



**THE PRESIDENCY  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

**DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

Enquiries: Tsakani Ngomane 012 312 0112, E-mail: Tsakani@po-dpme.gov.za

Mdu Shabane,  
Director General  
Department of Rural Development & Land Reform  
Private Bag X833  
Pretoria  
0001

Dear Mdu,

**RECAPITALISATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME EVALUATION ON THE NEP 2012/13**

As you know the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and ourselves have been collaborating on an implementation evaluation of the Recapitalisation and Development Programme which was approved in the National Evaluation Plan of 2012 to 2013.

The final report was approved by the Evaluation Steering Committee on the 29 October 2013. This is an approval that the evaluation is technically sound and that there are no factual errors, not necessarily agreeing with the content. I attach a copy of the Final Report. The recommendations have been extracted and are shown in Table 1 in Annex 1.

The next stages in the evaluation are to obtain a formal management response from the departments involved about the content, particularly the recommendations. To this end, I would like to invite you to respond officially within 30 days on 1 December 2013, endorsing or disagreeing with the combined recommendations in the attached table in Annex 1. To simplify this process could you endorse each recommendation (handwriting is fine) and indicate a substantive explanation if you disagree in the column provided. Then please initial each page and sign indicating your endorsement of the table as completed by you.

We will start the process of an independent quality assessment of the evaluation, which is based on the evaluation standards that DPME has developed.

After the 30 days the Final Report and Management Response will be presented immediately to the relevant cluster and thence to Cabinet for approval. After approval it will go up on the DPME website and be sent to the portfolio committees. Please let us know should you have any security concerns about a particular section of the report.

Within 4 months of approval of the Final Report by the Steering Committee (ideally sooner), the Department with DPME will then develop an Improvement Plan based on the agreed finding. I also attach a guideline on developing an Improvement Plan.

Kind regards

**Dr Sean Phillips  
Director-General**

Date: 01/11/13

**Signed**

---

**Mr Mdu Shabane**  
**Director-General**  
**Department of Rural Development and Land Reform**  
**Date:**

Cc Dr Tsakani Ngomane, Outcome Facilitator for Outcome 7, DPME  
Cc Dr Ian Goldman, Head: Evaluation and Research, DPME  
Cc Dr Vusi Mahlangu, DDG, DRDLR  
Cc Ms Mmakgomo Tshatsinde, Chief Director, DRDLR

Attached:

Final report on the evaluation

Annex 1: Table showing recommendations

# Annex 1

Table 1: Recommendations and management response

	RECORD OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT	REASONS FOR DISAGREEMENT
1. Strengthening RECAP is a second-best solution. The best and lasting solution would entail a <b>redesign and overhaul of all public agricultural support programmes and doing away with existing silos</b> of funding agricultural support services. This would entail the establishment of an all-inclusive fund to support land acquisition, extension and mentorship, agricultural finance and market access.		
2. As our <b>second best solution, we recommend that RECAP should continue in the interim.</b> Hence, the following <b>key</b> recommendations are meant to strengthen RECAP whilst a lasting solution is sought.		
3. <b>Review the objectives of RECAP to make them more clear and specific.</b> This should include defining the meanings of key terms used in the programme (e.g. distressed farms, recapitalisation, development, commercial farmer, etc.).		
4. <b>Ensure a common understanding of RECAP among its stakeholders</b> by engaging in an all-inclusive process to discuss the nature, operation, purpose and objectives of the programme.		
5. <b>Establish a separate organisational structure for RECAP</b> and ensure that the programme has its own full-time staff and do away with the current arrangement of seconding staff from other units of DRDLR to work for RECAP part-time. A separate organisational structure would also help to address the current problems experienced related to reporting arrangements between provincial and national RECAP offices.		
6. <b>Provide additional and appropriately qualified</b>		

	RECORD OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT	REASONS FOR DISAGREEMENT
<p><b>personnel dedicated to RECAP to improve its administrative and functional efficiency.</b> This will address the problem of understaffing in RECAP and lack of skills, especially among project officers.</p>		
<p><b>7. Develop clear and specific selection criteria for beneficiaries and land reform farms for recapitalisation and development in line with the objectives of RECAP.</b> The criteria should be developed to ensure that only deserving land reform farms and beneficiaries are selected for participation in RECAP.</p>		
<p><b>8. Review selection criteria for strategic partners and mentors</b> to ensure that only those that are competent and committed to RECAP objectives are selected.</p>		
<p><b>9. The requirement to have a strategic partner or mentor to qualify for participation in RECAP should be applied selectively to exempt beneficiaries with adequate experience and capacity to manage their farms.</b> This will require conducting skills and needs assessment to determine the readiness of beneficiaries to carry out farming activities without a mentor/strategic partner.</p>		
<p><b>10. Replace the current RECAP grant funding with loan funding.</b> RECAP funding should differentiate recapitalisation needs from farm development or growth needs, with a view to encourage beneficiaries to take responsibility for their enterprise/farm growth. Changing to loan funding would also increase the coverage of RECAP in terms of the number of beneficiaries assisted as the money paid back would become available for on-lending to more beneficiaries.</p>		

## Annex B: Example of Management Response

RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ECD EVALUATION STEERING GROUP	RECORD OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT	REASONS FOR DISAGREEMENT
services, showing models of good practice.		
15. Under-used space in community halls, traditional authority offices, schools, clinics, churches and homes can all be used to run home- and community-based programmes.	Agree with recommendation.	
<b>HUMAN RESOURCES, TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING</b>		
16. The National Curriculum Framework should take into consideration age ranges, ECD settings and, learning programme as articulated in Children's Act and NIPECD review recommendation.	Agree with recommendation. In addition to this recommendation it is also recommended that a decision should be taken on which department's responsibility the ECD Practitioners should be. Their basic conditions of employment needs attention.	
17. A human resource development strategy should be developed for all staff working in the ECD sector to improve staff qualifications, professionalise ECD, provide a career path and assist with retaining ECD workers. This should consider the different packages of services for different age groups. This should include staff working in early learning and care centres and programmes. To do this an audit of existing staff qualifications should be undertaken and resourcing made available for initial training	Agree with recommendation.	