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Abstract

The South African underdevelopment of the rural areas can mostly be attributed to the apartheid mode that aimed to build a first class capitalist economy for a few, leaving the majority and creating a legacy of underdevelopment and poverty in the rural areas. Geographic differentiation “apartheid system” effectively defined three kinds of spaces in South Africa, each with its own political, social and economic systems: the major urban areas; the commercial farming regions and the associated small towns; and the so-called Homelands.

The task of development is therefore one of reconstruction, healing of a deeply scarred nation bruised by centuries of exploitation of its human and natural resources, where the masses of the people seek inclusion and shared prosperity in a richly endowed land. This paper first outlines the particular challenges facing our rural areas, as defined under apartheid.

Efforts made since the dawn of democracy in 1994 have been geared towards ameliorating the negative consequences of economic, social and political exclusion and marginalization of the rural dwellers. Many policy and institutional measures have been put in place in order to improve the lives of the rural communities and regenerate rural economies but have had limited successes. The ruling party’s (African National Congress’s) 2009 Elections Manifesto promised a renewed focus on rural development through the:

- Creation of sustainable livelihoods and decent work in rural areas, largely but not solely within agriculture. In this context, the land reform programme should be intensified in ways that ensure more land in the hands of the rural poor, together with the skills, financial resources and organisations – especially co-operatives – needed for them to use it productively.
- Improvement of government services, especially education, health and sanitation.
- Introduction of measures to improve conditions for farm workers, both by improving their security of tenure, housing and living conditions and by supporting their organisation including unions.

This led to the introduction of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) with a clear vision “creating vibrant, equitable, sustainable rural communities and food security for all”.

The ultimate vision of creating vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities will be achieved through a three-pronged strategy based on a coordinated and integrated broad-based agrarian transformation; rural development infrastructure, and an improved land reform programme. Central to the comprehensive rural development programme is the job creation model. The interrelationship of land-community-livestock-cropping is central to a three-pronged strategy of agrarian transformation, rural development and land reform.

The 1997 Rural Development Framework states: “Rural development is everybody’s business. This captures the multi-sectoral nature of the enterprise and the notion that rural development is the business of rural people, that they should set the agenda, the priorities and the methods to achieve them. If structures that support rural people’s initiatives are set up, we will avoid perception that rural development is nobody’s business.”
INTRODUCTION

The aspiration of the majority of South African's for a more equitable and prosperous rural dispensation goes back to the earliest days of dispossession and colonialism. The 1913 Natives Land Act dispossessed Africans of 87% of their land. The impact of the statute on the lives of the majority of Africans in the Union of South Africa was devastating – “the South African Native found himself, not actually a slave, but a pariah in the land of his birth (Plaatje, 1914).

According to Statistics South Africa (2001) in 2001, 43% of the population of South Africa (21 million people) was living in a rural area.

In 1956, the Freedom Charter\(^1\) drove the liberation movement agenda and proclaimed:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{The Land shall be shared among those who work it!} \\
\text{Restrictions of land ownership on a racial basis shall be ended, and all the land re-divided amongst those who work it to banish famine and land hunger;} \\
\text{The state shall help the peasants with implements, seed, tractors and dams to save the soil and assist the tillers;} \\
\text{Freedom of movement shall be guaranteed to all who work on the land;} \\
\text{All shall have the right to occupy land wherever they choose;} \\
\text{People shall not be robbed of their cattle, and forced labour and farm prisons shall be abolished.}
\end{align*}
\]

Geographic differentiation “apartheid system” effectively defined three kinds of spaces in South Africa, each with its own political, social and economic systems: the major urban areas; the commercial farming regions and the associated small towns; and the so-called Homelands.

By the end of Apartheid, South Africa's economy was facing a variety of serious structural problems. The final two decades of the National Party's regime had been particularly damaging to the economic climate, with stagnant economic growth (the average over the entire period was just 1.7%), declining per capita income (averaging -0.7% annually), increasing unemployment (using the broad definition, up from around 20% at the start of the 1970s to around 30% by 1994) and a

---

\(^1\) Adopted at the Congress of the People, Kliptown South Africa, 26 June 1955. Downloaded from:
http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/charter.html on 10 March 2010
spiraling debt problem (under the De Klerk government (1989-1994) alone, debt had increased from less than 3% of GDP to more than 9%, and total government debt more than doubled).

However, rural communities always developed coping strategies particularly for survival and alternative means to income e.g. using mealies in exchange for services provided, “ukwenana” (where neighbours would share sugar for example pending receipt of remittance form a migrant family member working in the mine) or “ilima/litsima” to support each other while working in the fields. All these coping strategies created cohesive communities with strong Ubuntu values.

The poverty facing rural areas in South Africa today can therefore be understood to be as a result of the way apartheid shaped access to economic opportunities and government services through rigidly enforced tenure, settlement and labour policies.

Challenges related to this include under utilisation and/or unsustainable use of natural resources; poor or lack of access to socio-economic infrastructure and services, public amenities and government services (e.g. industrial parks lying idle especially in the former homeland areas), lack of access to water or lack of water sources for both household and agricultural development; low literacy, skills levels and migratory labour practices decay of the social fabric (child-headed households, crime, family disputes and lack of Ubuntu); death of cultural progress; unresolved restitution and land tenure issues; townships not formally established thus hindering service provision and development; dependence on social grants and other forms of social security and unexploited opportunities in agriculture, tourism, mining and manufacturing.

In his paper, Maano Ramutsindela (2001) states that any meaningful transformation in post apartheid South Africa will be measured by contours of governance and development in the rural areas of the former Bantustans. Though the Bantustans have been formally incorporated the legacy of governance in those areas poses a challenge. New political institutions and the deliberate use of welfare to give reconstructed ethnic identities a material reality have conflicting interests which now have to be taken into account for the transformation of South Africa including socialization of people into space. He argues that there is nothing wrong in giving people alternative choices but it is a well known fact that apartheid used development projects to channel people to a different direction and localities. The suggestion is that government should come with clear development policies that will change the apartheid legacy.

He argues that there is nothing wrong in giving people alternative choices but it is a well known fact that apartheid used development projects to channel people to a
different direction and localities. The suggestion is that government should come with clear development policies that will change the apartheid legacy.

It is against this background that the South African Government acknowledges that a rural development strategy must address the special challenges found in the farming and former homeland regions. It must explore and build on the knowledge and strengths of the rural communities strengthen and improve on what worked in the past while introducing new approaches to rural development. The rural development programme should be comprehensive covering a range of rural community challenges. It must bridge the gap between the so-called first and second economies. The ‘first’ and ‘second’ economies represent two ends of the spectrum, with wealth and resources concentrated at one end, and poverty at the other.

Rural development initiatives introduced by government since 1994

Following transition to democracy, The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996 (Act 108 of 1996)) provides for a common South African citizenship, with all citizens having equal access to the rights, privileges and benefits. South Africa is also one of the few countries on the continent with a constitution which entrenches democracy, eliminates all forms of discrimination, promotes and protects human rights but also strives to attain socio-economic rights for all.

The fact that the South African government has placed the need to address poverty and inequality firmly at the centre of its development agenda is reflected in the various development policy documents and strategies that have been developed in the few years that the government has been in power. Gigantic efforts made since the 1994 democratic elections to date have been geared towards ameliorating the negative consequences of economic, social and political exclusion and marginalization of the rural dwellers. However, many policy and institutional measures in place to improve the lives of the rural dwellers and regenerate rural economies have had limited successes.

Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), 1994-1996

Facing the "deep-seated structural crisis", the ANC-led government attempted to put together a policy framework that could address the variety of problems being faced both economically and otherwise.

The government development strategy was first articulated in the 1994 Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) document (Government of South Africa, 1994) in which the ANC sought “to mobilize all people and country’s resources towards the final eradication of apartheid and the building of a democratic, non-racial and non-sexist future”. The programme sought to attain
socio-economic growth and basic needs delivery, while at the same time addressing the legacy of injustice. The programme put emphasis on ‘people-centred, integrated and sustainable development’ that is democratic and participatory.

Here, the programme noted a need for integrated, well coordinated and sustainable programme, to be conducted in and integrated amongst all three spheres of government, along with civil society, business and parastatals and that ‘Development is not about the delivery of goods to a passive citizenry. It is about active involvement and growing empowerment. In taking this approach the Government would build on the many forums, peace structures and negotiations that people were involved in through the land.’ Indeed fora like the Community Development Fora (CDF) and Local Development Fora (LDF) were established in all regions to participate and contribute to development initiatives. In addition sector fora e.g. social development, business and education fora were established to deal with sector specific initiatives.

The RDP White Paper, presented to Parliament in 1994, noted of ‘minority control and privilege’ within the economy as a major obstacle to the achievement of an integrated developmentally-orientated economy. It also acknowledged that the people most affected by economic policy should participate in the decision-making, and that the government would also have to be restructured to fit the priorities of the RDP.

The programme would link growth, development, reconstruction, redistribution and reconciliation into a ‘unified program’, held together by a broad infrastructural programme that would focus on creating and enhancing existing services in the electricity, water, telecommunications, transport, health, education and training sectors. It also put emphasis on programmes to meet basic needs and enhance human resource development, placed a major emphasis on social infrastructure and development programmes that address poverty and inequality.

However, as a development policy document, it had a number of shortcomings. First, it looked more like a ‘wish list’ than a strategy document focusing on opportunities and constraints. Second, it made no attempt to set priorities; or to assign responsibility for the implementation of each programme component. Third, it lacked mechanisms for inter-departmental coordination. Finally, local government, which has been assigned constitutional responsibility for promoting socio-economic development, did not have adequate planning and implementation capacity.

While the government appeared to have been content with the RDP’s broad thrusts, problems began to surface from 1995. The economy, in particular, was not growing at the envisaged rates. The orientations of the programme also came under critical
scrutiny as investors and international financial institutions began demanding greater clarity on national economic policy. This contributed to the birth of GEAR and the hosting of the Growth and Development Summit that resulted in agreements between various stakeholders. This was later followed by summits and agreements at District Municipality level.

**Strategies focusing on rural development: 1994 and 2001:**

*The Rural Development Strategy of the Government of National Unity of 1995* set out the mechanisms by which rural people and their elected representatives at rural District Councils and Local Councils could take charge of the development process in their own areas. It highlighted that rural people and rural women in particular, bear the largest burden of poverty and suggested that if the inequalities and inefficiencies of the past could be changed, rural areas could become productive and sustainable. It suggested that building local government in rural areas is the first step in this direction. It also indicated that rural people must be at the heart of this strategy. This document however ended as a discussion document.

*The Rural Development Framework of 1997* describes how government, working with rural people, could achieve a rapid and sustained reduction in absolute rural poverty (Government of South Africa, 1997). The framework attempts to answer questions on how to involve rural people in decisions affecting their lives, through participation in rural local government; how to increase employment and economic growth in rural areas; how to provide affordable infrastructure and improve services in rural areas and resolve the problems posed by the remote, low-potential areas into which people were crowded during the apartheid era; how to ensure social sustainability in rural areas and how to increase rural local government capacity to plan and implement and assemble the essential information for planning, monitoring and evaluating both the process and progress of development.

The most notable value of the framework was its attempt to define rural areas as “the sparsely populated areas in which people farm or depend on natural resources, including the villages and small towns that are dispersed through these areas. In addition, they include the large settlements in the former homelands, created by the apartheid removals, which depend for their survival on migratory labour and remittances (Government of South Africa, 1997:1).” Though not adopted as an official definition most government departments seem to have adopted this definition as a working definition. This is not surprising considering that it is closely related to the conditions that affected rural communities prior to 1994 i.e. former homelands and farming communities.

*The Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Strategy* (ISRDS) announced by the former president in 2001 and later evolved to be a programme. The objective
was to *intensify a sustained attack on poverty and underdevelopment throughout the country* (Government of South Africa, 2001). The programme would seek to ‘transform rural South Africa into socially cohesive and stable communities with viable institutions, sustainable economies and universal access to social amenities.’ More specifically, the problem grew out of consistent failings of rural development projects to accomplish established targets and not delivering the success yields initially anticipated. One of the key reasons for this lack of success was not the actual development projects, their content, nor their structural set-up. Rather, the problem appeared to be the failure to coordinate projects and activities that would yield integrated service delivery, the eradication of poverty and the promotion of sustainable development. The ISRDP would therefore serve as a *mechanism* for the integration of government development projects (Government of South Africa, 2001).

The most important value of this programme is that it mainly targeted former homeland areas and attempted to introduce the spatial focus to deal with poverty and underdevelopment. It also attempted to define how integration would happen – through a basket of services, anchor projects that emphasise linkages and multiple spin-offs and the financing protocol.

However the unit of intervention was at District Municipality level hence failure to consciously target local municipality, wards and/or village needs. It was hoped that service delivery in these areas would be fast tracked through integrated planning and implementation. Due to lack of enforcement mechanisms, the misaligned planning cycles between local government and other spheres of government, the programme did not achieve the desired impact.

Finally, although the strategy had proposed the involvement of the local communities in their own development and the targeting vulnerable groups (youth women and the disabled). At implementation level the programme was, in most cases, coordinated at government level leaving out the key stakeholders, the community, only considering them as beneficiaries of government programmes.

**Sector specific strategies** focusing on rural areas e.g. rural sanitation, rural transport, and rural housing strategy, has also been developed by different sector departments. Other programmes that focus on the entire country, e.g. the Comprehensive Social Security Programme and social wage e.g. free basic services; no fee paying schools, subsidised housing etc. have made impact in the rural areas.

The expanded Public Works programme that was designed to equip participants with skills and work experience that would enhance their ability to earn a living, reduce poverty and provide income relief through temporary employed were introduced. It was envisaged that the
programme would be large enough to have a substantial impact on employment and social cohesion; especially for young people, women and the rural poor. Its principles had to be applied to all service delivery and infrastructure programmes.

**International conventions and programmes**

South Africa is also a signatory to the 1995 Copenhagen Declaration which emerged from the United Nations World Summit on Social Development. In terms of this Declaration, signatories undertook to develop a country specific measure of poverty by 1996. South Africa also has obligations in terms of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals to halve poverty and unemployment by 2015. South Africa committed to reaching these goals by 2014.

Other international covenants and treaties that commit signatory states to the advancement of the socio-economic rights of their inhabitants that South Africa has signed include the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights, the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Commission on Sustainable Development.

The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI) arising from the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 called for the building of rural infrastructure, diversifying the rural economy and improving transportation and access to markets, market information and credit to support sustainable agriculture and rural development. It also recognised that agriculture plays a crucial role in addressing the needs of growing global population and is inextricably linked to poverty eradication, especially in developing countries (United Nations, 2003).

However these international agreements do not bind countries to direct resources to rural areas and there are no punitive measures for non-compliance. It should also be noted that communities are rarely active participants in driving the development and finalisation of these treaties and conventions.

Despite the signing of international conventions and the development of sectoral rural focused programmes, rural areas remain underdeveloped. Four key reasons for this have emerged:

Firstly, there appears to be a lack of a common definition of “rural development”. Indicators of deprivation or lack of access to services are used to attempt to define what is needed in rural areas. What counts as rural or urban is extremely difficult to
define. This is especially so given the deep, continuous and intertwined relationships of urban and rural in South Africa.

Some academics even attempted to “rurbanize” rural areas (define development of rural areas in urban terms). The country is in the process of conducting comprehensive rural sector profiling towards a common understanding of rural development and rurality and effective targeting.

Secondly, budgets for and planning of these programmes cut across the different government departments. There is no incentive for seamless budgeting and planning for rural development across the different spheres of government. The core challenge is the reprioritization of funds to rural areas through a single budgetary and planning cycle.

Rural development is a cross cutting programme that calls for partnerships with multi stakeholders both within and outside government. However there are no enforcement mechanisms for integrated planning and implementation of government programmes of government.

Thirdly, very few of these programmes, especially the service delivery programmes, have fully decentralised service points. In the case of free basic services, for example, it was found that the token collection rate was low due to the fact that the cost of the token is far lower than the cost of travelling to the token collection point.

**Towards comprehensive rural development**

A process to change the development approach to rural areas began in 2005 with the National Land Summit that affirmed several issues that Government and other stakeholders had begun to flag as areas needing a rethink by both policy makers and implementers of land and agrarian reform. Prior to the Land Summit, a ten-year review (in 2005) of land and agrarian reform implementation had pointed to a number of gaps in the policy and legislative framework.

The 2007 ANC (ruling party) National Policy Conference identified rural development, land reform and agrarian change as critical pillars of South Africa’s programme of economic transformation. The policy conference further acknowledged that programmes of rural development, land reform and agrarian change must be integrated into a clear strategy that seeks to empower the poor, particularly those who already derive all or part of their livelihood from the exploitation of productive land.

Rural Development has then been included as one of the priories in the Medium Term Strategic Framework i.e. the key output of a broader Planning Framework that
enhances strategic medium term prioritization and ensures that the policy decisions taken by Cabinet inform planning exercises throughout government. It sets out the way in which government has translated its mandate into priorities, and sets out a mix of programmes that will be deployed to achieve its objectives for the electoral mandate period (Government of South Africa, 2009).

The overall priority is to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy of rural development that is aimed at improving the quality of life of rural households, enhance food security through a broader base of agricultural production, and exploit the economic potential that each region enjoys. This strategy will include:

- Aggressive implementation of land reform policies
- Stimulation of agricultural production with a view to contributing to food security. This includes focusing on institutional support that creates economies of scale and facilitates access to business services and markets.
- Rural livelihoods and food security through an intensification of the Ilima/Letsema (a community initiative where communities support each other) campaign to enhance household food security.

THE COMPREHENSIVE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

There can be no doubt that government’s rural-development programmes have met with some degree of successes. Nonetheless, government has not achieved its aim of transforming apartheid geography. The Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) was conceived as a strategic priority within the Government’s current Medium Term Strategic Framework.

The vision of the CRDP is “to create vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities”. It seeks to address poverty and food insecurity through maximising the use and management of natural resources. It also seeks to rectify past injustices and improve the standard of living and welfare through rights-based interventions that address skewed patterns of distribution and ownership of wealth and assets. The primary objective is to “facilitate integrated development and social cohesion through participatory approaches in partnership with all sectors of society”.

The ultimate vision of creating vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities will be achieved through a three-pronged strategy based on:

- a coordinated and integrated broad-based agrarian transformation;
- rural development infrastructure, and
- An improved land reform programme.
Agrarian transformation means the ‘rapid and fundamental change in the relations (systems and patterns of ownership and control) of land, livestock, cropping and community.’ It also focuses on, but is not limited to, the establishment of rural business initiatives, agro-industries, co-operatives, cultural initiatives and vibrant local markets in rural settings, the empowerment of rural people and communities (especially women and youth).

Land reform is a national priority and is further entrenched in Section 25 (4) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (Act No.108 of 1996). A three-pronged land reform programme aiming at tenure reform, restitution and land redistribution, was launched in 1994. Approximately 7 million hectares of the required 24 million hectares of agricultural land has been redistributed through these programmes.

The programme recognizes value of land as a catalyst for poverty alleviation, job creation, food security and entrepreneurship. The revised land reform strategy will include mechanisms for the effective development and beneficiation of land reform beneficiaries and the categorization of beneficiaries through targeted allocation; facilitating secure access to land; protecting the land rights of farm workers, and addressing basic needs for farm dwellers, including water, sanitation, electricity, housing, etc.; creating decent jobs on farm and establishing agri-villages for local economic development. A developmental approach to the settlement of restitution claims will be taken. In addition, all distressed land reform projects implemented since 1994 will be recapitalized through programmes that seeks to increase the productivity levels, employment and gross value of these farms.

In changing the patterns and systems of ownership and control over land, fundamental changes have to be effected to the current land reform agenda.

The land reform agenda will further focus on reviewing the Restitution, Redistribution and Tenure Reform Programmes. The focus will be on expediting the processing of settled claims and the settlement of outstanding claims.

Major reforms in the land tenure system are necessary in addressing the distorted power relations relative to productive land in South Africa and to safeguard limited agricultural land. We are currently developing a Green Paper on rural development, agrarian transformation and land reform and we proposing a complete overhaul of the land tenure system. In this regard we propose a three-tier land tenure system, namely (Nkwinti, 2010):

- State land under leasehold;
- Private land under freehold tenure but with limitations; and
- Foreign land ownership with precarious tenure linked to productivity and partnership models with South African citizens.
The above system will be based on a categorization model informed by land use needs at the household, small holder and commercial farming.

The Comprehensive Rural Development Programme Model

The CRDP is different from past government strategies in rural areas because it is premised on a proactive participatory community-based planning approach rather than an interventionist approach to rural development (Figure 1).

Figure 1: CRDP Concept

Socio-economic profiling, community participatory processes and intergovernmental co-operation

Evidence-based policy-making requires that every stage of the policy development process is informed by evidence. Collecting data, investing in research, ensuring that policy-makers have the appropriate skills to discriminate between evidence which is reliable and useful, and that which is not—all are essential tools in devising sound evidence-based policy. Evidence should also be open to rigorous public and
professional debate and independent evaluation. In addition to validating evidence, transparency can help the government to gauge community reaction to ideas in their formative stages and therefore better anticipate the likely consequences of pursuing different courses of action.

It is against this background that focus sites have been identified in eight provinces to pilot the comprehensive rural development approach. The design of the policy framework is therefore predicated on lessons learnt from pilot sites selected through socio-economic profiling, community participatory processes and intergovernmental co-operation.

The first step is collect information that assist in developing community profiles. A community profile illustrates:

- The major patterns of resource use in the community, illustrated by maps;
- The settlement patterns of the community;
- The major livelihood patterns of the community and which groups of households are engaged in those patterns, illustrated by maps, rankings and seasonal calendars;
- The main visible, formal and traditional institutions present in the community;
- The importance and accessibility of services in the community, illustrated by a Venn diagram; and
- A historical profile of the community, different groups within the community and resources and resource use over time, illustrated by timelines.\(^2\)

The understanding provided by these profiles aids in the development of a community engagement strategy and leads to identifying projects that are tailored to the needs and characteristics of the community.

Households are also profiled in order to determine individual household needs, strengths and potential, in line with the War on Poverty Campaign approach that was introduced by government in 2007 as an intervention aimed at attacking poverty at household level. These needs are matched with the community needs in order to identify those that should be addressed through community interventions at large and those that should be directed to individual households or individuals in a household. The profiles further inform placement of communities in skills development initiatives and employment opportunities in line with the job creation model that will be discussed below.

\(^2\) War on Poverty Campaign, Community Profiling Framework for the War room on Poverty, July 2009, unpublished document
Creating an enabling environment of the communities to participate in development

One contributory factor to achieving the objectives of the programme is the creation of an enabling environment for rural people to participate in development. This includes construction of new and revitalisation of old infrastructure for socio-economic development, facilitating access to Information and Communication Technology for development and access to information, ensuring access to public amenities and facilities for access to government information and participation in community activities like sports, concerts and debates as a way of strengthening social cohesion and national identity and revitilisation of small towns to be economic hubs.

Social mobilization of rural communities to take initiatives

The second success factor involves social mobilization of rural communities to take initiatives. This includes auditing of community organizations, cooperatives etc. and their strengths and establishing community structures where they do not exist; organizing communities to participate in cooperatives in line with local opportunities; participation of Non Governmental Organisations and Community Based Organisation; mobilizing stakeholders to support community empowerment, and skills development initiatives in line with identified needs and opportunities; empowering communities to be self-reliant and take charge of their destiny through leadership training, social facilitation for socio-economic independence and establishing savings clubs and cooperatives for economic development, wealth creation and productive use of assets.

Management systems

The CRDP proposes a strong management system (Figure 2) consisting of political champions at national and provincial level, technical committees at local government level.
At local level a **Council of Stakeholders** consisting of members of community based organisations, NGOs, social partners, sector departments, local government structures (ward committees and community development workers, traditional institutions) is established to:

- enforce compliance with the conditionalities for the state support to the CRDP beneficiaries;
- ensure compliance to the agreed code of conduct and support the implementation of the disciplinary code and;
- Be responsible for planning and implementation of projects together with the CRDP technical committees and play an oversight and monitoring role.

The council of Stake holders is configured around the government clusters (economic, infrastructure development, governance and admin, justice crime...
prevention and security, social security and community development). Their composition is dependent on the needs and potential and opportunities identified in area and consider inter-sectoral linkages and cross boundary corridors.

Operational Groups of twenty/ Co-operatives/ enterprises are formed to ensure better co-ordination, collaboration, commitment and effectiveness and to ensure that households have technical people to train them and create job opportunities.

**The job creation Model**

Central to the strategy is a job creation model (See Figure 3 below). The rural job creation and skills development model is intended to bring stability and skills to the rural households. It involves profiling households to determine their needs, skills and employability; identification of employment creation opportunities in line with planned interventions (e.g. rural infrastructure projects) and opportunities in neighboring areas; basic technical skills development in line with identified job creation opportunities, placing one member of the household per job on a two-year contract in line with the Expanded Public Works Programme principles and organising communities to participate in cooperative development initiatives and local opportunities. Each employed member contributes 50% percentage of income to households.
Phase 2

- Training & Development
  - Targeted training and development
  - Phase 2:
    - All Group D households each
    - Phase 3:
      - Professional training

- Strategy
  - 2 years

- Terms
  - Training & development:
    - Phase 1: on-the-job training
    - Certified at the end
  - Contribution to household
    - Total contribution for the household of income directly within the first 3 months

- To Do
  - Cost-benefit analysis of needed to establish
  - Identify success and failure factors - mainly technical
  - Opportunity cost analysis - mainly social

- Social Impact
  - Delay child pregnancy by at least 2 years
  - Reduce HIV infections
  - Reduce dependence on social grants
  - Reduce crime, especially petty

- VIBRANT, EQUITABLE AND SUSTAINABLE RURAL COMMUNITIES
  - Phase 1
    - Could be regarded as an incubator or nursery stage of the programme - meaning basic human needs as driver
  - Phase 2
    - Could be regarded as the entrepreneurial development stage - establish large-scale infrastructure development projects
  - Phase 3
    - Could be regarded as the entrepreneurial development stage - deliver small, micro and medium enterprises and village markets

- Implementation
  - Phase 1:
    - Rural livelihood and food security
  - Phase 2:
    - Financial inclusion
    - Agricultural development
    - Cooperatives
    - Value addition (production and marketing)
  - Phase 3:
    - Infrastructure development
    - Small, medium and large enterprises

- Catalyst
  - Phase 1:
    - Financial inclusion
  - Phase 2:
    - Cooperatives
    - Value addition (production and marketing)
  - Phase 3:
    - Infrastructure development
    - Small, medium and large enterprises

- Conclusion
  - Production development in both sectors
  - Financial assistance
  - Technical support
  - Access to markets and inputs
  - Collaborative efforts with community and NGOs

- Outputs
  - Improved livelihoods
  - Enhanced food security
  - Job creation
  - Entrepreneurship development
  - Addressing gender inequalities

- Outcomes
  - Improved health
  - Enhanced education
  - Reduced poverty
  - Increased economic growth

- Impact
  - Sustainable and replicable
  - Socially inclusive
  - Environmentally sustainable

- Lessons Learned
  - Importance of community engagement
  - Need for strong leadership
  - Importance of partnerships
  - Need for continuous monitoring and evaluation

- Recommendations
  - Strengthen institutional capacity
  - Enhance capacity building
  - Increase funding for projects
  - Establish partnerships with other stakeholders
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- References
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  - Annexes to provide additional information

- Glossary
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- Glossary
  - Glossary of terms
Para-development specialists are created at ward level in order to identify and take advantage of economic and social opportunities. They are empowered to train and mentor individuals and groups as required to ensure access to employment opportunities, and to work with other state agencies to identify economic opportunities and needs. A strong link is forged between the development specialists, extension services and the main agencies involved in development work in each region.

Phase One of this model is regarded as an incubator, where the main driver is “meeting the basic needs”. Phase two is seen as the entrepreneurial development stage characterized by the development of medium to large scale infrastructure. Phase three shall see the emergence of rural industrial and financial sectors marked by small, micro and medium enterprises and village markets. Although development does not always follow the steps in chronological order, the phases can be closely illustrated through the diagram below.

**Decent Employment through Inclusive & Diversified Economic Growth**

It would be unrealistic to assume that all jobs and opportunities will be created through the CRDP initiatives. The success of the model will depend on public private partnerships. The question to stakeholders (government and private sector) will be “how many employment opportunities will be created through the planned interventions and how many of the planned interventions and jobs are targeted to the identified rural spaces and beneficiaries?”

The main changes after 1994 involved the effort to restructure government support systems toward African smallholders and away from the narrow focus on commercial farms. At the same time, government had to maintain support for commercial farming, which remains the main source of agricultural production for both domestic use and for exports.

While agriculture is one of the main drivers of the rural economy, empirical evidence suggests that opportunities are also created in tourism; government services; construction; manufacturing and mining in selected locations and retail. In some rural areas, tourism can be one of the few non-farm sectors offering competitive advantage.

In its economic sector cluster and employment programme of action government has placed emphasis on employment creation and decent work while continuing to lay the basis for long-term competitive growth. The interventions include supporting labour-absorbing sectors (agricultural value chain, tourism, public sector etc.) geared more to domestic and regional markets as central to expanding employment; Continuing to support dynamic industries and economic diversification including knowledge intensive and green industries; greater mobilisation of
domestic resources for developmental aims, with reduced dependence on short-term capital inflows to fund investment; implementing the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme that encompasses support for rural development in economic and social terms and increasing investment in human capital particularly through education, skills development and health care. All spheres of government as well as state-owned enterprises and Development Finance Institutions (DFIs) are obliged to support these aims consistently and strongly.

In February government approved the second Industrial Policy Action Plan (IPAP2) (Government of South Africa, 2010). Its purpose is to expand production in value-added sectors with high employment and growth multipliers that compete in export markets as well in the domestic market against imports. The action plan also places emphasis on more labour absorbing production and services sectors, the increased participation of historically disadvantaged people in the economy will facilitate, in the medium term, South Africa’s contribution to industrial development in the African region.

Procurement legislation, regulations and practices will be revised in order to enable the designation of large, strategic and repeat or ‘fleet’ procurements in a range of sectors. The objective is to sequentially increase competitive local procurement and supplier development opportunities, minimise ‘leakages’ from the domestic economy and support meaningful Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment (B-BBEE) in all three spheres of government and in state owned enterprises (SOEs).

Sectors like metals fabrication, capital and transport equipment, green and energy saving industries and agro-processing, will be qualitatively new areas of focus of industrial policy. The plan will also build on and broaden interventions in sectors such as automotives and components, medium and heavy vehicles, plastics, pharmaceuticals and chemicals, clothing, textiles, footwear and leather, bio-fuels, forestry, paper, pulp and furniture, cultural industries and tourism and business process services (or call centres.) It is estimated that the IPAP 11 will result in the creation of 2 477 000 direct and indirect decent jobs over the next ten years.

Additional interventions include leveraging public sector for employment creation and strengthening and diversifying the Tourism sector to be competitive and support creation of decent work.

The development and maintenance of school and community gardens will create additional jobs for adult community members but more importantly provide much needed nutrition and contribute to increasing food security initiatives. The school gardens programme has the potential to lead to other livelihood opportunities such as the production of seeds, seedlings and manure as well as mentorship opportunities.
Lessons learnt to date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current sites</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 wards in eight provinces</td>
<td>to document and refine lessons in order to inform policy development</td>
<td>160 wards by 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous integrated sustainable rural development municipalities consisting of 641 wards</td>
<td>These are mainly former homeland areas where work has been going on since 2001. The comprehensive rural development programme builds on the lessons learnt in these areas</td>
<td>Intensify work done in these areas using the CRDP model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 wards and 150000 households under the War on Poverty Campaign</td>
<td>To attack poverty at household level</td>
<td>1128 by 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of rural development and transformation must be flexible as rural spaces, their characteristics, needs, required interventions and opportunities are not the same. What is important is to develop guiding approaches and principles that can be adapted to suit local needs and conditions.

Rural poverty cannot only be attacked at spatial level as this tends to miss needs at household level. Lessons from the sites show that poverty and low literacy levels contribute to lack of self-confidence that is key to attending community meetings and articulating needs. It is therefore important to augment interventions that are directed to the space with those that are directed to households.

Solutions for rural economy cannot be always found in a rural space that is being serviced. It is therefore important to identify opportunities and ensure linkages with other spaces in the proximity, including identifying linkages with the urban spaces.

Formal institutions for public participation are not effective in rural areas due to the vastness of the areas, distances and cost of travelling to the central point. The lowest average population per ward is 7000 and a ward can sometimes consist of 3 or more villages. This therefore has raised a need for institutions at village level that feed to the formal structures.

The government system highlights a need for intergovernmental relations and coordination. If not handled carefully, this can contribute to neglecting the most important stakeholder, the community, as discussions on development take place in the boardroom. It is against this background that the CRDP introduced the unit that deals with social, technical and institutional facilitation.
The ideal situation is to partner with municipalities in implementing interventions related to rural transformation. Lessons from the sites, however, indicate that rural municipalities themselves lack capacity and financial resources calling for national and provincial government to provide them with support. The question to be answered therefore is whether rural economies transformation specialist should spend time capacitating municipalities to deliver.

Although the constitution provides for support to municipalities, lessons from the Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Programme caution against this in favour of partnering with municipalities. Reasons for cautioning include the fact that there are specific departments that have a responsibility of supporting, capacitating and coordinating the work of the municipalities and that supporting municipalities tend to distract rural development specialists from the key mandate i.e. improving rural spaces and the quality of life and economies in the space. Strategies for doing away with this long established culture should be developed. Such support should therefore be on request.

Finally due to the history of the country there seems to be no understanding from the broader public of the difference between rural development and the land reform programme calling for an aggressive communication campaign to define the relationship between the two. Failure to do so will lead to the programme being viewed as a failure.

**Improving Government Performance and enforcement mechanisms**

The Monitoring and Evaluation Ministry in the Presidency initiated the process of defining outcomes and measurable outputs. Diverse range of performance measurement and management instruments, internal and external to Government were proposed. The measures include strengthening of internal government systems, enhanced citizen oversight and robust engagement with service delivery partners. It serves as a mechanism for guiding the direction of policy implementation, places emphasis on accountability throughout the service delivery chain and serves to assess individual and collectives, evaluate an institution’s effectiveness and assess the validity of a policy (Government of South Africa, 2010).

The following 12 outcomes, backed by measurable outputs and key activities to achieve these outputs, were approved:

1. Quality basic education
2. A long and healthy life for all South Africans
3. All people in South Africa are and feel safe
4. Decent employment through inclusive economic growth
5. Skilled and capable workforce to support an inclusive growth path
6. An efficient, competitive and responsive economic infrastructure

7. **Vibrant equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security for all**

8. Sustainable human settlement and improved quality of household life

9. And efficient, effective and development oriented public service and an empowered fair and inclusive citizenship

10. Enhance and protect our environmental assets and natural resources

11. Responsive, accountable, effective and efficient Local Government system

Outcome 7: “Vibrant equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security for all” is in line with the vision of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme. However, due to the fact that rural development is a cross cutting programme, all the other outcomes listed above contribute to the achievement of outcome seven calling for coordination and integration of implementation plans of all the stakeholders.

The responsibility for coordinating and managing the process of translating outcomes into delivery agreements for each outcome is assigned to a Minister or a group of Ministers in order to ensure one point of accountability. These Ministers constitute a Delivery Forum that negotiates terms of delivery including timelines and funding requirements and establish funding agreements, report six monthly to the President and review agreements to assess if changes are required. The departure point is the outcome, the outputs and the activities required for each sector, focusing on:

- designing and agreeing on the implementation process
- Delivery strategy, accountability, governance mechanisms and consultation processes
- specifying and agreeing on what each agency or institution undertakes to implement within specific time frames and budget in line with their mandate and accountability
- agreements on information gathering on outputs and outcomes for monitoring and evaluation purposes

Once the delivery agreement is finalized a Cabinet Cluster is set up to manage coordination and implementation of the outcome

At implementation level government officials who have a direct responsibility to implement the interventions constitute Official’s Implementation Clusters co chaired by the Presidency and the lead department. They do joint planning to operationalise the delivery agreements, address the identified needs, assign responsibilities and allocate resources (both financial and technical).
How it works:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet Cluster</th>
<th>Officials implementation cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of the Presidency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on outcomes</td>
<td>Overseen by two Ministers in the Presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor progress and iron out bottle necks</td>
<td>Presidency is secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure supporting actions across the relevant parties</td>
<td>• Prepare regular data report cards detailing progress against targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table reports to Cabinet on bimonthly basis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Presidency 2010)

Benefits

- Inter-sectoral and inter-sphere coordination and integration
- All spheres play a defined role and work together in a coherent manner
- Channelling resources and funding from all three spheres of government, external stakeholders and agencies to identified rural sites
- Enforcement from the highest level
- Unlike in the past integration does not only end at planning level but also cascades to implementation level
Illustration of the functioning of the delivery forum
Conclusion:

Achieving the required change transformation in rural areas requires an integrated and phased approach that can systematically transform the economic and social systems that keep rural communities in a poverty trap and move them to an improved quality of life.

In the short term, it is easier to improve basic services, expand public employment schemes and substantially reform the land tenure system as a way to improve incomes and enhance social cohesion. In the long term, the critical components of education and training combined with the development of new economic production systems must empower rural people and enable them to generate their own incomes.

The 1997 Rural Development Framework states: “Rural development is everybody's business. This captures the multi-sectoral nature of the enterprise and the notion that rural development is the business of rural people, that they should set the agenda, the priorities and the methods to achieve them. If structures that support rural people’s initiatives are set up, we will avoid perception that rural development is nobody's business (Government of South Africa, 1997:10).”
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