



FANRPAN

Food Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network

Inventory and SWOT Analysis of **Farmer Organizations in the SADC Region**

A regional synthesis report on
Strengths, Weaknesses, capacity needs and communication needs of
FOs in the SADC

Submitted to

**Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis
Network
(FANRPAN)**

By:

*Paul Jere
PJ Development Consultancy Company,
P.O. Box 1142,
Lilongwe,
Malawi*

October 2005

ACRONYMS

ABC:	Agricultural Business Chamber
Agri SA:	Agri South Africa
ASSMAG:	Association of Smallholder Seed Multiplication Action Group
BAU:	Botswana Agricultural Union
BDA:	Botswana Dairy Association
BOFA:	Botswana Ostrich Farmers Association
BPA:	Botswana Poultry Association
CA:	Crops Association
CCPA:	Commercial Cotton Producers Association
CCU:	Central Cooperative Union
CFU:	Commercial Farmers' Union
CGA:	Cane Growers Association
CGA:	Coffee Growers Association
CGA:	Citrus Growers Association of South Africa
CPA:	Cattle Producers Association
DFPT:	Deciduous Fruit Producers Trust
ECAZ:	Environmental Conservation of Zambia
FANRPAN:	Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network
FOs:	Farmer Organizations
FTPC:	Federation of Tea Planters Cooperatives
FUM:	Farmers Union of Malawi
GSA:	Grain South Africa
HODOM:	Horticulture Development Organization of Malawi
HPC:	Horticultural Promotion Council
ICFU:	Indigenous Commercial Farmers Union
IFAP:	International Federation of Agricultural Producers
LCCUL:	Lesotho Co-operative Credit Union League
LEHOFA:	Lesotho Horticultural Farmers Association
LNDFA:	Lesotho National Dairy Farmer Association
LNWMGA:	Lesotho National Wool and Mohair Growers Association
LPA:	Basotho Poultry Association
MALEZA :	Malawi Enterprise Zone Association
MAMCF:	Mauritius Agricultural Marketing Cooperative Federation
MCAF:	Mauritius Co-operative Agricultural Federation Ltd
MDFC:	Mauritius Deer Farming Cooperatives
MMPA:	Malawi Milk Producers Association
MPO:	Milk Producers Organization
MUSCCO:	Malawi Union of Savings and Credit Cooperatives Ltd
MVPA :	Mauritius Vegetable Planters Association
NADF:	National Association of Dairy Farmers
NAFU:	National African Farmers Union of South Africa
NASFAM:	National Smallholder Farmers Association of Malawi
NFYF:	National Federation of Young Farmers
NWGA:	National Wool Growers Association
OPA:	Onion Producers Association
OPPAZ:	Organic Producers and Processors Association of Zambia
PAMA:	Paprika Association of Malawi
PAZ:	Poultry Association of Zambia
PIAM:	Poultry Industry Association of Malawi
PSA:	Potatoes South Africa

PTFA:	Power Team Feedlotters Association
RPO:	Red meat Producers Organization
SACAU:	Southern Africa Confederation of African Unions
SADC:	Southern Africa Development Community
SAPA:	Southern African Poultry Association
SBDARA:	Small Beekeepers Development and Research Association
SBGA:	Swaziland Banana Growers Association
SESAFA:	Sembulelo Sakotini Farmers Association
SNGPA:	Swaziland National Grain Producers Association
SSBAB:	Small Stock Breeders Association of Botswana
TAMA:	Tobacco Association of Malawi
TAU SA:	Transvaal Agricultural Union South Africa
TAZ:	Tobacco Association of Zambia
TCCIA:	Tanzania Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture
TGT:	Tobacco Growers Trust
VINPRO:	Wine Producers Organization
ZCF:	Zambia Cooperative Federation
ZFU:	Zimbabwe Farmers Union
ZIADA:	Zimbabwe Indigenous Agro-Dealers Association
ZNFU:	Zambia National Farmers Union
ZTA:	Zimbabwe Tobacco Association
ZWA:	Zambia Women in Agriculture

Table of contents

(I) Executive Summary	5
1. Introduction and Background	7
2. Methodology for the study.....	7
3. Overview of the Farmer Organizations in the SADC region	8
a. Typologies of Farmer organizations in the region	8
b. Historical context of the organizations.....	9
c. Objectives and services of the organizations.....	10
d. Composition, Leadership and management Structure	14
i) Membership	14
ii) Leadership structure.....	16
e. Communication	17
f. Organizational Resources.....	19
(i) Assets	19
(ii) Financial Resources	20
(iii) Human resource	22
g. Organizational linkages and networks.....	22
h. Operational environment	24
i) Impact of the external environment	24
ii) Impact of the internal environment	26
4. Summary of SWOT analysis.....	28
5. Areas requiring development support.....	28
6. Conclusions and Recommendations for the way forward.....	29
Appendix 1: History of establishment of FOs	32
Appendix 2: List of organizations reviewed for this synthesis	33

I) Executive Summary

This study was commissioned by SACAU and FANRPAN to analyze the profiles of farmer organizations (FOs) in the SADC countries. The study was commissioned because information about farmer organizations in the SADC region has mostly been incomplete and fragmented. Such a situation has made it difficult for SACAU to mobilize broad-based support on regional and international matters that affect farmers in the region. This study is an attempt to address that need by profiling and identifying capacity constraints of farmer organizations that have a national constituency in the SADC. The countries included in the study include South Africa, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Malawi, Lesotho, Swaziland, Namibia and Mauritius and Tanzania. SACAU has already been interacting with Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Malawi. It therefore intends to direct its efforts to attract membership in the countries of Lesotho, Botswana, Tanzania and Mauritius as well as strengthening policy analysis and representation capacity of the FOs in the region.

This report mainly highlights the key aspects of farmer organizations in the SADC countries in terms of typologies of FOs, operating environments, structures (membership and leadership), roles and services, linkages, opportunities and constraints, key

challenges faced, capacity needs and strategies for empowering FOs.

The information about farmer organizations for each country was collected and compiled by country consultants who conducted interviews with senior officials of the identified organizations.

The study has shown that there are many farmer organizations in the different countries. These FOs are of different categories with the majority being commodity associations. The FOs are of different sizes in terms of membership, outreach, resource endowment (human, financial and assets) with the majority being small. The FOs are also of different ages with some being old and big but many being formed in recent years and still small in capacity. The FOs have been influenced positively and negatively by several external and internal factors. These factors have influenced the establishment and development of most FOs.

The profiles of various FOs in different countries highlight some strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats associated with these national farmer organizations involved in the study. Although these are different in many aspects, there are some common elements. The table below provides a summary of the main issues for most of the FOs:

Table 1: Summary of the SWOT Analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership driven FOs in terms of leadership and funding • Committed leadership • Having written constitutions to guide operations • Enabling policy environment • Available support (technical and financial) from government and donors • Functional secretariats with capable management and technical staff • Extensive networking and linkages among farmer organizations • Dealing with key crops and products – thereby having opportunity to influence policy/operating environment and increase incomes of members • Credibility with government and other stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited financial resources and funding sources • Donor dependence • Poor and limited communication systems • Lack of offices • Lack of own assets • Inadequate human capacity at leadership and secretariat levels • Lack of skills on leadership, advocacy and lobbying • Low investment levels for the members • Dependent on domestic market • Lack of adequate accounting systems • Inadequate promotional activities, marketing
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dealing with key crops and products in the economy • Trade liberalization leading to existence of domestic, regional and international markets • Vast untapped membership • Increasing donor support to social economic development • Availability of support structures such as government research stations, extension and training institutions • Favorable policy environment supporting farmer organizations • Political stability in most countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor and unstable macroeconomic climate • Trade liberalization • Changes in the government policy • Poor infrastructure (roads, hospitals, electricity and schools) • HIV/AIDS • Non payment of registration and annual subscription • Lack of adequate support from donors and government • High levels of insecurity • Poor research and extension services • Proliferation of competition among FO • Lack of sustainability • Unpredictable weather and unreliable forecasts

These situations affecting the FOs in the different countries of the region provide a wide avenue for SACAU and other stakeholders to support growth and development of FO in the region. Specifically, the following actions need to be considered:

- Identification of key FOs in each country
- Conducting specific needs assessments on the identified FOs
- Facilitate harmonization of roles and

responsibilities of FOs

- Support capacity building in policy awareness and analysis (national and regional policies), advocacy and lobbying skills and leadership
- Facilitate enhanced networking and linkages among FOs in the region
- Support improvement of communication between FOs and members and among FOs
- Assist in raising funds to support operations of lead FOs

1. Introduction and Background

As part of a collaborative work between SACAU and FANRPAN aimed at increasing membership of farmer organizations to SACAU as well as SACAU's interventions as a regional umbrella body, a study was commissioned to profile and undertake a SWOT analysis of farmer organizations in the SADC countries. The study was commissioned because information about farmer organizations in the SADC region has mostly been incomplete and fragmented. Such a situation has made it difficult for SACAU to mobilize broad-based support on regional and international matters that affect farmers in the region. This study is an attempt to address that need by profiling and identifying capacity constraints of farmer organizations that have a national constituency in the SADC. The countries included in the study include South Africa, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Malawi, Lesotho, Swaziland, Namibia and Mauritius and Tanzania. SACAU has already been interacting with Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Malawi. It therefore intends to direct its efforts to attract membership in Lesotho, Botswana, Tanzania and Mauritius.

This report will mainly highlight the key aspects of farmer organizations in the SADC countries. These issues include the following:

- Typologies of FOs
- Operating environments (policy and political)
- Structures of FOs (membership and leadership)
- Roles and services of FOs
- Linkages
- Opportunities and constraints
- Key challenges faced
- Capacity needs and strategies for empowering FO

2. Methodology for the study

The information on farmer organizations for each country was collected and compiled by country consultants who conducted interviews with senior officials of the identified organizations. A detailed checklist was used to guide the interview to ensure systematic data collection. This checklist covered various aspects of the organizations to ensure a detailed understanding of the organizations. In addition to the interviews, some documents about the organizations were collected during the visits to the organizations. These included constitutions, strategic plans and annual reports.

During the process of collecting the information, there were several problems encountered. These included the following:

- Difficulties to book appointments with some organizations as some of the organizations do not have a base/office, address or phones.
- Problems of communication as some organizations are based in remote districts and have no phones.
- Reluctance to give information due to perceived confidentiality of some information such as accounts and donor names.
- Limited resources
- Limited time frame
- Researchers-different styles and capacities
- Variable quality of information provided
- Length of questionnaire
- Challenges in collation/consolidation and synthesis –too many variables

This report provides a summary of the findings for 70 farmer organizations in ten countries in the SADC region. Details of these organizations are presented in Appendix 2.

3. Overview of the Farmer Organizations in the SADC region

a. Typologies of Farmer organizations in the region

The study has shown that there is a diverse existence of farmer organizations in the region. The main categories of the FOs include:

- **Farmer unions or associations** – these tend to be broader in scope and bringing together regional and/or district groupings and commodity associations. Because of the broader scope, there are likely chances of duplication, competition and antagonism in this category as new ones are formed. Examples of these are found in Zimbabwe (CFU vs. ZNFU), Malawi (FUM vs. NASFAM) and South Africa (NAFU vs. AgriSA). There is need to harmonize and streamline the roles, responsibilities and linkages of some of these FOs to ensure maximum benefits to their members and constituents.

- **Commodity associations** – these represent specific commodities or crops or enterprises. These are the majority of the FOs in the region as they operate on the main cash crops or commodities common throughout the region e.g. tobacco, coffee, horticultural crops, cotton, dairy farming, etc.
- **Co-operatives** – these tend to be centered on certain enterprises or commodities or functions. The most common are savings and credit cooperatives. Others e.g. in Mauritius and South Africa are operating as farmer unions or federations. It is also difficult for some countries to distinguish some cooperatives from commodity associations, as they seem to be performing similar functions.

This has implications in most cases on the legal and functional existence and operations of the organizations. Table 2 below shows the distribution of the FOs in various categories and in different countries based on the inventory compiled for this study.

Table 2: Categories of Farmer Organizations in the SADC

Country	Union/Association	Commodity Association	Cooperatives	Total
South Africa	5	5	1	11
Malawi	2	8	2	12
Swaziland	3	2		5
Zambia	3	3	1	7
Zimbabwe	3	11	-	14
Mauritius	1	5	2	8
Lesotho	-	4	2	6
Botswana	1	3	-	4
Tanzania	2	-	-	2
Namibia	1			1
Totals	21 (30%)	41 (59%)	8(11%)	70

From this table, it is evident that there are more commodity associations as they relate to specific commodities such as a crop or livestock type or enterprise. These represent about 59% of the farmer organizations studied. The table also shows that in most countries there is a union or general association that brings together the various commodity associations and cooperatives. In some countries, there is more than one union or general association. For example, in Zimbabwe and South Africa, there is a farmers union representing commercial (large) farmers as well as a union for smallholder (subsistence/semi-commercial) farmers. In Malawi, there is a smallholder farmers association (representing different commodity and area associations) and there is Farmers Union that is supposed to be an umbrella body.

There are however some countries (e.g. Lesotho) which do not yet have an umbrella body but they have several commodity associations and cooperatives. Due to this diversity, there is need for SACAU to work with the countries in according to their different circumstances. For the countries with no umbrella body, there is need to facilitate the process of uniting the various FOs to ensure that they link up to form a union or coordinating body. For those countries with many unions and general associations, there is need to facilitate the process of harmonizing

their activities and policies so that there is minimum competition and strong communication as they work towards a common goal.

b. Historical context of the organizations

There are visible differences in the historical development of farmer organization among the countries of the region. The number and ages of the organizations have followed the pattern of economic development and political transformations in the SADC region.. For example in Zimbabwe, South Africa and to some extent Zambia where there has been a long history of commercial farming and mining by white settlers, there are FOs which are more than 50-100 years old. With changes in the political systems in these countries, new FOs have emerged, these mainly focus on farmers who were previously marginalized by the colonial system. For example, in Zimbabwe the recent land reform program has resulted in FOs addressing the needs of resettled farmers. In South Africa, there is NAFU, which is focusing on the interests of farmers who were disadvantaged by the apartheid government policies. In addition, due to the recent economic and structural adjustments and globalization sweeping across the developing countries of the region, there are new avenues for farmer organizations to take advantage of

market liberalization, reduction in state control and globalization. In other countries e.g. Malawi, due to existence of extensive state control and dictatorial political regimes, it was previously difficult to form cooperatives and associations due to state or political restrictions. The majority of the farmer organizations in most countries therefore started in the 1990s to the early 2000 when changes in political systems became favourable. It is therefore critical for regional organizations such as SACAU to be aware of the country differences and the internal history and operations of these organizations. Appendix 1 gives the details in terms of years of establishment of the FOs in different countries.

There has also been a lot of government or donor support and influence in the formation of most Farmer Organizations especially the new ones and the commodity associations involving smallholder farmers. The support has been in terms of funding, office space, equipment, personnel and communication systems. The challenge for most of these is how to sustain themselves as the support is progressively withdrawn. Most of them are heavily dependent on outside support with very little internal financing mechanisms.

Most of the FOs in the region are legally registered with the government as non-profit making organizations or as cooperatives working to assist their members in various ways. The legal status depends on the available

legislation in a particular country or the type of legislation associated with that commodity. For example some are legally registered with a provision to collect levies on their members while some have opportunities to operate income-generating businesses and some have opportunities to receive government support or funding. The legal standing can therefore offer different opportunities and constraints to different FO categories in different countries. The FOs also have written constitutions that are mandatory for registering. Some of the constitutions are reviewed periodically to suit changing situations but for most FOs the constitutions have not been reviewed since inception.

c. Objectives and services of the organizations

For most, the drive to form farmer organizations came in because several farmers with common interest identified their constraints and opportunities affecting their operations. Farmers themselves took the initiative in the formation of these organizations so that they can act as their voice, protecting their interest, lobbying for favorable policies, facilitating the dissemination of market information, providing technical skills for improved production and quality of product and creating linkages by networking with other relevant organizations within and abroad.

Table 3 below provides a summary of the key objectives/services for the different types of FOs.

Table 3: Summary of Objectives of farmer organizations

Objectives for the Farmer organizations	Type of farmer organization			
	Union/ Association	Commodity association	Cooperative	Total
Providing technical skills for improved production	14	19	3	36 (51%)
Act as a mouth piece for members	17	17	2	36 (51%)
Facilitating marketing of the products	10	10	10	35 (46%)
Protecting members' interests	13	18	2	33 (47%)
Lobbying for favorable policies	13	13	2	28 (40%)
Facilitating dissemination of market information	8	14	2	28 (40%)
Capacity building	7	7	2	16 (23%)
Agricultural credit and marketing	5	6	3	14 (20%)
Creating linkages and networking	3	3	0	6 (9%)
Improving access to financial services	2		2	4 (6%)
Environmental management	1	2	0	3 (4%)
Improve living standards of members		2	1	3 (4%)
Sustainable resource management	1	1	1	3 (4%)
Promotion of broad awareness of HIV/AIDS		2		2 (3%)

% represents a percentage of the total number of FO (70) who identified that issue

The key services offered by the farmer organizations involve the following:

- Providing technical skills for improved production through provision of inputs, extension and training services and output marketing. This was indicated by 51% of the farmer organizations.
- Act as a voice for members, as identified by 51% of the farmer organizations
- Protecting members' interests was indicated by 47% of the FOs)
- Facilitating and improving marketing of agricultural products and access to agricultural inputs through transportation, bulk purchases, financing and market sourcing. This was indicated by 46% of the FOs)
- Lobbying and advocating for favorable policies, legislations, services and actions that promote and protect the interests of the members, as indicated by 40% of the FOs)

- Facilitating dissemination of market information was indicated by 40% of the FOs)
- Capacity building of members and organizations through training on leadership, group dynamics, production as well as marketing of various commodities was indicated by 23% of the FOs)
- Establishing linkages and/or guarantees to credit providers or providing credit and saving services to their members was identified by 20% of the FOs
- Directly engaging in business activities for the benefit of their members e.g. input and output marketing.
- Providing legal support to their members
- Fundraising for members and the organizations.

There are no significant differences between commodity associations and unions in terms of the main objectives and services offered to their members. The difference between these FOs and cooperatives are that the latter mainly focus on marketing and credit services.

The need for such services has come about over the years because the members have faced several challenges, such as the following:

- Prohibitive or restrictive policies and legislation or lack of conducive

policies for their operations, e.g. the effect of land reform in Zimbabwe for the Commercial Farmers Union.

- Poor access to production inputs such as fertilizer, seeds, feeds, machinery due to high costs and lack of credit,
- Trade or market liberalization resulting in stiff competition and influx of cheap imports thereby hindering the sale of their products.
- Trade restrictions for domestic markets or export markets
- Poor infrastructure in the rural areas e.g. roads, markets and lack of electricity,
- Competition with other bigger operators,
- Low technical capacity to run the associations,
- High prevalence of HIV/AIDS infecting and affecting farmers,
- Unfavorable political and economic environment e.g. in Zimbabwe

Table 4 below gives details of the challenges as identified by different types of farmer organizations. Overall, the key challenges, in their order of importance, as rated by the FOs, include poor access to production inputs by members (mainly for commodity associations) possibly due to high input cost, high production costs limiting production, unfavorable economic and political environment in some countries and lack of technical training.

Table 4: Summary of constraints and challenges for the FOs

Constraint/Challenge	Type of Farmer organization			
	Union/ Association	Commodity association	Cooperative	Total
High cost of production	6	28	2	36 (51%)
Poor access to production inputs	12	16	3	31 (44%)
Unfavorable political and economic environment	7	11	1	19 (27%)
Lack of technical training and extension on production	5	11	1	17 (24%)
Poor infrastructure (irrigation, roads, electricity, bridges, schools, hospitals)	8	6	0	14 (20%)
Trade and market liberalization	4	10	1	15 (21%)
Land reform program and land issues	5	8	1	14 (20%)
Prohibitive policies and legislation	6	7	1	14 (20%)
Lack of government support	5	4	0	9 (13%)
High prevalence of HIV/AIDS	5	3	0	8 (11%)
Poor access to information	3	4	0	7 (10%)
Trade restrictions for domestic or export markets	1	5	1	7 (10%)
High illiteracy levels among members	2	2	1	5 (7%)
Competition with big operators/multinationals	2	1	2	5 (7%)
High risks and uncertainties	2	3		5 (7%)
Low technical capacity to run the association	0	4	0	4 (6%)
Erratic rainfall	3	1	0	4 (6%)
Increased insecurity and theft	2	2	0	4 (6%)
Demand for high quality products	1	1	2	4 (6%)
Food insecurity	1	2	0	3 (4%)
Lack of business skills	2	1		3 (4%)
Labor shortage		2		2 (3%)
World Trade Organization (WTO) protocol	1	1		2 (3%)
Lack of awareness on government policies	1	1	0	2 (3%)

% represents a percentage of the total number of FO (70) who identified that issue

Some of the farmers' organizations have engaged government on policy issues such as land reform (in Zimbabwe and South Africa), inputs and output marketing (in Malawi, Zimbabwe, Mauritius), micro finance, privatization and trade liberalization. For example, in Malawi, some Farmer organizations have been involved in lobbying for farm input subsidies that the government has implemented this year. Their ability to lobby and influence policy in different countries depends on a number of issues. These include:

- The type of commodities (e.g. crop) with respect to the national economy. Those dealing with high value export crops (e.g. tobacco in Malawi) tend to have more influence.
- The size of the organization in terms of membership and outreach in the country;
- The history of the organization with respect to the period it has existed;
- The linkages and support it has with government and donors. For example, the FOs supporting smallholder farmers have had strong support from government and donors and have some influence on government policy in these countries. Examples can be drawn from South Africa (NAFU), Zimbabwe (ZNFU) and Malawi (NASFAM).
- The presence on an apex

organization harmonizing and representing the voice of many FOs.

d. Composition, Leadership and management Structure

There are many similarities in the membership, organizational and leadership structures for most farmer organizations in the region.

i) Membership

For most of the organizations, the membership comprises mainly regional or district associations and cooperatives, and commodity associations. These in turn comprise of lower level groupings and individual members. Some farmer organizations especially the commodity associations and cooperative in some countries also comprise corporate organizations and individual farmers as members. The old organizations have a large membership (e.g. the commercially oriented unions and commodity associations in South Africa and Zimbabwe). This is also true of some of the newly formed but 'politically' supported national farmer unions or associations targeted smallholder farmer groups. Table 5 below gives details of membership categories for the different types of FOs in the region.

Table 5: Membership categories for the farmer organizations

Membership category	Type of Farmer organization			
	Union/ Association	Commodity association	Cooperative	Total
Associations (commodity/regional/district)	13	17	1	31 (44%)
Individuals	8	12	2	22 (31%)
Cooperatives/cooperative societies	5	3	7	15 (21%)
Companies	2	6	2	10 (14%)
Clubs	2	5	0	7 (10%)
Students groups	3	1	0	4 (6%)
Business entrepreneurs	2	0	1	3 (4%)
NGOs	1	1	0	2 (3%)
Professional groups	0	1	0	1 (1%)
Government institutions	0	1	0	1 (1%)
Study groups	0	1	0	1 (1%)

% represents a percentage of the total number of FO (70) who identified that issue

As highlighted above, the membership for both commodity associations and unions has been wide encompassing farmer groups or clubs, associations and individuals. This diversity of membership within a farmer organization may pose a challenge in terms of management and provision of services. There is need to streamline the membership regimes and hierarchy of different FOs in each country so as to avoid overlaps, duplication and competition especially between union and commodity associations. This is one area where SACAU could provide leadership and support.

The criteria for membership into most FOs are open and wide. Table 6 below provides a summary of the criteria used by different farmer organizations.

Table 6: Summary of criteria for membership

Criteria	Type of farmer organization			
	Union/ Association	Commodity association	Cooperative	Total
Paying registration fees, annual fees and membership fees	15	28	4	47 (67%)
Being farmers/producer	12	9	2	22 (33%)
Registered bodies or in the process of registration	4	9	1	14 (20%)
Representing farmers from the same area with common interest, goal and problems	7	3	3	13 (19%)
Application for membership	4	6	1	11 (16%)
Having a constitution	3	2	0	5 (7%)
Having democratically elected leaders	2	1	0	3 (4%)

% represents a percentage of the total number of FO (70) who identified that issue

The main criteria for all the FOs include the following:

- Paying registration, subscription and membership fees as mentioned by 67% of the FOs
- Being farmers or producer in that enterprise in about 33% of the FOs
- Should be a registered with the government or in the process of registration for 20% of the FOs
- Representing farmers from an area of common agricultural enterprise and problems was identified by 18% of the FOs
- Having a constitution in 7% of the FOs
- Democratically elected leaders for 4% of the FOs

For the majority of commodity associations and other FOs, attracting membership is a challenge as this involves branching out to different areas of the country and providing many services and requiring more funds. For some organizations, membership has been declining because of unfavorable

operating environments. This is evident in Zimbabwe where unstable macroeconomic conditions and the land reform have caused a drastic decline in the membership to CFU. Declining donor support for some small FOs has also caused membership and outreach programs to decline. There are however some organizations who have experienced increasing membership over the years. This has come up due to increased services offered by these organizations and increased support (technical and financial) from government and donors.

ii) Leadership structure

Most of the organizations in different countries have similar leadership structure with the only differences being the naming and sizes of the leadership organs. The top most leadership bodies are either a Board of Directors (BOD) or Board of Trustee (BOT) or National Council or Congress. This is the body that deals with policy issues. The BOD or BOT members are elected by the general assembly or general congress

that meets every year or two. Most of the Boards include ex-official members drawn from government ministries and departments and the private sector to add capacity. The tenure of office for the elected BOD or BOT is on average two years with a range of one to three years. An individual elected to the board can be reelected for two terms. The BOD or BOT meets normally on quarterly basis or more frequently if need arises. The size of the board varies among the categories of FOs and countries. For most of the countries, the boards contain on average 10-15 people but there are some boards which contain more than 20 people (up to 50 people) depending on the number of regional or district representatives or number of commodity associations or cooperative societies it represents. The bigger boards have been identified mainly in South Africa (e.g. ABC SA has 30 board members while NAFU has about 50 as they are representing all 9 provinces and several commodity associations and cooperatives) and Zimbabwe (ZFU National council has more than 50 members representing all the provinces and several commodity associations and cooperatives) There are also some boards which contain less than ten people for the smaller organizations in smaller countries such as ZNFU in Zambia (8 members) and MALEZA in Malawi (7 members). Where there are large boards, there is also a smaller executive committee or management committee of about 6-10 people that is responsible for policy and operational decisions.

The leadership structures at the top level are replicated at provincial or district level for most FOs in all the countries and for most affiliate commodity associations or cooperatives. This is more common for well developed commercially oriented farmer organizations (e.g. in South Africa and

Zimbabwe). There are also organizations that have offices in some provinces or districts of a country and they have tried to establish structures in those areas. For example, ZNFU in Zambia has 14 district offices while NASFAM in Malawi has offices in almost 15 districts.

The management of the farmer organizations is vested in the secretariat and/or the executive committee where it exists. Most FOs have a secretariat with full time employed staff. While the executive committee manages the secretariat, it is the chairperson, secretary, their vices, and the treasurer that do every day management of the organization and report to the board. The Farmer Organizations that are managed by a secretariat have some employed staff working on full time. An Executive Director, General Manager or Chief Executive heads the secretariats. This person reports to the board and is responsible for the implementation of the organization's policies and every day management. Various staff for the different departments support the head of the secretariat. The secretariats have various departments or units responsible for various functions.

e. Communication

Communication within a farmer organization and among farmer organizations is very critical for the operation and growth of the farmer organizations. The Farmer Organizations communicate to their members and other stakeholders through various channels but most of them have limited means of communication.

Table 7 below shows the different communication channels used by the FOs in the region:

Table 7: Communication Channels

Communication channels	Category of Farmer organization				
	Unions/ Associations	Commodity association	Cooperative	Totals	
				Total	%
Annual General meeting	13	23	6	42	60
Annual reports	12	23	4	39	56
Periodic newsletters	12	19	2	33	47
Phone	9	17	1	27	39
Letters	6	15	2	23	33
E-mail	7	14	2	23	33
Radio programs	8	12	2	22	31
Fax	5	13	1	19	27
Magazines	3	9	1	13	19
Trainings	3	8	1	12	17
News paper publications	6	5	0	11	16
Executive meetings	3	6	1	10	14
Brochures	5	4	1	10	14
Quarterly General Meeting	1	5	1	7	10
Field visits	2	4	1	7	10
Government extension system	0	6	0	6	9
TV	2	2	0	4	6
Calendars	0	3	0	3	4
Banners	0	1	0	1	1
Caps and T-shirts	0	1	0	1	1
Drama	1	0	0	1	1
Bulletins	1	0	0	1	1
Workshops and training	1	0	0	1	1

% represents a percentage of the total number of FO (70) who identified that issue

According to the table above,

- About 60% of the FOs use Annual General Meetings (AGM) as the main means of communicating with its members.
- Annual reports are used by about 56% of the FOs as the main means of communication
- 47% of the FOs are able to produce and use Quarterly or monthly newsletters to communicate to their members.
- More than half of the FOs do not use phones, e-mails, fax or radio to communicate to their members
- Other communication channels used by few FOs include bulletins, brochures, newspaper publications, radio programs, government extension systems and letters.

The use of a specific communication channel depends on the availability of financial resources and the size of the FO. The smaller and recently established FOs lack financial resources thus use very limited channels such as AGMs and the government extension system. Very few have e-mail communication and can produce a newsletter or brochure for their members. For the bigger and more resource endowed FOs (e.g. in South Africa), there are more channels of communication at their disposal including e-mail and Internet. The area of communication is one of the critical areas for the survival and development of FOs as it facilitates flow of information and promotes participation of members in the operations of the FOs. For them to truly represent and

serve the interests of their members there is need to have reliable and diverse communication channels that depend on financial resources and technology. This is one of the areas where SACAU can support FOs in the region so that they can improve their communication methods; systems and technologies to enable them deliver their services to their members and to network with other FOs in the region.

f. Organizational Resources

There are substantial differences in the resources (financial, human and assets) the different FOs in the different countries of the region have at their disposal. Except for a few old commercially oriented FOs (e.g. in South Africa), the general situation is that most of them are resource constrained. The following sections give a synopsis of the resource endowment of the various FOs in different countries.

i) Assets

The different Farmer Organizations have varying levels of assets. Almost all of them have an office or offices where they are operating. Few have their own

office as most of them are renting. Some of the FOs who own office complex, lease out some of their office space to raise funds. The study found that a few FOs did not have office space and such FOs operate from their homes and hire a building when there is need for a meeting. Some of the organizations are being offered free office space by government departments e.g. in Malawi, Lesotho, Zambia. As the FOs represent their members located in different parts of the country, transport and communication equipment are essential for their operations. With respect to transportation, some bigger organizations have a large fleet of vehicles, while some small FOs barely have transportation. The situation is the same for phones, e-mails, fax machines, computers, printers and copiers. A significant number of the organizations do not have these facilities, especially computers and other communication gadgets. This is prevalent for smaller commodity organizations and cooperatives in countries like Malawi, Zambia, Lesotho, Zimbabwe, etc with the exception of South Africa and to a lesser degree Zimbabwe and Botswana.

Table 8 below provides details of the assets for the different FO categories.

Table 8: Organizational resources

Assets	Category of Farmer organization							
	Unions/ Association		Commodity association		Cooperative		Totals	
	Owned	Rented	Owned	Rented	Owned	Rented	Owned	Rented
Offices	8	13	14	14	4	4	26	31
Motor vehicles	15	1	19	0	4	0	38	1
Motor cycle	5	0	6	0	1	0	12	0
Bicycle	4	0	4	0	0	0	8	0
Furniture table	16	0	28	0	6	1	50	1
Furniture chairs	16	0	26	0	6	1	48	1
Internet facility	14	1	17	3	3	0	34	4
E-mail	16	1	20	4	5	0	41	5
Telephone	16	1	23	3	5	1	44	5
Fax machine	14	1	23	3	5	0	42	4
Computers	17	0	29	0	6	1	52	1
Printers	15	1	26	1	5	0	46	2
Photocopiers	9	1	20	2	4	0	33	3
Duplicating machine	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Binding machine	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0

ii) Financial Resources

There are many sources of financing for FOs in the different countries of the

region. Table 9 below provides details of the main sources of funding for the different types of FOs.

Table 9: Main sources of funding

Source	Category of farmer organizations				
	Unions/ Association	Commodity association	Cooperative	Total	%
Membership, registration and annual fees	6	35	4	43	64
Donors	6	18	1	24	36
Levy	3	18		20	30
Business operations		8	3	10	15
Consultancy fees		4		4	6
Government		3	1	4	6
Service charges	1	3	1	4	6
Donations		1		1	1
Bank loans		1		1	1
Monthly member contributions	1			1	1
Interest on loans			1	1	1
Projects		1		1	1
Licensing fees		1		1	1
Training fees	1			1	1
Membership savings			1	1	1

% represents a percentage of the total number of FO (67) who identified that issue

The main sources of financing for most FOs include the following:

- Membership subscriptions/registration fees (reported by about 64% of the FOs)
- Donors (about 36% of the FOs)
- Levies (mandatory or voluntary) – indicated by about 30% of the FOs
- Business operations (15% of the FOs)

There are differences in the amount of resources among organizations in different countries depending on the sources of financing. For some organizations especially the old and established ones, their membership and financial base is quite strong while for smaller and recent organizations in most countries, their financial base is very weak as they rely on donor support. A few examples are cited below for different countries:

a) **Transvaal Agricultural Union (TAU)** in South Africa is financed through Membership fees (75%), Sponsorships (15%) and Projects (10%). The Total Funded Budget in USD for the past three years has been:

- \$752 000
- \$556 500
- \$485 000

b) **Cane growers SA** is funded by means of a voluntary levy of 13 US cents per ton cane delivered to mills. The 2005 budget is US \$ 2 733 774

c) **Potato SA** is funded mainly through levies (0.017 USD per 10kg bag for potato producers, 0.005 USD per 10kg for seed potato producers and 0.007

USD per 10kg for processing potato producers. Annual budget for 2004/2005 is \$2 170 116.54

d) **The Lesotho Cooperative Credit Union (LCCUL)** financial resources come from membership fees (Members pay US\$16.00 as registration fee and annual membership fee of US\$25.00), 2% interest charges on outstanding loans. The LCCUL also has a building where it leases out office space.

e) **The Lesotho Horticultural Farmers Association (LEHOFA)** raises funds from member registration fees, membership fees and donor funds. LEHOFA is very much depended on donor financial resources. It is estimated that donor funds account for more than 95% of LEHOFA's funds.

f) **Basotho Poultry Farmers Association (BAPOFA)** financial resources are from members' registration fees and annual membership fees. The registration is US\$8.00 while the annual membership fee is US\$30.00. Currently BAPOFA has no funded budget. Associated members like LFFM sometimes fund specific events like workshops and field days.

g) **The Zimbabwe Farmers Union (ZFU)** gets its funds from membership subscriptions, levies, service fees, donors, government grants, asset rentals and agribusiness. The Union's joining membership fee, which is renewed annually, is based on farm category as shown below:

Table 10: ZFU Entrance fees.

Farm Category	Membership Fee Per Annum
Communal, Old Resettlement and A1	US\$ 1.00
A2 and Small-Scale Commercial	US\$ 3.00
Large Scale Commercial	US\$10.00

h) **The Commercial Farmers Union (CFU)** of Zimbabwe generates its finances mainly through membership licenses (88%) and levies (12%). The Union does not receive donor funding or grants from the Government of Zimbabwe. The Union's total funded budgets for the past three years are as follows:

- 2004/05 US\$ 420 000.00
- 2003/04 US\$ 200 000.00
- 2002/03 US\$ 100 000.00

i) The main sources of funding for **Horticultural Promotion Council (HPC)** in Zimbabwe are membership fees/subscriptions (5%), levies (90%), handbooks and donations (5%). Donations are mainly from members. Membership fees are as follows:

- HPC entrance fee US\$20.00
- Individual growers membership fee US\$20.00
- Associate/Affiliate members US\$20.00
- Export Agents, Syndicates and Corporate Members US\$100.00.

Levies paid are US\$0.05c/kg of all exports. The Council's total funded budgets over the last three years are:

- 2005 - US\$60 000.00
- 2004 -US\$35 000.00
- 2003 -US\$ 9 500.00

j) For Malawi, most of the farmer organizations have benefited from donors, governments and other development agents. Some FOs are currently not being funded by any donor, government and development agent. The farmer organizations also

generate some funds from registration fees, annual membership fee and subscription fees and levies from sale proceeds but these are limited by numbers of paying members as such they are small.

iii) Human resource

There are different set ups for farmer organizations. Most of the organizations have qualified professional personnel that support the Executive directors or Officers of the Farmer Organizations' Secretariats. Most of the FOs in the region have limited staff at their secretariat due to limited funding, with on average 3 staff at the secretariat, which comprises of the Chief Executive, a finance or Administrative officer. The few old and well-established organizations have adequate or higher number of staff levels for the various functions at the secretariat and in provincial and district offices. Few examples of these are found in South Africa and NASFAM in Malawi. The effectiveness of the secretariats is thus hampered by the financial stand of these organizations that limit their human capacity.

g. Organizational linkages and networks

There are a number of linkages the farmer organizations in different countries of the region have established over their years of existence. These have been at national, regional and international levels. Table 11 below provides details of the linkages and networks for the FOs in the region.

Table 11: Organizational linkages and networks

Linkages and networks	Category of Farmer organization				
	Unions/ Association	Commodity association	Cooperative	Total	%
National organizations	13	27	4	41	61
International organizations	16	19	4	37	55
Knowledge of SACAU	13	15	1	28	42
Regional organizations	13	14	1	27	40

% represents a percentage of the total number of FO (70) who identified that issue

According to the table above, about 61% of the FOs included in this study have linkages or are affiliated with national organizations while 55% have linkages with international organizations and 42 are linked to regional organizations. For the 21 unions included in the study, 16 (76%) were linked to some international organizations while only 19 (46%) of the 41 Commodity associations are linked to international organizations. The same situation is true of the knowledge of and/or linkage to SACAU as a regional body. Almost all the unions were aware of SACAU while only 15 of the commodity association were unaware. The FOs have been developing these linkages to solicit support in terms of funding, technical skills and marketing linkages.

Most Farmer Organizations have the view that affiliation or linkage to regional and international organizations is of benefit on a number of issues such as: provision of a forum to harmonize the standards, to solve problems, share technology through research and utilization of such technology, sharing of information on marketing, and also a means to influence regional policies through the governments in the region. Most of these FOs thus indicated that they are quite keen to link up with regional bodies such as SACAU as these tackle and share the same challenges in the region e.g. poverty and food security. Almost all the FOs interviewed find it useful to be a member or be affiliated to SACAU. Due to the diversity of these FOs, SACAU will have to select only those FOs that are truly apex and

representative of larger spectrum of membership.

The sections below provide examples of some country experiences in establishing linkages.

South Africa

Most FOs have developed linkages among themselves and with national institutions including government agencies in their spheres of influence e.g. the agricultural sector.

Some are members of international institutions such as IFAP, World Potato Congress, World Association of Beet and Cane Growers depending on the areas of concern.

Malawi

The farmer organizations in Malawi have linkages both at national, regional and international levels. The farmer organizations' relationships vary considerably. Some of the organizations are members, sit on the board, and or just attend meetings or forums.

On the regional level, some FOs have links with Regional Farmer Organization Network for Southern and Eastern Africa, Swedish Cooperative Centre in Zimbabwe, and Southern Africa Confederation of Agricultural Unions (SACAU) while on the international level they have links with International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP).

Lesotho

Currently there is no apex national farmer organization in the country such that all the farmer organizations are not affiliated to a national organization. Steps are underway for the formation of a national farmers' union in the country. Interim district farmers' unions were established in 2004 and the plan was to form the national farmers' union sometime in 2005. The commodity associations have close links with their counterparts in the Republic of South Africa (RSA). All the commodity associations do not have regional (SADC) and international linkages. The co-operatives do not have regional linkages but have international linkages.

Mauritius

Most FOs have linkages with national institutions including government agencies in the agricultural sector. Some of the FOs are represented on the boards and committees of several institutions that are closely associated with the sector. The representatives have a say in the decision-making process and as such safeguard and protect the interests of their members.

Most of the FOs identified in this study do not have linkages or affiliations with regional and international organizations. From this study only one FO, MDFC has linkages with the regional CIRAD – Centre de Cooperation Internaitonale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Development of Reunion island and also with Universities in Australia and New Zealand.

h. Operational environment

i) Impact of the external environment

The Farmer organizations have operated in different environments in the different countries. These external environments have had both positive and negative effects on the operations

and growth of the organizations. Even within a country, the operating environment has affected the FOs differently. This section provides some of the effects of the external environment on the FOs.

a. Positive effects

In most countries, the most important external positive factors that have assisted farmer organizations to get established have been the involvement and support of the government and donors. The government has also provided a conducive policy framework on formation and running of the farmer organizations. There have also been other factors in different countries that have positively affected the establishment and development of FOs. These have varied across the countries of the region. Some examples are highlighted below.

For Zimbabwe, the external developments that impacted positively on the growth and development of some FOs include:

- The Land and Agrarian Reform that decongested the communal areas expanded the potential membership base for the ZNFU by providing agricultural land to landless Zimbabweans but created negative effects on other FOs such as CFU.
- Some trade agreements between Zimbabwe and South Africa resulted removal of duty on some inputs e.g. seed.
- Provision of credit facilities at concessionary interest rates by the Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe to the agricultural sector for production and capital development such as developing and rehabilitating irrigation systems, barn rehabilitation and dairy development.
- At national level, the allocation of foreign currency to import inputs, namely farm machinery and equipment (tractors, one ton trucks, knap sack sprayers) and

agricultural chemicals and fertilizers.

In South Africa, some positive effects have come up due to:

- Deregulation of the SA agricultural environment;
- New legislation and broad agricultural and land policies
- Government approval of statutory levies on members.
- Opening up of trade and linkages with other regions and countries

For Zambia, the main positive effects for FOs have come from government recognition and involvement of key FOs in policy processes. For example, some FOs are permanent members of Agriculture Consultative Forum, the highest policy framing body of the agricultural sector.

b) Negative effects

Despite the positive developments in some countries for some FOs, there have been some negative impacts that have emanated from the external environment. These have varied from country to country.

In Zimbabwe, some FOs have identified the following:

- The Land Reform Programme that compulsorily acquired land from commercial farmers resulting in a drastic decrease of membership of some FOs and loss of FOs revenue. In addition, it also resulted in some FOs (e.g. CFU) refocusing resources to assist farmers who lost their land by providing welfare, legal representation and lobbying for compensation.
- The introduction of controlled markets and prices of agricultural outputs affected market forces resulting in shortages on the domestic market. Controlling of maize and wheat producer prices reduced the viability of growing the crops to Union members.

- Lack of security of tenure due to the Land Reform Programme resulted in members failing to access loans from commercial banks, as land is no longer a form of collateral.

In South Africa, the negative effects for some FOs have come due to:

- Uncertainty regarding land reform.
- Poor state of rural safety
- Non-approval or removal of statutory levies for some FOs as a tool for funding organizations,
- The non-approval of statutory funding for product promotion and limited funding for research and development.
- Slow international trade reform with continued non-level playing fields.
- Poor infrastructure for international trade.

For Zambia, some of the external negative developments that have affected FO members are:

- Instability of the local currency against major currencies compounded by the high interest rates and inflation had a large negative impact on agriculture.
- The influx of cheap imports which have threatened to erode the profit margins of the industry.

In Lesotho, the economy is very much integrated and dependent on South Africa such that most of the external environment is from South Africa. The major external environment that has had a negative impact on farmer organizations' activities is the issue of free trade and liberalization. For a long time most agricultural imports were controlled. Agricultural products could only be imported when the local produce was not enough. In recent times the government has liberalized agricultural trade whereby imports from South Africa can freely come in. Most farmer organizations see this as unfair competition as South African farmers enjoy economies of scale with big-sized farms and production at low costs.

For Mauritius, the negative effects have come up due to the following factors:

- Increasing cost of inputs such as fuel, fertilizer, feeds, and veterinary products have a negative impact on farming.
- Globalisation and trade liberalization. For example reform of the sugar protocol of the EU will bring down the price of sugar by 39% in 2007. This measure will have a drastic effect on the income earning of sugar farmers and FO members.
- Climate change – resulting in cyclones, drought and floods that pose serious threats to the members’ agricultural activities.
- Low market prices,
- Inadequate market infrastructures.

In Malawi, the negative factors that are affecting the growth and development of the farmer organizations include poor and unstable macroeconomic climate, poor rural infrastructure, dwindling support from donors and high levels of insecurity and theft.

The issues from the different countries cited above show that the FOs face different situations and are operating in different and varied environments. The main issues emanate from prevailing macroeconomic environment, government policies and strategies as well as the regional and international trade relations and patterns. This means that efforts to support them need to take into consideration the prevailing situations in a particular country. This might call for deeper situational analysis and needs assessment for specific categories of FOs in different countries in order to map out appropriate interventions for support. The nature of the operating environment also calls for the FOs to interact with government to lobby and advocate for policies, strategies and actions that will sustain their development. Most of the FOs lack advocacy and lobbying skills in addition to lack of human resources. Some of the

FOs are not even aware of the policies and legislation affecting their operations. These are also some of the areas requiring support to ensure that the FOs (especially the unions) are aware of the policies and have the requisite advocacy and lobbying skills to participate in policy processes.

ii) Impact of the internal environment

In addition to the effects and impacts of the external environment, there are several internal factors that have positively or negatively affected the growth and development of the farmer organizations in the region. As with external factors, the internal issues are also different for different countries and for different categories of FOs. These are highlighted in the following sections.

a) Positive factors

Due to diversity of the factors, some country examples are highlighted below:

For Zimbabwe, some of the identified issues are:

- Committed secretariat management and staff bringing stakeholder confidence in operations of the FOs.
- Participation of experienced, disciplined and skilled farmers.

For Malawi, these include:

- Presence of self-motivated membership for most FOs
- Development of constitutions and strategic plans to guide activities of the FOs,
- Formal registration of the organizations with government and
- Capable leadership involving the members themselves in the management of the organizations

In Zambia, the main important internal developments that have impacted positively on the growth and development of FOs in recent past include:

- Involvement of members in the running of the FOs to formulate tangible services for its members.
- The maintenance and enhancement of effective communication with members
- The establishment of district associations around the country.
- Recognition of some FOs by regional, continental and internal organizations.
- Emergence of some members of FOs from small scale to medium scale heading for commercialized farming.
- Ability to create market linkages

For South Africa, the following were mentioned as the key positive internal factors:

- High quality leadership representing all members
- Improved communication systems
- Operating as autonomous and independent organizations.
- Positive member-funding initiatives.
- Good management of the organizations through high caliber focused secretariat staff.
- Proper financial capacity of the organizations.
- Good organizational infrastructure

Overall the main issues highlighted above show that the participation and contribution of the members, the leadership and the secretariat are key to the growth and development of FOs in the region. There is therefore need to enhance and build capacity of these three critical building blocks of the FOs through training, and provision of appropriate technology (e.g. for communication) for each one of them to contribute effectively to the development of the FO and the realizations of their objectives.

b) Negative factors

Most of the negative internal factors affecting the FOs point to the capacity constraints of most FOs in terms of human and financial resources,

leadership, member participation, advocacy and lobbying skills and technology for facilitating operation (e.g. computers and communication equipment). Some country experiences are highlighted below.

For Mauritius, some of the internal factors experienced by some FOs include the following

- Ageing farmer population and scarcity of labor.
- Low technology level of planters.
- Low income from agriculture due to increasing competition.

For Malawi, the negative internal factors that are affecting the growth and development of the farmer organizations include the following:

- High illiteracy level of the members and the country as a whole,
- Non-payments of registration and annual subscriptions.
- Lack of, or absence of technical specialists in most FOs

In Zimbabwe, the internal factors that have impacted negatively on the growth of some FOs include:

- Loss of membership due to the Land Reform Programme resulted in the restructuring of some FOs and the retrenchment of some of its staff. Some Commodity Associations such as Grains and Cereals was merged with Oil Seeds, while the Wildlife and Crocodile Associations were dissolved.
- Erosion of revenue generating capacity of some FOs due to reduction in the amount of levies being collected. This is due to reduced commercial cropping programmes and introduction of controlled markets.
- Exodus of experienced and skilled staff due to the Union's failure to offer attractive packages.

In Lesotho, the internal negative factors that hamper the impact of farmer organizations include the following:

- Lack of lobbying and advocacy skills

- Lack of office space resulting in most of the organizations depending on Government institutions for office space and human resources.

For Botswana, the key factor identified is the inadequate capacity to manage the organizations and the industry.

In Zambia, the most important internal developments that have impacted negatively on the growth and development of FOs include:

- Poor communication with members
- Low involvement of members in policy formulation
- No affirmative policy to hoist capable women to decision-making positions.

For South Africa, some of the main factors mentioned include:

- Lack of capacity to engage in development.
- Lack of trade capacity.
- Lack of interaction with SADC Secretariat.
- Lack of sufficient funds to appoint additional key personnel and purchase equipment.

- The role of personalities and individual agendas amongst leadership.

4. Summary of SWOT analysis

The analysis of the profiles of various FOs in different countries highlight some strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats associated with these national farmer organizations involved in the study. Although these are different in many aspects, there are some common elements. Table 1 provides a summary of the main issues for most of the FOs:

5. Areas requiring development support

Based on their constraints and opportunities, the FOs identified specific areas where they need support from SACAU or any other stakeholders. Table 12 below provides details of those needs for the different categories of FOs.

Table 12: Key areas requiring development support

Areas	Category of Farmer organizations				
	Unions/ Association	Commodity association	Cooperative	Total	%
Overall capacity building	6	17	4	26	39
Training in management, advocacy, negotiation and lobbying skills	7	14	1	22	33
Information management and dissemination	4	6	1	11	16
Improved production techniques and technology	1	8		9	13
Functional offices (secretariat)	2	4	2	8	12
Funding	2	3	3	8	12
Development of economically sustainable FOs	3	4	1	8	12
Improvement of service delivery	4	4		8	12
Farmer development through training and direct support	4	3		7	10
Infrastructure improvement		3		3	4
Women empowerment		2	1	3	4
Trade facilitation in the region	1	2		3	4
Financial and labour management		1	1	2	3

% represents a percentage of the total number of FO (67) who identified that issue

The main areas requiring support include capacity building and training in a number of areas such as association management skills, financial management, advocacy, negotiation and lobbying skills. Other support is needed in areas on information management and dissemination as well as sourcing and dissemination of technology for improving production. Commodity associations need most of this support but it is also required in unions and cooperatives.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations for the way forward

The study has shown that there are many farmer organizations in the

different countries. These FOs are of different categories with the majority being commodity associations. The FOs are of different sizes in terms of membership, outreach, resource endowment (human, financial and assets) with the majority being small. The FOs are also of different ages with some being old and big but many have been formed in recent years and are still small capacity-wise. The FOs have been influenced positively and negatively by several external and internal factors. These factors have influenced the establishment and development of most FOs.

These situations affecting the FOs in the different countries of the region provide a wide avenue for SACAU and other stakeholders to support growth and

development of FOs in the region. Specifically, the following actions need to be considered:

a) Identification of key FOs in each country

Considering that there are many FO operating in different countries, there is need to identify few key FOs who can represent the needs of all other FOs. These could be apex FOs in the different categories of FOs. These will be the focal points for support and interaction with regional bodies like SACAU. The other FOs will be affiliated to these lead FOs and benefit from the regional linkages.

b) Conducting specific needs assessments on the identified FOs

For the identified contact FOs, there is need to undertake a deeper needs assessment of their operations considering that they operate in different external and internal environments. This will help in identifying their roles, responsibilities, challenge and constraints so as to determine specific areas on support and modalities for interaction and engagement.

c) Facilitate harmonization of roles and responsibilities of FOs

The study has shown that there are some FOs with similar roles and functions as members operating in the same or different countries. There is need to facilitate the process of harmonization and streamlining of the roles and responsibilities of the lead FOs so as to minimize competition or duplication of efforts. This will also ensure that there are clear channels for communication and support to the affiliate FOs and members. There might be need for regional guidelines or policy for establishment, operations and support for FOs that will be adopted by countries to ensure harmonization of operation of FOs in the region.

d) Support capacity building in policy awareness and analysis (national and regional policies), advocacy and lobbying skills and

leadership

The study has shown that there are a number of policy issues affecting the operations of the FOs positively and negatively. There is thus need for the organizations to continue lobbying government for better policies that create an environment conducive for the running of the organizations. Most of the FOs in most developing countries are not aware or are not conversant in the government policies affecting them as such they can not effectively analyze them and engage government in dialogue and policy reform process. Therefore there is need to support FOs in policy awareness and development of capacity to analyze policies and advocate for better policies.

The study has also shown that the most important priority for these organizations to forge ahead is through capacity building for the leadership, secretariats and member associations. The capacity building should be in the areas of association management, leadership skills, advocacy and lobbying skills, negotiation skill, monitoring and reporting skills. For the members, capacity building should be on business management through provision of training and information on business plans, production, marketing and leadership.

e) Facilitate enhanced networking and linkages among FOs in the region

The various FOs in the different countries are involved in linkages and networking among themselves and with outside stakeholders. For some FOs, there is not much linkage and networking happening. There is thus need for support in building effective linkages and networks for FOs with common characteristics and activities within the region and internationally. This will help in sharing problems, challenges, solutions, technologies and even resources among the FOs in the region.

f) Support improvement of

communication between FOs and members Analyzing the profiles of various FOs in different countries, it is evident that there is inadequate communication within the FOs. This is due to lack of financial resources and appropriate communication equipment. It is understood among FOs that communication is vital for the FOs to transmit information and provide services to their members as well as establishing linkages with other FOs and regional bodies. There is thus need for support the FOs in the region especially the lead FOs in developing appropriate communication mechanism and strategies and acquiring appropriate technology and equipment for communication.

g) Assist in raising funds to support operations of lead FOs

Most of the FOs in the region have a limited financial base and sources so that their operations and growth is severely limited. It has also been found that a lot of them are heavily dependent on donor funding. There is need for support in developing effective fundraising strategies to ensure sustainability of the FO operations. Donor support should also be sought regionally which will be used to support lead FOs in all the countries of the region in identified priority areas. This will promote coordination and harmonization of operations of FOs across the region.

Appendix 1:

History of establishment of FOs

Country	Union/ Association	Commodity Association	Cooperative
	Year Established	Year Established	Year Established
South Africa	TAU SA 1897	CANEGROWERS 1927	
	ABC 1943	PSA 1993	
	NAFU 1991	DFPT 1997	
	ADMA 1998	GSA 1999	
	CGA 1998	RPO 1986	WINPRO(KWW) 1918
Swaziland	CCU 1971	PTFA 2003	
	SNGPA 1988	SBGA 1989	
	SESAFA 2002		
Malawi	NASFAM 1997	TAMA 1929	MUSCCO 1980
	FUM 2003	MMPA 1980s	MALEZA 1999
		PIAM 1992	
		PAMA 1998	
		HODOM 1999	
		SBDARA 2000	
		ASSMAG 2001	
		Cassava Association 2003	
Zambia	ZWA 1995	PAZ not known	ZCF 1973
	ZNFU 1904	ECAZ 1904	
	TAZ 1964		
	OPPAZ 1999		
Zimbabwe	ICFU 1996	NADF 1965	
	CFU 1892	CPA 1970	
	ZFU 1991	HPC 1986	
	ZIADA 2001	TGT 2001	
		CA 2002	
		ZTA 1940	
		CGA 1965	
Mauritius	NFYF 1962	Federation of tea planters 1975	MCAF 1950
		MDFC 1992	
		CGA 1952	
		MVPA 2000	
		OPA 1991	
		MAMCF 1968	
Lesotho		LNWMGA 1967	LCCUL 1968
		LNDFA 1993	SACALE 2000
		BPFA 2001	
		LEHOFA 2003	
Botswana	BAU 1960s	BOFA 1994	
	BDA 1998		
	SSBAD 1996		
Tanzania	TCCIA 1988		
Namibia	NNFU1992		

Appendix 2:

List of organizations reviewed for this synthesis

South Africa

1. Agricultural Business Chamber (ABC)
2. National African Farmers Union of South Africa (NAFU)
3. South African Cane Growers Association (CANEGROWERS)
4. Transvaal Agricultural Union South Africa (TAU SA)
5. Deciduous Fruit Producers Trust (DFPT)
6. Potatoes South Africa (PSA)
7. Southern African Poultry Association (SAPA)
8. Citrus Growers Association of South Africa (CGA)
9. Red meat Producers Organization (RPO)
10. Wine Producers Organization (VINPRO)
11. Agri South Africa (Agri SA)
12. Grain South Africa (GSA)
13. Milk Producers Organization (MPO)
14. National Wool Growers Association (NWGA)

Malawi

1. Association of Smallholder Seed Multiplication Action Group (ASSMAG)
2. Horticulture Development Organization of Malawi (HODOM)
3. Small Beekeepers Development and Research Association (SBDARA)
4. Malawi Enterprise Zone Association (MALEZA)
5. Tobacco Association of Malawi (TAMA)
6. Paprika Association of Malawi (PAMA)
7. National Cassava Growers and Marketing Association of Malawi
8. National Smallholder Farmers Association of Malawi (NASFAM)
9. Malawi Union of Savings and Credit Cooperatives LTD (MUSCCO)
10. Malawi Milk Producers Association (MMPA)
11. Farmers Union of Malawi (FUM)
12. Poultry Industry Association of Malawi (PIAM)

Botswana

1. Botswana Agricultural Union (BAU)
2. Botswana Dairy Association (BDA)
3. Botswana Ostrich Farmers Association (BOFA)
4. Botswana Poultry Association (BPA)
5. Small Stock Breeders Association of Botswana (SSBAB)

Lesotho

1. Lesotho Co-operative Credit Union League (LCCUL)
2. Lesotho Horticultural Farmers Association (LEHOFA)
3. Lesotho National Dairy Farmer Association (LNDFA)
4. Basotho Poultry Association (LPA)
5. Lesotho National Wool and Mohair Growers Association (LNWMGA)
6. Sankatana Cooperative Alliance of Lesotho

Zambia

1. Poultry Association of Zambia (PAZ)
2. Zambia National Farmers Union (ZNFU)
3. Zambia Women in Agriculture (ZWA)
4. Environmental Conservation of Zambia (ECAZ)
5. Zambia Cooperative Federation (ZCF)

6. Tobacco Association of Zambia (TAZ)
7. Organic Producers and Processors Association of Zambia (OPPAZ)

Zimbabwe

1. Horticultural Promotion Council (HPC)
2. Commercial Farmers Union's (CFU)
3. Coffee Growers Association (CGA)
4. Tobacco Growers Trust (TGT)
5. Zimbabwe Farmers Union (ZFU)
6. Crops Association (CA)
7. Zimbabwe Indigenous Agro-Dealers Association (ZIADA)
8. Cattle Producers Association (CPA)
9. Zimbabwe Tobacco Association (ZTA)
10. National Association of Dairy Farmers (NADF)
11. Indigenous Commercial Farmers Union (ICFU)
12. Commercial Cotton Producers Association (CCPA)

Mauritius

1. Mauritius Deer Farming Cooperatives (MDFC)
2. National Federation of Young Farmers (NFYF)
3. Mauritius Co-operative Agricultural Federation Ltd (MCAF)
4. Federation of Tea Planters Cooperatives (FTPC)
5. Cane Growers Association (CGA)
6. Mauritius Vegetable Planters Association (MVPA)
7. Onion Producers Association (OPA)
8. Mauritius Agricultural Marketing Cooperative Federation (MAMCF)

Swaziland

1. Swaziland National Grain Producers Association (SNGPA)
2. Swaziland Banana Growers Association (SBGA)
3. Sembulelo Sakotini Farmers Association (SESAFA)
4. Power Team Feedlotters Association (PTFA)
5. Central Cooperative Union (CCU)

Tanzania

1. Tanzania Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture (TCCIA)