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Abstract

The pursuit of socio economic development lies in a government's ability to not only formulate appropriate policy, but lies in their ability or lack thereof to engage in effective and efficient management of the implementation of such policy. Good governance is a term associated with those governments who succeed in this regard. The overall objective of this paper is to critique the nature and extent of food security policy implementation in South Africa within a good governance framework. Furthermore, the paper explores the successes and failures of food security on poverty alleviation as a good governance strategy. The paper supports food security as one good governance practice contributing towards socio economic development and thus to an improved Public Administration.
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INTRODUCTION

Public Administration is as old as human history and has come a long way from being associated with activities aimed at managing the affairs of the monarch. The scope of Public Administration has expanded with the rise of the modern state and now includes policy decisions, planning, work organization and citizen participation as key factors guiding the successes and/or failures of government towards the achievement of internationally set guidelines for governments. Post colonial states in a modern era are challenged further by the need for state sponsored socio economic development. In an age of increasing poverty and high unemployment, effective and efficient policy implementation is important in addressing socio economic development.

It is the purpose of this paper to explore the link between socio economic development and good governance. The overall objective of this paper is to critique the nature and extent of food security policy implementation in South Africa within a good governance framework. Furthermore, the paper explores the successes and failures of food security on poverty alleviation as a good governance strategy. The paper supports food security as one good governance practice contributing towards socio economic development and thus to an improved Public Administration.

GOOD GOVERNANCE

The concept of ‘governance’ is a very old one. It can be traced back to the works of Aristotle, who referred to governance as a state ruled by an ethical and just governor. In its simplest form, the word “governance” refers to an activity, whilst the word “government” refers to those parties who put into effect the activities (Oxford English Dictionary 1989).

There are differing interpretations of the term ‘good governance’. According to the World Bank (1994) governance means more than government, and that it is the style of interaction between a government and the society that it governs. Olowu & Sako (in Cloete 2005:1) describes governance as “…a system of values, policies and institutions by which a society manages its economic, political and social affairs through interaction within and among the state, civil society and private sector”.

Good governance, according to the UNDP (quoted in Davids, Theron and Maphunye 2011:3) “comprises the mechanisms, processes and institutions through which collective decisions are made and implemented, the public, groups and communities pursue their visions, articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences”. Good governance in this regard includes the
levels of accountability, levels of ethical standards and the extent to which the government responds to the needs of its people.

In a report entitled “Governance and Development (1992)”, the World Bank endorsed “good governance” as a core element of development strategy. The bank focused on the capacity of a government to formulate and implement financial and economic policy as being a key factor for good governance. Four key dimensions of good governance were identified, namely: public sector management, accountability, the rule of law, transparency and access to information. This language was adopted by its “sister” banks including the African Development Bank and as a result has had an impact on the interpretations adopted by NEPAD and its member countries (Davids, Theron and Maphunye 2011:3).

Despite the varying definitions and interpretations of good governance, there is acceptance that it is an important part of a modern state. Good governance is treated both as a means to an end through its focus on sustainable and equitable economic development; and as an end in itself, through its focus on political stability, transparency and accountability. The distinction between good and bad governance would thus be based upon a government’s ability to manage its affairs and deliver services. The four dimensions identified by the World Bank are the focus for this paper and are thus used as a framework for good governance.

**Figure 1: The Four Dimensions of Good Governance**

Source: Adapted from World Bank (2010)
Public Sector Management

Policy making starts with an understanding of the situation within a society and defining what policies are required to address those needs. For socio economic development, this requires an unbiased information base on those who are poor, where they are geographically located and what the causes of poverty are.

Where democratic governance prevails, the formulation and implementation of government development policy agenda strongly depends on the support of political parties, pressure groups and external actors who may be funding the process. This can present problems in the way that “problem areas” are prioritized, causing problems in addressing the needs of communities. These internal power plays are an important part of the democratic process but can hinder the achievement of socio economic development (Kaufman & Kraay 2003).

Accountability

The concept of ‘accountability’ implies that individuals are held responsible for their actions and are required to report to a recognised authority. Accountability hence forms an important component of the level of legitimacy that a government possesses and displays. Despite the fact that accountability is generally viewed as desirable in any organisation, there will be a tendency to avoid accountability. The notion of an organisation with perfect accountability must be dismissed, but it must be noted that there is a level at which the absence of accountability impacts on the legitimacy of the organisation (Edwards & Hulme 1995). Methods of accountability include formal methods through evaluations and annual reports, or informal through discussions (Haque 2000: 599).

Central to accountability is that those to whom one is accountable exercise the power (through the ability to participate) to regulate and guide interventions. They decide the substantive meanings given to development, to the boundaries one draws (or does not draw) between interventions and their turbulent contexts, and the rationale (goal-oriented or action-learning oriented) for interventions. Critical issues for government accountability are: Who does the planning? How it is implemented? Who implements it? Who organises the process of accounting? (Zwane & Duvel 2008: 116).

Political accountability means regular and open methods for sanctioning or rewarding those who hold positions of public trust through a system of checks and balances among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Administrative accountability implies systems of control internal to the government including public service standards and incentives, ethics codes and administrative reviews (Cheema and Rondinelli 2003).
Decision-makers in formal and informal structures should be answerable to the people they serve for their actions. Accountability cannot be ensured without the rule of law and transparency.

**Legal Framework**

This principle is aimed at commenting on the integrity of the state. The rule of law acts as a safeguard against random use of government authority and lawless activities. Legal frameworks should be adopted and enforced in conformity with established procedures, and be public and accessible to all. No person or body can breach the law with impunity. Institutions and processes should serve all stakeholders within a reasonable timeframe. Governing structures, either formal or informal, should respond to a wide range of diverse interests, including those of the most vulnerable and poor (Ghaus-Pasha 2007).

**Transparency and information**

Transparency implies that timely and reliable information on the decisions and performance of all decision-making structures should be freely and easily accessible by the public. Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take that may affect people’s socio economic development. People must be informed about the decision-making processes and who is accountable and responsible for what.

All members in a society should feel that they have a stake in government. All groups, particularly the most vulnerable, should have opportunity to improve or maintain their livelihood. The principle of equality requires that every person is equal before the law irrespective of sex, age, race, color, religion or any other ground. It also includes the need for specific measures aimed at correcting de facto discrimination or eliminating conditions that cause or help to perpetuate discrimination in practice as well as measures promoting equality among persons and groups. All men and women should be able to participate in the planning, design, monitoring and evaluation of decisions that affect them. Thus, individuals should be able to take part in the conduct of public affairs, including the adoption and implementation of state policies. Such participation should be active, free and meaningful whether it is exercised directly or through intermediary organizations representing specific interests (Ghaus Pasha 2007).

In totality, good governance is participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows the
rule of law. The nature and extent of corruption is minimal, the views of minorities are taken into account and that the voices of the most vulnerable in society are heard in decision-making and are thus included in the policy making process. Good governance is responsive to the present and future needs of the society it represents and hence provides a basis for development.

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

Depending on the context and the objective sought, governance is qualified as “good”, “democratic” or “responsible”, and said to include: political pluralism, the rule of law, an efficient and effective public sector, legitimacy, effective participation, full respect and protection of human rights, multi-actor partnerships, political empowerment, absence of corruption, sharing of power, equity, sustainability and responsiveness (Abdellatif 2003:7). It is employed in varying contexts, with different meaning and different degrees of precision. Within a larger context, good governance raises questions over coordination of government activities, competences, participation, transparency, and accountability and performance, which is a cornerstone for this paper.

Democratic governance means that: people’s human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected, allowing them to live with dignity; people have a say in decisions that affect their lives; people can hold decision-makers accountable; inclusive and fair rules, institutions and practices govern social interactions; women are equal partners with men in private and public spheres of life and decision-making; people are free from discrimination based on race, ethnicity, class, gender or any other attribute; the needs of future generations are reflected in current policies; economic and social policies are responsive to people’s needs and aspirations (Abdellatif 2003:8).

GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

Governance became important in the development field at a time when development policies were failing and structural adjustments became the new language for governments seeking assistance with socio-economic development. The new language emphasized the need for government efficiency and effectiveness for economic performance and development interventions to be possible. Calls for governments to rule out corruption and for officials to be financially accountable and transparent became part of the small print of financing agreements. Assessing the levels of good governance was largely aimed at economic criteria rather than assessing the impact of development intervention on peoples’ socio economic status (Ghaus-Pasha 2007). The framework for good governance encourages socio economic
development, and the Millennium Development Goals sets out specific targets for such development. A discussion of the Millennium Development Goals will now follow.

**MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS**

The international community has been committed to fighting poverty and hunger through a series of statements issued at international summits of heads of state culminating in The Millennium Declaration issued at the 24th special session of the United Nations General Assembly in June 2000. The declaration reflects consensus on a common vision of “…peace and security, development and poverty reduction, securing human rights, and … democracy and good governance” (Abdellatif 2003:2). The framework presents eight goals, 18 targets and 48 indicators were decided upon as the development goals which present a pro-active strategy towards sustainable socio economic development.

The key areas of focus are:

1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
2. Achieve universal primary education
3. Promote gender equality and empower women
4. Reduce child mortality
5. Improve maternal health
6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases
7. Ensure environmental sustainability
8. Develop a global partnership for development

Good governance and the MDGs are linked in two ways according to Ghaus- Pasha (2007:16-17):

- **Indirectly**, through the growth of a country; and
- **Directly**, through issues of administration that affect the attainment of the MDGs.

Effective and efficient economic governance has the potential to lead to further economic growth. This will further enable the effective and efficient implementation of socio economic policies. Combined with competent government officials, an independent judiciary, “…along with proper information technology, open and transparent public institutions, a literate civil society to better act as “watchdog” of public sector activities, and extensive participation in decision making and other stages of development” can facilitate improved institutions, which, in turn, ensure that effective and efficient socio economic policies are made and their implementation monitored (Ghaus- Pasha 2007: 17).
Kaufmann and Kraay (2003) argue that the negative impact of the cost of good governance must also be considered. By this they imply that whilst good governance can lead to higher socio economic growth, that growth does not automatically imply the enforcement of good governance. Their findings have two important implications for socio economic development. The first is that waiting for improvements in governance such as democracy, improved accountability and transparency to automatically become part of normal functioning as countries become richer is unlikely to happen. The second, point is that it is unlikely that a “virtuous circle” of improved governance leading to improved socio economic development will lead to further improvements in levels of governance (Ghaus- Pasha 2007: 18).

While good governance can contribute to socio economic growth, and the opposite, poor governance can hinder socio economic growth governance can be enhanced by investing in the socio economic development of communities. This reinforces the need for broad based strategies aimed at the socio economic needs of communities. Bringing about any change, like achieving the MDGs, requires a positive policy environment, adequate resources and an institutional framework to guide these processes. These elements emphasize the critical dimensions for good governance. Good governance through the adoption of its main principles can present the opportunity of achieving the MDGs. However, it is important to take into consideration the existing socio- economic, political and historical context of each country. Further, issues related to power and distribution of resources remains critical for the success and/ or failure to attain good governance and the MDGs. Achievement of the MDGs nevertheless requires a policy framework that together with a skilled public service can assist in achieving good governance and socio economic development for which poverty reduction is a key strategy as the first goal of the MDGs (Vyas- Doorgapersad 2010:225).

GOOD GOVERNANCE, THE MDGS, FOOD SECURITY AND THE RIGHT TO FOOD

The Millennium Development Goals has, as its first priority, the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger. Under this goal, world leaders have committed themselves to halving the number of hungry people before 2015. As this deadline draws near, there is realization that these goals are unlikely in many countries in sub-Saharan Africa where recent estimates indicate a shortfall (UNDP Report on Human Development 2010). Recent reports indicate that population growth and consumption increases will accelerate the demand for food and augment competition over land, water and energy amongst other resources (Godfray, Beddington, Crute, Haddad, Lawrence, Muir, Pretty, Robinson, Thomas and Tolmin 2010:812). This presents a complex challenge for governments in their attempt to provide for the socio-economic welfare of its
communities as food security in its most primal form is defined as access by all people at all times to food (Mohamed Sayeed & Pillay 2011a). This right is entrenched in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and needs to be a fundamental objective of development policy aimed at good governance.

Achieving food security has three proportions. Firstly, it is necessary to ensure at a national and household level, a nutritionally adequate food supply. Secondly, it is necessary to have stability in the supply of food. Thirdly, it is important to make certain that each household has access to enough food to meet its needs without waste or over consumption being encouraged. The key challenge thus for food security policy, is whether, and to what extent, growth will translate into socio economic development and poverty reduction. Policy would need to focus on the creation of opportunities for the poor to improve their livelihoods by promoting development, and, needs to ensure that ensure that policy implementation leads to access to food thereby improving their productive potential (Mohamed Sayeed & Pillay 2011a:5).

Improving global governance of food and nutrition security through the “Rome principles for sustainable global food security” as part of the World Summit on Food Security Declaration (2009) underline the need to “Foster strategic coordination at national, regional and global level to improve governance, promote better allocation of resources, avoid duplication of efforts and identify response-gaps.” (UNDP Report on Human Development 2010). According to Rosegrant and Cline (2003:1917) food security will remain a challenge for the next 50 years and beyond. The 2020 Vision of Food for All represents a shift in these goals. As a result, real government commitment towards dealing with the complex issue of food security requires organized government with policies that respond to the needs of the final beneficiaries of policies rather than responding to the resources and powers that are closer to political elite. Pingali, Alinovi, & Sutton (2005:S19) argue that poverty reduction mechanisms via food security efforts need to have a “Twin Track Approach” to enhance the socio economic development of individuals and households. In other words, food security policy whilst aiming at reducing the risk of food insecurity needs to be combined with policy aimed at improving the economic welfare of the ends users of such policies. This remains a priority for UN driven food security efforts and needs to be considered when assessing food security policy at a country level.

FOOD SECURITY POLICY IN SOUTH AFRICA THROUGH A GOOD GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

As mentioned earlier in this paper, “good governance” is largely seen as a benchmark for government actions and performance. This term is used loosely in the South African
context to refer to the activities of government. With this in mind, the purpose of looking at food security through a good governance framework, is not to describe an ideal state of good or bad food security governance, but is aimed at providing a mechanism for analyzing and understanding the shortcomings in the existing governance reality in the food security policy implementation, to identify those factors that influence the implementation or lack thereof of policy decisions, and service delivery; and for integrating good food security governance dimensions in the revision and implementation of policy. This paper will now explore Food Security Policy in South Africa within a governance framework based upon the four principles identified by the World Bank (1994).

Public Sector Management and the Legal Framework for Food Security Policy in South Africa

Within South Africa, commitment to socio economic development is a key part of government activities. The legacy of apartheid has resulted in deeply fragmented communities whose potential for development lies within an inexperienced public service whose experience of accountability and performance is limited resulting in poor policy implementation (Bernstein 1994:5). Transition for South Africa as a developmental state, has witnessed extensive public sector investments aimed at the improvement in the socio-economic status of its population.

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) provides guidelines within which government has to determine its policies and how the administration of the public sector has to be conducted. Chapter 10 of the Constitution, 1996 for example, requires public administration to be governed by democratic values and principles as contained in the Constitution including inter alia:

- promoting and maintaining professional ethics;
- promoting the efficient and effective utilization of resources;
- development-oriented public administration;
- providing services impartially, fairly and equitably;
- responding to people’s needs by encouraging participation in policymaking;
- obtaining accountable public administration; and
• promote transparency by proving the public with timely, accessible and accurate information.

The Constitution thus presents a framework for democratic process which provides for equal representation. The eight Batho Pele principles provide a set of values and principles which place people first in the public service delivery process.

A performance based governance system of public services delivery is outlined in the Department of Public Service and Administration and in the Public Service Commission. The Public Service Commission outlines several indicators based upon constitutional principles.

Table 1: Principles for the Public Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPLE NUMBER</th>
<th>CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professional ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participatory Development orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Impartiality and fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transparency and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Human resource management and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Representatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cloete (2005:3)

These present key performance areas for public officials and ought to guide them in their daily activities. Elements of good governance are included here through ethics, efficiency and effectiveness, and transparency and accountability.

Poverty in South Africa is characterized by the inability of individuals, households or communities to attain an acceptable minimum standard of living due to lack of resources (Ngwane, Yadavalli & Steffens 2001: 201). Statistics South Africa in “Measuring Poverty in South Africa 2000) indicate that whilst at the national level South Africa is food secure, 14.3 million people are vulnerable to food insecurity (Statistics SA 2000).

Section 27 of the Constitution of South Africa provides that every citizen has the right to access to sufficient food and water. It further states that “the state must by legislation and other measures, within its available resources, avail to progressive realization of the right to sufficient food”. These goals have been translated into a strategy for food security. The vision of the Integrated Food Security Strategy is to attain physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food by all South Africans at all
times to meet their dietary and food preferences. Its goal is to eradicate hunger, malnutrition and food insecurity by 2015. The strategic objectives here are to:

- Increase household food production and trading;
- Improve income generation and job creation opportunities;
- Improve nutrition and food safety;
- Increase safety nets and food emergency management systems;
- Improve analysis and information management system;
- Provide capacity building; and
- Hold stakeholder dialogue.

The Department of Agriculture is the convener of the Integrated Food Security Strategy and has committed itself to the achievement of the first Millennium Development Goal which is the eradication of extreme hunger and poverty. (The Integrated Food Security Strategy for South Africa, Department of Agriculture: Republic of South Africa 2002; Altman, Hart and Jacobs 2009:345). There is however recognition by government that these goals will not be met within the time period and that these goals will have to be shifted by years if not by decades. The challenge for government and development practitioners is to find ways and means to “fast track” food security policy implementation in order to facilitate socio economic development (Department of Agriculture Annual Report 2008/2009; Jacobs 2009:410, Mohamed Sayeed & Pillay 2011a).

Surveys on policy and practice indicate that we are failing to meet development goals (Millennium Development Country Report 2010).
Table 2: Achieving MDG 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1</th>
<th>1994 baseline or closest year</th>
<th>Current Status or nearest year</th>
<th>2015 Target</th>
<th>Target Achievability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population below 1 $ (PPP) per day</td>
<td>11.3 (2000)</td>
<td>5.0 (2006)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>ACHIEVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty gap ration (1$ (PPP) per day)</td>
<td>3.2 (2000)</td>
<td>1.1 (2006)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>ACHIEVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of the poorest quintile in national consumption</td>
<td>2.9 (2000)</td>
<td>2.8 (2006)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage growth rate of GDP per person employed</td>
<td>4.7 (2002)</td>
<td>1.9 (2009)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>POSSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment to population ration</td>
<td>41.5 (2003)</td>
<td>42.5 (2009)</td>
<td>50 – 70</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of employed people living below $1 (PPP) per day</td>
<td>5.2 (2000)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of own account and contributing family workers in total employment</td>
<td>11.0 (2001)</td>
<td>9.9 (2010)</td>
<td>~5</td>
<td>POSSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age (as percentage)</td>
<td>9.3 (1994)</td>
<td>10.2 (2005)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No target</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A review of the MDG Country Report indicates the number of people living on less that $1 per day has decreased (see table above). Closer inspection indicates that this could be attributed to the increase in the number of people benefitting from social grants. These grants however should not be an end in itself as it does not provide for sustainable socio economic development. Poverty reduction mechanisms need to deal with the multi faceted nature of human development thereby supporting the need for participation in the process of development. It is also important to note that these statistics do not reflect individual access to food. Household surveys have indicated that rural women and children carry the burden of food insecurity (Aliber 2009: 384; Altman, Hart & Jacobs 2009: 351; Baiphethi & Jacobs 2009: 459), and as a result policy addressing food security and the implementers of policy need to be mindful of this.
The failure to meet goals set has been attributed to a failure in implementation (Brynard 2007; Edwards 2008). Poor implementation is thus having a devastating impact on poverty reduction efforts and thus on the socio economic status of households, especially women and children. The recent Human Development Report indicates that despite a marginal increase in Life Expectancy at birth, this value has dropped since 1994. Also, infant mortality still remains high.

Table 3: Human Development Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on health, public (% of GDP)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy at birth (years)</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health index (life expectancy)</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Women and children thus remain more vulnerable to food insecurity. For rural women who rely on agriculture as their livelihood, this raises questions over whether they are receiving the “right” forms of development intervention. Research has shown that women’s empowerment is a key contributor to food security and poverty reduction and further that women are the subsistence producers in sub-saharan Africa (Moser in Mohamed Sayeed & Pillay 2011:9). Thus investments in women’s subsistence agriculture has potential to impact on the food security status of the household and needs to be considered in the implementation of current food security policy in South Africa. Current policy focuses on agriculture as the main opportunity for success in obtaining food security. This according to Drimmie and Ruysenaar (2010:325) is evidence of apartheid “residual memory” which focused on production issues of white commercial farmers with little consideration for the majority black subsistence farmers. The focus of the Department of Agriculture is largely aimed at the commercial farmer as part of the land reform programme, and in extending skills to subsistence farmers with a view to supplying local markets. Altman, Hart and Jacobs (2009:356) argue that with an estimated 2.5 million households who engage in home food production, more robust policy intervention can go a long way in addressing the food security status of households (also Aliber & Hart 2009:359).

Food security policies currently tend to be implemented with a view to maintaining political support, rather than to improve food security within the country. Only some objectives are set that favor subsistence farmers. This contributes to ineffective policy implementation. A further dimension that will need to be addressed in the near future as
a result in rural to urban migration is urban agriculture as a mechanism for socio economic development (Crush, Hovorka & Tevera 2011:298).

If good governance is a factor for consideration through the food security policy, mechanisms for learning by both the implementers of policy and the end users of such policy need to be part of the policy process. Learning has the potential to influence more positive change and can have the effect of improving the livelihood status of individuals and households and can provide an overall improvement in the socio economic welfare of individuals and households. Further, Altman, Hart and Jacobs (2009:346) argue that food security cannot be understood in isolation from other developmental questions such as social protection, sources of income, rural and urban development, changing household structures, health, and access to land, water and inputs, retail markets, or education and nutritional knowledge as this impacts negatively on the ability to identify projects to improve access. The very nature of food security dictates that any response strategy should be multi-sectoral and inter-disciplinary in nature (Mohamed Sayeed & Pillay 2011a; Drimie & Ruysenaar 2010: 316).

If the rule of law and the prevalence of sound policies are taken as a measure of good governance, the South African government passes in this regard. However for good governance to be effected, policies need to be clear, understandable and user friendly. Further they need to provide a clear administrative framework clearly indicating rights, rules, duties, analysis and outline processes to be followed (Labadarios, Mchiza, Steyn, Gericke, Maunder, Davids, & Parker 2011:891). The rule of law and administrative frameworks offer opportunity for effective accountability and transparency measures to be implemented.

**Accountability and Transparency**

Food security policy formulation did not take place in a vacuum in South Africa. A history of disadvantage with its perpetuating inequalities has created a situation a deeply divided society. Community Extension Workers as implementers of the Food Security Policy are forced to work within this environment and are expected to respond to the needs of communities whilst at the same time adhere to the guidelines provided within the policy. The recent uprisings by communities is a wake-up call to those in leadership positions to reconsider the impact they are having on peoples’ lives and to re-evaluate the extent to which the promises made pre 1994 are being achieved. The failure of the Department of Agriculture to effectively implement the Food Security Strategy is a reflection of the how high it is on the political agenda in the country, and the extent to which it is considered as being critical for planned public sector-wide governance reforms.
Understanding specific power dynamics in food security governance itself is equally relevant. All countries have governance regimes of agricultural and food security policy which have developed in response to particular historical socio-economic and political challenges. These involve a variety of public and private actors developing and implementing formal and informal rules and procedures to organize and coordinate food production, processing, distribution and consumption at different scales. Cloete (2004:620) argues that insufficient use of policy impact indicators to enable governments to effectively assess the impact of policy has a devastating impact on the implementation of policy. Corruption adds a further dimension to the success and/or failure of food security policy. The most effective way of ensuring that the good governance dimensions are achieved through the Food Security Policy implementation in South Africa is to have an effective monitoring and evaluation information system that seeks to adhere to the basic principles and thereby ensures effective, efficient, accountable and transparent process.

Whilst currently there is no monitoring and evaluation information system in place for the Food Security Policy, there are guidelines through the Constitution, the Batho Pele Principles and Norms and Standards for Extension and Advisory Services in Agriculture. Added to which the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation Programme proposed in 2005 provides a framework for what it hopes to be a results oriented strategy to improve the implementation process. The degree to which monitoring and evaluation can bring about an improvement in the current effectiveness and efficiency of the food security policy depends on the current level of implementation of policy and the level to which its performance and accountability mechanisms can be improved. (Mohamed Sayeed & Pillay 2011a: 13; Zwane & Duvel 2008: 116, Duvel 2007:78; Duvel 2004: 2).

**SUMMATION**

The lack of growth, inequality in socio economic development and governance failure are considered to be the major reasons for the failure to meet the MDGs (Ghaus-Pasha 2007: iv). Developing countries face a number of challenges in the pursuit of socio economic development which are linked to good governance. These include the lack of pro poor policy, like a food security policy.

The delivery of public services is often surrounded by incidents of corruption and maladministration. In some cases, the decentralization of key public services has not occurred making access by the impoverished very difficult. Further these services need to be attuned to the needs of the end-users of these services. Targeted interventions are needed to assist with development in critical areas like nutrition, schooling and HIV/AIDS. A strong legal system with separation of powers is necessary. Monitoring
and evaluation systems are necessary to ensure that policy is implemented effectively and to monitor the performance and accountability of public servants.

Striving for good governance has provided an appropriate framework for socio economic development through the Food Security Policy. The problem however is that the accountability and transparency dimensions are not being met. Capacity to implement the policy is a major problem, together with high levels of corruption. A focus by the Department of Agriculture on commercial farming as opposed to subsistence farming presents a further problem for success of the food security policy.

What is good? What is wrong? What is next?

- Mohamed Sayeed & Pillay (2011a:16) argue that whilst the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) contains clear guidelines about policies and the administration thereof, they are failing to meet development goals as a result of a failure in implementation largely due to a lack of capacity.
- Food Security strategy for improved socio development needs to be part of a twin track approach aimed at both economic development and social development and in the process work towards good governance.
- A more comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system needs to be implemented in order to ensure that the elements of accountability and transparency are achieved.
- A multi-disciplinary approach to Agriculture Extension with a focus on policy analysis can improve the skills base and thus the level of professionalism displayed by those tasked with the implementation of the Food Security Policy (Mohamed Sayeed 2011b:17).
- Good governance provides a stepping stone towards socio economic development.
- Food security initiatives present but one aspect of socio economic development.

To conclude, this paper on food security is based on on-going research for academic scholarship towards a doctoral qualification. When this overall study is completed several innovative interventions and recommendations, culminating in a holistic model will be proposed.
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