and the impact of this support service to the restitution projects and farming in general.

According to Quizon, et.al (2000), agricultural extension can be described as the process of introducing farmers to information and technologies that can improve their production, income and welfare. In many developing countries agricultural extension is considered an important public service that deserves public support. However, Norvafrica (2005) states that government's agricultural extension support can be described as a process of introducing farmers to information and technologies that can improve their production, income and welfare. These services are essential elements of any resettlement, including restitution or agricultural development programmes. The role of an extension worker is regarded as being that of a facilitator, who supports farmers in articulating their needs as well as co-ordinating their activities of the different service providers. Extension is essential not only in farming technology, but also in marketing and financial management, farming techniques, advice on the correct usage and maintenance of farming equipments.

The Millennium Development Goals for South Africa to increase food production in 2015 can however not succeed without professional extension support. Extension officer act as an essential link between government and land restitution beneficiaries. Interaction is much more group-orientated and extension officers act as facilitators or catalysts with regard to farmer's personal development. In both cases, professional extension officers perform an important function to promote agricultural development, which in turn leads to community development. He further notes that extension officers must do things in a professional standard. Professional extension officers are important links for the competitive and sustainable farmers. "Professional" refers to a job with an intellectual character and demonstrates accountability.

(Stevens, 2007),

Extension officers have to provide a multi-faceted support service that addresses the multitude of needs on land reform projects and which also specifically covers social and institutional issues such as land right, obligation, benefits and other tenure-related issues. This means that extension officers are required to be multi-skilled, or at least capable of drawing in appropriate additional expertise (RSA, 2007).

However, in most cases, this service is also faced with its own challenges:

Feder et.al (1999) note that there are several generic problems that make extension services difficult to deliver. These include lack of commitment and political support for extension, over loaded with public sector functions beyond agricultural knowledge and information transfer, weak interaction with knowledge generation, lack of accountability and extension services dependence on the wider policy environment.

However, Stevens (2007) notes the following as factors that contribute to extension officers not being professional:

1. Lack of technical knowledge (training) like training in crop production, soil science, irrigation water management, agro-climatology, irrigation economics and engineering.

2. Lack of formal training curricular offered by tertiary institutions, lack in build capacity in a trans-disciplinary approach.
3. Failing to pursue a personal plan for continuous professional development. Professional extension officers should continue to seek opportunities for systematic maintenance, improvement and broadening of knowledge and skills through continuous learning throughout their working life.

According to Diako, et. al. (2005) and Kirsten, et.al (2005) extension officers are not visiting these projects to give advice. This clearly shows that there is management failure by both National and Provincial Departments of Agriculture which need to be addressed urgently. This further highlights the need for the involvement of extension officers who focus on emerging enterprises more generally, and the links between agricultural and other entrepreneurial activities that take place on land acquired through the land reform programme.

In-service training programme is needed for extension officer who will be serving land restitution projects (RSA, 2007). However, Umhlaba Rural Services (2006), found that among the agricultural extension officers, only 2.8% met their own expectations in terms of productivity and they had visited less than half of the land restitution project surveyed. Kirsten, et. al ( 2005) also note that a research done in North West province of South Africa reported that land restitution projects received limited advice and support from the Provincial Department of Agriculture. The Department provided advice to 47% and support to 5% of projects whilst 49% indicated that they have not received any help from the Department.

However through the Extension Recovery Plan(ERP), extension officers are encouraged to further their studies to be equipped with more knowledge and knew technology ,and moreover they are provided with laptops ,cell phones and Smart Pens to improve their communication with farmers and for the collection of production and marketing data (Shushu, 2011).



It appears that there is a significant improvement in extension services since the introduction of this plan as more extension officers are visible to farmers.

### **2.7.2.1 Impact of extension support in land restitution project**

According to a research report by Manenzhe (2007), appropriate extension service is essential for the improvement of agricultural production. Land restitution beneficiaries should be advised in ploughing, crop production, access to inputs, irrigation as well as marketing. Without extension service, agricultural production will not be improved and this will lead to disaster of project. Land restitution beneficiaries in South Africa will not be able to access Department of Agriculture programmes like MAFISA, CASP & LETSEMA to assist them in improving their production. However this was evidently shown at Manavhela restitution project where there was a significant decline in production due to lack of extension and advisory services.

International experiences have shown that with adequate support service, farmers can significantly increase agricultural production, for example in Zimbabwe farmers doubled their maize and cotton production when extension and marketing service were provided (<http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title>). Similar results were seen in South-East Asia when access to farmers support service was provided (Hu & Xing, 2011). By only providing land claimants with land in the absence of support services is unlikely to make a significant difference to their livelihood.

According to the World Bank Research Observer (1986) farmers yield levels has shown to be higher where extension agents interact with farmers as they were able to get more information on farming from the agents. Dissemination of technological information to farmers through extension enables them to acquire more information that is needed.

### **2.7.3 Market access**

In this section, the researcher will review about market access , market information and the impact of this support service to the restitution projects.

Market access, though not enough in itself, is a necessary condition for agricultural and restitution projects in South Africa. There are other constraints that have an adverse effect on restitution projects in South Africa, such as infrastructures and mechanisms of agricultural financing. However, market access is a major constraint that restricts restitution projects development in South Africa. Both market access conditions “border measures” and domestic support measures such as export subsidies vitiate the capacity of restitution projects to develop (Hammouda et al, 2006).

According to Krakoff (2003), barriers to exports include tariffs, which make exports less competitive by raising prices; quota restrictions, which physically limit the quantity of exports; and subsidies, through which governments absorb the cost disadvantages that domestic producers might otherwise face with respect to cost-competitive imports

The National Agriculture Marketing Council confirmed that increases in the price of water, electricity, fuel, labour and road tolls over the past six years have raised the cost of doing business for farmers. This has made it hard for new entrants to join the sector (Letsatsi-Duba, 2011).

In his 2006 state of the Nation Address, President Mbeki indicated that the public sector will accelerate infrastructure investment in underdeveloped urban and rural areas to improve service delivery in the areas of the second economy, which includes the provision of roads, water and energy. This is expected to have a positive impact on food security and income generation for rural communities, as emerging farmers would have greater access to infrastructure required to improve production and marketing of their produce (Mbeki, 2006).

According to (DBSA, 2005) the role of the State in agricultural marketing does not prevent it from still playing a role in support of land reform. In a study of agriculture in South Africa's second economy, the Development Bank of Southern Africa held that improving market access requires a range of intervention by the State, and these include the provision of marketing infrastructure, information on prices, market, buyers, grades, etc, extension information on technical production issues, quality requirements and financial and market knowledge and research on a wide range of issues (DBSA, 2005). The National Agricultural Marketing Council (NAMC) has the responsibility to provide marketing access as stipulated by the Act. Section 7 of the Marketing Agricultural Products Act provides for NAMC to appoint committees to investigate any issue related to marketing and to undertake specific council duties (NAMC, 2006).

Mabunda (2008) states that market establishment alone is not sufficient but farmers should position their produce well by producing quality crops and appropriate packaging that meet the export requirements and standards for the European Union (Global gap/Euro gap) However Shepherd and Farolfi (1999) states that the key challenges in export are to maintain or enhance product quality, maintain remunerative producer prices in the face of low and fluctuating international prices, to find ways of delivering finance to producers, and to ensure that high quality research and extension support for continual productivity increases. It appears that due to low capital assets and support services, the majority of land restitution projects tend to produce low quantities and poor quality products, which result in products being rejected at the markets.

### **2.7.3.1 The impact of Market access**

Poultron, *et al.* (2006) argues that increased investment in key public goods such as roads, communications and infrastructure, agricultural research and water control revitalised agricultural development, does not necessary mean that performance of agricultural markets will improve. Expansion of production for export could contribute to national economic growth, thus contribute to poverty reduction and higher income to the project. However, Magingxa, *et al.* (2003) concur that market failure is as a result of

government not investing in infrastructure. By investing on infrastructure like roads will thus encourage and support the market as the produce will reach the market in good conditions and sold in good price which will then lead to farmers getting profit. This will also improve their socio-economic conditions and the growth of the national economy in general.

Baloyi (2010) argues that lack of market information by the project beneficiaries about product prices at national level, the quality requirements, the best places and time to sell their product as well as the potential buyers have negative impact on the profitability and sustainability of the project. However Jacobs (2003) concurs that perfect information by farmers result in reaching a good decision which will influence good decision in marketing and as such, produce will get higher prices. Lack of skills can also lead to farmers undervalue their production and as such the project can run in to a great loss. As a result, farmers must be capacitated to minimise this risk.

There is no literature on this but the evidence on export market was verbally explained by CPA management committee in Levubu restitution farms that due to lack on market information their projects happen to lose in income from export market.

#### **2.7.4. Capacity building and skills transfer**

Skills and capacity development are central in every developing nation. Necessary investment and penetration of global markets can only be attracted through the required skills and capacity development (Mabunda, 2008).

Skills development is a key requirement for economic growth and for empowering the previously disadvantaged majority economically. As a result, the Skills Development Act of 1998(Act No 97 of 1998) provides a framework for developing skills in the work-place. The Act also makes provision for skills development by means of a levy-grant scheme and the establishment of 27 Sector Education and Training Authorities (Setas) to administer the scheme's fund and manage the skills development process. A Seta must

develop and implement a skills development plan, be responsible for quality control and pay out development grants (Sowetan, 2008).

Hanson (2006) states that over the prescribed period of time, private sector should strive to improve practical skills to new staff and update skills of experienced staff. Anyone can put in the time to learn management skills, but not everyone can be an effective leader (Doke, 2008). This means that the skills, knowledge and experience needed by the previously disadvantaged restitution beneficiaries in agricultural management should be natured through the passage of time. It is however argued that long term training is time consuming and not cost effective, the restitution beneficiaries would better served by short duration course that focus on a particular knowledge and skills development(Hanson,2006).

There should be the balance between the formal training and continuous professional development on the skills acquired through formal training, and as such both the above arguments have merits as it should be born in mind that management in every business including farming business in land restitution is a skill that is not inherent, but has to be formally learned even by born leaders who are land restitution beneficiaries.

In 2008, 30 land restitution beneficiaries and extension officers in Limpopo province in South Africa received training in Export Market Readiness. This training covered export requirements and standards for European Union (Global gap/Euro gap), negotiating for markets, developing a market plan strategy and conducting market analysis (Mabunda, 2008).

Skills shortage in the farming sector is a major concern as farming is expected to contribute a big portion to the economy by making lands productive but they are failing due to lack of skills and experience. Skilled farmers in North West province of South Africa are doing their part to ensure land restitution beneficiaries learn the necessary skills to manage their own farms. Five experienced farmers have pooled together under the African Farming Franchise project to train emerging farmers on how to produce

good quality crops, thus transferring skills. There is great need for our government and private sector to support emerging farmers (Masingi, 2008).

Todaro & Smith state that capacity building in land restitution beneficiaries is required because they lack required skills to manage huge agricultural projects efficiently and effectively, however, Mokeki (2007) states that through training and workshops, the management of a project will be able to develop in strategic planning, quality management, operational planning, project management, change management and human resource management development.

Training in agricultural sector is a necessity due to the transformation in this sector as the South African Government aims to have 30% of land in the hands of black owners by the end of 2014, so training institute like agricultural colleges must deliver appropriate, accredited training courses that will support the development of black farmers (Mokeki, 2007).

Another successful way of skills transfer is through mentoring. According to RSA (a) 2005 the following are definitions that capture the meaning of mentoring well, but they are not sector specific:-

1. .Mentoring exists when suitably experienced and competent person acts as a resource, sponsor and transitional figure for another person. Mentoring provides less experienced persons with knowledge, advice, challenge and support in their pursuit of becoming full members of a particular segment of life. Mentors welcome less experienced persons into their world and represent skill, knowledge, network and success that the aspiring professionals hope to someday acquire.
2. Mentoring helps people understand and work through change and so contributes to the achievement of their intended improvements. Mentoring helps people to learn and support self development.

3. Mentoring is a process of forming relationship between more experienced, seasoned and wiser person (mentor) and a less experienced person (mentee) where the mentor assists the mentee to achieve a specific goal or development of a specified capacity.

Mentoring is more than a process of skill transfer or training, although a mentor must have the skills and knowledge that the mentee needs. Mentoring also differs from training in that it is not a once-off event with predetermined content and results. Mentoring responds to actual needs and issues of the mentee as and when they are left or expressed, therefore it requires frequent interaction over a period of time until the mentee feels empowered to pursue his or her goals with a sense of confidence and independence (RSA(a), 2005).

International experience shows that farmers find it easier to learn from other farmers than from formal training and supply sound advice for several reasons like sharing the same interest and challenges; farmers are seldom in direct competition with one another, so there are no barriers to co-operation. Above all, a mentor understands that farming is a business (RSA (a), 2005).

According to RSA (a), 2005) mentoring is important by integrating new entrants in the commercial farming community and the associated network of providers of goods, services and information..

It appears as if there is no training and skills transfer programme to land restitution beneficiaries, and as such, there should be a major shift on this as it can be a great embarrassment to the government if capacity building and skills transfer programmes is not addressed urgently.

#### **2.7.4.1. Impact of capacity building**

According to Manenzhe (2007) reports reveals that through capacity building or training, beneficiaries of land restitution are empowered with skills and knowledge to improve

production in their project and thus they have self confident and able to make decisions affecting their lives. Hu & Xing (2011) argued that through training, farmers develop technical and management skills, thus promote sustainability of their projects. Farmers then become entrepreneurs and as such there is an increase in production for marketing. Project beneficiaries understand and control market better if they are knowledgeable.

Hall (2007) argued that due to lack of training, beneficiaries tend to lack skills in decision making, management and thus hamper development in the project. However LEDET (2007), the final draft report of the study on the impact of land reform in Limpopo province concurs that capacity building to land reform beneficiaries improved their farming techniques and as such improve production that is accepted by the market.

In a research undertaken at Manavhela projects (LEDET, 2007) reveals that due to lack of training and capacity building to beneficiaries, there were no records kept regarding to output or production details. This result in the project being leased to a white farmer, showing the failure in management. Jacob (2003) concur that skills development and training workshop to beneficiaries which include workshop is vital for the success of the project as in the case of Delindlela project in the Eastern Cape. Through skills development the project was able to increase its production, create jobs for the beneficiaries and then enable them to receive income from their employment. However in a research done at Jericho in Northwest province of South Africa, Masingi (2008) concur that since project beneficiaries started to receive training and mentorship, they acquired the necessary farming skills and as such ,positive results in their crop production is visible.

According to [www.danishknowhow.com](http://www.danishknowhow.com), effective training for managers and directors equipped them with enough knowledge and technology which led them to increase their production because they have enough tools to use. Experience suggested that access



to support service have a positive impact as the farmers are being developed in skills and thus improved their production and provides project development in general.

After reviewing of studies undertaken by different authors it suggest that agricultural support services such as financial support, agricultural extension support, market access information and capacity building are crucial in order to achieve increased agricultural production, change in farmers skills and attitudes, improve on farmers income owing to increased productivity and job creation.

It appears that no agricultural support service is independent to each other and as such for the project to show positive improvement in production, employment opportunities, knowledge and skills, farm mechanisation and marketing, all the agricultural support services such as financial support, agricultural extension support, market access information and capacity building are crucial

## **CHAPTER 3: MASAKONA LAND RESTITUTION CASE STUDY**

### **3.1. Historical background of the case study**

The Masakona community was one of the Luvuvhu river valley community forcibly removed from their land by the South African government between the 1920 and 1930s. The Luvuvhu river valley is very fertile and has many tributaries like Lutanangwa, Luvhungwe, Muunga, Vumbani and Mutandabinyuka. The name “Luvuvhu “means the river full of Hippopotamus (Mvuvhu). The name was corrupted by the Europeans and changed into Levubu and the valley is today known as Levubu, but officially the river is known as Luvuvhu. Other communities along the Luvuvhu river valley were Luonde, Tshakhuma, Mashau, Matumba, Matidza, Ratombo, Ravele, Tshiungani, Makatu and Davhana. Those communities, with the possible exception of Davhana paid tribute to the Ramabulana royal house (Ramudzuli, 2001).

The piece of the land under study is situated  $\pm 40$  KM east of Makhado along the Punda maria road (R523) to Thohoyandou. The vegetation in Levubu is bushy sourveld, with the average rainfall of between 500mm and 800mm per annum. Temperature can go as high as 35°C in summer and drop to 15°C in winter. This area was previously controlled by the Ravele royal house and was bordered in the east by the Luvhungwe river which separated the Ravele and Tshakhuma community. In the north there is a grazing area bordering the Mugwada community (Entabeni), and in the west it was bordered by ha-Bvumbi community (Ramudzuli, 2001).

The Luvuvhu river valley was scheduled as a white area in terms of section 2 of the Land Act, No.27 of 1913. Irrigation scheme and forestry led to the taking away of Luvuvhu river valley from the, Masakona, Mashau, Ravele, Ratombo Makatu, Matidze, Mukwevho and Davhana communities. These communities were forcibly removed to make way for settlers and to also solve the ‘poor white problem’. Irrigation construction began in 1936 while the process of removing the Luvuvhu communities had commenced in 1921.

After their removal in the early 1920 and late 1930 the Masakona community was relocated to a place known as ha- Masakona, approximately 50km south of their previous settlement place (Ramudzuli, 2001).

### **3.2 Masakona land restitution process**

The land restitution process evolved out of the (Interim) constitution of 1993. Anybody who was dispossessed of their land after 19<sup>th</sup> June 1913 under racist legislation was given the right to their land restitution from the state and the commission and court swere established to give effect to this process and the deadline to register a claim was given as December 1998. The Masakona community together with other dispossessed community along the Luvuvhu valley submitted a claim to the office of the land claim commission, there by applying for restitution during the late 1990s.

The process of the restitution of the land in South Africa works as follows, according to the Restitution of Land rights Act 22 of 1994:

1. As already started above, the claims had to be registered with the land claim commission before 31 December 1998.
2. Screening and verification of the rightful claimants through feasibility study, prioritisation and field research, verification of the validity of the claim, identification of beneficiaries and determination of the extent of the land,
3. Gazetting of the claim.
4. Project planning for claimants, research for any outstanding information, evaluation, monitoring, value of claim, verification and preparation and obtaining mandate was then done;
5. Negotiation and agreement, preparation of memorandum of approach, title deed for claimant land claim court and ministerial approach begin.
6. Development planning and settlement support, transfer of land, development funds, grant and handing over of land is the next stage. Financial compensation and the provision of alternative state-owned land

to claimants are implemented in cases where claimants are not restored to their claimed land (Kruger Real Estate, 2008).

The Limpopo Regional Land Claim Commission (RLCC) together with Limpopo Department of Agriculture (LDA), prepared the Terms of Reference to assist in the selection of a private partner for the Levubu Communities, as every community was required to enter into strategic partnership on a contractual basis for a period of time (CRLR, 2006). During the adjudication process, the Masakona community chose South African Farm Management Services (SAFM) as their strategic partner.

The Limpopo Regional Land Claim Commission (RLCC) together with Limpopo Department of Agriculture (LDA), came up with the idea of the formation of strategic partnership with the communities for the effective management of the farms after realising that the community who get their land back have no farming skills and through this partnership, the Private partner will be able to assist the land restitution beneficiaries with skills such as management skills, training of both CPA members and beneficiaries, accessing market of produce, drawing of business plan to guide operational activities of the farms, accessing finance and giving advice on farming business as they outlined during their presentation of their plan.

### **3.3. Masakona Communal Property Association**

The Masakona community that acquired their land through land claim formed a legal body called the Communal Property Association with ±800 members who were registered as beneficiaries. Members of the community collectively acquire, hold and manage property in terms of a written constitution. Through this legal body, a selected simple and accessible mechanism is provided through which group ownership system is recognised (RSA, 1997).

Masakona CPA has nine members at the time of commissioning this report who are democratically elected to serve for a period of five years and thereafter election of new

members is held. Four members within the CPA constitute the board of the operating company called Sharp Move Trading 150 (Pty) Ltd.

### **3.4 Economical activities of Masakona land restitution project**

At the time of commissioning this report, eight farms with the total of 345,2 hectares were restituted to Masakona land claim community. The farms are as follows: Picardo top, Picardo bottom, Wilgan, Paul Smith, Portion 155, Hamphaphada, Theron and Chris Nel. The farms produce subtropical fruits such as avocados (54,9 ha), bananas (123,3 ha), macadamia (58,2 ha), citrus (66 ha) and guavas (42,8 ha). The Masakona CPA (100% share holding) has formed their own operating company called Sharp Move Trading 150 (Pty) Ltd which is managing their farming business (Masakona, 2010). By the time I was commissioned this research, I was unable to find a business plan for this project, contrary to the agreement reached between the CPA and the private partner which has since been liquidated.

## **CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **4.1. Research design**

Research design is a logical strategy for gathering evidence for the desired knowledge. This design strategy must be efficient, meaning that it must yield the sought knowledge. The means of acquiring the information should be simple, cost effective and acceptable to all parties involved and also methodologically tight (De Vos, et. al,1998).The researcher used qualitative research methods with the aim of describing and understanding rather than explaining and predicting human behaviour.

Qualitative methodologies have been used - for example interviews and primary and secondary literature reviews were made. Straus and Corbin suggest that qualitative methodology allows a researcher to produce findings not arrived at by statistical procedures or other means of quantification. Some of the data may be quantified but the bulk of the analysis is interpretative. For instance some information was gathered through interviews and observation, techniques normally associated with qualitative methods. However, information gets coded in a manner that allows them to be statistically analyzed.

### **4.2. Area of the case study**

The study was conducted in Makhado Local Municipality, Vhembe district, within the Limpopo province of South Africa. The study area is situated in the North- Eastern part of the province; this study was based on the land restitution claim settlement of the Masakona community. The village is situated  $\pm 40$  kilometres east of Makhado Town and consisted of communities that had been successfully restituted to Levubu farms.

### **4.3. Population**

According to Babbie & Mouton,( 2005) population for a study is that group about whom the researcher wants to draw a conclusion from. In this research, the population was 183 employed beneficiaries of Masakona land restitution project.

## **4.4 Sampling method and Procedure**

### **4.4.1. Sampling method**

Sampling method was a simple random sampling. According to Newman (2006) simple random sampling is a sample by which a researcher can select cases so that each sampling element in the population will have an equal probability of being selected. Drawing a simple random sample is accomplished by making a complete list of all the elements in a population, assigning each a number and then drawing a set of random numbers which represent the sample size ( $n$ ) from the complete list of all elements in a population ( $N$ ). In this instance it is believed that each element in a complete population have equal opportunity of been selected.

### **4.4.2 Sampling procedures**

A list of 183 Masakona land restitution beneficiaries who are working at the eight (8) restitution projects was made and each beneficiary was assigned with a number. The numbers are then put on pieces on papers, inserted in a box and mixed perfectly well for the purpose of quality of random selection. One beneficiary working at Masakona restitution project was blindfolded and made a draw of sixty nine (69) out of the total population (183). The researcher drew a sample of 69 employed beneficiaries which he considered a manageable and sizeable sample. The sample size in percentage is  $n/N=69/183= 37.7\%$ . The researcher believes that there was no bias in the selection of beneficiaries of Masakona land restitution project. All 69 beneficiaries represented by the selected numbers were interviewed using questionnaire. It was believed that every beneficiary had an equal opportunity of being selected and used as a representative of the population. Nine (9) CPA members and four (4) Limpopo Department of Agriculture extension officers who are servicing the restitution projects were interviewed through interview schedule guided by the main research questions.

#### **4.5. Research instrument**

1. Sixty-nine (69) beneficiaries who are working at Masakona land restitution projects were interviewed using questionnaire guided by the main research questions.
2. Nine (9) Masakona CPA management committee members and four (4) extension officers from Limpopo Department of Agriculture who are servicing the restitution project were interviewed using interview schedule guided by the main research questions.

#### **4.6. Pilot study**

Two (2) research assistants visited Masakona restitution projects with (10) questionnaires to pilot or test them as to whether they are meaningful and understandable to the respondents. After piloting the questionnaire, few adjustments were made to align questions with research objectives.

#### **4.7. Data collection procedure**

Due to the nature of the research problem, it required the researcher to interact with the unit of analysis through methods and techniques mentioned above so that firsthand information is obtained.

In this research the following procedure was used by the researcher to acquire information from various sources. Two (2) sources of data collection were used, namely:

##### **1. Primary Data Sources**

Primary Data Sources comprised the following respondents:

1. Employed beneficiaries of Masakona land restitution project were interviewed using questionnaire guided by the main research questions.



2. Masakona Communal Property Association (CPA) management committee were interviewed using interview schedule guided by the main research questions.
3. Extension officers from Limpopo Department of Agriculture servicing the restitution project were interviewed using an interview schedule guided by the main research questions.

## **2 .Secondary data sources**

Secondary data sources comprised information from books, journals, internet, reports from workshops, conferences and publication. In this research all secondary sources of information were cited as a source of reference.

### **4.8. Research ethics**

The researcher contacted the Chairperson of Masakona CPA management committee who arranged a meeting were all stake holders, namely: CPA management committee, beneficiaries working at the restitution project and extension officers servicing the project attended. During the meeting the researcher introduced himself and the topic of the research, the aims and objectives of conducting the research. The researcher then requested permission to conduct the research which he was given. Participants were informed that the participation is voluntary; all information will be confidential as no names will be written down and as such they should express their views without fear. Pressure on interviewees to divulge information was avoided. All participants were assured that the findings of this research will be presented to them Participants were treated with dignity and respect throughout this research. Interviewees' request for anonymity was accepted and their identity protected. The information gathered is to be used purely for academic purposes.

#### **4.9. Data analysis**

In order to assist in the synthesis of data gathered, data collected was broken up into manageable themes, patterns, trends and relationships as Mouton (2001) suggests. It helped the author see emerging trends and establishes themes in the data. Analysis of data used for this study is both qualitative and quantitative. It involved use of statistical tables to analyze data while analysis of respondents' perceptions, beliefs, behavior, attitudes and aspirations was done.

In this research sixty-nine (69) questionnaires were used to collect the data from the beneficiaries. The data collected was then analyzed using the Microsoft Excel software package. Each questionnaire was captured on the excel programme and then variables were counted and calculated to give effective frequency and percentage. Tables were used to interpret the data.

## **CHAPTER 5: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **5.1. Introduction**

This chapter presents a discussion of the collected data generated from employees of Masakona land restitution project. Interview schedules for nine members of Masakona CPA management committee, and four Limpopo Department of Agriculture extension officers who are servicing the restitution project were used. The chapter also presents a discussion of the findings of this study; it starts off by providing the general information on the participants.

This research is informed by the perceived problem of unsatisfactory production on land restitution projects believed to be influenced by lack of agricultural support services such as financial support, extension advisory service, market accessibility and capacity building. As such the researcher aims to obtain data on the following objectives: the accessibility of financial support by beneficiaries of Masakona land restitution project; the extent of advisory support services to Masakona land restitution project; the extent of accessibility to market to Masakona land restitution project and the level of capacity building to Masakona land restitution project beneficiaries. These objectives were guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the level of financial support from financial institutions to Masakona Land restitution projects?
2. What is the extent of extension advisory services offered to Masakona Land restitution project?
3. How accessible are market for the Masakona land restitution project?
4. What is the level of capacity building at Masakona land restitution project?

In addressing the research questions the researcher developed the interview questionnaire to acquire information from the project beneficiaries and also conducted schedule interview with the Communal Property Association and the agricultural extension officer in service of the project. Based on the agricultural support services variables that guided the research questions (i.e. financial support, extension advisory

service, market access and capacity building) various indicators were developed to assess the impact that support services have on sustainability of Masakona land restitution project. The indicators include improved access to financial support, implements (e.g. implements and mechanization) and job creation; access to extension support (improved crop production owing to provided advisory services); access to market information; and capacity building (change in farmer's skills and knowledge). The baseline was set from the time the project accessed the agricultural support services and the indicators were used to measure the improvement or decline in the project success towards its sustainability.

## 5.2. Findings and discussion

### 5.2.1 Demographic information

The purpose of demographic information is to highlight the general characteristics of beneficiaries or respondents in terms of gender, age and educational background.

**Table: 1. Gender of beneficiaries**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Females</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>60.9</b>
<b>Males</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>39.1</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 1 shows that 60.9% of the respondents working at Masakona restitution project are females whilst only 39.1% are males. This results show that the majority of the respondents that are working in Masakona restitution farms are females.

**Table: 2. Age of beneficiaries in years**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Adult(36 and above)</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>60.9</b>
<b>Youth (18-35)</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>39.1</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

This table indicates that only 39.1% of the respondents are youth whilst 60.9% fall under adult category. This shows that there is very little involvement of youth in farming activities which will impact negatively on succession plan and the future sustainability of this land restitution project. Manpower and fresh ideas would be needed in this project for future development but looking at the above statistics, it will be quite difficult to do this as the majority of workers are near retirement age.

**Table :3. Educational background of respondents**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>No formal education</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>66.7</b>
<b>Grade 1-7</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21.7</b>
<b>Grade 8-12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8.7</b>
<b>Tertiary</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The above table indicates that 66.7% of the respondents have no formal education, which means that the majority of the workers might not be able to read and write. Poor understanding of the information needed for the sustainability might have been caused by the high number of illiterate workers. On the other hand, 21.7% of the workers have gone from grade 1 to 7. Adult basic education and training (ABET) classes are essential to enable the majority of workers to read and write, to enable them have access to information for the sustainability of the project.

### **5.2.2 Financial support services of Masakona restitution project**

**Table: 4. Do you have access to finance from the banking institutions and other NGOs?**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>40.5</b>
<b>I do not know</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>34.7</b>

<b>Yes</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>24.6</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The research revealed that 40.5 % of the respondents believed that there is no access to finance from the banking institutions and other NGO`s whilst 34.7% responded that they do not know whether the project has access to finance from the banking institutions and other NGOs. One of the reasons for this state of affairs might be that the majority of the respondents (66.7%) as indicated on Table 3 do not have formal education and as such would not have access to information. Another reason for not accessing finance might be as a result of operating without a comprehensive business plan.

**Table : 5. Access to government financial support programmes**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>I do not know</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>40.5</b>
<b>CASP</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>34.7</b>
<b>LETSEMA</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14.4</b>
<b>MAFISA</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5.7</b>
<b>MERECAS</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.3</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The above table shows that 40.5% of the respondents responded that they do not know whether the project has access to government financial support programmes. This might have been caused by lack of information, or lack of information dissemination, or through ignorance on the part of the project beneficiaries. 34.7% of the respondents believe that Comprehensive Agricultural support programme is assisting them in purchasing irrigation infrastructure like irrigation pipes and pumping machines, though some of the pipes were not of the required standard. 14.4% of the respondents believe that they have access to LETSEMA as the project received 338X50kg bags of fertilisers at time of commissioning this report.

The Communal Property Association management committee argues that the project is sustained through a grant from land claim commissions. The CPA was allocated a grant amounting to R12.5m of which a large portion was squandered by the South African Farm Management Services (SAFM), who were the strategic partner. They came up with false promises of accessing funds and as a result left the communities with huge debt from Absa Bank, to the amount of R4.4 m. SAFM is now liquidated. The project is failing to purchase additional tractors to assist on the farm and they are presently using the old tractors which are not reliable. This also affects the production at the project. The company was unable to access funds from the banking institutions for sustainability. The projects were operating without a comprehensive business plan which made it difficult to attract donors and access financial capital from the banks. KPMG firm of auditors is also giving advice on book keeping and how to compile a financial statement so that the project is able to have records and able to access funds from financial institutions.

In schedule interview conducted with the Extension officers from Department of agriculture servicing the project, it was found that financial support is available for land restitution projects but not enough. The project relies on Grant from the Department of Rural Development & Land Reform to survive, however they should have other way of accessing funds from other institutions like banks and NGOs. A comprehensive business plan is essential to access funds from other financial institutions. The project is also getting financial support from Department of Agriculture programmes such as CASP and Letsema ,though not enough ,but have positive implications on project production. This has been witnessed by recent employment opportunities that emanated since the project secured the government financial programs (CASP and LETSEMA). The project can also access financial assistance from MERECAS programme from the Department of Agriculture but the challenge is that all their grants are exhausted and as such, they will not be able to pay the portion that they are suppose to pay.

### 5.2.3 Extension advisory support services for Masakona land restitution project

**Table: 6. Extension advisory services received by Masakona restitution project beneficiaries**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Farm management</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>50.7</b>
<b>Marketing</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>30.4</b>
<b>Financial</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18.8</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The above table shows that 50.7% of the respondents believe that most of the advice received was on farm management whereas 30.4% believes that the advice was on market-related issues. Only 18.8 % have the view that extension advice was on how to access finance to support the project.

**Table: 7. Extension advisory services needed by Masakona restitution project beneficiaries**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Financial</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>36.2</b>
<b>Farm management</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>34.7</b>
<b>Marketing</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>28.9</b>
<b>None of the above</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The above table reveals that 36.2% of the respondents, need advise in financial matters,34.7% in farm management where as 28.9% in marketing .There is a very slight variance in extension advisory needs, apparently beneficiaries need to be advised in all spheres for the benefit of their project. Extension advice on farm management alone is inadequate without advice on accessing fund to run and develop the project as well as advice on accessing the markets for the produce. All these advice are urgently needed as the project cannot be sustained without them.



In a schedule interview conducted with the CPA it was found that extension officers are giving advise especially in government programmes to support restitution projects such as; CASP, MERECAS, LETSEMA and MAFISA, but is not enough. Officials from CRI also advise on the attributes of a good marketing agency and quality assurance of produce. Land restitution beneficiaries are not receiving enough farming advice and information and as such lack knowledge and skills to improve their farming.

The extension officers argued that extension advisory services done by them and land reform advisors are more on issue of government programmes than to support land restitution beneficiaries. The challenge is that officials do not have enough resources, like transport, which makes it difficult to access all their clients, thus hampering capacitation and affect production .Project beneficiaries are also getting advisory services from Citrus Research International (CRI) on accessing the market for their produce. Marketing agency (Fruit Unlimited) is also giving advice on marketing of their produce.

#### 5.2.4 Access to markets

**Table: 8. Do you have access to markets?**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>53.6</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>24.6</b>
<b>I do not know</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21.7</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 8 above indicates that the majority of the respondents, 53.6% believe that the project has access to markets whereas 24.6 % believe that the project has no access to markets. 21.7% of the respondents indicate that they do not know whether the project has access to markets or not.

**Table:9. Types of accessible markets**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Local markets</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>59.4</b>
<b>National markets</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>26.0</b>
<b>Export markets</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14.4</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The above Table indicates that the majority of the respondents, 59.4% indicated that the project has access to local market whereas 26% believe that the project has access to National markets and only 14.4% believe that the project has access to export market. The project is mainly supported by local buyers and as such they are not collecting enough revenue as local price is too low compared to national and export market. Maybe the reason for the project not having access to export markets is the barriers to export markets entry which is still hindering many emerging farmers from exporting their produce. The other contributing factor might be the quality and quantity of the produce. Another contributing factor might be that beneficiaries are producing the needed products, but they do not know where to sell; this means that no pre-contract was signed on where to market the produce.

According to the CPA, the project relies on local market, especially for banana, but citrus is exported overseas with very few sent to the local juice factory. The project is also marketing bananas through Pretoria and Johannesburg market. Macadamia nuts are sent to Greenfarm factory around Levubu at a very good price. Market access is crucial as without it there is no business and no cash flow. Beneficiaries need to be well trained so that the right quality produce is exported. Fruit Unlimited marketing agency and CRI are assisting the project on accessing market for the produce. The project pack house is if good standard and quality. The challenge is the barriers to export market. Land reform beneficiaries are not getting information on market which results in the loss of income from export and hampers sustainability.

The extension officers servicing the project also concur that the project is relying on local market, especially on bananas, but citrus is exported overseas. Advice in

accessing market is given by officials from Citrus Research International (CRI) and facilitation is done by officials from the Department of Agriculture. Export marketing is done through Fruit Unlimited marketing agency. The project has a well established pack house where they are packing their produce for local and international market. Land reform beneficiaries are not getting information on market which results in the loss of income from export and hampers sustainability .The unscrupulous marketing agencies who are not accredited also cause the disqualification of the project citrus consignment in 2009 and then a loss in project income. Fruit quality is also a great concern due to lack of skills. The other challenge is barriers to market entry especially into the export market.

### 5.2.5 Capacity building and skills transfer

**Table: 10. Training received by Masakona restitution project beneficiaries**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Occupational Health &amp; Safety(OHS)</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>49.2</b>
<b>Human resource</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21.7</b>
<b>Farm management and operations</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17.3</b>
<b>Marketing</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11.5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The research reveals that 49.2% of the respondents believe that the training received by Masakona land restitution beneficiaries were on OHS-related, whilst 21.7% were on human resource issues. Although training on health, safety and well-being of employees in the workplace is ethical compliance, the majority of workers believe that enough training is not done on farm management and operation so that beneficiaries should acquire those skills for the future sustainability of the project.

**Table: 11 Last periods training received**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Less than 6 months</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14.4</b>
<b>7-12 months</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21.7</b>
<b>More than 12 months</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>53.6</b>
<b>I do not know</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10.1</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The above table shows that the majority of the respondents, 53.6% believe that they received their last training more than 12 months ago. This means that the project is taking a long interval in training of its beneficiaries which has a negative impact on the progress of the project. Project beneficiaries should be trained on relevant skills at all times for the effectiveness and efficiency of the project. New and innovative skills can only be acquired through training, and as such the project should have training programme in place. Monitoring and evaluation should be done by the Department of land affairs as well as Department of agriculture to ensure that training programme is followed.

**Table: 12. Training needed by Masakona restitution project beneficiaries**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Farm management and operations</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>44.9</b>
<b>Marketing</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21.7</b>
<b>Financial</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18.8</b>
<b>Human resource</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14.4</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The research reveals that 44.9 % of the respondents believe that training on farm management and operations is of dire need. This might have been influenced by the fact that most of the beneficiaries do not have farm management and farm operations skills as the majority of them started to work on the project in 2007 after land restitution. 21.7% believe that training on marketing is more urgently needed. 18.8% of the respondents wanted to be trained on financial matters. Only 14.4% need training on

human resource. This shows that a skills audit is essential to identify the skills gap so that training should be offered according to needs. Training should not be imposed, but beneficiaries must also have a role to play to training. Training of beneficiaries is done for the benefit and future sustainability of the project, and as such training must be relevant to beneficiaries.

Through the schedule interview that was conducted with CPA, it was found that beneficiaries need to be trained in crop production, spraying programme , grading and packing of fruits, financial management, how to access finance, bookkeeping, marketing skills as these form the basis of a project`s sustainability. It is perceived that if such trainings can be conducted to land restitution beneficiaries, there will be gradual increase in production, KPMG firm of auditors offered training to CPA members on financial management, bookkeeping and the drawing of financial statement. Trainings offered to most of the beneficiaries were on tractor maintenance, occupational health and safety (OHS), safe use of insecticides.

The extension officer in service also concurs that most of the trainings offered to beneficiaries who are general workers were on occupational health and safety, whereas clerks were offered trainings on human resource related-issues. Training for general workers on farming operations is very limited as they are only getting in-service training on crop management and packing and grading of fruits. Training should starts from ABET due to high percentage of illiteracy. This should assist beneficiaries in reading and enable them to see the danger signs in production and marketing information. Recruitment drive of young people in farm management, financial management, and marketing and human resource management should be of priority for the future and sustainability of the project. Outsourcing of personnel to do book-keeping whilst mentoring a beneficiary is very necessary for the sustainability of the project. Beneficiaries should get on-farm training or in-service training in all farming operations.

## **CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION**

### **6.1. Introduction**

The study envisaged to investigate the problem of agricultural support services to Masakona land restitution project as well as other challenges confronted by the beneficiaries. Access to agricultural support is critical as without having access to those services, such as financial support, extension and advisory support, market and capacity building and skills transfer threaten the sustainability of restituted projects.

However, this study envisages in achieving to investigate and assess as to whether there is support services rendered to Masakona land restitution claim settlement. The study wanted to find out the level of financial support from the government departments and other financial institutions rendered to the project, the extent of extension advisory services offered to the restituted project, the accessibility of market for the project as well as the level of capacity building and skills transfer to land restitution beneficiaries.

The study includes a review of literature on land reform, especially on land restitution with particular interest on post settlement support services. The study is based on repeated field visits to Masakona land restituted project, on interviews to CPA management committee members, interviews to employed beneficiaries of Masakona restituted project using questionnaires, as well as interviews to extension officers from Limpopo Department of Agriculture who are servicing the restituted project.

The findings of the study will give guidance to the Department of Agriculture and land Affairs on the new strategies on post settlement support and the involvement of other institutions, especially local government for sustainability and productivity of the restitution projects.

## **6.2 Key research findings.**

### **6.2.1 Impact of financial support services**

The research revealed that the land restitution project is not having access to credit facility or loan. The project is operating without a comprehensive businessplan and as such, makes it difficult to access credit facility or loan from banking institutions or other NGO's.

The research also revealed that the project relies on grant from the Department of Rural Development of Land Reform to survive. However, the project is also surviving through the financial programme from the Department of Agriculture such as CASP and LETSEMA, even though the support is not enough. The finding revealed that MAFISA and MEREKAS programmes are not assisting them at all, as the beneficiaries have only heard of them, but have not accessed them since being resituated.

### **6.2.2 Impact of extension and advisory support services.**

The research revealed that the project is able to access extension and advisory services, though not adequate. The extension advice is mostly accessed by management staff whereas most of the staff at production or operational levels are accessing advice which are not relevant to their day to day activities. However, relevant information like how to manage the project, how to access finance and market should be accessed by all beneficiaries.

The research also revealed that there is a challenge of visibility by government extension officers to the project due to lack of transport, however the findings revealed that extension officers from non-governmental organisations like Agricultural Research Council (ARC), Citrus Research International(CRI) are very scarce. Extension officers from CRI only avail themselves through invitation. The research revealed that another challenge is that government extension officers are not up-to-date with new farming

information and technologies. The findings also revealed that mentoring of beneficiaries is not enough.

### **6.2.3 Impact of market information.**

The research revealed that the restitution project is mostly relying on local market for their produce, especially bananas, with very few exported to Johannesburg and Pretoria markets. This really affected their turn-over as local markets too low compared to export market. Poor quality banana production leads to disqualification for export market. This is caused by lack of production inputs which resulted in poor quality bunch and yield.

The research also revealed that the project is able to access export market for their produce like citrus, with the challenge being high tariffs and unscrupulous marketing agencies. This challenge discourages the project to export their products as this result to loss of income and revenue. Unscrupulous marketing agencies that are not accredited result in the disqualification of citrus produce and as such loss of revenue. The research also revealed that the project is able to access the market for their macadamia nuts at Greenfarm factory around Levubu at a very good price. The results also revealed that poor quality and low quantity of produce is as a result of lack of crop production inputs like fertilizers and pesticides.

### **6.2.4 Impact of capacity building and skills transfer.**

The findings revealed that the project received training on OHS-related issues. Although training on health, safety and well-being of employees in the workplace is ethical compliance, the majority of beneficiaries at production level believed that training in required skills is not satisfactory for the future and sustainability of the project.

The research also revealed that the project is taking a long interval in training of its beneficiaries which has a negative impact on project progress. However, new and



innovative skills should be imparted at all times through training for the effectiveness and efficiency of the project. The findings also revealed that relevant training must be done to relevant staff. Staff at operational level must be trained on farm management and operation, sorting and grading of product to the market, as without quality products will lead to disqualification for export market. The findings also show that workers from all levels must be treated with respect.

### **6.3 Conclusion**

This research has highlighted some key issues for South Africa's land restitution projects. It has argued that the post-settlement support is critical to the development and sustainability of land restitution projects. This research argued that support services such as access to finance, credit facility, production input, extension, market and capacity building and skill transfer are of fundamental importance for the survival of the restitution project since the unsatisfactory production of Masakona land restituted project owing to inadequate access to such services. The findings conclude that the support services that are currently being rendered to restituted projects are not adequate .Beneficiaries are not properly trained , they do not possess any technical ,farming, management or marketing skills, financial resources are not readily available, government support through the Department of Land Affairs and Agriculture is very minimal, extension officers are not well trained and supported to assist beneficiaries etc., this explains why restitution projects are not doing well.

### **6.4 .Recommendations**

Possible solutions can be implemented in order to rectify the problem of accessing support services to land restituted projects.

#### **6.4.1 Financial support services**

Government should intervene to unblock the barriers on collaterals to enable beneficiaries to access finance from financial institutions like banks and NGO's. Every restitution project must have a comprehensive business plan to enable accessibility to finance. Outsourcing of scarce skills like book keeping, administration and finance should be implemented. Beneficiaries must be mentored to acquire those scarce skills and project must be audited for clean administration.

#### **6.4.2 Extension advisory support services.**

Extension officers must be skilled with new information and technical knowledge to be able to assist restitution beneficiaries with relevant skills. Government must give extension officers enough support such as transport, laptops and relevant material so that they be able to be visible to the projects and assist land restitution beneficiaries with relevant skills and information like government support programmes .

#### **6.4.3 Access to markets**

Since market is one of the key challenges, government must strive towards linking restitutions projects with market establishment .Government must also intervene by unlocking the barriers to markets like the reduction of high tariffs for export for projects to enter export market.

#### **6.4.4 Capacity building and skills transfer.**

Land restitution beneficiaries must be workshopped and trained on relevant skills like p crops production, spraying programmes, irrigation, fertilization of crops, grading, sorting, packaging and marketing of produce. Comprehensive formal and informal training

should be introduced to support the project beneficiaries. Succession plan should be in place for new ideas and energies to support the project. Co-option of qualified personnel to mentor, coach to strengthen beneficiary management team is essential.

#### **6.4.5. Recommendations for further study**

The finding from this study contributes towards solidifying that adequate agricultural support services are essential in determining the success of restituted agricultural projects. As the study was only limited to assessing the impact of agricultural support services to success of restituted agricultural project, it is therefore recommended that further research be done on how support services can be delivered in land restitution projects as the future and sustainability of these projects depends on support services provided. It would also be interesting to see what the findings would be if the same study were conducted with a larger sampling utilising both qualitative and quantitative research methods.

## REFERENCES

African National Congress (ANC), 1994. The Reconstruction and development programme: A policy framework, Umanyano Publications.

Andrew et al. 2003. Evaluating land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa: Land Use & Livelihoods. Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape. Occasional paper series; no. 8)

Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. 2005. The practice of social science research, Oxford University Press.

Baloyi, J.K. 2010. An analysis of constraints facing smallholder farmers in the Agribusiness value chain. A case study of farmers in Limpopo Province. Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree M Inst Agrar (Agricultural Economics) in the Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development. Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences. University of Pretoria.

Binswanger, H.P and Kinsey, B.H. 1993. "Characteristics and Performance of Resettlement Programmes": A Review. World Development Vol.21, No.9 Pergamon Press Ltd.

Bourdeaux, K. 2009. Land Reform as Social Justice: The Case of South Africa. Mercatus Center. George Mason University

Burton, E. and Rajalahti S.R. 2010. The World Bank. Agriculture and Rural Development Discussion Paper 45. Strengthening Agricultural Extension & Advisory Systems: Procedure for assessing, Transforming, and Evaluating Extension Systems

Centre for Development and Enterprise, 2008. Land Reform in South Africa, Research No 16, May

DBSA (Development Bank of Southern Africa),2005. Agriculture in South Africa's second economy: Synthesis report on overcoming underdevelopment in South Africa's second economy. Poverty and Inequality in South Africa United Nations Development Programme, Human Sciences Research Council and Development Bank of Southern Africa.

DBSA (Development Bank of Southern Africa),2007. DBSA and CRLR (Commission on Restitution of Land Rights) facilitate Land Restitution and Sustainable Settlement of Outstanding Land Claims. <http://www.dbsa.org>.

Deininger, K., 2003. Land Policies for growth and poverty reduction: World Bank Policy Report. [www.oecd.org/dataoecd/24/55/36562720.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/24/55/36562720.pdf).

Derman,B;Lahiff, E&Sjaastad E. 2006. Strategic questions about strategic partners: Challenges and pitfalls in South Africa's new model of land restitution. Unpublished conference paper. Cape Town.

De Villiers, A. 2008. Management for Development Proceeding of selected papers: Development challenges for the Limpopo Province. Turfloop Graduate School of Leadership (TGSL).

De Vos,A.S.,Strydom.H.,Fouche,C.B.,Poggenpoel,M.,Schurink,E.& Schurink,W.1998. Research at grass roots: a primer for catering professions. Van Schaik Publishers.

Diako, B., Weideman, M. et al. 2005. Assessment of the status quo of settled land restitution claims with a developmental component nationally. Community Agency for Social Enquiry (CASE)

Doke, L. 2008. Timing of everything: Mentoring and coaching provide knowledge and training that are job specific. Sunday Times, Business Times 14 Sept p12.

Feder,G.,Willet, A. and Zijp, W. 1999.“Agricultural Extension: Generic Challenges and the Ingredients for Solution”.Policy Research Working Paper No. 2129.The World Bank.

Fourie, C. 2000. Land and the cadastre in South Africa: Its history and present government policy.School of Civil Engineering, Surveying and Construction. Durban: University of Natal.

GhostDigest,2008. Conveyance News and views: Communal Property Association.

Griffin,K., Rachman, K., A., & Ickowitz, A.; 2003. Poverty and distribution of land, Journal of agrarian change, 2(3): 279-330.

Hall, R. 2003. Rural land restitution in South Africa: programme for land and agrarian studies. South Africa: University of Western Cape

Hall, R. 2004. Land and Agrarian reform in South African: A Status Report,\_School of Government, University of the Western Cape.

Hall, R.2007.The Impact of Land Restitution and Land Reform on Livelihoods. Research Report 32. PLAAS, School of Government, University of the Western Cape.

Hammouda, H.; Karingji,S, et.al.2006. African Trade Policy Centre(ATPC). Can Market Access help African Agriculture? Work in Progress No 42.Economic Commission for Africa.

Hanson,P. 2006. ASPA Training priorities APSA-AVRDC workshop 2006, Mony 1-2AVRDC,Shanshua, Taiwano.

Hu, X. & Xing, Y. 2011. Economic effects of financial and fiscal support for agriculture in Western China [Accessed May 15, 2011 from <http://www.ceauk.org.uk/2010-conference-papers/full-papers/Xiaoping-Hu-and-Yan-Xing-CEA-final.pdf> ]

Jacobs, P. 2003. Support for Agricultural Development. Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape. (Occasional Series 4)

Kepe, T. and Cousins, B. 2001. Policy brief: Radical land reform is key to sustainable rural development in South Africa. School of government, University of the Western Cape.

Kgosana, C. 2008. Land Reform VS Investment. P21. City Press, August 31.

Kirsten, J., Machete, C. & Fischer, A. 2005. Appraisal of land reform projects in North West Province. Report for the National Department of Agriculture, March 2005.

Krakoff, C. 2003. SADC: Key potential export market and the market access barriers facing exporters. Presented to the Southern Africa Trade Regional network Symposium. Maputo, Mozambique. November 20-22. 2003.

Kruger Real Estate, 2008. Land claims/Land Restitution. The Real story: Land Restitution in South Africa is done in an orderly and legal way. [www.krugerrealestate.co.za](http://www.krugerrealestate.co.za)

Lahiff, E. 2001. Policy brief: Land reform in South Africa; is it meeting the challenge? School of government University of Western Cape.

Lahiff, E. & Hall, R. 2004. Policy brief; Budgeting for land reform, School of government, University of the Western Cape.

Land reform in Zimbabwe. 2011. Impact on production. (<http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title>)

Leland SATrip Report.pdf. 2007 Country Policy Study Trip Report Mickey Leland International Hunger Fellows. <http://www.hungercentre.org/international/Leland SA Trip Report.pdf>.

Letsatsi-Duba, D.2011/12. Limpopo Agriculture Provincial Budget Vote.24 March 2011. Limpopo Department of Agriculture, 2009. Strategic Plan 2010/11-2014/15: From Farming to Agricultural Industrial Development

Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism,2007. Final Draft Report. A study on the Impact of Land Reform in Limpopo Province.

Mabunda, S. 2008. Skills development. Zwavhulimi, official news letter of Limpopo department of Agriculture. August 2008.

Magadzi, D. 2007/08.Limpopo Agricultural Provincial Budget Vote.

Magingxa,L and Kamara, A. 2003.Institutional perspective of enhancing smallholder market access in South Africa. Contributed Paper presented at the 41<sup>st</sup> Annual Conference of the Agricultural Economic Association of South Africa (AEASA), October 2-3, 2003.Pretoria.

Manenzhe, T.J.2007. Post settlement challenges for Land Reform Beneficiaries: Three Case Studies from Limpopo Province. A mini-thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters Philosophy (Land and Agrarian Studies). Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS).Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences. University of the Western Cape(UWC).

Manyathi, T. 2006. Land and Local Government: Implications of Restitution. How integrated is restitution? Restitution and municipal IDPs. Association for Rural Advancement (AFRA).



Masakona, 2010. Sharp Move Trading 150(Pty) Ltd monthly Boardpack for November 2010.

Masingi, S. 2008. Land claims could be settled by 2011. Bua News, May 10

Mbeki, T. M. 2006. State of the Nation Address. Government Printers.

Moeki, L. 2007. Transformation in Agricultural Training. Jet Education Services Bulletin no. 17. April 2007.

Mouton, J. 2001. How to succeed in your Masters and Doctoral studies: A South African guide book. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

National Department of Agriculture, 2001. Land reform in South Africa. [www.etu.org.za](http://www.etu.org.za).

National Agricultural Marketing Council (NAMC), 2006. Strategic Plan 2006/2007. [www.info.gov.za/aboutgovt/contacts/bodies/namc.htm](http://www.info.gov.za/aboutgovt/contacts/bodies/namc.htm)

Newman, W.L. 2006. Social Research Methods Qualitative and Quantitative Approach 6<sup>th</sup> (ed). University of Wisconsin at White-Water

Nieuwoudt, L and Groenewald, J. 2003 (ed). The challenge of change: Agriculture Land and the South African Economy. University of Natal Press

Nkuzi Development Association (2003) Report on Area Land Reform Initiative . (ALRI)Pilot Project Report. Unpublished document. Nkuzi: Elim.

Norvafrica, 2005. Orientation training Hand book for participatory approach (PEA). Centre for Innovation in Development in Partnership with the BASED programme.

Organisation for Economic Corporation and Development (OECD), 2006. Policy Brief: Agricultural Policy Reform in South Africa.

Parliamentary Monitoring Group, 2010. Land claims & Restitution projects: Briefing by the Department of Rural Development and Land reform.

Phaahla, J, 2010. Department of Rural Development and Land Reform Budget vote for 2010/11. <http://www.ruraldevelopment.gov.za>.

Poultron, C; Kydd, J and Dorward A, 2006. Overcoming Market Constraints on Pro-Poor Agricultural Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa. Development Policy review, 24(3):243-277.

Quizon, J.; Feder, G. & Margai, R. 2000. A note on the Sustainability of the Farmer Field School Approach to Agricultural Extension. Development Economics Group. The World Bank. September 2000.

Ramudzuli, F.E. 2001. The Uprooting of Ravele Community in the Luvuvhu River Valley and its Consequences, 1920-1930's. Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of Magister Artium in Historical Studies in the Faculty of Arts, Rand Afrikaans University, May 2001.

Ramukosi, K. Land reform advisor. Makhado Department of Agriculture [25/11/2011].

RSA, 1996. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996. Government Printers.

RSA, 1997. White Paper on South African Land Policy, Government Printers.

RSA, 1998. White Paper on South Africa Land Policy. Department of Land Affairs.

RSA, 2003. Commission on Restitution of Land Rights, Land Restitution in South Africa, our Achievements and Challenges. Government printers.

RSA, 2004. CASP Programme. Government printers.

RSA, 2005 (a). Department of Agriculture, Farmers mentorship: Policy and Guidelines. Government Printers.

RSA, 2005 (b). Department of Agriculture and Land Affairs, Report of the National Land Summit Government Printers.

RSA, 2006 (a). Strategic Plan for the Department of Agriculture. Government Printers.

RSA, 2006 (b). Land News, January – March, Vol 4 no1 Government Printers.

RSA,2007.SustainableDevelopment Consortium: Settlement and Implementation Support (SIS) Strategy for Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa, synthesis document.

SADC international conference on poverty and development: Strengthening the role of agriculture in poverty alleviation:18-20 April 2008, Pailless, Mauritius.  
<http://www.sadc.int/conference/content/english/cc%>

Shepherd, A. and Farolfi, S.(1999) Export Crop Liberalisation in Africa: A Review. Rome: FAO.

Shushu G.N.J,2011.Northern Cape Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development. 17 May 2011.

Sibanda,S. 2001.Land reform and poverty alleviation in South Africa. A paper presented at the SARPN conference on Land reform and poverty alleviation in Southern Africa held at the Human Science Research Council. Pretoria 4<sup>th</sup> -5<sup>th</sup> June.

Singini, R. and Van Rooyen, J. 1995. Serving small-scale farmers. An evaluation of the DBSA`s farmer support programme. Development Bank of Southern Africa.

Stevens,J.B, 2007. Professional Extension support: A prerequisite for sustainable irrigation development, vol, 36. 2007. Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development, University of Pretoria.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 2001.The World Bank Research observer, vol, 16. no. 2.

Turner, S, 2001. Policy brief: Sustainable Development: What's Land got to do with it? School of government, University of the Western Cape.

URS (Umhlaba Rural Services), 2006. A study on agricultural support services offered by the private and public sector in South Africa.

Vink , N. & Kirsten ,J. 2001. A descriptive Analysis of employment trends in South Africa Agriculture. Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development. University of Pretoria.

Walker, C. 2002. Agrarian Change, Gender and Land Reform. A South African Case Study. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Wegerif, M, 2004. A critical appraisal of South Africa's market-based land form policy: The Case of the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) programme in Limpopo, School of government University of the Western Cape.

Western Cape Department of Agriculture, 2008. Western Cape: Farmers Support and Development: <http://www.elsenburg.com/fsd.html.2008/08/04>.

Xingwana, L. 2007. Budget Vote Speech, National Council of Province's (NCOP). Government Printers, Pretoria, June 06.

# QUESTIONNAIRE

## AN INVESTIGATION OF THE IMPACT OF SUPPORT SERVICES IN LAND RESTITUTION WITH REFERENCE TO MASAKONA COMMUNITY IN MAKHADO MUNICIPALITY, LIMPOPO PROVINCE

Name of interviewer.....

Name of community.....

DATE .....

### SECTION A

#### 1. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

##### 1.1 Respondent characteristics

1.1.1 Are you a beneficiary of Masakona Land Restitution Settlement Project?

Yes	1
No	2

1.1.2 Please indicate your gender

Male	1
Female	2

1.1.3 Marital Status of respondent.

Single	1
--------	---

Married	2
Divorced	3
Widower	4
Widow	5

1.1.4 Can the beneficiary speak the following languages?

Language	Speak
English	1
Venda	2
Tsonga	3
Sotho	4
Afrikaans	5
Other	6

1.1.5 Please indicate your age

Age	Code
Youth(18-35)	1
Adult(36 and above)	2

## 1.2. Beneficiary household characteristics

1.2.1. Number of people in the household

1.2.2. Gender of people in the household

1. Male	
2. Female	

**SECTION B: Support services**

**2. Financial support**

2.1. When was the land transferred to your household?

Period	Code
Less than 1 year	1
1-4 years	2
5-8 years	3
More than 8 years	4
I do not know	9

2.2. How many farms have you claimed?

.....

2.3. How many farms have you acquire up to date?

.....

2.4. Do you have access to finance from banking institutions and any NGOs ?

Yes	1
No	2
I do not know	3

2.5. If yes, from which banking institution or NGO?

2.6. Do you have access to government financial support programme?

Yes	1
No	2

2.7. If yes, which government financial support programmes do you have access to ?



CASP	1
LETSEMA	2
MERECAS	3
MAFISA	4
I do not know	5

2.8. Which other financial support institution that is financing your restitution project do you know?

### Section C

#### 3. Advisory support services

3.1. Which stakeholders are involved in advisory service for your restitution project?

Private consultant	1
Research institutions	2
Project Managers	3
Government extension officers	4
Others	5

3.2. Which extension advice is being rendered at your restitution project?

### SECTION D

#### 4. CAPACITY BUILDING

4.1. What is the highest level of education attained by the respondent?

No formal education	1
Grade 1-7	2
Grade 8-12	3

Tertiary	4
----------	---

4.2. Which skills do you have?

.....  
 .....

4.3. How did you acquire the skills?

In-service training	1
Formal training	2
Informal training	3

4.4. Which training did you receive?

Occupational Health & Safety(OHS)	1
Human resource	2
Farm management and operations	3
Marketing	4

4.5 Which other trainings do you require?

.....  
 .....

4.6 When last did you receive training?

Period	Code
Less than 6 months	1
7-12 months	2
More than 12 Months	3
I do not know	4

**SECTION E**

**5. Markets access**

5.1 Do you have access to markets?

Yes	1
No	2

5.2. If yes, which markets do you have access to?

Local market	1
National market	2
Export market	3

5.3. Do you have any challenges in marketing your produce?

Yes	1
No	2

5.4 If yes, which challenges do you encounter in marketing your produce?

5.5 Other comments that you would like to make.

.....

.....

.....

.....

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION**