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Abstract

Historically, neither the public nor private sugar industry in South Africa had the resources to provide an effective extension service for the small-scale sugarcane farmers. In 1996, the South Africa Sugar Association proposed to join forces with the Department of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs to form a private/public partnership called the “Joint Venture” (JV). A more suitable and appropriate extension service to the more than 46,000 small-scale sugarcane farmers was sought using the combined resources of the two organisations. A review of this relationship was conducted in 2002, six years since the inception of the partnership, to determine the extent to which the two principal organisations were able to meet their objectives. The methodology employed in the review of the Joint Venture after orientation included literature review, group and individual interviews, and field visits.

Sugarcane production and small-scale farmers’ incomes from sugarcane have increased since the implementation of the JV, which has been largely attributed to more land in production, better distribution of improved varieties, improved communication flow to the farmers, and increased skills and motivations of the extension agents. There has been a substantial contribution to rural development and capacity building in the communities served by the JV. The partnership has not only been responsible for the transfer of technical knowledge and information but has encouraged a positive attitude change in farmers and service providers alike. Field technicians have shown a remarkable transformation and developed increased capability and credibility as a result of this Joint Venture.
Introduction

South Africa is a country of diversity, which has recently emerged from a position of separateness, based on race and culture, to one that has had to participate in a global society since 1994. Historically, people of different groups were compelled by laws to have separate health and education facilities, and even were required to live in designated areas and therefore there was little opportunity for social, cultural, and professional exchange. The post apartheid period of growth has provided opportunities for reparation and reform that is encouraging unity and inclusion in many areas. South Africa is now a successful world model of political, cultural, and social reform, having been on the brink of civil revolt and anarchy less than 10 years ago.

Edmund Morewood established the first sugarcane fields in the KwaZulu-Natal province in 1848 with the first shipment of sugar following in 1853. The first black owned steam mill was established in 1865. The predominantly white, commercial growers established the Experiment Station (SASEX) in 1925 as the research division of the South African Sugar Association (SASA) (Anon 2001/2003). The primary objective of this research center continues to be the development of new varieties with specific characteristics of high sucrose and disease resistance. Previously, growers paid a levy to SASA on every ton of cane produced and sugar millers paid a levy on every ton of sugar processed. These funds have been used to provide development of research, marketing, and extension. However, these growers were primarily white, commercial producers. Black small-scale growers became a contributing entity to the mills in the early 1970’s. The provision of the informational needs of these rural growers was the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture and Environment Affairs (DAEA). Unfortunately, the DAEA extension had little access to current research and production information even though the black small-scale growers were contributing to the SASA levy.

In 1994, the apartheid government was replaced in a democratic election process. Also in 1994, as a result of deregulation measures within the sugar industry, there was a change in the funding of extension services to sugar growers; specifically, the millers were no longer willing to contribute to the funding of extension. Therefore, commercial growers decided to pay for extension on a tonnage basis through an additional extension levy to support SASA. SASA still did not have sufficient resources to provide an effective extension service for the emerging small-scale grower sector, which continued to be the responsibility of DAEA. However SASA, did make their research facilities available to all growers.

At the same time, SASEX approached the Department of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs (DAEA) to form a partnership for the provision of extension services to the 46,000 small-scale growers, recognizing their importance to the industry. The original 1995 Joint Venture agreement required that the SASEX extension and the DAEA extension structures interact to create a vehicle to deliver sugarcane extension to the Small-Scale Growers (SSG) in the province. The Joint Venture agreement operates with four SASEX Sugar Extension Specialists, (SES) and 36 DAEA Agricultural Technicians (AT). The SASEX staffs provide the technical expertise and the DAEA provide the AT. The partnership requires a financial
obligation from both parties. The DAEA is contributing staff costs for the 36 AT. The four extension specialists are paid staff of SASEX, but half of their costs are recovered from the DAEA by agreement in the JV contract. The DAEA is to provide all administrative materials and services to allow the specialists to operate efficiently. Administratively, AT are required to report to the DAEA Heads of districts, who are their immediate supervisors. The SASEX Sugar extension specialists operate in an advisory capacity and do not have any official managerial function over the AT’s. Technicians do work very closely with the SASEX specialists who report back into the Sugar Industry structures.

Although the initial purpose, and one of the continuing purposes of the Joint Venture (JV), is to improve sugarcane production, the impetus for pushing sugarcane production amongst the various stakeholders are as varied as the stakeholders themselves. The DAEA and SASEX the formal partners in the JV are encouraged and motivated to improve sugarcane production among all sugarcane producers in the province, concerned about improving the profit or economic bottom-line of their producers and to improve the social situation within the province. There are also several informal partners in this JV including Mill staff, the Commercial Growers, the Medium-Scale Indian Growers, Mill Cane Committees, Farmers Organizations, Input suppliers, Contractors and the Tribal Authorities, or Municipalities. These informal partners have many and varied reasons for wanting the Joint Venture to succeed. Yet, the common thread that brings them all together is to improve the production of sugarcane in the region, providing a social and economic stability to rural producers and hence provide stable and improved living conditions of all involved.

Growing Pains
There are essentially three groups of sugarcane farmers in South Africa: commercial farmers on titled land of 30 hectares and more; freehold farmers farming on titled land of often less than 30 hectares in size; and small-scale farmers farming on tribal trust land without ownership. The term ‘small-scale’ is used for land holdings of less than 30 hectares and may include both freehold titled land and tribal land. Most of the small-scale sugarcane farmers are farming on ‘Ngonyama’ tribal trust land without freehold title and have, on average, holdings of less than one hectare planted to sugarcane. The history of small-scale sugarcane farmers in the sugar industry is one of exponential growth in both numbers and production, from 1.3 million tons cane produced 10 years ago, to 3.1 million tons today (Anon 1992/3 – 2001/2). The number of small-scale sugarcane farmers rose from 43 000 in 1992 to 48 000 in 2002, see Table 1. The small-scale farmer contribution to the total South African sugarcane crop increased from 10% in 1992 to 15% in 2002 and this figure was as high as 18% in 1997.
Table 1: Numbers and Production figures of Small-scale Growers (1991 – 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th># of Small-scale growers</th>
<th># SSG delivering cane</th>
<th>Total tons by SSG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991/92</td>
<td>41359</td>
<td>21234</td>
<td>1926027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
<td>44991</td>
<td>20816</td>
<td>1198454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>52746</td>
<td>23488</td>
<td>2545210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>52106</td>
<td>27886</td>
<td>4073955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/2000</td>
<td>51439</td>
<td>30370</td>
<td>3104559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The JV agreement required that the SASEX extension and DAEA extension structures to interact to deliver sugarcane extension (Anon 1996). Some understanding of both structures is required in order to appreciate the constraints under which the Joint Venture has operated. SASEX is a non-profit, private organisation and has a flat management structure with a high level of accountability on budget. Heads of Departments have substantial autonomy and report to their respective divisional Directors only. Conversely, the DAEA has a rigid empirical structure with all accountability being at the senior levels only. There is a system of administration that requires considerable effort and time delays between initiation and delivery. There are Sub Directorates that offer a support service to the regions, but these are often bureaucratic in nature with little autonomy, not allowing for efficiency or effectiveness. This system varies little from that which operates in many national public sectors around the world and is in contrast to the structure and accountability and reporting of the private sector.

It appears that many of the reoccurring problems revolve around the issue of the JV partnership trying to work between two different management systems - one with a low level of professional accountability and the other with a strong culture of accountability. This review was initiated by SASA.

**Purpose and Objectives**

A review of this unique partnership between public and private extension services was undertaken in 2002 to assess the impact it has had on the delivery of extension to the SSG during the implementation period of August 1996 to August 2001. Other areas of impact to be reviewed include the effectiveness of both the SASEX and DAEA structures, and the impact on grower and miller structures and operations (Anon 2000-2001). The review will also explore the question: “Has the DAEA been able to deliver a better extension service to the SSG of KwaZulu-Natal through the Joint Venture than it would have independently?”

It was also necessary to benchmark the Joint Venture through peer review for future reference so that it would have credibility if the model were to be adopted for use in other sectors of government. As the success of the Joint Venture mainly depends on the SASA Extension Specialists and the DAEA Agriculture Technicians, their roles and contributions to the Joint Venture needed to be examined. Specific questions/issues to be examined included:

- Training needs of the SASA Extension Specialists and the DAEA AT.
- Do the RD&E Committees in each mill area serve as an effective form of communication?
• What is the effectiveness of the refresher courses provided by SASEX for the AT?
• How do the AT’s interact with the Small-scale growers? How can the credibility of the AT be increased with the Small-scale growers?
• What is the adequacy of the higher-level administration in providing supervision, goal setting and communication?
• Has the JV added value to the extension activities of the sugar milling companies?
• Has the DAEA been able to deliver a better extension service to the Small-scale growers of KwaZulu-Natal through the JV than it would have independently?

Methodology

Ten days prior to starting the JV review, the Reviewing Officer, (RO) met with the Principal Extension Officer (PEO), SASEX to review the programme of visits and background documentation to the JV, including information on the structures of SASEX and DAEA. The PEO and Head of the Extension department, SASEX conducted an orientation and tour of the SASEX facilities, and a presentation reviewing the background of the sugar industry. This preliminary information allowed the reviewing officer to develop a focus for the interviews. The interviews were open in design but also allowed for some directed questions on the implementation of the JV.

The interviews were conducted over a two-week period with approximately 140 participants. The interview participants were assured of confidentiality in that the specific remarks from their interviews would not be circulated. This approach was taken to allow for more freedom in volunteering information and honest opinions on the operation of the JV Agreement. Interviews were initiated with open-ended questions, followed with leading or summarising questions, especially if no negative comments were forthcoming. Interviews often begun by asking first for an explanation of background information on the individuals professional experience, their perceptions of the Joint Venture and then became more directed in inquiring about the specifics of the Joint Venture.

Interviews were conducted of all relevant stakeholders regardless of their extent of involvement in the JV activities. The primary stakeholders are members of SASEX and DAEA. However, the JV activities also impact upon and are affected by Mill staff and Local Cane Growers Associations and included: Mill extension staff, SASEX Extension Officers, SASA staff, DAEA Agriculture Technicians (AT), DAEA Heads of Districts (HOD), Small-Scale Growers (SSG), Medium Scale Growers, Commercial Growers (CG), Local Cane Growers Associations, Mill Cane Committee members (MCC), DAEA Regional Directors (RD), and Mill Cane Committee Development Officers (DO). Informal discussions and briefings were also held with senior staff from both signatory organisations to the JV.

Results

Introduction

Even with little background information on which to model this activity, it was evident that there have been great strides made in meeting the objective of improving extension delivery to the small-scale rural farmers over a relatively short period of time. The JV seems to have
not only made inroads into improving sugar production among the SSGs and improving capacity of the technicians, the members of the MCC and even mill extension staff, but also changing attitudes of these stakeholders towards government extension services. In terms of rural development, human capacity building, advancements in agriculture production, and changes in attitudes towards extension, enormous gains have been made in a short 5-6 year time period.

**Structure: Information Flow**

Prior to the development of the JV, information to the farmers or SSG was coming in an uncoordinated fashion not only from DAEA and SASEX but also from Mill staff, Contractors and Input suppliers. Now with the JV structure in place, the SSG have noted that they are getting their information in a more organized manner. In achieving its objective of improving extension services to SSG, the JV has had a substantive impact on the flow of information both from researchers to the farmer and from the farmer to the researchers, primarily through the development of a separate communication structure that incorporates some of the structural characteristics of both partners. The main structure in this new communication flow is the Research, Development and Extension committees (RD&E). Both partners of the JV bring their relative strengths to the information flow. SASEX is stronger in providing sugarcane production information, while the DAEA is stronger in providing rural development information, which is equally important to the SSG, and this coordination of production and development information is vital for success of the SSG.

What is important to note is that the structure of the JV is somehow separate from the two partners while both partners are able to feed information into the new communication structure, see Figure 1. It is important to note that the information flowing to the farmers is now coming from the JV in a unified fashion and not from two independently acting stakeholders. And as indicated by the diagram, the JV also allows for better information flow from the farmers (SSG) to both of the JV partners.

![Diagram of information flow from Joint Venture to farmers](image-url)
The above diagram characterizes some important components of the unique structure established by the JV. Additionally, in some locations, the Mill staff members are contributing their information into this new communication structure and are delivering information in coordination with the partners of the JV. The enthusiasm of the SSG to improve sugarcane production is highest in areas where the information flow is coordinated between DAEA, SASEX and Mill staff. And in some of the best cases, the RD&E committees are working to bring the Contractors and Input suppliers into this communication structure. This improvement of information delivery is one of the best things about the JV noted by the SSG and MCC. Once a communication structure is developed and implemented for delivery of information to rural farmers, other stakeholders can use this structure for information delivery.

Structure - Meetings & Reporting
The monthly Research, Development and Extension meetings (RD&E) at each mill is a good example of how the formal and informal partners of the JV are able to come together under the umbrella of the JV to discuss common problems and issues and improve information flow to the SSG. The meetings are scheduled on a monthly basis and attended by members of SASEX, Mill extension, DAEA, Farmer representatives, the local Development Officer (DO) and other invited developers or supply agents.

Participants who attend the monthly RD&E meetings find them to be constructive, useful and worthwhile. It is during these meetings that all the extension staff - SASEX, DAEA and Mill - can explain their work plans and discuss common areas of relevance. In this way, the extension work carried out in the field with the common audience of SSG, is thus delivered in a coordinated and more effective arrangement. It is interesting that the groups that have an active RD&E committee have fewer problems with implementing the JV, because they are able to deal with problems and issues on an on-going basis. Groups not holding these RD&E meetings have lists of problems with sugarcane production in their areas, and one group that has not been meeting for some time has requested that the RD&E meetings should resume. It is important to note that the locations where the SSG are experiencing the best improvements in sugarcane production and income are also the locations where the RD&E committees are meeting regularly with full participation of the stakeholders.

Structure - Extension Materials
In addition to the JV structure, the improvement of information flow can also be attributed to the development of better extension materials. The poster training modules and “Zulu” vernacular newsletters developed by the SASEX team are greatly appreciated by all stakeholders. The development of these materials is done in collaboration with the sugar extension specialists (SES) and agricultural technicians (AT). The small-scale growers report that the field sessions are more informative and interesting with the posters and they are more likely to attend the training sessions now.

There is overwhelming support for the posters by the AT. The technicians report that the information available to them via the posters is excellent, although sometimes the posters may have too many words and too few pictures. The scripts provided to the technicians with the posters were also appreciated aiding in the consistency of information delivery.
However, sometimes AT need to deliver the same extension message repeatedly to the same group which is boring using the same methodology each time.

Stakeholders - Small-Scale Growers
As a direct result of the implementation of JV partnership agreement, the number of SSG has increased and the SSG have increased their sugarcane yields from 28 tons/ha to 39 tons/ha during the time period reviewed, see Figure 2. There has also been an increase in the horizontal production of sugarcane as many more hectares are being developed in the tribal trust land areas. More farmers have gone into sugarcane production since the inception of the JV, partly because of the guaranteed market and improved technical services, see Figure 3. Black farmers (primarily SSG) who were previously denied land ownership can now acquire land by way of redistribution of state owned land by the national government. Also, a land sale market has been created in the traditional white commercial area where any farmer can purchase title to this land through the willing buyer/willing seller principal. It has been observed that black farmers who purchase large farms are now welcomed as commercial sugarcane farmers and receive their extension services from SASEX with the other commercial growers.

Figure 2. Yield per Unit Area for SSG over 20 years
Where the JV has been successful, it has created an atmosphere of hope amongst the small-scale sugarcane growers. And this is no small thing in the development world. The SSG are producing more sugarcane with higher sugar content and hence earning more money from their sugarcane production than they had prior to this reform in extension delivery. As a result, these growers are hopeful of further improvements in their management, production and monetary returns of their sugarcane fields. In addition, their neighboring farmers are also becoming interested in the information and technology being offered by the technicians as a means to improving their income from sugarcane. Growers are now hopeful that their economic position and that of their families will improve. It would be destructive to both the social and economic development of the province to remove the structure and support of the JV at this time.

When growers were asked what they would do if their AT was reassigned to a different area, they replied that they would simply get another technician. Hence, it has been questioned that perhaps the JV is creating a dependency of the SSG upon extension services, which may be true to some degree. However, when considering the role of extension in rural development, this is probably as it should be, initially. Ideally the AT should be the link to bring the relevant information and skills to the SSG and stimulate development within rural communities. As the farmers and groups improve their skills and as the members of these communities recognize the value of what the AT is offering, they should begin to demand more of this type of information and service. The farmers and groups should begin to develop more organizational and leadership skills (through the RD&E) so as to be able to access the required information on their own accord. The fact that some of the SSG within the JV are already demanding more involvement and information (bookkeeping, market
gardening, and syndicate farming) from the AT is a very healthy sign that they are already looking to take more control of their own development.

**Stakeholders - Agriculture Technicians**

There is an observable difference in the enthusiasm levels of the AT, which can be directly correlated to the success of the JV in their particular area. In places where the JV is working well, the ATs are fully committed to their work. These ATs were appreciative of the training and support afforded them through the JV, in particular, the junior and senior sugarcane certificate training courses offered by SASEX. The ATs appreciate the monthly refresher courses and the training materials provided to them. They acknowledge that by their involvement with the JV, they receive priority travel for their work programmes. Overall, it can be said that the AT are empowered and encouraged to do their jobs well. Some of the more enthusiastic AT refer to the SASEX research station as 'our' research station, even though they are employed by DAEA, denoting a sense of ownership.

Conversely, in areas where the JV is not quite so successful, the ATs are not motivated to do their jobs well. When asked about the RD&E meetings, there are many excuses as to why these meetings were not occurring. These AT are not visiting their SSG; are not delivering many field sessions; do not have many observation plots; and do not often travel to the monthly refresher courses. It is possible that these AT do not have the necessary support of their Heads of Districts to motivate them to perform well.

Two additional issues raised by the AT are transparency and accountability. AT do not understand the responsibilities of the different stakeholders, nor who pays the salaries of the various members of the JV. AT also are not sure what the contribution of their efforts could mean in real or perceived benefits to their professional development. The technicians are unclear as to the reporting structure of the JV. Most view the reports as only additional workload, not identifying the reports as being useful to their own work programme or their own professional development. The selection of DAEA technicians for involvement in the JV is uncoordinated and unclear. There should be more transparency in the establishment of selection criteria and guidelines for removal or changing of a low performing AT.

**Stakeholders - Head of Districts**

All technicians are required to prepare monthly progress reports, but only those in the JV do so with any regularity, primarily due to the additional supervision of the SASEX Sugar Extension Specialists. The Heads of Districts (HOD) of the DAEA, indicate that these reports make their workload much easier to manage as they are better informed of the work of their AT. A few of the HODs are trying to instill this same reporting principal and format for all of the technicians involved in other disciplines and commodities in their districts. This is a case of the structure of the JV partnership having a positive impact on the reporting structure of the public extension system. However, this issue of supervision of the JV AT seems to be a sensitive issue and some HOD are not willing to relinquish any of their administrative authority over their AT. It has been documented that in the areas where the HOD is receptive to administrative support from SASA, the RD&E functions better and the sugarcane production has improved.
Stakeholders - Informal Partners
The Mill extension staff members are generally supportive of the JV agreement and view the improved delivery of extension information as a way to make their own jobs of cane procurement easier. Since the Mill extension staff can avail upon the communication structure of the JV, this frees up some of the time of the Mill extension staff to focus on coordinating the delivery of the sugarcane to the mill. The JV structure, specifically the RD&E meetings and newsletter, allows the Mill extension staff to disseminate their own information to the SSG more timely and effectively. Many of the Mill extension staff members have undergone the SASEX junior and senior level certificate training courses, as have the ATs. Often the Mill extension staff members report that through their involvement with the JV, they have a more positive reception from the SSG in the field. They attribute this attitude change to the fact that they are part of the process of delivering coordinated information to the SSG who appreciates the fact that they are no longer receiving confusing or conflicting extension messages.

The Mill Cane Committee (a local body representing the farmers within the sugar industry) employs the Development Officers (DO) at each mill. The DO provides the administrative connection to local growers organizations. The DO facilitates the taking of MCC minutes, prepares agendas and arranges the training as required by each group. The DO is a key link between the resources of the JV and the SSG. In some areas the DO is very effective in promoting the development of the SSG and sugarcane production. However, there are reports of some DO who are manipulative and self-serving. In these cases, the MCC are not very enthusiastic about the potential of the JV in their mill area.

Implications and Application

General
This JV has not only made inroads into improving sugar production among the SSG and improving capacity of the technicians, members of the MCC and mill extension staff, but also changing attitudes of these stakeholders about government (public) extension services. Government is now seen as a partner and not a single service provider, and this is a positive change. As mentioned by one of the government officials, “The JV is not pushing sugar, it is pushing development”. And this may be one of the most convincing and pervasive strengths of this JV partnership when looking to the future.

Structure
The extension messages delivered by the JV are technically sound and widely appreciated. Most of the extension messages and materials developed to date have come from SASEX, with input from the HOD and AT. Although they greatly appreciate the posters, they indicated that they sometimes feel constrained by the posters and the accompanying scripts. The technicians stated that they would like to explore other means of communicating the same message to their growers groups, but still maintaining the consistency of delivery.

One use of extension materials that is clearly appreciated by the farmers and technicians alike is the “Ingede” newsletter produced four times a year in the local “Zulu” language. Although useful and highly requested, it is relatively costly. An alternative recommendation is to
consider the creation of a one-page newsletter or bulletin that would be less expensive than the “Ingede” and allow all SSG something tangible to take home as a reminder of the topic.

The Mill extension staff members highly recommend the continuation of the Observation Plots. These plots allow the SSG to critically select sugarcane varieties best adapted to their growing conditions and encourage farmer-to-farmer interactions.

As the JV continues to evolve and mature, the improved information channels and communication structures developed to improve distribution of sugarcane management and technical information could be utilized in the future to address economic and social concerns of the sugarcane grower groups.

**Stakeholders**

Technicians have a greater recognition and status level in DAEA and communities by way of the corporate identity shirts worn by technicians, the refresher courses, and the priority travel arrangements given them in their districts. Many have suggested that AT could be better motivated with new shirts, which would better indicate the partnership involvement of the JV team. It is also suggested that the issue of reporting be clearly addressed to the AT. The AT need to be better briefed on their reporting responsibilities. In addition, they need to be made aware of the opportunities for professional development that may arise as a consequence of completing their reports. Along the same line of improving communication among the AT, there should be some forum or structure in place allowing the technicians to interact with each other outside the supervision of DAEA or SASEX. They could benefit from a period of time to freely share Programme of Work problems and solutions their to.

It was mentioned during a couple of the interviews that although the technicians were improving, were more knowledgeable and credible, perhaps it would be better if they were actually growers themselves. This comment came from both SSG and mill staff members. Some thought that this would indeed give the technicians more credibility with the growers. However, others were strongly against the idea, saying that the AT would then be spending too much time on their own fields and not doing their jobs as extension technicians, leading to a conflict of interests. It was also speculated that part of the value of the observation fields is that they are done by farmers and therefore doable by other farmers. However, another possible approach to this situation would be to utilize model farmers or farmer promoters.

In some places, the role of the Development Officer was being abused to the detriment of the success of the JV. It has been suggested that management of MCC finances become the responsibility of the MCC (a group) instead of the DO (an individual). This would allow the farmers to have more input into how the funds of the MCC are spent. The SSG might request more training opportunities from the SES and AT if they had control of their funds. It is recommended that whoever has responsibility of MCC funds should provide clear and transparent records of these funds to the local associations and possibly also to the RD&E.

Another informal partner in the improvement of sugarcane production are the farm labourers and contractors/haulers. Some of the Mill extension staff members are of the view that it is ineffectual to train SSG, as it is not the SSG themselves, but rather hired farm labourers who
are doing the farm work. These Mill extension staff may not want to cooperate with the JV because they believe the JV is focusing on the wrong target group, SSG. Whatever the answer, the labourers are part of the equation. The JV has not yet dealt with the training of farm labourers and contractors/haulers.

Training and Education
Farmers raised the need for more information and skills in group work (syndicate farming), bookkeeping skills (farming as a business) and market gardening (other crops to provide an income when there is no income from sugarcane). This is a strong indication that these farmers, the local associations and MCC are looking to take more control of their own development. As such, the JV is going to have to become more involved in the development of rural development extension messages, where growers have more control over the development of these messages.

Although the technical information contained within the training posters is conveyed in the field, often the delivery is lecture oriented. The SASA and DAEA extension staff could benefit from more training on extension delivery methods. It might be useful to explore other delivery methods such as songs, contests, drama groups, or radio as a few examples.

For the JV to be successful, it is critical to have the support of the HOD and an operating RD&E with active involvement of the MCC (either the DO or key contact growers). In areas where the JV is not yet fully operational or successful, it might be useful to use 'study tours' of key people, such as HOD or Tribal Leaders, to areas where the JV is operating successfully. It is highly recommended that the tours of the SASEX research station continue for just this reason, to build the support of supervisory staff and key decision makers in the communities.
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