

# ANNUAL REPORT

2020/2021



**COMMISSION ON RESTITUTION OF  
LAND RIGHTS**



# ANNUAL REPORT

## Commission on Restitution of Land Rights



1 April 2020–31 March 2021



## Letter of transmission

Honourable Didiza, AT (MP)  
Minister of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development

Madam,

### **Report to Parliament in terms of section 21 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act No. 22 of 1994)**

It is my pleasure to submit this Annual Report of the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights (CRLR) for the financial year that ended on 31 March 2021 for tabling in Parliament. This is in compliance with section 21 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, which prescribes that the CRLR submits this report no later than 1 June every year.

I will present the same report to the relevant Portfolio Committee in the National Assembly, as well as to the Select Committee of Land and Mineral Resources in the National Council of Provinces, on the dates to be decided by these committees.

Yours faithfully

**Ms Nomfundo Ntloko-Gobodo**  
**Chief Land Claims Commissioner**  
**August 2021**



# Table of contents

Letter of transmission	i
Abbreviations, acronyms and terminology	1
Minister's foreword	3
Overview by the Chief Land Claims Commissioner	6
Accounting Officer's Statement	8
<b>Part A: General information</b>	<b>9</b>
Contact details	10
Strategic overview: Vision, Mission and Values	12
Legislative and other mandates	12
Organisational structure and Restitution Management Team	14
<b>Part B: Performance information</b>	<b>15</b>
Service delivery environment	16
Organisational environment, developments and changes	16
Inter-Ministerial Committee on Land Reform	18
Strategic outcome-oriented goals	19
Overall performance and delivery in terms of the Annual Performance Plan	21
Performance information per province	27
Eastern Cape	28
Free State	34
Gauteng	38
KwaZulu-Natal	44
Limpopo	50
Mpumalanga	56
North West	62
Northern Cape	68
Western Cape	72

**Part C: Financial information****77**

Introduction	78
Financial performance overview	78
Report of the Auditor-General	81
Annual financial statements	86

**Part D: Governance****99**

Introduction	100
Risk management	100
Internal audit and audit committees	100

**Part E: Human resource management****101**

Introduction	102
Human resource statistics	102
Performance management	106
Employee Health and Wellness	106

<b>Annexure A</b>	<b>108</b>
-------------------	------------



# Abbreviations, acronyms and terminology

<b>AGSA</b>	Auditor-General of South Africa
<b>APP</b>	Annual Performance Plan
<b>CLCC</b>	Chief Land Claims Commissioner
<b>CoE</b>	Compensation of employees
<b>CPA</b>	Communal Property Association
<b>CPI</b>	Consumer Price Index
<b>CRLR</b>	Commission on Restitution of Land Rights
<b>DG</b>	Director-General of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform
<b>DALRRD</b>	Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development
<b>DRDLR</b>	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform
<b>EHW</b>	Employee Health and Wellness
<b>GCIS</b>	Government Communication Information System
<b>GRAP</b>	Generally Recognised Accounting Practice
<b>HR</b>	Human Resources
<b>IESBA</b>	International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants
<b>IMC</b>	Inter-Ministerial Committee on Land Reform
<b>ISA</b>	International Standards on Auditing
<b>LAMOSA</b>	Land Access Movement of South Africa
<b>LCC</b>	Land Claims Court
<b>MP</b>	Member of Parliament
<b>NMOG</b>	National Macro Organisational Restructuring of Government
<b>OVG</b>	Office of the Valuer-General
<b>PAA</b>	Public Audit Act

<b>PERSAL</b>	Personnel Salary
<b>PFMA</b>	Public Finance Management Act
<b>PMDS</b>	Performance Management Development Strategy
<b>PMO</b>	Project Management Office
<b>PSSC</b>	Provincial Shared Service Centres
<b>RETM</b>	Rural Economy Transformation Model
<b>RLCC</b>	Regional Land Claims Commissioner
<b>SAFDA</b>	South African Farmers' Development Association
<b>SANParks</b>	South African National Parks
<b>SMS</b>	Senior Management Service
<b>SOP</b>	Standard Operating Procedures
<b>SSO</b>	Standard Settlement Offer
<b>TDT</b>	Tsitsikamma Development Trust
<b>LAMOS A 1</b>	Constitutional Court judgment of 28 July 2016 in the matter of Land Access Movement of South Africa and Others vs Chairperson of the National Council of Provinces and Others.
<b>LAMOS A 2</b>	Constitutional Court judgement of 19 March 2019 in the matter of the Speaker of the National Assembly and Chairperson of the National Council of Provinces vs LAMOS A and Others.
<b>The Constitution</b>	The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (Act No. 108 of 1996)
<b>The Restitution Act</b>	Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act No. 22 of 1994), as amended
<b>Old-order claims</b>	Land restitution claims submitted prior to 31 December 1998
<b>New-order claims</b>	Land restitution claims submitted between 1 July 2014 and 28 July 2016
<b>Phased claims</b>	If a project is very large, it is settled in phases due to all the claimed properties not being settled at once. It would therefore constitute a partial settlement. At this point, a commitment is created to the value of the partial settlement.
<b>Settled claims</b>	Claims are regarded as settled when signed by the Minister of Agriculture, Rural Development and Land Reform or in accordance with a delegation to the CLCC or if a court directive is received. When all phases have been concluded, a claim is settled. At this point, a commitment is created.
<b>Finalised claims</b>	Claims are regarded as finalised when full financial compensation has been disbursed or the land purchase price has been paid and the land has been transferred. It includes claims that have been dismissed, as well as when the commitment register has been cleared of any grant funding.

# Minister's Foreword



The 1913 Natives Land Act abolished indigenous forms of communal tenure that had existed among African and indigenous communities for centuries and crowded approximately 4.5 million black South Africans into a miniscule 13% portion of South Africa's land mass, essentially rendering them landless and homeless in the country of their birth.

The socioeconomic legacy of this land dispossession can be traced directly back to the highly unequal nature of contemporary South African society, in which more than a third of the country's black citizens still live in the former homelands and more than three million farm dwellers and workers reside on white-owned commercial farms without security of tenure.

The Restitution Programme, codified as a constitutional imperative, has the ambitious goal of not only reversing the damage caused by the Natives Land Act and other successive forms of institutionalised land dispossession, but to also ensure that restitution of land is sustainable and thriving.

The state's responsibility for land restitution is captured in section 25 of the Constitution, which, while providing for land reform, seeks to balance the state's power to expropriate land for land reform purposes with the land owner's rights to due process and compensation.

While noting parliamentary processes probing the viability of constitutional amendments that would allow the state to acquire certain types of land under certain conditions without compensation, it is necessary to recognise the

strides being made to restore land claimants' dignity under the current constraints.

As at 31 March 2021, the Restitution Programme has, since its inception, settled 82 198 land claims. The settlement of these claims has resulted in the award of 3.7 million hectares of land to beneficiaries at an amount of R24 billion. The programme has, furthermore, approved over 18 billion in the settlement of claims involving financial compensation, and has allocated an amount of R5 269 346 522,95 in development grants to beneficiaries of land restitution, utilising section 42C of the Restitution Act. It has also benefitted 2.2 million individual beneficiaries who are members of 442 948 households. Of those, 169 625 are female-headed households and 1 208 are households headed by persons living with a disability.

While noting these figures relating to both financial compensation and parcels of land restored to claimants to date, it is acknowledged as a common cause that much needs to be done to both hasten the pace of processing and settling the remaining less than 9 000 old-order claims, as well as to significantly improve the outcomes of restitution in relation to farm productivity and job creation.

The Department acknowledges that improvements at the post-settlement level depend on closer intra-departmental, government-wide integration and coordination in the provision of the myriad of services that cut across various mandates. It furthermore acknowledges that, notwithstanding institutional challenges that have been identified within the Commission, it could have done better if it had focused solely on the processing and settlement of claims.

The Commission is moving apace with developments to delineate areas of the legislation that focus it on the processing and settlement of land claims, while the Department and other relevant sectors take care of the broader aspect of sustainable land reform and agrarian transformation. As part of these developments, I am happy to announce that the Commission has finalised a business case that is a critical step towards transforming the organisation into an autonomous entity as required by the legislation and the Auditor-General of South Africa.

### **Performance in the year under review**

It is a common cause that COVID-19, which broke out in South Africa in March 2020, and the necessary containment measures declared by government, disrupted the operation of state organs. It is noteworthy, though, that – despite operating under such conditions – the Commission was able to achieve and exceed its 2020/21 annual performance targets, achieving 102% on the settlement of claims and 108% on the finalisation of claims. The Commission also managed to spend 100% of its final budget. It managed to do this by devising innovative strategies to execute some of the major claims-processing activities, while keeping within the COVID-19 regulations.

While COVID-19 remains vicious and continues to frustrate operations, the Commission intends to improve on these strategies to ensure that the momentum of settling and finalising claims is maintained and improved upon.

### **Programme and institutional alignment**

I am happy to report that Project Kuyasa, which seeks to improve the way the Commission does business, is beginning to bear fruit. Regarding the Organisational Form Project, a business case that contains more details on the proposed entity has been completed and submitted to the relevant structures. An interim structure, which accords more operational powers to the Commission to expedite the settlement of claims, has also been approved.

As a key subproject, the Backlog Reduction Strategy is taking on a clear form, with current projections – budget allowing – indicating that outstanding old-order claims could be settled within the next five years. I may also add that a complementary research strategy that is targeted at completing research on outstanding claims by 2023 has also been developed and approved.

Following the development of an improved business process that allows upfront development planning, the Commission has also completed the development of accompanying standard operating procedures (SOPs) for all claims-processing milestones. This is necessary since the settling of land claims is not enough without requisite prior land-use planning and continuous farmer development support.

Similarly, since settlement modelling frames both the settlement of a claim, as well as subsequent post-settlement requirements, the Commission has – in the preceding year – organised sector-based stakeholder engagement across various land uses to discuss and agree on the most appropriate settlement models. These engagements have resulted in the identification of sites where the settlement models are to be piloted.

The relevant state components, in partnership with private entities, are charged with the responsibility of coordinating and providing requisite support in the development planning, settlement modelling and post-settlement stages in all the claims that are settled. This is an important development that demonstrates that private and public sector partners see the importance of cooperative governance, which improves the sustainability of restitution settlements.

### **Broader legislative and policy development to facilitate speedier land reform**

At a legislative and policy level, measures aimed at supporting speedier and more cost-effective land reform are noteworthy. The Commission welcomes parliamentary developments towards the promulgation of an expropriation law for the country. Such a law will address major weaknesses identified by the Presidential Advisory Panel on Land Reform in the current antiquated Expropriation Act of 1975.

The Commission is particularly excited that this law will enable government to utilise a suite of land acquisition methods, inclusive of expropriation without compensation. The Presidential Advisory Panel, echoing the Commission, has also identified major constraints in the operations of the Office of the Valuer-General (OVG). These include the capacity constraints that result in longer turnaround times for the completion of land reform land valuations, thus negatively impacting on land reform performance. I have begun to address these challenges at the OVG, starting with appointments that are being made in some of the critical posts.

## Concluding remarks


In conclusion, we pay homage to all those in our country, especially land claimants, who succumbed to the ravaging COVID-19 pandemic while waiting for the resolution of their claims. We acknowledge that it has taken much too long to settle and finalise the backlog old-order claims, notwithstanding financial and other constraints. It is, however, encouraging that, as demonstrated in this report, the Commission has implemented demonstrable measures that are aimed at expediting the settlement of all outstanding old-order claims: measures that are now starting to pay dividends.

Equally significant are measures aimed at ensuring that the land, once restored, is used productively and optimally.

Finally, in presenting this 2020/21 Annual Report, my staff and I are grateful for the continuous guidance and support that the Portfolio Committee provides to the Department and the CRLR. We thus commit to redouble our efforts to ensure that the remaining claims are dealt with expeditiously.



**Honourable Didiza, AT (MP)**  
**Minister of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development**



# Overview by the Chief Land Claims Commissioner



We have reported, on numerous occasions, that the CRLR is neither structured nor operates as intended by the founding legislation. This is said to have contributed, in no small measure, to some of the performance weaknesses that have been widely reported. This issue is now a common cause and, as will be seen, this report is devoted largely to updating the public on the progress made with the redress measures instituted thus far.

Before we go into matters relating to organisation development, we first wish to review our performance in the financial year under review.

## Performance in the preceding year

The Commission, like all other organisations, was negatively impacted on by the COVID-19 pandemic and the state of disaster declared by government to mitigate its effects. Against such odds, the Commission managed to not only achieve, but to over-deliver on all its annual performance targets.

The Commission settled 10 claims against the target of the originally tabled Annual Performance Plan (APP) of 454 and 314 against the retabled APP target of 244, which resulted in an overall performance of 324 claims settled. It also finalised 49 claims against the initial APP target of 479 and 336 against the retabled APP target of 295, which resulted in an overall performance of 385 claims finalised.

The Commission was able to perform some of its main claims-processing activities due to strategies devised to conduct “business unusual”. This meant that meetings were

held with claimants while controlling group numbers within existing regulations.

## Institutional challenges linked to Project Kuyasa’s deliverables

In the previous report, we mentioned that the Commission had initiated an overarching organisational and performance improvement project called Project Kuyasa. The objectives of this project are tailored to resolve the challenges that we briefly sketch out here before we delve into the progress that has been made.

We previously reported that section 4 of the Restitution Act, which establishes the Commission, envisions an independent statutory body charged with the responsibility of investigating and facilitating negotiations towards the settlement of land claims. The Commission, however, operates as a branch in the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD). It has raised the challenge posed by this setup, which not only compromises the operational independence of the Commission envisioned by legislation, but also makes the organisation prone to resource constraints.

We have raised the concern that the Commission is stretched beyond its legislated mandate of investigating and resolving land claims. We are of the opinion that matters related to land development could be better and more suitably performed by other government components, while the Commission focuses on processing and settling claims. This, we pointed out, is exacerbated by the centralised nature of the current Commission structure, which provides for only one Regional Land Claims

Commissioner (RLCC), who is in the national office. Owing to the numerous statutory powers of the RLCC during the processing of a claim, the structure is prone to performance bottlenecks.

We acknowledged that project management had not been mainstreamed in the processing of land claims, and that the method of claim counting has not been consistent. This has resulted in both varied claim settlement timelines and fluid outstanding claims baselines.

We conceded that the research of claims, which is a fundamental stage in the processing of a claim, remains a particularly challenging area with regard to requisite skills and management. We furthermore acknowledged that we did not have SOPs for all stages of claims processing. This made it difficult to promote standardisation and monitor non-compliance.

We have indicated that the gains of land reform are essentially reversed when planning for proper land use is not undertaken prior to the settlement of a land claim and land acquisition. We pointed out that this area requires the involvement of both private and public sector partners. These challenges have also been raised in reviews conducted by other competent state entities. It is of critical importance then to ask: What has been done?

### **Project Kuyasa progress made thus far**

We are excited to report that Project Kuyasa is beginning to bear fruit in the Organisational Form Project. Following the discussion and agreement on the suitable corporate entity, the following has been achieved:

- The business case, which details the proposed design and cost implications, has been developed and submitted for further processing by the relevant authorities.
- The Minister has approved an interim Commission structure, which begins to introduce some level of operational autonomy, as well as several RLCCs based on a cluster of provinces. This will somehow resolve the problem of centralisation of the powers of the RLCC.
- Related to the organisational form and the interim structure are advanced discussions and agreement within the Department that the Commission focuses on the processing and settling of land claims.

In order to mainstream the project management of claims processing and demystify the statistics, the Backlog Reduction Strategy has delivered results in the form of the following:

- A plan that, within available resources, projects to settle all outstanding claims within the next five years
- A project reporting and monitoring tool that allows management to monitor the processing of claims at any given time
- Related and, as a reinforcement to this project, the mandatory use of the figures of the Backlog Reduction Strategy in all reports on outstanding claims
- An approved research strategy that projects the completion of all research on outstanding claims by 2023.

This strategy also introduces mandatory specialised research units within all Commission offices that have significant numbers of outstanding claims.

To improve operating procedures and standardise implementation, the following strides have been made:

- Final business processes have been developed and approved
- SOPs have been developed across the entire business process
- SOPs have been workshopped with implementers and are now ready for piloting in identified pilot sites

While the Commission is correctly relieved of land development or post-settlement activities, it has created a business process that allows for land development planning prior to the settlement of a claim. The Commission has also organised stakeholder engagements to develop claim settlement models suited to various land uses.

In this regard, the following can be reported:

- The following stakeholder engagements were held: Sugarcane claims in KwaZulu-Natal, mining claims in the Northern Cape, forestry claims in Mpumalanga, conservation and tourism claims in North West, high-value agriculture claims in the Eastern Cape, and urban settlement development claims in the Western Cape.
- The piloting of settlement models on identified claims across land uses in the same identified provinces with the intention to move towards consensus on the most suitable model.

We also note the positive steps taken by the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development to alleviate the capacity constraints within the OVG. This demonstrates a shared understanding that bottlenecks in the OVG militate against the faster settlement of claims. At a bilateral level, the Commission continues to monitor and review performance on the service delivery agreement that has been entered into with the OVG.

### **In conclusion**

The Commission intends to build on the progress being made in Project Kuyasa and, budget allowing, to significantly increase the number of claims settled so that all outstanding claims are settled within the next five years. My staff and I are indebted to the support provided by the Minister of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development, and the Portfolio Committee, which demonstrates our common and shared devotion to the noble cause of land restitution.



**Ms Nomfundo Ntloko-Gobodo**  
**Chief Land Claims Commissioner**

# Accounting Officer's Statement



## Statement of responsibility and confirmation of the accuracy of the Annual Report

To the best of my knowledge and belief, I confirm that:

- All information and amounts disclosed throughout the Annual Report are consistent.
- The Annual Report is complete, accurate and free from any omissions.
- The Annual Report has been prepared in compliance with section 21 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act (Act No. 22 of 1994).

The Annual Report has been prepared broadly in line with the guidelines issued by National Treasury. The Restitution Programme will be dealt with more comprehensively in the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture, Land

Reform and Rural Development, as a programme of the Department.

In my opinion, the Annual Report fairly reflects the operations, performance information, human resources information and financial affairs of the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights for the financial year that ended on 31 March 2021.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'M' followed by a horizontal line and a small flourish at the end.

**Mr M Ramasodi**  
**Acting Accounting Officer: Department of Rural Development and Land Reform**

# PART A

## GENERAL INFORMATION



*The CRLC is resolute to transform the economy to serve all people with a radical land reform plan to broaden landownership and equitable redress*

# 1. Contact details

## Commission on Restitution of Land Rights

**Postal address:** Private Bag X833, Pretoria, 0001  
**Physical address:** 266 Pretorius Street, Centre Walk Building (West Block), Pretoria, 0002  
**Tel:** 012 407 4400

<http://www.ruraldevelopment.gov.za>



## NATIONAL OFFICE

**Physical address:** 8th floor, Centre Walk Building, cnr Pretorius and Thabo Sehume Streets, Pretoria  
**Tel:** 012 407 4400/4402

### Chief Land Claims Commissioner

Ms Nomfundo Ntloko-Gobodo  
**Email:** [nomfundo.ntloko-gobodo@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:nomfundo.ntloko-gobodo@dalrrd.gov.za)

### Acting Deputy Land Claims Commissioner

Ms Cindy Benyane  
**Email:** [cindy.benyane@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:cindy.benyane@dalrrd.gov.za)

### Regional Land Claims Commissioner

Mr Lebjane Maphutha  
**Email:** [lebjane.maphutha@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:lebjane.maphutha@dalrrd.gov.za)

## REGIONAL OFFICES

### Eastern Cape

**Acting Chief Director: Land Restitution Support**  
Ms Zama Memela  
**Email:** [Zama.memela@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:Zama.memela@dalrrd.gov.za)  
**Postal address:** PO Box 1375, East London, 5200  
**Physical address:** Shop 15, Beacon Bay Crossing, Bonza Bay Road, Beacon Bay, East London  
**Tel:** 043 700 6000

### Free State

**Chief Director: Land Restitution Support**  
Ms Lezzane Naran  
**Email:** [lezzane.rungasamy@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:lezzane.rungasamy@dalrrd.gov.za)  
**Postal address:** PO Box 4376, Bloemfontein, 9300  
**Physical address:** 136 SA Eagle Building, Maitland Street, Bloemfontein  
**Tel:** 051 403 0700

### Gauteng

**Chief Director: Land Restitution Support**  
Ms Cindy Benyane  
**Email:** [cindy.benyane@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:cindy.benyane@dalrrd.gov.za)

**Postal address:** Private Bag X03, Arcadia, Pretoria, 0001

**Physical address:** 9 Bailey Street, Arcadia, Pretoria

**Tel:** 012 310 6500

### Limpopo

**Chief Director: Land Restitution Support**  
Mr Tele Maphoto  
**Email:** [tele.maphoto@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:tele.maphoto@dalrrd.gov.za)  
**Postal address:** Private Bag X9552, Polokwane, 0700  
**Physical address:** Kagiso House, 61 Biccard Street, cnr Rissik and Schoeman, Polokwane  
**Tel:** 015 284 6300/287 2600

### KwaZulu-Natal

**Chief Director: Land Restitution Support**  
Adv. Bheki Mbili  
**Email:** [bheki.mbili@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:bheki.mbili@dalrrd.gov.za)  
**Postal address:** Private Bag X3120, Pietermaritzburg, 3200  
**Physical address:** 2nd Floor, African Life Building, 200 Church Street, Pietermaritzburg  
**Tel:** 033 355 8400

### Mpumalanga

**Chief Director: Land Restitution Support**  
Mr Sam Nkosi  
**Email:** [sam.nkosi@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:sam.nkosi@dalrrd.gov.za)  
**Postal address:** Private Bag X11330, Nelspruit, 1200  
**Physical address:** Restitution House, 20 Samora Machel Drive, Nelspruit  
**Tel:** 013 755 8100

### North West

**Chief Director: Land Restitution Support**  
Mr Lengane Bogatsu  
**Email:** [lengane.bogatsu@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:lengane.bogatsu@dalrrd.gov.za)  
**Postal address:** Private Bag X8, Mmabatho, 2735  
**Physical address:** Cnr James Moroka and Sekame Drive, Megacity West Gallery, Mmabatho  
**Tel:** 018 388 7068

### Northern Cape

**Chief Director: Land Restitution Support**  
Ms Mangalane du Toit  
**Email:** [mangalane.dutoit@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:mangalane.dutoit@dalrrd.gov.za)  
**Postal address:** PO Box 2458, Kimberley, 8300  
**Physical address:** 4th Floor, Old SARS Building, Old Main Road, Kimberley  
**Tel:** 053 807 1340

### Western Cape

**Chief Director: Land Restitution Support**  
Dr Wayne Alexander  
**Email:** [wayne.alexander@dalrrd.gov.za](mailto:wayne.alexander@dalrrd.gov.za)  
**Postal address:** Private Bag X9163, Cape Town, 8000  
**Physical address:** 14 Long Street, Cape Town  
**Tel:** 021 426 2930



# Strategic overview

## 2. Vision

A commission of excellence that ensures that effective, efficient and speedy redress is provided to victims of racially based land dispossessions.

## 3. Mission

We exist to provide equitable redress to victims of racially motivated land dispossession, in line with the provisions of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act No. 22 of 1994), as amended.

## 4. Values

We uphold these values:

- We value and encourage diversity and will not discriminate against anyone. We uphold the rights of individuals as enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa.
- We strive to be transparent, accountable and responsive in all the services we offer to claimants and other stakeholders in order to ensure equitable redress.
- We strive towards maintaining high service standards through improved business processes and a focus on ethical and professional operational principles.
- We ensure that we have a dedicated, loyal, results-oriented, professional and people-focused workforce that is passionate, and committed to serving the people of South Africa.
- In collaboration with all stakeholders, the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights will comply with all laws of this country and will not pass any legislation that is in conflict with the Constitution.

# Legislative and other mandates

## 5. Mandate

The CRLR is meant to be an autonomous institution established by the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act No. 22 of 1994), to solicit, investigate and attempt to resolve land claims through negotiation and/or mediation, or otherwise refer the claim for adjudication to the Land Claims Court (LCC).

### 5.1 Constitutional mandate

#### 5.1.1 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (Act No. 108 of 1996)

The mandate for the restitution of land rights is derived from section 25(7) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, which states that a “person or

community dispossessed of property after 19 June 1913 as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to restitution of that property or to equitable redress.”

## 5.1.2 Legislative mandate

### 5.1.2.1 Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act No. 22 of 1994)

Emerging from section 25(7) of the Constitution, the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act No. 22 of 1994), as amended (also referred to as the Restitution Act), was promulgated. The long title of the Restitution Act is “to provide for the restitution of rights in land to persons or communities dispossessed of such rights after 19 June 1913 as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices; to establish a CRLR and a LCC; and to provide for matters connected therewith.”

The Restitution Act also empowers the Minister of Agriculture, Rural Development and Land Reform and the LCC to make awards to restitution claimants where they are satisfied that there is a valid restitution claim, by awarding to the claimant land, a portion of land or any other right in land, the payment of financial compensation, or an award of both land and financial compensation.

Section 21 of the Restitution Act stipulates that the CRLR must “annually, not later than the first day of June, submit to Parliament a report on all its activities during the previous year up to 31 March.” This Annual Report is in fulfilment of this requirement, but is also largely in line with the requirements of section 40(1) and (3) of the Public Finance Management Act, 1999 (Act No. 1 of 1999) (PFMA). The Public Service Regulations, 2001, prescribe that human resources information is included in the Annual Report and that the Minister of Public Service and Administration prescribes this requirement for all government departments within the public service.

As the CRLR is neither a fully fledged government department, nor a completely independent entity of government, this Annual Report only extracts and reports on the most crucial performance and reporting requirements in terms of the statutory requirements above. Comprehensive reporting on Programme 3

(the Restitution Branch) is done in the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development.

## 5.1.3 Constitutional Court judgments

The Restitution Amendment Act (Act No. 15 of 2014) was signed into law by the President, allowing for the lodgment of new claims for a further period of five years. On 27 July 2016, in terms of the first Land Access Movement of South Africa (LAMOSA 1), the Constitutional Court declared it unconstitutional and interdicted the state from processing all new-order land claims received during that time. Parliament was given 24 months from the date of the order to enact new legislation. In the meantime, these claims are being held in abeyance until Parliament passes a new Amendment Act.


A second judgment was handed down on 29 March 2019 (LAMOSA 2) after the Speaker of the National Assembly and the Chairperson of the National Council of Provinces (Parliament) – the applicants – sought an extension to the 24 months given in the 2016 judgment. The judgment was unanimous, dismissing the application. They further made provision for appropriate judicial oversight by the LCC. The Chief Land Claims Commissioner (CLCC) is required to file reports on a range of aspects, including constraints and solutions, and the LCC will have the necessary expertise to assist when needed.

The CRLR is prohibited from processing any new-order claims lodged between 1 July 2014 and 28 July 2016 until it has settled or referred to the LCC all claims lodged on or before 31 December 1998 (old-order claims).

In addition, the CLCC must file a report with the LCC at six-monthly intervals from the date of this order, setting out the number of outstanding old-order claims and how the CRLR intended processing them with an anticipated date of completion. The CRLR should also indicate the nature of any constraints, whether budgetary or otherwise, it faced in meeting its anticipated completion date.

The first report to the LCC was submitted on 19 September 2019. The second report to the LCC was submitted on 30 April 2020. The third report to the LCC was submitted on 19 November 2020.

# Organisational structure



## 6. Restitution Management Team

Chief Director: KwaZulu-Natal	Adv. Bheki Mbili
Chief Director: Gauteng	Ms Cindy Benyane
Chief Director: Western Cape	Dr Wayne Alexander
Chief Director: North West	Mr Lengane Bogatsu
Chief Director: Free State	Ms Lezzane Naran
Chief Director: Mpumalanga	Mr Sam Nkosi
Chief Director: Limpopo	Mr Tele Maphoto
Acting Chief Director: Eastern Cape	Mr Zama Memela
Chief Director: Northern Cape	Ms Mangalane Du Toit
Chief Director: Restitution Management Support	Mr Sunjay Singh

A Chief Director heads each of the nine provincial offices of the Regional Land Claims Commissioner. The Chief Land Claims Commissioner reports directly to the Minister of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development, although the Director-General remains the Accounting Officer in terms of the PFMA and the Restitution Act.

# PART B

## PERFORMANCE INFORMATION



***The CRLC has implemented demonstrable measures that are aimed at expediting the settlement of all outstanding old-order claims***

The Commission prepared the overview of its performance in the Annual Report against predetermined objectives in accordance with the requirements of sections 40(3)(a) and 55(2)(a) of the PFMA, Chapter 18, section 18.3.1(b) of the Treasury Regulations and Chapter 6 of the framework issued by National Treasury for managing programme performance information.

The information reported is a product of established internal policies, procedures and controls related to the management of performance information designed to provide reasonable assurance about the integrity and reliability of the performance information.

## 7. Service delivery environment

During the period under review, the CRLR operated as Programme 3 of the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development. The Commission settled 10 claims against the target of the originally tabled APP of 454 and 314 against the retabled APP target of 244, which resulted in an overall performance of 324 claims settled. It also finalised 49 claims against the initial APP target of 479 and 336 against the retabled APP target of 295, which resulted in an overall performance of 385 claims finalised.

The Auditor-General of South Africa (AGSA) found that the Commission is an entity in terms of the Restitution Act and that it must report separately as an entity under section 1 of the PFMA. This means that the CRLR must prepare financial statements in terms of standards of Generally Recognised Accounting Practice (GRAP) for the period under review.

Additional funding is required to accommodate functions such as supply chain management, human resource management, audit and risk management, and bookkeeping.

## 8. Organisational environment, developments and changes

The Commission started a business improvement project, Project Kuyasa, in the period under review. “Kuyasa” is the isiZulu phrase for “the sun is rising”.

This project is underpinned by insights from Project Phakisa, concluded in 2018. Project Kuyasa is a project to transform the Commission into a highly effective organisation with faster turnaround times, optimised processes, effective systems, efficient offices and improved customer service.

The objectives of Project Kuyasa are as follows:

- Improve business processes and systems in order to reduce the backlog
- Develop financial and settlement models
- Determine an appropriate organisational form with autonomy
- Develop an organisational structure design to support the redesigned process based on the new operating model

Based on these objectives, nine projects were identified, as set out below.

### Project 1: Backlog Reduction

The aim of the Backlog Reduction Project is to develop a Backlog Reduction Strategy and pilot the approach in preparation for implementation. This project will address the two key issues of defining and categorising the current backlog, and then to develop a strategy and plan to eliminate the backlog.

All provincial offices have performed a complete and comprehensive assessment of each outstanding claim, the properties under these claims, the location of the claims and other attribute data. Each claim was categorised according to the backlog status. During this process, pilots were completed and all provinces attended learning sessions. A tracking tool was developed from inputs obtained during the pilot.

An external verification agent will be appointed to conduct the physical verification of this data to ensure that the database reflects authentic information that is a true reflection of the project files.

Provinces started providing status updates on the progress made regarding the updating of outstanding claims data.

### Project 2: Process Improvement

The Process Improvement Project will arm the CRLR with improved business processes in order to be more effective and efficient in service delivery and the processing of land claims. The results of inefficient processes include unhappy clients,

stressed colleagues, missed deadlines and increased costs, as just some of the problems that can be created by dysfunctional processes, which is why it is important to improve processes when they are not working well. A key outcome of this project is the standardisation of the restitution business processes.

The business process was mapped at a Level 4 detail after a detailed consultative process had taken place. The approval of this mapping will lead to the development of SOPs, which will set out the responsibilities, accountability, consultation and information sharing.

### Project 3: Change Management

The main agenda of the Change Management Project is to counter the challenges related to change faced by the CRLR in its turnaround transition. The key agenda of the Change Management Project is to ensure that change is thoroughly and smoothly implemented; to ensure that the lasting benefits of change are achieved; and to give both internal and external stakeholders a level of comfort regarding the changes that are coming. It is imperative to create awareness of the need for change (for the organisation and for individuals); to understand the impact, risk and readiness for change; and to initiate a capacity-building journey in key leaders.

A Change and Stakeholder Management Plan was prepared, and internal and external stakeholder questionnaires were completed.

### Project 4: People Management

The agenda of the People Management Project is to develop an organisational structure that is best suited for the new CRLR, which is aligned to the “to-be” vision, and which will optimise service delivery. The project is expected to deliver an effective and efficient best-fit organisational structure, which will facilitate the delivery of the CRLR’s mandate, with a priority focus on improving service delivery. The development of an organisational structure that is linked to the appropriate organisational form will be accompanied by a skills development report and a transition plan, which will result from the project’s analytical activities.

### Project 5: Organisational Form

The overall objective of the Organisational Form Project is to identify the optimal operating model to deliver services to clients while identifying the resources required to most effectively deliver these services. This project will determine the appropriate business model for the CRLR by analysing various options, developing a business case for the selected option and supporting the CRLR through the process of approving the selected option. The project will be undertaken in three phases over a period of six months, ensuring that the expected benefits are met through the project.

### Project 6: Financial Model

The agenda of the Financial Model Project is to provide support in developing compensation models for the land restitution process and to develop an optimal strategic model for financial compensation awards, given the variable and predetermined parameters.

### Project 7: Settlement Model

The agenda of the Settlement Model Project is to enhance the processing and settlement of land claims in a manner that is fair, qualitative, comprehensive and inclusive. Various workshops and consultative meetings have been held with sector stakeholders.

### Project 8: Project Management

The overall objective of the Project Management Project is to design and implement a strategy, plans and tools to drive Project Kuyasa and ensure the on-time delivery of quality results for each workstream. The core responsibility of the Programme Management Office (PMO) is to ensure that the overall project is delivered on time and within budget, and to develop a project close-out report at the end of the project.

### Project 9: Project Close-out

Project Close-out will ensure the finalisation of all the project’s activities, the completion of all planned work, the archiving of project information and the release of project-specific resources.

## 9. Inter-Ministerial Committee on Land Reform

Since 2018, the Commission has been participating in the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Land Reform (IMC), established by President Cyril Ramaphosa. It is chaired by the Deputy President, David Mabuza. This committee provides political oversight on the implementation of Cabinet decisions on land reform and anti-poverty interventions. The decisions of the IMC impacted substantially on the operations of the CRLR, especially the increased focus on restoration and the transfer of state land.

In the previous financial year, the Commission reported the transfer of 181 land parcels, measuring 113 507.1800 ha in extent. In the current financial year, 120 land parcels were transferred, measuring 24 703.63916 ha in extent.

The breakdown of the land parcels transferred are as per the table below:

**Table 1: List of properties transferred**

Province	Transferred from 261 list	Transferred from 278 list	Additional list	Total	Hectares
Eastern Cape	0	0	0	0	0
Free State	0	0	0	0	0
Gauteng	0	0	6	6	19.5933
KwaZulu-Natal	1	0	10	11	5 660.4452
Limpopo	0	0	0	0	0
Mpumalanga	0	0	4	4	13 099.5103
Northern Cape	0	0	2	2	6.3714
North West	10	0	86	96	5 913.98745
Western Cape	-	1	0	1	3.7315
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>24 703.63916</b>

The financial year started while the country was under lockdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic. It resulted in the downward adjustment of targets due to the limited movement that was allowed under the state of emergency regulations that were applicable at the time. This, therefore, impacted negatively on the number of state land hectares that could be transferred.

The COVID-19 lockdown created delays as municipalities were unable to issue rates clearance certificates for properties due to staff working on a rotational basis.

The registration of legal entities to receive the transfer of state land was also hampered, for example in the Eastern Cape, the Tsitsikamma properties of approximately 8 600 hectares could not be transferred as it is a large community and convening community meetings to facilitate workshops to establish the legal entity was not possible. Settlement agreements to be signed by communities were also affected due to the inability to have large gatherings.

In general, there were delays in properties being released by the provincial or national Department of Public Works and Infrastructure due to user rights complications.

Delays in the subdivision and surveying of unsurveyed state land and litigation where there were competing rights remained a contributing factor that affected the transfer of land in the year under review.

# Strategic outcome-oriented goals

In line with the outcomes of government and as contained in the CRLR's Strategic Plan of 2015–2020, the Commission identified three strategic goals to be achieved in the period of this plan and beyond, as set out below:

Land rights restored in order to support land reform and agrarian transformation by 2020

1

Restoration of land rights or equitable redress to those dispossessed of rights in land as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices, prioritising claims lodged prior to 31 December 1998

Lodgement of restitution land claims reopened for people who did not meet the 1998 deadline

2

Solicit and receive claims for the restitution of land rights by 30 June 2019

Organisational change management

3

Improved corporate governance and service excellence through, inter alia, the operationalisation of an autonomous CRLR, a strengthened legal framework, improved business information and improved communication

In respect of Strategic Goal 1, the objectives of the CRLR's annual performance targets for the period covered by the Strategic Plan of 2015–2020 were to settle and finalise claims.

Strategic Goal 2 fell away following LAMOS 1 in 2016.

Strategic Goal 3 is directly linked to Project Kuyasa, which aims to standardise business processes in all provinces, to improve information and project management, to improve governance and communication, and to improve customer satisfaction and communication.



# Overall performance and delivery in terms of the Annual Performance Plan

The overall performance against the strategic objective to facilitate the restoration of land rights and alternative forms of equitable redress, as set out in the Annual Performance Plan 2020/21, is contained in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Report against the originally tabled Annual Performance Plan until date of retabing programme**


Performance indicator	Actual performance against target until date of retabing		Deviation from planned target to actual achievement (2020/21)	Reasons for revision to the outputs, indicators and annual targets
	Target (2020/21)	Achievement (2020/21)		
Number of land claims settled	454	10	The annual target was 454 with a Quarter 1 target of 57. Only 10 claims were settled against the Quarter 1 target, which resulted in a variance of 47 against the Quarter 1 target and a variance of 444 against the annual target. The variance was due to the COVID-19 lockdown restrictions, which made it impossible to interact with the claimants and other relevant stakeholders required in the process of settlement.	The target was revised from 454 to 244 due to the budget reprioritisation informed by the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) Circular 2 of 2020.
Number of land claims finalised	479	49	The annual target was 479 with a Quarter 1 target of 79. Only 49 claims were settled against the Quarter 1 target, which resulted in a variance of 30 against the Quarter 1 target and 430 against the annual target. The variance was due to the COVID-19 lockdown restrictions, which made it impossible for regional offices to interact with the claimants required in the process of finalisation.	The target was revised from 479 to 294 due to the budget reprioritisation informed by DPME Circular 2 of 2020.

**Table 3: Report against the retabled Annual Performance Plan**

Performance indicator	Actual performance against target until date of retabling		Deviation from planned target to actual achievement (2020/21)	Reasons for variance
	Target (2020/21)	Achievement (2020/21)		
<b>Number of land claims settled</b>	244	314	For the period under review and against the retabled APP target, 70 more claims were settled.	<p>The over-performance against the retabled annual target was due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The implementation of recovery plans since the under-performance in Quarter 1 and Quarter 3, which resulted in an overperformance in Quarter 4.</li> <li>• The reprioritisation of claims against the project registers and recovery plans to identify claims at advanced stages.</li> <li>• The approval of projects consisting of multiple claims (Gauteng, KwaZulu-Natal and Limpopo)</li> <li>• Consistent follow ups and interventions with the Office of the Valuer-General in terms of valuation requests</li> </ul>
<b>Number of land claims finalised</b>	295	336	For the period under review and against the retabled APP target, 41 more claims were finalised.	<p>The over-performance against the re-tabled annual target was due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistently meeting and exceeding the quarterly targets</li> <li>• Non-compliance in terms of section 2 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act (Act No. 22 of 1994)</li> <li>• The identification of 13 claims finalised in the first three quarters, which was omitted during these three reporting periods and reported as adjustments in Quarter 4.</li> <li>• Resolving issues pertaining to challenges regarding the transfer of state land to communities (North West and Western Cape)</li> <li>• Fast tracking financial compensation payments to claimants.</li> </ul>

**Table 4: Number of land claims settled: 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021**

Province	First APP target	First APP target achieved	Retabled APP target	Retabled APP target achieved	Total achieved
Eastern Cape	100	3	60	37	40
Free State	0	1	2	1	2
Gauteng	10	1	7	45	46
KwaZulu-Natal	100	0	29	37	37
Limpopo	64	0	64	112	112
Mpumalanga	90	1	40	38	39
North West	5	0	1	2	2
Northern Cape	7	0	1	6	6
Western Cape	78	4	40	36	40
<b>Total</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>324</b>



**Table 5: Number of land claims finalised: 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021**

Province	First APP target	First APP target achieved	Retabled APP target	Retabled APP target achieved	Total achieved
Eastern Cape	85	9	65	65	74
Free State	6	0	6	0	0
Gauteng	20	2	9	35	37
KwaZulu-Natal	137	34	50	50	84
Limpopo	32	1	32	30	31
Mpumalanga	54	2	54	64	66
North West	30	1	14	17	18
Northern Cape	15	0	5	15	16
Western Cape	100	0	60	60	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>385</b>





Table 9 shows the number of land claims settled and finalised per province

**Table 6: Number of land claims settled and finalised per province: 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021**

Province	Claims settled					Claims finalised				
	First APP target	First APP target achieved	Retabled APP target	Retabled APP target achieved	Total achieved	First APP target	First APP target achieved	Retabled APP target	Retabled APP target achieved	Total achieved
Eastern Cape	100	3	60	37	40	85	9	65	65	74
Free State	0	1	2	1	2	6	0	6	0	0
Gauteng	10	1	7	45	46	20	2	9	35	37
KwaZulu-Natal	100	0	29	37	37	137	34	50	50	84
Limpopo	64	0	64	112	112	32	1	32	30	31
Mpumalanga	90	1	40	38	39	54	2	54	64	66
North West	5	0	1	2	2	30	1	14	17	18
Northern Cape	7	0	1	6	6	15	0	5	15	15
Western Cape	78	4	40	36	40	100	0	60	60	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>385</b>



**Number of land claims settled and finalised per province: 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021**



## 10. Number of hectares settled and transferred

During the year under review, all submissions approved resulted in over 65 134.2348 hectares being settled. The cost of said land came to R772 361 720,75. A total of 39 372 beneficiaries benefitted from the Restitution Programme and over R1 327 758 212,59 was allocated to beneficiaries in the form of financial compensation.

**Table 7: Selected performance statistics per province**

Province	Hectares awarded	Land cost	Financial compensation	Grants	Total award
Eastern Cape	4 717.7730	2 800 000,00	596 555 160,68	-	599 355 160,68
Free State	627.9014	13 376 000,00	-	-	13 376 000,00
Gauteng	-	-	35 593 556,30	-	35 593 556,30
KwaZulu-Natal	12 752.1901	199 438 953,80	191 082 673,63	7 340 000,00	397 861 627,43
Limpopo	15 677.4680	124 301 000,00	229 907 436,36	-	354 208 436,36
Mpumalanga	5 740.7470	23 230 000,00	206 203 624,46	-	229 433 624,46
Northern Cape	87.0000	-	3 028 069,78	-	3 028 069,78
North West	25 523.8742	238 768 462,95	-	312 709,15	239 081 172,10
Western Cape	7.2811	170 447 304,00	65 387 691,38	50 745 637,00	286 580 632,38
<b>Total</b>	<b>65 134.2348</b>	<b>772 361 720,75</b>	<b>1 327 758 212,59</b>	<b>58 398 346,15</b>	<b>2 158 518 279,49</b>

**Table 8: Number of beneficiaries and hectares awarded per quarter**


Quarter	Beneficiaries	Hectares awarded
Quarter 1	8 245	4 840.4605
Quarter 2	8 199	20 330.4699
Quarter 3	5 928	23 540.1562
Quarter 4	17 000	16 423.1482
<b>Total</b>	<b>39 372</b>	<b>65 134.2348</b>

Table 9: Number of settled claims in rural, urban, female-headed households and people living with a disability

Province	Claims	Rural	Urban	Dismissed	Households	Female-headed households	People living with a disability
Eastern Cape	40	34	6	40	2 699	1 383	-
Free State	2	2	-	-	100	46	-
Gauteng	46	22	24	3	398	231	3
KwaZulu-Natal	37	13	24	4	768	386	59
Limpopo	112	112	-	1	952	428	-
Mpumalanga	39	38	1	29	1 185	668	-
Northern Cape	6	6	-	12	19	8	11
North West	2	2	-	1	835	25	-
Western Cape	40	-	40	4	139	55	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>7 095</b>	<b>3 230</b>	<b>73</b>

# Performance information per province

The Annual Report provides a selection of highlights of claims settled and finalised during the 2020/21 financial year. A comprehensive list of settled and finalised claims is included in Annexure A.





# Eastern Cape



## Number of land claims settled



## Number of land claims finalised



## Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, the Eastern Cape projected settling 60 land claims and finalising 65 land claims during the 2020/21 financial year. It succeeded in settling 40 land claims and finalising 74 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

**R599 355 160,68**

## Bulembu Community Claim



### The history

The Bulembu community was forcefully removed from Mbongiseni to the location where they currently reside, which is within Bulembu. The archival information shows that dispossession of a right in land first occurred in 1954 due to the Betterment Scheme in terms of Proclamation 31 of 1939 and Government Notice 791 of 1939.

The betterment and division of villages comprised camps that were at the centre of the village, which the community used for grazing. In 1963, the camps and recent boundaries of the village were fenced after the village was declared a betterment area.

In around 1981, the claimants were informed that an airport was to be built on their land by the former Government of Ciskei. At the time, the Bulembu community was utilising Camp 3 and Camp 4 for residential and grazing purposes. The claimant families lost their land rights when the Government of Ciskei started fencing portions of their grazing camps without giving them any compensation.



### The administration

The claims were lodged with the Office of the RLLC: Eastern Cape and were taken through a rigorous validation and vetting process to ensure that they comply with the Restitution Act. The claims were processed in terms of Rule 2 and Rule 3 of the Rules of the Commission and were accepted to meet the criteria as provided for in section 11(1), read together with section 2 of the Restitution Act, as amended, in that:

- The land claims submitted by the Bulembu claimants substantially meet the criteria of the prescribed claim form.
- The claimants are persons as defined in terms of section 1 of the Restitution Act and therefore competent in terms of section 2 of the Act to bring a restitution claim.

The claims are not precluded by the provisions of section 2(1) or section 1(A) of the Restitution Act in that:

- Just and equitable compensation was not paid at the time of the two dispossessions.
- The claims were lodged prior to the cut-off date of 31 December 1998, as set out in terms of section 2(1) of the Act.

It needs to be noted that the extent of 1 morgen reflected in Government Gazette Notice 2417 of 2002 is included in the total extent of the claimed land, which is 1 792 hectares. Interested parties were invited to forward their comments regarding the claims within 60 days of publication of the notice. However, the Office of the RLLC did not receive any response to the Notice.



### The settlement

The claimant community opted for financial compensation as a form of redress for their land rights lost as a result of dispossession. In calculating the monetary value of the claim, the Office of the RLLC: Eastern Cape commissioned a valuation to be conducted on the claimed property. This was conducted by an independent professional valuer, Meritone Valuations.

Valuation analysis was performed and the Bulembu community was subsequently presented with a standard settlement offer (SSO) as values updated through the Consumer Price Index (CPI) are below the SSO. The community accepted an offer of R47 263 422,00 and Phase 1 settlement was approved to the value of R14 201 216,00. The award per household is adjusted from R110 947,00 to R160 573,00 per right lost and in accordance with the latest financial compensation policy.

## Rosedale Community Claim



### The history

The Rosedale community was originally removed from Elangeni Forest in 1964 when their land was turned into forest plantations, and they were given compensatory land on Trust farms around Mthatha. While settled on the Trust farms, the claimants again lost their land, which they were using as arable land, as a result of the construction of Mthatha Dam in 1977.

The legislation responsible for the removal was the Native Trust and Land Act, Act No. 18 of 1936, through Proclamation 116 of 1949, which provided for the culling of livestock and the reduction of grazing lands, as well as arable and residential lands.

The Rosedale community was dispossessed of their informal or unregistered rights in land in the form of beneficial occupation for a continuous period of more than ten years. They were dispossessed of their unregistered rights in land in 1977.



### The administration

The claim was lodged with the Office of the RLCC: Eastern Cape and was accepted as having met the criteria provided for by section 11(1), read together with section 2 the Restitution Act, as amended and amplified by Rule 2 and Rule 3 of the Rules of the Commission, in that:

- The land claim submitted by the Rosedale community substantially meets the criteria of the prescribed claim forms.
- The claim is not precluded by the provisions of section 2(1) or section 1(A) of the Restitution Act.
- The dispossession was effected after 19 June 1913, as provided for by section 2(1)(a) of the Restitution Act and section 25(7) of the Constitution.
- The claim was lodged with the Office of the CRLR prior to the cut-off date of 31 December 1998, as set out in terms of section 2(1)(e) of the Restitution Act, as amended.
- The claimants were affected when Proclamation 116 of 1949 provided for the culling of livestock and the reduction of grazing lands, arable land and residential lands.
- The claimants were dispossessed of their right to beneficial occupation and use of the subject properties, and just and equitable compensation was not paid at the time of dispossession.

The Office of the RLLC: Eastern Cape published a notice of the claim in Government Gazette 42669 Notice 1123, dated 30 August 2019, in accordance with section 11(1) of the Restitution Act, as amended. Interested parties were invited to submit their comments regarding the claim within 60 days of publication. However, the Office of the RLLC did not receive any objections or comments.



### The settlement

Rosedale community has been workshopped on the options within the Restitution Act, as amended, and each option was explained in detail with its merits and demerits. The claimants opted for financial compensation. The financial implications of the Rosedale community arise after applying the latest financial compensation policy. The total value of this claim would therefore be R4 977 763,00.

The amount of R4 977 763,00 has been presented and accepted by the Rosedale community and will be shared among the fully verified beneficiaries.

## Tsitsikamma Community Claim



### The history

The circumstances of dispossession were sourced from the members of the Tsitsikamma Development Trust (TDT) and community elders who are the direct descendants of the first Mfengu owners of the land. This gave the office a historical perspective of the claimants in terms of dispossession.

The information received from the claimants was complemented by archival information, which shows that the Mfengus served as allies to the colonial forces in the ongoing wars in the 1800s (the Eastern Cape Frontier War), and were given land grants by the British authorities for their loyalty and support.

As a reward for assisting the British forces in defeating the AmaXhosa, Sir George Grey bequeathed tracts of land to the AmaMfengu/Fingoes of Tsitsikamma for their settlement in 1834. The parcels of land referred to are those of Palmiet Rivier, Snyklip, Wittekleibosch and Dorriskraal. At the time, the Amamfengu were led by five chiefs: Zibi, Gubevu, Mbilase, Matomela and Plaatjies. The archival documents show that the land was allocated as follows:

- Palmiet River Farm No. 584 in Humansdorp, measuring approximately 660 morgen (565.31112 ha), was assigned to Makupula and his people on 30 October 1858.
- Dorriskraal Farm No. 652 in Humansdorp, measuring approximately 490 morgen (419.70120 ha), was assigned to Uzweibi (originally Zibi) and his people on 30 October 1858.
- Snyklip Farm No. 656 in Humansdorp, measuring approximately 1 500 morgen (1 284.79958 ha), was assigned to Umblatje (Plaatje) and his people on 30 October 1858.
- Wittekleibosch Farm 674 in Humansdorp, measuring approximately 1 800 morgen (1 541.7590 ha), was assigned to Matomda (Matomela) and his people on 30 October 1858.



### The administration

The claims were processed in terms of Rule 2 and Rule 3 of the Rules of the Commission and were accepted to meet the criteria as provided for by section 11(1), read together with section 2 of the Restitution Act, as amended, in that:

- The land claims submitted by the Tsitsikamma (AmaMfengu) community substantially meet the criteria and were lodged on the prescribed claim forms on 14 August 1997 and 12 December 1998, respectively.
- The claimants are persons as defined in section 1 of the Restitution Act, as amended, and therefore competent in terms of section 2 of the Act to lodge a restitution claim.

The claim is not precluded by the provisions of section 2(1) or section 1(A) of the Restitution Act in that:

- The claimants were forcefully removed for the purposes of furthering the object of racially discriminative legislation.
- The claimants were dispossessed of their right to beneficial occupational rights and use of the subject property.

The dispossession was effected after 13 June 1913, as provided for by section 2(1)(A) and section 2(1)(C) of the Restitution Act. The claim was lodged prior to the cut-off date of 31 December 1998, as set out in terms of section 2(1)(c) of the Act. Just and equitable compensation was not paid at the time of dispossession.



## The settlement

The community has been workshopped on the available options within the Restitution Act, as amended, and each option was explained in detail with its merits and demerits. The Tsitsikamma (AmaMfengu) community has opted for land restoration as a form of redress for the land rights lost as a result of dispossession. However, this Phase 1 is for financial compensation in lieu of the improvements lost during dispossession of properties not feasible to restore.

In calculating the monetary value of the claim, the CRLC commissioned a valuation of the claimed properties in order to determine the value of the loss that was incurred by the claimant families during the dispossession. This was conducted by an independent and private valuer, Tradesoon 85 (Pty) Ltd Property Valuation Services.

The valuation looked at the historical market value of the subject properties at the time of dispossession, and the current market value. The new financial compensation policy was applied as the amounts determined by the valuer were less than what it offered.

The Tsitsikamma (AmaMfengu) community comprised 486 households with 5 320 beneficiaries. In terms of this policy, only 200 households were fully verified and are entitled to R32 114 600,00 to be paid as financial compensation for the loss of improvements during the dispossession, and each of the dispossessed households will be paid R160 573,00 in partial settlement of Phase 1 of this claim.

The recommended financial compensation in Phase 1 of this submission for the loss suffered by 200 TDT AmaMfengu families is therefore R160 573,00 per household x 200 originally dispossessed individuals. The total award is R32 114 600,00.




# Free State



## Number of land claims settled



## Number of land claims finalised



## Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, the Free State projected settling two land claims and finalising six land claims during the 2020/21 financial year. It succeeded in settling two land claims, but none were finalised.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

**R13 376 000,00**

## Groenhof and Geluksvlei Land Claim



### The history

The Marumo Family, in its narrative, indicated that their forefathers were the first occupants and users of the property Geluksvlei No. 605.

The claimant's unregistered right to the land had been transferred from generation to generation through African Customary Law arrangements. It is of note that the Marumo Family had held unregistered rights to the land for more than a decade, from 1800 until their dispossession in 1958.

The Marumo Family's history with regard to the land indicates that they once occupied a bigger portion of the farm Geluksvlei No.605, and their unregistered rights weakened drastically as the years passed, which resulted in them occupying less land before the forceful removals.

The claimant's family continued to reside on and use the land under harsh conditions. It is therefore important that, when settling the land claimed, the rights of the claimants should not be limited to the restricted rights imposed on them by the former land owners.



### The administration

The claim was found to have met the criteria set out in section 2 of the Restitution Act, as amended. The research established that the Marumo Family had lost their land rights in the form of sharecropping and labour tenancy rights. The claim was lodged in the prescribed manner on 15 April 1996, prior to the cut-off date of 31 December 1998. The claimant families did not receive any compensation for the loss of their rights in land after the said dispossession.

The claim is neither frivolous nor vexatious and was accepted to be in compliance with section 2, read together with section 11 of the Restitution Act, as amended. Furthermore, Rule 3 and Rule 5 submissions were approved by the RLCC validating the claim. The claim was gazetted and published in Government Gazette Notice 1433 of 2008.



### The settlement

The Office of the RLCC: Free State appointed the valuer Mr Simon Van Wyk of Sinfra Investments (Pty) Ltd on 17 December 2019 to conduct a current market valuation on Portion 5 of the farm Smaldeel No. 683 located in the registration division of Heilbron, Metsimaholo Local Municipality – Fezile Dabi District in the Free State. The inspection was conducted on 11 January 2020 and the valuation report was delivered on 23 January 2020.

The RLCC made an offer to the amount of R5 530 000,00 to the current land owner of the farm Smaldeel No. 683 in order to purchase the property for the finalisation of the Groenhof and Geluksvlei land claim.

## Hetloo Land Claim



### The history

The claimed portion of the farm was originally registered in the name of Mr KP Fourie. Upon his death, the farm was transferred from his estate to Mr Christiaan Lodewikus Moolman on 15 March 1878. Prior to Mr Fourie's death, the claimants alleged that their grandfather, Mr Makakamela Matjeka, came into Portion 1 of the farm Hetloo No. 178 after he sought land for cultivation, to rear livestock and for residential purposes as he came from the nearest farm, Mount Morkel, where his father stayed. The claimants further declared that an agreement had been reached between Mr Matjeka and Mr Fourie that Mr Matjeka could utilise a certain portion of the farm. The claimants' grandfather used this land for residential purposes and to plough maize, and he had an abundant harvest. The maize and sugar cane he ploughed were so plentiful that he used to give the soldiers who camped in the area between Ficksburg and Fouriesburg maize whenever they experienced food shortages in their camps.

The claimants assert that their grandfather had enjoyed unregistered rights in the land until an old age. According to them, he was a wealthy black farmer, who owned the farm Hetloo, situated southwest of Fouriesburg.



### The administration

The claim was found to have met the criteria set out in section 2 of the Restitution Act, as amended. The research established that the family of Mr Makakamela Matjeka had lost their land rights in the form of beneficial occupation in 1949. Therefore, it is clear that they lost their rights after 19 June 1913.

The claim was lodged in the form of a letter on 10 April 1996, prior to the cut-off date of 31 December 1998. The racial practice was supported by the then newly elected National Party, and its legislation at the time steered the system of the separation of races, and eventually led to dispossession of the claimants' rights in land. The claimant families did not receive any just and equitable compensation for the loss of their rights in land after the said dispossession. The land claim on Portion 1 of the Farm Hetloo No. 178 was found to be neither frivolous nor vexatious, as it was accepted to be in compliance with section 2 of the Restitution Act.

To validate the process and validity of the claim, a copy of the research report was attached to the claim for further scrutiny and convenience in order to meet the requirement of Rule 3 and Rule 5 of the Restitution Act. The claim was gazetted and published in Government Gazette Notice 1136 of 2008.



### The settlement

The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform appointed MM Steyn Consultants on 22 May 2019 and 12 June 2019, respectively, to establish the current open market value of alternative land on the Farm Brakvley No. 837, measuring 229.3378 hectares, and Portion 1 of the Farm Komweer No. 937, measuring 249.5270 hectares, situated in the Registration Division of Ficksburg, Setsoto Local Municipality in Thabo Mofutsanyana District in the Free State, to establish the market value of the property.

The main objective of the valuation was to provide the Department, through the CRLR, with true information relating to the current open market value of the property with consideration of the factors in section 25(3) of the Constitution. The valuation report will assist the Office of the RLLC to engage in negotiations with the land owner of the Farm Brakvley No. 837, measuring 229.3378 hectares, and Portion 1 of the Farm Komweer No. 937, measuring 249.5270 hectares, to purchase the property. The Office of the RLLC: Free State has made an offer to purchase the Farm Brakvley No. 837, measuring 229.3378 hectares, to the amount of R4 036 000,00, and Portion 1 of the Farm Komweer No. 937, measuring 249.5270 hectares, to the amount of R3 810 000,00, on 20 March 2020. The offers to purchase were accepted by the land owner on 23 March 2020.




# Gauteng

GAUTENG

## Number of land claims settled



## Number of land claims finalised



## Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, Gauteng projected settling seven land claims and finalising nine land claims during the 2020/21 financial year. It succeeded in settling 46 land claims and finalising 37 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

**R35 593 556,30**

## Mabena Family Claim



### The history

The farm Welgedacht 130 JR (formerly 86) was transferred from the government for the first time to Simon Lodewyk Rikerd by deed of grant dated 13 October 1859. The farm was later subdivided and changed hands between private white individuals. The remaining extent of portion 5, measuring 918,5496 morgen, was acquired by Dirkie van Zyl du Preez (born Badenhorst) from Willem Jacobus Engelbrecht by deed of transfer T36248/1946 dated 20 November 1946. Welgedacht Veepos Trust later acquired the remaining extent of portion 5 under title deed T16960/1982. The property is currently owned by Eagle Creek INV 234 (Pty) Ltd under title deed T15155/2006.

The oral evidence for the claim was provided by the claimant's aunt, Ms Kathiwe Martha Mabena. She is the ninth-born child of the late Mr Kleinboy Shlothi Mabena. According to Ms Mabena, her father and his two wives, Mrs Matsoboke Mabena and Mrs Sarah Mabena, arrived on the farm Welgedacht 130 JR in 1952 from Jakkalsdans. Mr Mabena was a traditional leader and a former soldier who came to stay on the farm. Although he never worked on the farm, the land owner at the time, Mr du Preez, employed his three children, Mr Sanyane Johannes Mabena, Mr Ramohloiwa Alfred Mabena and Ms Nomithi Ellena Qungwarie (as a domestic worker). They were employed as labour tenants working for three months a year without any form of remuneration or compensation to guarantee the family a place to stay, graze their livestock and plough the fields for a subsistence existence. According to Ms Kathiwe Martha Mabena, her family used the land for beneficial purposes, i.e. they grazed their cattle, sheep and goats, kept chicken, ploughed fields for food security, buried deceased family members and used it for residential purposes.

Following the death of Mr Kleinboy Shlothi Mabena on 27 May 1957, his children continued to use the land under the same arrangement. After working for the required three months, Mr du Preez extended the working contract without pay to six months. When the dispossessed individuals questioned Mr du Preez about their working conditions, he ordered them to vacate the property in 1957.

The Mabena family was not provided with alternative accommodation or land, nor were they compensated for their lost rights in land.



### The administration

The Mabena Family claim was found to be compliant and the RLCC accepted that processes to finalise it be embarked on through negotiations and settlement in terms of section 11 of the Restitution Act, read together with Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission, in that:

- It substantially complied with the requirements as contained in the prescribed land claim form.
- One land claim was lodged on 28 December 1998.
- The land claimant lodged his land claim on the basis of unregistered land rights.
- Neither the LCC nor the Minister of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development had made an order in respect of the land under claim.

Subsequent to the acceptance and gazetting of the claim, it was further investigated and found to be valid and in compliance with the provisions of section 2 and 11, read together with Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission.

Detailed research was conducted as contemplated in section 11(1)(a), (b) and (c) of the Restitution Act, as amended, and the claim was duly accepted as compliant in terms of Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission. The claim was gazetted in terms of section 11(1)(c) of the Restitution Act, as amended, under Government Gazette 40279 Notice 1052, dated 16 September 2016.



## The settlement

During the option workshop, the beneficiaries in the land claim opted for financial compensation for the settlement and finalisation of their land claim. The Mabena families are not considering going back to the farm.

At the time of land dispossession, the affected property was used for grazing livestock, including cattle, and for cultivation and residential purposes. Calculations of the determination of financial compensation is based on these land use rights. The recommendation by the OVG will be used as a base for the determination of land values for financial compensation to be offered to the Mabena family for their dispossession.

The total settlement cost for the land claim is R3 444 576,14 to the Mabena family regarding portion 5 (remaining extent) of the farm Welgedacht 130 JR.



## Skosana Family Claim



### The history

The farms Boschkop 369 JR (formerly 208) and Klipkop 396 JR (formerly 211) were transferred from the government to Lourens Abraham Erasmus on 27 September 1858 and Hendrik Ludorf Neethling on 16 January 1861, respectively. Both farms later changed hands between private white individuals. The farms were never registered in the names of black persons.

During oral interviews, the land claimant, Mr Khuzelo Mack Skosana, indicated that his late grandfather, Mr Phillip Skosana, and Ms Friday Skosana arrived on the farm as labour tenants looking for a job on the farm Kameelkraal in 1936. Together with their children, the Skosanas were expected to work for the white farmer for three months without pay in exchange for the family being allowed to stay on the farm. They were not given any monetary payment, instead were given a piece of land to plough and on which they could graze their own livestock. The family also sold pumpkin, beans and watermelons in Atteridgeville and at Lady Selborne. They used the money to buy groceries from a store in Boschkop known as Sill, Selly, Mangereza or Bhani. Surplus maize was milled at Kameelkraal and transported by ox-drawn sleighwagons.

In 1959, Mr Daniel de Branche ordered the family to leave the farm, without providing reasons for his decision. The family was told to take all their belongings. Unfortunately, the family only managed to take their livestock, thatching grass and some furniture, and relocated to a farm known as Kleson Road (Mathlakomeng). Other family members were buried on the farm. This is evident from their graves on the farm. The family managed to accumulate a considerable number of their livestock.



## The administration

The Skosana Family land claim was found to be compliant and the RLCC: Gauteng accepted that processes to finalise it be embarked on through negotiations and settlement in terms of section 11, read together with Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission, in that:

- The land claim substantially complied with the requirements as contained in the prescribed land claim form.
- The land claim was lodged on 18 May 1998, before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998.
- The land claimant lodged this land claim on the basis of labour tenancy and beneficial occupation land rights.

Detailed research was conducted as contemplated in section 11(1)(a), (b) and (c) of the Restitution Act, as amended, and the claim was duly accepted as compliant in terms of Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission. The claim was blanketly gazetted under Government Gazette 32483 Notice 1089 on 14 August 2009. It was, however, properly gazetted under Government Gazette 40496 Notice 1562 on 15 December 2016. Land owners were notified of the claim and given time to submit representations. No objections to the claim were received.



## The settlement

The CRLR engaged the claimants regarding the restitution options at their disposal, ranging from original land restoration to financial compensation and alternative land. Furthermore, they were taken through the financial compensation policy to enable them to make an informed decision. The claimants considered financial compensation as their option and as a manner in which their land claim should be settled and finalised.

The historical values, together with the CPI of 2016, were employed to arrive at the amount of the offer. The recommended historical amount by the OVG for the claimed properties during dispossession in 1959 is R21 150,00. Added to the offer is the increased comprehensive housing quantum for financial compensation award of R160 573,00, which is in line with the improvement rights lost, as approved by the Minister. The total settlement cost for the land claim is R2 806 509,43.

## Maphosa Family Claims



### The history

The Maphosa Family was never registered as the owner of the farms and was therefore not in possession of a title deed at dispossession. The family arrived on the farm Wolvengat 442 JR in 1933. According to the Aktex report and deeds records, the first registration of the farm Wolvengat, then number 126 (now 442 JR), took place on 11 December 1866 when the farm was transferred from the government to WGS Oosthuizen (born Roetz).

The latter transaction was followed by many transfers between private white individuals. Portion 0 (remaining extent) of the farm Hartbeestfontein 441 JR appears to have been under white ownership before it was acquired by the Suid-Afrikaanse Ontwikkelingstrust in 1985 by deed of transfer T9046/1985.

During oral interviews conducted with the claimants, supported by an affidavit, they indicated that their grandfather, Mr Krisjan Maphosa, arrived on the farm Wolvengat 442 JR in 1933. He was employed as a labour tenant on a six-month contract by the land owner, Mr van der Byl. Their verbal agreement was that they would work on the farm in exchange for shelter, the cultivation of crops, grazing of livestock and burial rights.

In the beginning of 1947, Mr van der Byl introduced the unbearable conditions whereby the young boys were forced to work on the farm from a very young age and the system of finding casual jobs elsewhere was abolished. It was only in the house of the claimant's two uncles, Hendrick Maphosa and Besabakhe Maphosa, that the boys could work on the farm.

The claimant's father, Khupheka Daniel Maphosa, could not tolerate the oppressive, unfair living conditions that were introduced on the farm. Those non-negotiable conditions were intentionally introduced to abuse the children staying on the farm, which included denying them access to schooling, thus the abuse and poor living conditions at the time continued. Khupheka Daniel Maphosa was the first to leave the farm Wolvengat in 1947. He took the decision to protect his only son from such horrible oppressive living conditions in the future. However, his only family members, his grandmother and his uncles, continued living there, exposing their children to these living conditions.



## The administration

The Maphosa Family's land claims were found to be compliant and the RLCC: Gauteng accepted that processes to finalise the land claims be embarked on through negotiations and settlement in terms of section 11, read together with Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission, in that:

- They substantially complied with the requirements as contained in the prescribed land claim forms.
- The land claims were lodged on 22 December 1998 and 25 December 1998, before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998.
- The land claimants lodged their land claims on the basis of unregistered land rights.
- The land claims are neither frivolous nor vexatious.
- Neither the LCC nor the Minister of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development had made an order in respect of the land under claim.

Subsequent to acceptance and gazetting, these claims were further investigated and found to be valid and in compliance with the provisions of section 2 and 11, read together with Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission.


The RLCC: Gauteng also approved the land claims for publication in the Government Gazette. The properties under land claim were therefore gazetted under Government Gazette 39553 Notice 1276 on 24 December 2015. It should also be noted that the claim for Z 0261 was part of the blanket gazette under Government Gazette 32482 Notice 1088 dated 14 August 2009.



## The settlement


During the option workshop, the beneficiaries in the land claims opted for financial compensation for settlement and the finalisation of their land claims.

Historical valuation on portion 0 (remaining extent) of the farm Hartbeestfontein 441JR was done for 1967 on behalf of Khupheka Daniel Maphosa's household. This amounts to R16 200,00 based on 64.5845 hectares. When that is escalated, it amounts to R1 162 588,24. When the housing quantum is included, it comes to a total of R1 323 161,24. The total settlement cost for the land claims is R3 223 083,30 to the Maphosa families regarding the properties cited.






# KwaZulu-Natal



## Number of land claims settled



## Number of land claims finalised



## Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, KwaZulu-Natal projected settling 29 land claims and finalising 50 land claims during the 2020/21 financial year. It succeeded in settling 37 land claims and finalising 84 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

**R397 861 627,43**

## Juluku Families Land Claim



### The history

The claimant families allege that their forefathers had lived on the land for generations before the first white farmer came. The farm was named after Mr Juluku Gansa, who is the forefather of the claimant. Before the arrival of the white farmer, they had plenty of land for residential purposes, for subsistence cropping, grazing land for their livestock, and burial sites. They used to hunt and get wood from the nearby mountains and bushes.

The claimants allege that, soon after the arrival of the white farmer, they were restricted in terms of the extent of the land they could utilise for residential purposes. They also had to reduce their livestock and had to work for the farmer, which changed their circumstances to being labour tenants.

Physical removals started to take place from 1919 when the property started to exchange hands. As the new owners came, they started to chase the claimant household away. Upon removal, the claimants recall that they lost their livestock and other belongings as they were not provided with alternative land or compensation. The removals caused severe disruptions as families were forced to go in separate directions. Since the removals, the claimants were scattered; some settled in the KwaMbotho location and others at a nearby farm called The Gorge. The claimed property has since been used for commercial sugarcane farming.

The inhabitants were not formally the owners of the land. However, they enjoyed the beneficial occupational rights in the land. The Juluku claimant families were removed through the Natives Land Act of 1913 and the Labour Tenancy Act.



### The administration

This claim meets the acceptance criteria as required by section 11(1)(a) and (c), read together with section 2 of the Restitution Act and amplified by Rule 3 of the Rules of the Commission, in that:

- The claimants lost land rights after 19 June 1913.
- The claim was lodged prior to the cut-off date of 31 December 1998.
- The removals were based on racially discriminatory laws and practices.
- No compensation was received at the time of dispossession.
- The claim is not frivolous or vexatious.

The Juluku Family Land Claim was published in Government Gazette 43686 Notice 479 of 2020.

The acceptance of the claim was as a result of the report of the investigation conducted by the RLCC: KwaZulu-Natal in terms of Rule 3 and Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission.



### The settlement

The method of valuation employed to determine the value of the subject property is the comparable sales approach, whereby the value indicated is established by comparing the subject property with similar properties, called comparable sales. Comparable sales are recent property transactions of properties that were sold in accordance with the definition of market value. Comparable sales are analysed and measured against the subject property in various elements of comparison that might influence and ultimately determine the value of the subject property.

The Office of the RLCC, through the OVG, appointed DDP Valuation and Advisory Services to do a valuation of the claimed property. The valuation was done on 15 January 2020.

The provisional valuation certificate was sent to the land owner on 5 March 2020 and the land owner accepted the valuation.

The total value of the settlement of the claim is R5 800 000,00.

## Mathonsi Community Land Claim



### The history

Historical information about the Mathonsi community obtained from the Stanger Magistrate History Record Book states that the tribal community assembled and reformed prior to the colonisation of Natal, dating back to Sir Theophilus Shepstone's time in the 1890s. According to claimants' historical accounts, their forefathers were born and lived in that area before the white man set foot there in the 1800s. Some other families slowly migrated to the area in the early 1900s and settled there under Inkosi Mathonsi, where they were later dispossessed by white men by the late 1940s.

Land dispossession of the Mathonsi Tribal Community gained momentum from 1949 onwards as per information collected from the claiming community members through oral research. The forced removals and land dispossessions were started by Mr Hansen, nicknamed "Zikhewu", a member of the white group that removed people from the area, dispossessing them of their right in land. In the beginning, when he arrived, he showed allegiance to the existing traditional structure and had a very humble approach that earned him the respect of Inkosi Mathonsi. The Inkosi allowed him to live with the community. The tribal community enjoyed full land right benefits over the areas covered by the claimed land. However, that did not imply that any person could come and take away those benefits through registered rights as the white groups claimed that land was granted to them by the Queen of England.



### The administration

A land claim was lodged by Inkosi Thanduzulu Edward Mathonsi on behalf of the Mathonsi claimant community on 19 April 1996 in accordance with the acceptance criteria, as provided for by section 11 of the Restitution Act, as amended, and as amplified by Rule 3 of the Rules of the Commission, in that:

- The land claim forms submitted on behalf of the claimant community substantially meet the requirements prescribed by section 10(1) of the Act.

The Mathonsi land claim is not precluded by section 2(1) and 2(2) of the Restitution Act, as amended, in that:

- The claimant community is a claimant as defined in terms of section 1 of the Act, and therefore competent, in terms of section 2 of the Act, to bring a claim for restitution.
- The claimant community had been dispossessed of its rights in land, which it held for many years.
- The rights are rights in land within the definition of rights in land as set out in section 1 of the Act.
- The claim was lodged before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998, in compliance with section 2(1)(c) of the Act.
- The dispossession occurred from the 1940s until the 1970s, which is after 19 June 1913, being the date set by section 25(7) of the Constitution and confirmed in terms of section 2(1)(c) of the Act.
- The claimant community did not receive compensation for their dispossession. The rights in land lost were not compensated justly and equitably.
- The claim, as submitted, is neither frivolous nor vexatious. The foregoing submissions indicate that there is sufficient merit in the claim. With regard to the above acceptance criteria, the CLCC further referred to the Investigation Report in terms of Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission, as required by section 14(2)(a) of the Act.



## The settlement

The Mathonsi opted for land restoration. The Mathonsi Trust will hold the restored land in title and form an operating company, which will be responsible for the day-to-day operational management of farming operations. The Trust, through its operating company, will appoint farm managers who will be responsible for the management of the business operations and make sure that production takes place on a day-to-day basis. This arrangement will allow for the segregation of duties between the landholding and operating entities, which will bring about better accountability at all levels.

The development vehicles will be carried out by a separate development entity, where the households will be the beneficiaries or shareholders, and development initiatives will be funded through the income generated from the business or through other funds that may be made available by other programmes of government and other strategic partners.



## Umbizo Somopho Madlebe Claim



### The history

Empangeni had its origins in May 1841 with the establishment of the Inkanyezi mission station next to the Mpangeni River. This mission station was later replaced with the first Lutheran mission station north of Thukela. This marked the introduction of a Western culture to this traditional Zulu area. The area where these mission stations were located is now known as Matshana and forms part of the Madlebe tribal area. This is the evidence that the people of Madlebe were occupying these areas before the land was earmarked for sugar cane.

During 1920, there was an acquisition and expansion of sugar lands surrounding Empangeni. The Madlebe community was forcefully removed and the land was subdivided and offered to concession planters who, at the time, held poor farms. Some of these planters were soldiers coming from World War I.

Each farmer had to produce 126 700 tons of sugar cane. They could not reach their targets because the people of the Madlebe tribe refused to work as labour tenants. Their argument was that they could not assist white farmers to reach their targets on their own land.

The communities were dispossessed of their beneficial occupational rights because of their status as a community that had been reduced to that of labour tenants. The claimant communities had beneficial occupation of the claimed land. They resided on the claimed land by virtue of a historical right of occupation.



## The administration

The land claims were lodged by Inkosi Nsikayezwe Cebekhulu on 20 April 1995 on behalf of the Ubizo claimant community, Inkosi Mtengeni Mthembu of the Somopho tribe, acting with the assistance of the then Somopho Tribal Authority on 29 July 1996, and Inkosi Zenzo Khulumangifile Zungu on behalf of the Madlebe claimant community on 31 December 1998 in accordance with the acceptance criteria, as provided for by section 11 of the Restitution Act, and as amplified by Rule 3 of the Rules of the Commission, in that:

- The dispossession occurred from the 1920s until the 1980s, which is after 19 June 1913, being the date set by section 25(7) of the Constitution and confirmed in terms of section 2(1)(c) of the Restitution Act.
- The claimant communities did not receive compensation at the time of their removals.
- The claims, as submitted, are neither frivolous nor vexatious. The foregoing submissions indicate that there is enough merit in the claim. With regard to the above acceptance criteria, the Minister is further referred to the Investigation Report in terms of Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission, as required by section 14(2)(a) of the Restitution Act.



## The settlement

During the negotiations towards the settlement of the claim, the Commission informed the parties to the negotiations that the Minister had adopted the Rural Economy Transformation Model (RETM) as a tool to implement the Department's strategy of agrarian transformation, and the RETM was thoroughly explained to them.

The three communities opted for land restoration. As such, the land to be restored shall be held by governance entities. There will be separate vehicles for development (investment development and financing facilities). Governance will be carried out by the Trust/Communal Property Association (CPA), which shall be registered as similar entities in terms of the CPA Act such that the provisions of that Act will apply to them.


The development vehicles will be carried out by a separate development entity, where the households will be the beneficiaries or shareholders, and development initiatives will be funded through the income generated from the business or through other funds that may be made available by other programmes of government and other strategic partners.

The community is expected to benefit from income and other enterprises that will be established to take advantage of economic opportunities arising from the restored land. That income will be used to meet the basic human needs of the community, and to develop skills (bursaries, etc.).

A sustainable post-settlement model is expected to allow the parties to establish any other form of strategic partnership such as share equity or co-management.

The office is in talks with South African Farmers' Development Association (SAFDA) to offer technical support to the governance structure of the three communities to ensure skills transfer and sustainability of the current farming enterprise.








# Limpopo



## Number of land claims settled



## Number of land claims finalised



### Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, Limpopo projected settling 64 land claims and finalising 32 land claims during the 2020/21 financial year. It succeeded in settling 112 land claims and finalising 31 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

**R354 208 436,36**

## Vreemdeling Community Claim



### The history

The dispossessions occurred after 19 June 1913, as required by the provisions of section 25(7) of the Constitution. The investigations revealed that the Vreemdeling community settled on the farm between 1700 and 1800 during the tribal wars. They originated from Bantoane Ba Mathebe and were the first black people to occupy the land. They lived in the area until 1973 when they were forcefully removed from the claimed property by whites.

The community acquired ownership of the land before the introduction of the Natives Land Act of 1913. They used the land for residential, ploughing, grazing and hunting purposes, and for burials, and were later turned into labour tenants on the claimed property.

According to the claimants, whites arrived on the farm and asked for a piece of land to occupy, but at a later stage, they took ownership of the entire farm with the backing of legislation such as the Natives Land Act of 1913. The indigenous people who were staying on the farm were then forced to provide labour to the white land owners as was the practice at most of the farms in the Groblersdal area.

The Vreemdeling community was dispossessed of their unregistered rights such as residential, ploughing, hunting and burial rights, and a place to work. They also had beneficial occupation to stay on the property for a continuous period of not less than ten years prior to the dispossession.

The removal of the claimants caused the Vreemdeling community to be dislocated to a large degree, with their family network broken up. It further caused the community members to become wanderers. Their houses, outbuildings, sheds and kraals were destroyed by state bulldozers.



### The administration

The land claim was lodged with the Commission before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998. The land claim forms submitted substantially met the requirements of the Restitution Act, as amended. The dispossession occurred as a result of past racially discriminatory laws and practices.

The dispossession took place in 1971, after 19 June 1913, as required by the provisions of section 25(7) of the Constitution. The claimants did not receive any form of compensation at the time of the dispossession.

The CRLR has accepted the land claims by the Vreemdeling community as a prima-facie valid case in terms of section 2 of the Restitution Act, read together with Rule 3 and Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission. The land claims were gazetted in Government Gazette 29457 Notice 1801 of 2006.



### The settlement

The land under claim by the Vreemdeling community is not feasible for restoration. The property is currently used for grazing by the community under the Amandebele. The claimants have opted for financial compensation as full and final settlement of their land claims.

An amount of R321 146,00, derived from the total of the land value (R160 573,00) and the housing quantum (R160 573,00) will be paid to the claimants as full and final settlement of their claim. Each of the 196 verified claimants will receive an amount of R321 146,00.



## Tshivhula Community Claim



### The history

The Tshivhula tribe had settled in the Soutpan area, from where they were driven away by King Makhado to relocate around Blouberg. Around 1900, their chief (Madimetja Sebola) was killed during the Anglo-Boer War. Before the war, Madimetja ruled all the indigenous people to the north of the Soutpansberg, including the area bounded by the Salt River in the east, and the Limpopo River in the north and west.

The Tshivhula claimants provided evidence that they belonged to the Vhatwanamba, who left Vhurwa (north) in central Africa around 1700, moving southwards until they settled at Makorwe Hill, now known as Mapungubwe, where they encountered the Vhaleya of Musina. The tribe became associated with the Vhaleyas through inter-marriages.

The oral evidence also reflected the ownership of ornaments similar to the ones excavated at Mapungubwe. From Makorwe Hill, the Tshivhulas moved on to Mavhambo at the foot of the Soutpansberg Mountain. Mavhambo became the headquarters of the Vhatwanamba under Chief Tshivhula. The Tshivhula Group asserted that they originated from the Vhatwanamba tribe, originally from Central Africa (i.e. Afrika Kati). They call themselves the Vhatwanamba of Maphari who trekked from Central Africa to Zimbabwe and seem to have been of the Vharodzi of the Kalanga royal house (by their own account). They left Zimbabwe under the leadership of Munna wa-Khwara many years ago (the exact period is unknown), and crossed the Limpopo River to settle at Mapungubwe (as they call it).

They reported of their intermarriage relationship with the Vhaleya of Musina. Munna WA Khwara was succeeded by his son, King Ramasunzi, who left Mapungubwe as he disliked being ruled by other tribes, and moved to the western side along with the Vhatwanamba of Maphari tribe and settled at Matshema where he used “mirango” as building material for his new residence. It was from Matshema that the rest of the clan moved to the Soutpansberg Mountain to a place called Muroi or Zwaini. After the death of Ramasunzi – and as the clan had grown substantially – they expanded to new headquarters at Mavhambo and Tshagozwana. It is from Mavhambo that they later moved to Blouberg where they settled among the Malivhoho tribe, learning their language. Some had to change their surnames to Sebola.

The Tshivhula tribe was dispossessed of their land over a number of years as their land was so vast. The dispossession started in 1916 after their chief (Madimetja Sebola) was killed during the Anglo-Boer War and government started to get involved in the affairs of the Tshivhula tribe. This is reflected in the Native Commissioner’s report, which indicated that there was a dispute between the late Chief’s sons, Sebola and Toporo, regarding the chieftainship after 31 July 1916. The former government started giving the Tshivhula trek-passes to move off their land. The dispossession continued for many years, and in 1965, the Tshivhula people were removed in large numbers, leaving behind the beautiful land of their birth.



## The administration

The land claim form submitted substantially met the requirements of the prescribed manner of lodgement. The claimants are a community as defined in terms of section 1 of the Restitution Act, as amended, and therefore competent in terms of section 2 of the Act to submit a restitution claim.

The claimants were dispossessed of their rights in land as defined in section 1 of the Act, as amended. The dispossession was effected in terms of the Black Administration Act 1927 (Act No. 38 of 1927). The dispossession took place after 19 June 1913, i.e. between 1913 and 1968. The claim was lodged with the Commission before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998.

The dispossession was effected under or for the purpose of furthering the objects of a law, which would have been inconsistent with the prohibition of racial discrimination contained in section 9(3) of the Restitution Act, as amended.

The Commission has accepted the land claim by the Tshivhula community as a prima-facie valid land claim in terms of section 2 of the Restitution Act, as amended, and as read together with Rule 3 and Rule 5 of the Rules of the Commission.

The remaining extent of the farm Palmerston 296 MS, measuring 1 069.9284 hectares, among others, was published in Government Gazette 29397 Notice 1721, dated 7 July 2006.




## The settlement

The claimants have opted for the restoration of their original land, hence the properties have already been restored and transferred to the Tshivhula CPA on behalf of the Tshivhula Community. On 16 March 2020, the OVG recommended an amount of R5 915 000,00 to be offered to the land owners of the subject property.

On 25 June 2020, the Office of the RLCC: Limpopo presented a recommended offer of R5 915 000,00. The land owner accepted the offer.









# Mpumalanga

MPUMALANGA

## Number of land claims settled



## Number of land claims finalised



## Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, Mpumalanga projected settling 40 land claims and finalising 54 land claims during the 2020/21 financial year. It succeeded in settling 39 land claims and finalising 66 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

**R229 433 624,46**

## Sethlare Community Claim



### The history

The claimants are not certain about the exact date on which they had occupied the farms under land claim. However, they indicated that the properties under claim had always belonged to them, even before the government divided the properties into portions and settled the Sethlare community on various portions that had previously been allocated to white farmers. Furthermore, the claimants affirmed that the land had been occupied by their forefathers since time immemorial and before the arrival of the Europeans.

Chief Maripe Chiloane acquired the land under claim by defeating the Koni Tribe. He came from the south together with the rest of the Mapulana tribe and the Pedi from around 1800 onwards. Chief Chiloane was living at the top of the Drakensberg Mountains and the kraals were found on the slopes of the mountain towards the Lowveld. Chief Chiloane died in the 1900s and was buried on the farm Brooklyn. The chieftancy was handed to Chief Sethlare, his only son.

Chief Sethlare participated in World War I in 1914 and presided over his subjects on the farms Acornhoek, Greenvalley, Brooklyn, Arthurseat, Graigieburn, Rooiboklaagte, Dingleydale, Hebron, Marieskop, Salique and Champagne in terms of Law 4 of 1886. He passed away in the 1930s and was buried at Brooklyn. As a result, the chieftancy was handed to Mapalane Chiloane. The chieftancy changed hands until the current encumbent, Kgoshi Reuben Ntokobona Chiloane.

The claimants lived on these farms for a period exceeding 10 years and endured the labour tenancy system and stock tax. The farms Brooklyn 426 KT, Dingleydale 229 KU, Craigieburn 462 KT and Rooyboklaagte 215 KU were proclaimed for forestry purposes in the 1920s. The state then forcefully removed the claimants to Andover and Leamington. The government, through the Department of Native Affairs, provided transport and the claimants were relocated without any compensation apart from transportation. The total number of Chief Chiloane's population at that time was 427 people eligible for compensation.



### The administration

The claim meets the acceptance criteria as required by section 2 of the Restitution Act, read together with section 11 and amplified by Rule 3 of the Rules of the Commission, in that:

- The land claim was lodged on the prescribed, signed claim form and it substantially meets the requirements of the Restitution Act, as amended.
- The claimants were dispossessed of rights in land between 1920 and 1960, of which the dates fall after 19 June 1913, as required by section 2(1)(a) of the Restitution Act, as amended.
- The claim was lodged before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998.
- The claimants did not receive just and equitable compensation at the time of dispossession.

The claim was validated, accepted and published in Government Gazette 42380 Notice 547, dated 5 April 2019.



### The settlement

The community agreed to the offer and subsequently signed the offer to the amount of R11 400 683,00, being partial settlement of the Sethlare community's land claim.

## Songimvelo Group of Families



### The history

The Songimvelo Group of Families is made up of the following families: Nkosi, Mtoni, Thoyane Nkabinde, Mazibuko, Nhlabathi, Ngwenya, Maseko, Matsebula, Maseko, Mkhonto, Mazibuko, Motha, Zulu, Khoza, Fakudze, Shongwe Msibi, Mhlanga, Mthimkhulu and Shabangu.

Their history of acquisition ranges way before 1900 until 1954 as the families did not arrive on the different properties at the same time. Most of these families were either born on the farm or arrived on the farm in a certain year. The claimants indicated that they worked on these farms before white people arrived on the claimed properties. Some of the claimants found the white people on the claimed properties.

As the years went by, white people came to the claimed properties at different times. When the white people arrived on the property, they told the families that they had bought the farms. They would tell them that they should start working for them so they could live on the claimed properties, and they had no choice but to follow their orders.



### The administration

It is submitted that the land claim meets the acceptance criteria on the properties listed above, as required by section 11(1) of the Restitution Act, read together with section 2, and amplified by Rule 2 and Rule 3 of the Rules of the Commission, in that:

- The claimants are persons as identified in terms of section 1 of the Restitution Act and therefore competent in terms of section 2 of the Act to lodge a claim for restitution.

The claim is not precluded by the provision of section 2(1) of the Restitution Act, in that:

- The claimants (the Songimvelo Group of Families) were dispossessed of their land in terms of racially discriminatory laws and practices as defined by section 1 of the Act.
- The dispossession was effected between 1984 until 1989, i.e. after June 1913, as the date set in terms of section 2(1)(a) of the Restitution Act, as amended, and section 25(7) of the Constitution.
- The land claim was lodged on 17 July 1996, prior to the cut-off date of 31 December 1998, as set out in terms of section 2(1)(c) of the Restitution Act.
- Just and equitable compensation was not paid at the time of dispossession.
- The claim is not frivolous and vexatious as stipulated by section 11(3) of the Restitution Act.

The land claim was accepted as compliant by the RLLC: Mpumalanga, and subsequently published in Government Gazette 42849 Notice 1501, dated 22 November 2019.



### The settlement

The Songimvelo Group of Families has opted for land restoration and financial compensation to cover the land rights and improvements lost during dispossession. The Songimvelo Group of Families accepted the offer for improvements of R35 165 487,00 on 5 November 2020.

## Nonoko Samson Masilela Family Claim



### The history

The late Nonoko Samson Masilela Family was forcefully removed from the farm Weimershoek around 1973. The claimants allege that they were removed by a white person not known by the families, who was given the name Duruduru. The white person had bought the farm from the Joubert Family.

According to the land transfer records, it can be argued that Mr Hendrik Nicolas Tredoux is the one who dispossessed the claimants as the claimed property was transferred to his name in 1974.

The Masilela family of Mr Buyile Thomas Masilela was dispossessed of the land between 1971 and 1979. The families were removed to make way for subdivision of the farm. They were later expected to provide labour in exchange for a place to stay. According to the oral evidence obtained from the claimants, their grandfather was absent from work because he was taking care of his sick son, Thomas (the claimant).

The family of the late Nonoko Samson Masilela came to the property to seek work from Mr Koos Joubert. They were given land to plough, graze their cattle and a place to stay. The land for grazing was limited to 10 heads of cattle. The ploughing fields were smaller than those of other families who had arrived on the farm before Mr Joubert took ownership. The late Nonoko Samson Masilela was also given land for residential purposes, grazing for not more than ten head of cattle and land on which to practice subsistence farming.



### The administration

The claims pertaining to this submission were subjected to a validation process to ensure their compliance with the Restitution Act, and were accepted. The claims were processed in terms of the Rules of the Commission. The RLCC: Mpumalanga is satisfied that the claim conforms to the acceptance criteria.

The original dispossessed person was dispossessed of land rights after 19 June 1913. The dispossession was as a direct result of racially discriminatory laws and/or practices. The claims were lodged before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998. The Masilela family did not receive any just and equitable compensation at the time of dispossession.

The LCC has not made any order in respect of the land under claim. The claims were accepted in terms of section 2 of the Restitution Act, as amended, for Buyile Thomas Masilela and for the late Nonoko Samson Masilela. The acceptance reports were approved by the RLCC: Mpumalanga.

The land claim of Buyile Thomas Mailela was published in Government Gazette 30333 Notice 1233, dated 5 October 2007. It was then amended to include the claim of Nonoko Samson Masilela in Government Gazette 42514 Notice 861, dated 7 September 2019.



### The settlement


The restitution option considered for the settlement of both Masilela families on Portion 10, the remaining extent of Portion 11 and Portion 12 of the farm Weimershoek 81 JT is equitable redress in the form of restoration to the original land, as contemplated in section 42D(1)(a) of the Restitution Act.

During an options workshop held with both families, which provided them with information that helped them make informed decisions on different options, which include restoration of the original land, the alternative land and financial compensation, the families opted for land restoration, and it is indicated that they want restoration to their original land.





# North West



## Number of land claims settled



## Number of land claims finalised



## Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, North West projected settling one land claim and finalising five land claims during the 2020/21 financial year. It succeeded in settling six land claims and finalising 15 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

**R239 081 172,10**

## Barolong Boo Phoi Community Claim



### The history

A historical account of the Barolong tribes, as narrated by PL Breutz in his book *The tribes of Mafikeng*, indicates that there were four main branches of Barolong: the Ratlou, the Ratshidi, the Seleka and the Rapulana. Their territory varied over time due to disputes between different branches and hardships that required them to accommodate each other.

At some time before 1500, the Barolong occupied an area that then consisted of the present Molopo, Mosita and Setlagole reserves and the European farms surrounded by them. Chief Ratlou moved from Taung to Mosita around 1720–1740 and from there to Setlagole around 1740–1760. During the second half of the 18th century, the centre of the Boo Ratlou country was in the Molopo region. In 1824, the Boo Ratlou section of Barolong went to Thaba Nchu for a short time, and around 1850 or even earlier the Boo Ratlou moved back to their old country on the Setlagole Reserve, but fled to Taung in 1852. When they returned in 1877, the main part of the tribe settled at Khunwana.

In a report of the Location Commission of 1906–1907 (Department of Native Affairs files), it is stated that President Burgers made an offer to Chief Moswete (who was the seventh chief) in 1868 of land in the South African Republic, provided that the tribe was loyal to the Republic. During March 1874, the Barolong Boo Ratlou country (Khunwana location) was officially declared part of the South African Republic.

The claimants indicated that they were removed during the Anglo-Boer War in the late 1800s. The history of the Barolong Boo Ratlou Boo Phoi shows that the tribe (in smaller groups) had shorter residences or periods of stay in certain areas due to the conflict during the Anglo-Boer War.



### The administration

This land claim has met the acceptance criteria as set out in section 2 of the Restitution Act, as amended, and the Rules of the Commission.

This land claim was processed in terms of the Rules of the Commission. The Office of the RLCC: North West is satisfied that the claim conforms with the acceptance criteria, in that:

- The original owners were dispossessed of land rights after 19 June 1913 (in the period between 1936 and 1940).
- The land claim was lodged before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998 (on 9 July 1996).
- The land claimants were not compensated financially, nor did they receive any form of compensatory land. The claimants confirm that they were not compensated, and the research could not establish any compensation that might have been paid or given to Barolong Boo Phoi.

The Office of the RLCC: North West, based on the above, accepted some properties. The claim was then gazetted and published in Government Gazette Notice 1005 of 2005. The properties in this submission have been published in Government Gazette 43878 Notice 1183, dated 5 November 2020.



### The settlement

During the option workshop, it was explained to the claimants that the award will be guided by the responses at the options workshop and that there will be an offer made in terms of section 42D of the Restitution Act, as amended. The land claimants were also told that they have the right to ask the court to make an award. The options presented to the land claimants were restoration, alternative land and financial compensation. The land claimants opted for restoration as they need land to perform various farming activities. The Office of the RLCC: North West has satisfied itself that it is feasible to restore the properties to the claimants. The land will be transferred to Gaesegwe CPA.

## Barolong Ba Ga Mariba Community Claim



### The history

The forethers of the Barolong Ba Ga Mariba community occupied the properties in the 19th century. This was before the farms were purchased by whites in this region. Many farms were not fenced until 1933 when the government of the time started erecting fences.

The community stayed near the Molopo River using the land for farming and residential purposes. Around 1933, there was an outbreak of animal disease and the white farmers advised the community that the only way to control the disease was by establishing camps or fences around the area. That was when they started erecting fences separating the blacks' livestock from the whites' livestock. The community was told not to let its livestock cross the established fence. Since then, the rest of the community was cut off from the rest of the claimed properties as described in the research report.

In terms of the Restitution Act, the dispossession of the rights claimed must have taken place on or after 19 June 1913. The dispossession of the Barolong Ba Ga Mariba community took place from 1933 onwards.



### The administration

Investigations and research have been conducted on the land claim, which proved that the land claim is prima facie valid. The land claim was found to comply with the acceptance criteria of land claims in terms of Rule 3(a) to (h) of the Rules of the Commission, in that:

- It was lodged before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998 (on 28 December 1998). Neither the LCC nor the Minister has made an order in respect of the land under claim.
- No form of compensation was paid or given to the land claimants. They had to find alternative accommodation. Some joined nearby communities and the rest relocated to other parts of the province.

The claim on Barolong Boo Mariba had previously been gazetted in two gazette notices. The first was published in Government Gazette Notice 1706 of 2005. Some properties were not included and were later published as Notice 405 of 2007. Other properties were subsequently gazetted as Notice 378 on 8 March 2019.

Subsequent to the claimed land being gazetted, the land owners disputed the validity of the claim and the case was referred to the LCC in terms of section 14 of the Act. The case is currently at the pleading stage under case reference LCC 160/2010.



### The settlement

An options workshop was held on 4 March 2019 and all the available options were explained to the claimants.

The options presented to the claimants were restoration, alternative land and financial compensation. In this case, the claimants chose restoration. The claimants opted for land restoration, with the property transfer documents to be lodged with the Deeds Office at a later stage on behalf of the Minister.



## Bahurutshe Boo Mokgatlha Community Claim



### The history

The Bahurutshe is one of the famous tribes in North West. From the historical account, as narrated by PL Breutz, it is evident that the Bahurutshe had occupied and settled on vast pieces of land as early as the 16th century. It is stated that, on the southwest, they shared borders with the Barolong, while towards the northwest, they shared borders with the Bakgatlha in Rustenburg.

It should be placed on record that Groot Marico, which is today mostly privately occupied by white farmers, used to be the stronghold of the Bahurutshe. Tswenyane/Enselsberg was regarded as the capital city of the Bahurutshe. Furthermore, the name Marico is inherited from the Tswana word “Madikwe”, which means “place attacked by a superior force”.



### The administration

Investigations and research have been conducted into the land claim, which proved that the land claim is prima facie valid. The valid land claim was found to comply with the acceptance criteria of land claims in terms of Rule 3(a) to (h) of the Rules of the Commission, in that:

- It substantially complies with the requirements as contained in the prescribed land claim form.
- It was lodged before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998 (on 22 December 1996).

The land claimants lodged their land claim on the basis of beneficial occupation, i.e. they had stayed on the land for more than ten years prior to the dispossession.

The RLCC: North West accepted the land claim on the farm Syferfontein 80 JP and other properties, and it was gazetted and published in Government Gazette 30781 Notice 264, dated 22 February 2008. It was amended as Government Gazette 37443 Notice 221, dated 20 March 2014.



### The settlement

During the option workshop, it was explained to the claimants that the award would be guided by the responses at the option workshop and that an offer would be made in terms of section 42D of the Restitution Act, as amended. The land claimants were also told that they would have the right to ask the court to make an award. The options presented to the land claimants were restoration, alternative land and financial compensation.


The land claimants opted for restoration, as they need land to perform various farming activities. The Office of the RLCC: North West has satisfied itself that it is feasible to restore the properties to the claimants.

The Office has registered a legal entity on behalf of this community. The name of the legal entity is Bahurutshe Boo Mokgatlha CPA.






# Northern Cape



## Number of land claims settled



## Number of land claims finalised



## Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, the Northern Cape projected settling one land claim and finalising 14 claims during the 2020/21 financial year. It succeeded in settling two land claims and finalising 18 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

**R3 028 069,78**

## Groenkloof Claim



### The history

The original inhabitants of Namaqualand were the San and the Khoi-Khoi people who occupied the lands north and south of the Gariep (Orange) River for hundreds of years prior to the Dutch colonial expansion. The land north of the river was known as Great Namaqualand (now Namibia), and the land south of the river was known as Little Namaqualand.

Long before the British colonial government extended the boundary of the Cape Colony and annexed Namaqualand in 1847, the communities living in this area formed three distinct groups known to the northern tribes as the Orlams. Abraham Vigiland Orlam was the leader of the people who lived in the central region of Little Namaqualand, the region now being claimed by the Steinkopf community. This community claims that they had settled there as early as the 1700s.

Cattle and sheep played a central role in Khoi-Khoi society and history. Given the dry climate of the area, the inhabitants of this region needed vast tracts of land for pasturage. Communities in this area traditionally moved with their animals from one watering source and grazing land to another.

During oral research conducted in Springbok on 1 September 2011, Mr Richards stated that his great-grandfather started residing on a portion of the farm Brakfontein, known to the claimant as Groenkloof. The claimant is not sure of the precise date when his great-grandfather started residing on the property, but indicated that three generations had lived on the farm and that his father was born there on 19 February 1917. He also indicated that his grandfather's brother was born there in 1902.

Mr Richards further stated that his grandfather was employed by the O'Kiep Copper Company (OCC), and worked for the company as a labourer on the mine. The claimant further asserts that, in 1933, his grandfather, David Louis Richards, retired from the O'Kiep Copper Company and that the mine granted the portion of the farm Brakfontein, referred to as Groenkloof by the claimant, to his grandfather, in lieu of a pension. Mrs Catherine Richards was forcefully removed from Groenkloof by the O'Kiep Copper Company. They then allotted her house to a white man, Mr Boetie Coetzee, who occupied their house and land.

The claimant states that his grandmother, Catherine Richards, was forced to relocate and live with family in the nearby town of O'Kiep. Furthermore, she was forced to leave their livestock in the care of someone. This person stole most of the livestock and sold the rest.



### The administration

The Office of the CRLR: Northern Cape has satisfied itself that the claim was lodged as prescribed

and is compliant with the provisions of section 2(1) and 11(1) of the Restitution Act, as amended, and as provided for by section 25 of the Constitution.

The claim was published in Government Gazette Notice 161, dated 13 February 2009. The then Office of the RLLC: Western Cape and Northern Cape received one family land claim, which was lodged on 12 December 1998 on behalf of the direct descendants of Mr David Louis Richards senior.



### The settlement

The restitution option considered for full and final settlement of the Richards Family's claim is equitable redress in the form of financial

compensation that will be paid to the beneficiaries in lieu of 42 hectares that cannot be acquired from the open market, as contemplated in section 42D(1a) of the Restitution Act, as amended.

The parties have agreed to resolve the claims amicably through negotiations and an agreement was reached. The beneficiaries have taken the resolution that they accept financial compensation based on the standard settlement amount. The offer that was made to the claimants amounts to R321 146,00. The claimants have agreed that this amount must be paid into the CPA's bank account.



### The history

Namaqualand is located to the northwest of the Republic of South Africa and is part of southern Africa's Karoo Namib region. Namaqualand remained a very quiet place regarding cultural evolution until about 2 000 years ago when the Khoi-Khoi or Nama clans invaded the area. They introduced a new and unknown means of wealth (power) in the form of domestic livestock, mostly goats and cattle.

This resulted in conflict between the local San inhabitants and the Nama clans whose livestock started grazing in the same areas as the game the San depended on for their survival. The Nama clans were a more organised society. They had leaders, and owned property and livestock. The weaker San inhabitants had to retreat to inferior areas, away from the prime grazing areas now occupied by the Nama clans. After the loss of their grazing land, the San became stock thieves or were enslaved by the Nama to work as hunters.

The Dutch pastoralists or trekboere arrived in the Cape in 1652. With the use of their weapons, the Dutch had conquered Namaqualand by 1750. This colonial expansion into Namaqualand was temporarily reversed at the beginning of the 19th century when the Nama and San clans started to reclaim their land and reversed the expansion of the Dutch colony into Namaqualand.

The claimant's grandmother, Elizabeth Cloete, was dispossessed of her right in land in 1944. No compensation was received. The claimants are claiming for unregistered rights in the form of beneficial occupational and grazing rights lost at the time of dispossession.



### The administration

The Office of the RLCC: Northern Cape has satisfied itself that the claim was lodged as prescribed and is compliant with the provisions of section 2(1) and 11(1) of the Restitution Act, as amended, and as provided for by section 25 of the Constitution.

The claim was published in Government Gazette Notice 41114, dated 15 September 2017.

The Office of the RLCC: Western Cape and Northern Cape received one family land claim, which was lodged by Mr Samuel Ruiters on 20 December 1998 on behalf of the direct descendants of Elizabeth Cloete.




### The settlement

The restitution option considered for settlement of the Ruiters Family's claim is equitable redress in the form of land restoration, as contemplated in section 42D(1a) of the Restitution Act, as amended.

The parties have agreed to resolve the claims amicably through negotiations and an agreement was reached. The Nama-Khoi Local Municipality has agreed to donate 16 hectares of the remainder of the farm Melkboschkuil No. 132 to the Commission in order to settle the Ruiters Family's claim. After approval of this submission, the Office of the RLCC: Northern Cape will appoint a service provider to subdivide the donated portion, 16 hectares of the farm Melkboschkuil No. 132, in order for the land to be transferred into the name of the CPA. An agreement for the settlement of the claim was arrived at based on the claimant's option for equitable redress in the form of land restoration.




# Western Cape



## Number of land claims settled



## Number of land claims finalised



### Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, the Western Cape projected settling 40 land claims and finalising 60 claims during the 2020/21 financial year. It succeeded in settling 40 land claims and finalising 60 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

**R286 580 632,38**

## Alexander Claim



### The history

Mr Jacobus Johannes Alexander acquired the remainder of Erf 2539 Stellenbosch in 1923 through Deed of Transfer T1179/1923. The remainder of Erf 2539 was later dispossessed from Mrs Martha Alexander (spouse of JJ Alexander) and transferred to the Community Development Board in 1968 through deed of transfer T27802/1968. The area in which the remainder of Erf 2530 Stellenbosch was situated had been proclaimed a “White Group Area” by Proclamation 211 of 1964; it became affected and was transferred to the Community Development Board.

The dispossession occurred because the area in which this property was situated was proclaimed a “White Group Area” and the original dispossessed person, Mrs Martha Alexander, was classified in the “Coloured Group” at the time of dispossession, so she had to move out and reside in the area that was reserved for the “Coloured Group” only.



### The administration

The claim was lodged on 15 March 1996 in compliance with section 2(1) and section 11(1) of the Restitution Act, as amended, and section 25(3) of the Constitution. The claim was lodged on behalf of the original dispossessed person, Mrs Martha Alexander, and processed in terms of the Rules of the Commission.

The RLCC: Western Cape is thus satisfied that the land claim made by the Alexander family conforms to the acceptance criteria, in that:

- A composite of rights in land was lost after 19 June 1913 as a result of racially discriminatory laws and practices.
- Just and equitable compensation was not received at the time of dispossession.
- The claim was lodged on 15 March 1996, which was before the closing date to lodge land claims.
- The LCC has made no order in respect of the land under claim.

This claim has been individually published in Government Gazette Notice 979 of 1999.



### The settlement

The restitution options were explained to the Alexander family and they have indicated

their preferred choice of financial compensation (historical valuation) as full and final settlement for the remainder of Erf 2539 Stellenbosch. The total amount of financial compensation for this ownership claim is R1 355 555,56.

The amount that was paid to the original dispossessed individual, Mrs Martha Alexander, during dispossession is not reflected on the deed of dispossession.



## Tarka Community Claim



### The history

Historical records show that the land on which Tarka is located was originally granted by the state to the Municipality of Mossel Bay on 9 October 1917 to form townships.

A survey from 1898 presents Tarka location (then Mossel Bay location) as a rocky amphitheatre that originated as an informal settlement for Coloured people on the outskirts of Mossel Bay. This informal settlement was characterised by unique stone cottages located along a rocky ridge overlooking the Indian Ocean.

Forced removals in Tarka took place over an extended period from approximately the 1930s until the 1970s when the group areas were altered on a number of occasions to expand former “white areas” to form the present-day Da Nova residential suburb now overlooking Tarka. Finally, a “buffer strip” was created between Tarka and Da Nova in line with the relevant policies of the time. When a section of Tarka was declared a white group area in the 1960s/1970s, many of these stone cottages were demolished.



### The administration

This claim was lodged on 2 February 1995 in compliance with section 2 and section 11(1) of the Restitution Act, as amended, and section 25(3) of the Constitution. This claim was lodged on behalf of the Tarka Grondeisers and processed in terms of the Rules of the Commission.

The RLCC: Western Cape is satisfied that it conforms to the acceptance criteria, in that:

- A composite of rights in land was lost after 19 June 1913 as a result of racially discriminatory laws and practices.
- Just and equitable compensation was not received at the time of dispossession.
- The claim was lodged before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998.
- The LCC has made no order in respect of the land under claim.

The claim has been gazetted on three occasions as follows:

- 60 tenants (Government Gazette 30585 Notice 1777, on 21 December 2007)
- 160 previous tenants (Government Gazette 30485 Notice 1686, on 23 November 2007)
- 18 previous tenants (Government Gazette 31957 Notice 221, on 6 March 2009)



### The settlement

The claimant households opted for alternative land as full and final settlement of their land rights lost. The Mossel Bay Municipality released 27 erven (12943, 12946, 12967, 12975, 12983, 12994, 12996, 12998, 13000, 13001, 13003, 13004, 13006, 13007, 13008, 13009, 13010, 13011, 13013, 13014, 13015, 13016, 13037, 13043, 13048, 13070, 13086 and portion of Erf 2003 Tarka), which will be subdivided into nine erven for restitution purposes.

Mossel Bay Municipality approved the release and alienation of the subject properties at a compensation amount of 50% of market value, which is R1 974 400,00, in settlement of the Tarka community claim.



# PART C

## FINANCIAL INFORMATION



*The CRLC strives to continuously improve its outcomes by improving procedures and standardising implementation within its budget*

## 20. Introduction

Section 21 of the Restitution Act stipulates that the CRLR must “*annually, not later than the first day of June, submit to Parliament a report on all its activities during the previous year, up to 31 March*”. This annual report is in fulfilment of that requirement, but is also largely in line with the requirements of section 40(1) and (3) of the PFMA. The Public Service Regulations, 2001, prescribes that human resources information is included in the annual report and that the Minister of Public Service and Administration has made this a set requirement for all government departments.

The PFMA requires entities to publish annual reports containing their annual financial statements and Audit Report within five months after the financial year end. These dates do not align with the requirements of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, which expects the annual report to be published by 1 June of every year. This discrepancy must be addressed for alignment in future.

The CRLR is an entity under the Department of Agriculture Land Reform and Rural Development. The Department’s financial year is from 1 April to 31 March each year. The CRLR follows the same financial year period. The annual financial statements of the CRLR consist of the functions performed by the entity, which only includes the investigation and recommendation of the settlement of claims.

The settlement and finalisation of claims is performed by the Restitution Branch within the DALRRD. The budget and expenditure are reported in the Department’s annual financial statements and annual report. Only a high-level overview will be included in this annual report.

## 21. Financial performance overview

The performance of the Restitution Branch in respect of financial management and expenditure during the period under review was excellent.

**Table 10: Summary of budget expenditure the 2020/21 financial year**

FINAL VIREMENT INFORMATION FOR 2020–2021 FINANCIAL YEAR				
Economic classification	Final budget '000	Expenditure '000	Variance '000	Percentage expenditure
Compensation of employees	383 959	382 798	1 161	100%
Goods and services	97 365	97 364	1	100%
Municipality	13 200	13 200	–	100%
Social benefits	346	346	–	100%
Capital assets	97 888	97 888	–	100%
Interest on land	4 617	4 617	–	100%
Land and subsoil	815 584	815 584	–	100%
Households	1 356 575	1 356 575	–	100%
Financial assets	0	437	437	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 769 534</b>	<b>2 768 809</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 11: Project expenditure summary per province for the 2020/21 financial year**


Office	Land purchase (R'000)	Land and subsoil (R'000)	Grants (R'000)	Financial compensation (R'000)	Conveyancing fees (R'000)	Total (R'000)
Eastern Cape	3 150	0	0	415 996	0	419 146
Free State	4 013	3 429	0	505	0	7 947
Gauteng	0	0	0	37 767	129	37 896
KwaZulu-Natal	226 943	21 690	8 394	229 720	2 276	489 023
Limpopo	124 736	0	2 775	334 588	0	462 099
Mpumalanga	17 829	419	1 299	159 565	353	179 465
Northern Cape	1 633	0	0	2 228	82	3 943
North West	244 129	477	17 892	6 452	1 134	270 084
Western Cape	165 991	1 176	171 154	54 561	0	392 883
<b>Total</b>	<b>788 425</b>	<b>27 191</b>	<b>201 515</b>	<b>1 241 382</b>	<b>3 974</b>	<b>2 262 487</b>

**Table 12: Commitment reduction breakdown between backlog and new claims for the 2020/21 financial year**

Province	Expenditure – claims approved prior to 2020/21	Expenditure – claims approved 2020/21	Total expenditure
Eastern Cape	327 227	91 920	419 146
Free State	431	7 442	7 873
Gauteng	13 274	24 622	37 896
KwaZulu-Natal	210 375	274 326	484 700
Limpopo	184 193	277 906	462 099
Mpumalanga	95 874	83 591	179 465
Northern Cape	3 622	321	3 943
North West	34 482	223 669	258 151
Western Cape	127 312	277 505	404 816
<b>Total</b>	<b>996 788</b>	<b>1 261 302</b>	<b>2 258 090</b>



## Expenditure per province



## 22. Report of the Auditor-General to Parliament on the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights

### Report on the audit of the financial statements

#### Opinion

1. I have audited the financial statements of the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights set out on pages **86 to 98**, which comprise the Statement of Financial Position as at 31 March 2021, the Statement of Financial Performance, Statement of Changes in Net Assets, Cash Flow Statement and Statement of Comparison of Budget and Actual Amounts for the year then ended, as well as Notes to the Financial Statements, including a summary of significant accounting policies.
2. In my opinion, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights as at 31 March 2021, and its financial performance and cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with the Standards of Generally Recognised Accounting Practice (GRAP) and the requirements of the Public Finance Management Act, Act No. 1 of 1999 (PFMA).

#### Basis for opinion

3. I conducted my audit in accordance with the International Standards on Auditing (ISAs). My responsibilities under those standards are further described in the Auditor-General's responsibilities for the audit of the financial statements section of my report.
4. I am independent of the public entity in accordance with the International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants' International Code of Ethics for professional accountants (including the international independence standards) (the IESBA Code), as well as other ethical requirements that are relevant to my audit in South Africa. I have fulfilled my other ethical responsibilities in accordance with these requirements and the IESBA Code.
5. I believe that the audit evidence I have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for my opinion.

#### Emphasis of matter

6. I draw attention to the matter below. My opinion is not modified in respect of this matter.

#### Restatement of corresponding figures

7. As disclosed in Note 6 to the financial statements, the corresponding figures for 31 March 2020 were restated as a result of errors in the financial statements of the public entity at and for the year ended 31 March 2021.

#### Responsibilities of the Accounting Officer for the financial statements

8. The Accounting Officer is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in accordance with the GRAP standards and the requirements of the PFMA, and for such internal control as the Accounting Officer determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.
9. In preparing the financial statements, the Accounting Officer is responsible for assessing the public entity's ability to continue as a going concern, disclosing, as applicable, matters relating to a going concern and using the going-concern basis of accounting, unless the appropriate governance structure either intends to liquidate the public entity or to cease operations, or has no realistic alternative but to do so.

## Auditor-General's responsibilities for the audit of the financial statements

10. My objectives are to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements, as a whole, are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, and to issue an Auditor's Report that includes my opinion. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance, but is not a guarantee that an audit conducted in accordance with the ISAs will always detect a material misstatement when it exists. Misstatements can arise from fraud or error and are considered material if, individually or in aggregate, they could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of these financial statements.
11. A further description of my responsibilities for the audit of the financial statements is included in the annexure to this Auditor's Report.

## Report on the audit of the Annual Performance Report

12. Section 55(2)(a) of the PFMA requires the public entity to prepare an Annual Performance Report. The public entity's performance information was reported in the Annual Performance Report of the DALRRD. The usefulness and reliability of the reported performance information was tested as part of the audit of the DALRRD and any audit findings are included in the management and auditor's reports of the DALRRD.

## Report on the audit of compliance with legislation

### Introduction and scope

13. In accordance with the Public Audit Act (PAA) and the general notice issued in terms thereof, I have a responsibility to report material findings on the public entity's compliance with specific matters in key legislation. I performed procedures to identify findings, but not to gather evidence to express assurance.
14. The material finding on compliance with specific matters in key legislation are as follows:

### Annual financial statements

15. The financial statements submitted for auditing were not prepared in accordance with the prescribed financial reporting framework as required by section 55(1)(a) and (b) of the PFMA. Material misstatements of government grants, employee-related costs and general expenses, and the statement of comparison of budget and actual amounts identified by the auditors in the submitted financial statement were corrected and the supporting records were provided subsequently, resulting in the financial statements receiving an unqualified opinion.

## Other information

16. The Accounting Officer is responsible for the other information. The other information comprises the information included in the annual report. The other information does not include the financial statements and the Auditor's Report.
17. My opinion on the financial statements and findings on compliance with legislation do not cover the other information and I do not express an audit opinion or any form of assurance conclusion on it.
18. In connection with my audit, my responsibility is to read the other information and, in doing so, consider whether the other information is materially inconsistent with the financial statements, or my knowledge obtained in the audit, or otherwise appears to be materially misstated.

19. The other information I obtained prior to the date of this Auditor's Report is the Accounting Officer's report and the Audit Committee report. The other information to be included in the annual report is expected to be made available to us after 31 July 2021.
20. When I receive and read this other information to be included in the annual report, if I conclude that there is a material misstatement therein, I am required to communicate the matter to those charged with governance and request that the other information be corrected. If the other information is not corrected, I may have to retract this Auditor's Report and re-issue an amended report as appropriate. However, if it is corrected this will not be necessary.

### **Internal control deficiencies**

21. I considered internal control relevant to my audit of the financial statements, reported performance information and compliance with applicable legislation. However, my objective was not to express any form of assurance on it. The matters reported below are limited to the significant internal control deficiencies that resulted in the basis for the opinion and the findings on compliance with legislation included in this report.
22. There is a lack of adequate and regular review of monitoring of compliance with legislation as the financial statements were not prepared in accordance with the prescribed framework as required by section 55(1) of the PFMA.

*Auditor-General*

**Pretoria**  
**31 July 2021**



AUDITOR-GENERAL  
SOUTH AFRICA

*Auditing to build public confidence*

## ANNEXURE – AUDITOR-GENERAL’S RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE AUDIT

1. As part of an audit in accordance with the ISAs, I exercise professional judgement and maintain professional scepticism throughout my audit of the financial statements and on the entity’s compliance with respect to the selected subject matters.

### Financial statements

2. In addition to my responsibility for the audit of the financial statements as described in this Auditor’s Report, I also do the following:
  - Identify and assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error; design and perform audit procedures responsive to those risks; and obtain audit evidence that is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for my opinion. The risk of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from fraud is higher than for one resulting from error, as fraud may involve collusion, forgery, intentional omissions, misrepresentations or the override of internal control.
  - Obtain an understanding of internal control relevant to the audit in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the public entity’s internal control.
  - Evaluate the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates and related disclosures made by the Accounting Officer.
  - Conclude on the appropriateness of the Accounting Officer’s use of the going-concern basis of accounting in the preparation of the financial statements. I also conclude, based on the audit evidence obtained, whether a material uncertainty exists relating to events or conditions that may cast significant doubt on the ability of the CRLR to continue as a going concern. If I conclude that a material uncertainty exists, I am required to draw attention in my Auditor’s Report to the related disclosures in the financial statements about the material uncertainty or, if such disclosures are inadequate, to modify my opinion on the financial statements. My conclusions are based on the information available to me at the date of this Auditor’s Report. However, future events or conditions may cause a public entity to cease operating as a going concern.
  - Evaluate the overall presentation, structure and content of the financial statements, including the disclosures, and determine whether the financial statements represent the underlying transactions and events in a manner that achieves fair presentation.

### Communication with those charged with governance

3. I communicate with the accounting officer regarding, among other matters, the planned scope and timing of the audit and significant audit findings, including any significant deficiencies in internal control that I identify during my audit.
4. I also provide the public entity with a statement that I have complied with relevant ethical requirements regarding independence, and communicate with them all relationships and other matters that may reasonably be thought to bear on my independence and, where applicable, actions taken to eliminate threats or safeguards applied.

# Contents

1. Statement of Financial Position	86
2. Statement of Financial Performance	87
3. Statement of Changes in Net Assets	88
4. Cash Flow Statement	88
5. Statement of Comparison of Budget and Actual Amounts	89
6. Notes to the Financial Statements	90

## STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION AS AT 31 MARCH 2021

	Notes	2021 R '000	Restated – 2020 R '000
<b>Non-current assets</b>		<b>703</b>	<b>757</b>
Property, plant and equipment	2	703	757
<b>Current assets</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>		<b>703</b>	<b>757</b>
<b>Net assets</b>		<b>703</b>	<b>757</b>
Accumulated surplus/(deficit)		703	757
<b>Liabilities</b>			
<b>Current liabilities</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
Trade and other payables from exchange transactions		-	-
<b>TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</b>		<b>703</b>	<b>757</b>

## STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE AS AT 31 MARCH 2021

	Notes	2021 R '000	Restated – 2020 R '000
<b>Revenue</b>			
<b>Revenue for non-exchange transactions</b>			
Government grants	3	25 284	26 801
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>		<b>25 284</b>	<b>26 801</b>
<b>Expenses</b>			
Employee-related costs	4	(12 206)	(8 979)
General Expenses	5	(13 132)	(17 952)
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>		<b>(25 338)</b>	<b>(26 931)</b>
<b>Continuing operations surplus/(deficit) before tax</b>		<b>(53)</b>	<b>(130)</b>
Taxation		-	-
<b>Continuing operations surplus/(deficit) after tax</b>		<b>(53)</b>	<b>(130)</b>
<b>Discontinued operations surplus/(deficit) after tax</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Total surplus/(deficit) for the period net of tax</b>		<b>(53)</b>	<b>(130)</b>

## STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS AS AT 31 MARCH 2021

	Note	Accumulated surplus R '000	Total net assets R '000
<b>Balance at 1 April 2019</b>		(66)	(66)
<b>Changes in net assets</b>			
Reversal of 2018/19 accumulated deficit – prior period error	6	66	66
Restated accumulated surplus/(deficit) as at 1 April 2019 – prior period error	6	886	886
Surplus/(deficit) for the year – restated		(130)	(130)
<b>Balance at 31 March 2020 – restated</b>		<b>757</b>	<b>757</b>
<b>Changes in net assets</b>			
Surplus/(deficit) for the year		(53)	(53)
<b>Balance at 31 March 2021</b>		<b>703</b>	<b>703</b>

## CASH FLOW STATEMENT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2021

The Standard of GRAP 2 requires the Cash Flow Statement presented to report cash flows during the period and to be classified as cash flows from operating, investing and financing activities.

Cash flows are defined as inflows and outflows of cash and cash equivalents. The CRLR does not operate a bank account and does not hold any cash or cash equivalents. All cash flows pertaining to the Commission are accounted for in the accounts of the DALRRD.

# STATEMENT OF COMPARISON OF BUDGET AND ACTUAL AMOUNTS

## Budget on accrual basis

	Approved budget R '000	Adjustments R '000	Final budget R '000	Actual amounts R '000	Difference on final R '000	Reference R '000
<b>Statement of Financial Performance</b>						
<b>Revenue</b>						
<b>Transfer revenue</b>						
Government grants and subsidies	-	-	-	25 284	25 284	1
<b>Expenditure</b>						
Personnel	-	-	-	(12 206)	(12 206)	1
General expenses	-	-	-	(13 132)	(13 132)	1
<b>Total expenditure</b>	-	-	-	<b>(25 338)</b>	<b>(25 338)</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Deficit for the year</b>	-	-	-	<b>(53)</b>	<b>(53)</b>	<b>1</b>

1. The budget is part of the Restitution allocation for Programme 3 and the budget for the CRLR cannot be practically isolated.

# NOTES TO THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

## ACCOUNTING POLICIES

### 1. Presentation of the Annual Financial Statements

The Annual Financial Statements have been prepared in accordance with the effective Standards of GRAP, including any interpretations, guidelines and directives issued by the Accounting Standards Board in accordance with section 91(1) of the PFMA.

The Annual Financial Statements have been prepared on the accrual basis of accounting and incorporated the historical cost conventions as the basis of measurement, except where specified otherwise. All amounts have been presented in South African rand (R), which is also the functional currency of the entity.

Unless otherwise stated, all financial figures have been rounded to the nearest R1 000 (R' 000). Assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses were not offset, except where offsetting is either required or permitted by a Standard of GRAP.

#### 1.1 Going-concern assumption

These Annual Financial Statements have been prepared based on the expectation that the entity will continue to operate as a going concern for at least the next 12 months.

#### 1.2 Comparative figures

Where material accounting errors, which relate to prior periods, have been identified in the current year, the correction is made retrospectively as far as is practicable and the prior-year comparatives are restated accordingly. Where there has been a change in accounting policy in the current year, the adjustment is made retrospectively as far as is practicable and the prior-year comparatives are restated accordingly.

#### 1.3 Significant judgements and sources of estimation uncertainty

In preparing the annual financial statements, management is required to make estimates and assumptions that affect the amounts presented in the Annual Financial Statements and related disclosures. Use of available information and the application of judgement is inherent in the formation of estimates. Actual results in the future could differ from these estimates, which may be material to the Annual Financial Statements. Significant judgements include the following:

#### 1.4 Employee benefits

Employee benefits are all forms of consideration given by an entity in exchange for service rendered by employees.

##### **Short-term employee benefits**

Short-term employee benefits are employee benefits (other than termination benefits) that are due to be settled within 12 months after the end of the period in which the employees render the related service.

##### **Short-term employee benefits include items such as the following:**

- Wages, salaries and social security contributions
- Short-term compensated absences (such as paid annual leave and paid sick leave) where the compensation for the absences is due to be settled within 12 months after the end of the reporting period in which the employees render the related employee service

- Bonusses, incentives, and performance-related payments payable within 12 months after the end of the reporting period in which the employees render the related service
- Non-monetary benefits (for example, medical care, and free or subsidised goods or services, such as housing, cars and cell phones) for current employees.

#### **Post-employment benefits: Defined contribution plans**

Defined contribution plans are post-employment benefit plans under which an entity pays fixed or determinable contributions into a separate entity (a fund) and will have no legal or constructive obligation to pay further contributions if the fund does not hold sufficient assets to pay all employee benefits relating to employee service in the current and prior periods.

When an employee has rendered service to the entity during a reporting period, the entity recognises the contribution payable to a defined contribution plan in exchange for that service:

- As a liability (accrued expense), after deducting any contribution already paid. If the contribution already paid exceeds the contribution due for service before the reporting date, an entity recognises that excess as an asset (prepaid expense) to the extent that the prepayment will lead to, for example, a reduction in future payments or a cash refund.
- As an expense, unless another standard requires or permits the inclusion of the contribution in the cost of an asset.

### **1.5 Revenue from non-exchange transactions**

Non-exchange transactions are transactions that are not exchange transactions. In a non-exchange transaction, an entity either receives value from another entity without directly giving approximately equal value in exchange or gives value to another entity without directly receiving approximately equal value in exchange.

Revenue received from conditional or operational grants, donations and funding are recognised as revenue to the extent that the entity has complied with any of the criterias, conditions or obligations if any are embodied in the agreement. To the extent that the criteria, conditions or obligations have not been met, a liability is recognised.

#### **Recognition**

An inflow of resources from a non-exchange transaction recognised as an asset is recognised as revenue, except to the extent that a liability is also recognised in respect of the same inflow

#### **Measurement**

Revenue from a non-exchange transaction is measured at the amount of the increase in net assets recognised by the entity.

When, as a result of a non-exchange transaction, the entity recognises an asset, it also recognises revenue equivalent to the amount of the asset measured at its fair value as at the date of acquisition.

#### **Transfers**

Apart from services in kind, which are not recognised, the entity recognises an asset in respect of transfers when the transferred resources meet the definition of an asset and satisfy the criteria for recognition as an asset.

The entity recognises an asset in respect of transfers when the transferred resources meet the definition of an asset and satisfy the criteria for recognition as an asset.

Transferred assets are measured at their fair value as at the date of acquisition.

The disclosure of their nature and type has, however, been disclosed by way of a note to the financial statements in line with GRAP 23.

These services may include the following:

- Administration service
- Accommodation services
- Information technology
- Staff training

### **Debt forgiveness and assumption of liabilities**

The entity recognises revenue in respect of liabilities that are assumed by another entity when the former debt no longer meets the definition of a liability or satisfies the criteria for recognition as a liability, provided that the assumption of the liability does not satisfy the definition of a contribution from owners.

Revenue arising from the assumption of liabilities is measured at the carrying amount of the liability assumed.

### **Gifts and donations, including goods in-kind**

Gifts and donations, including goods in-kind, are recognised as assets and revenue when it is probable that the future economic benefits or service potential will flow to the entity and the fair value of the assets can be measured reliably.

### **Services in-kind**

The entity recognises services in-kind that are significant to its operations and/or service delivery objectives as assets and recognises the related revenue when it is probable that the future economic benefits or service potential will flow to the entity and the fair value of the assets can be measured reliably.

Where services in-kind are not significant to the entity's operations and/or service delivery objectives and/or do not satisfy the criteria for recognition, the entity discloses the nature and type of services in-kind received during the reporting period.

## **1.6 Property, plant and equipment**

The cost of an asset acquired through a non-exchange transaction is its fair value as at date of acquisition.

When significant components of an item of property, plant and equipment have different useful lives, they are accounted for as separate items (major components) of property, plant and equipment.

Recognition of costs in the carrying amount of an item of property, plant and equipment ceases when the item is in the location and condition necessary for it to be capable of operating in the manner intended by management.

Items such as spare parts, standby equipment and servicing equipment are recognised when they meet the definition of property, plant and equipment.

Property, plant, and equipment are carried at cost less accumulated depreciation and any impairment losses.

Property, plant, and equipment are depreciated on the straight-line basis over their expected useful lives.

The useful lives of items of property, plant and equipment have been assessed as follows:

<b>Item</b>	<b>Depreciation method</b>	<b>Estimate useful life</b>
Computer equipment	Straight-line method	3 years
Furniture and fittings	Straight-line method	10 years

The depreciable amount of an asset is allocated on a systematic basis over its useful life.

Each part of an item of property, plant and equipment with a cost that is significant in relation to the total cost of the item is depreciated separately.

The entity assesses, at each reporting date, whether there is any indication that the entity's expectations about the useful life of an asset have changed since the preceding reporting date. If any such indication exists, the entity revises the expected useful life accordingly. The change is accounted for as a change in an accounting estimate.

The depreciation charge for each period is recognised in surplus or deficit unless it is included in the carrying amount of another asset.

Items of property, plant and equipment are derecognised when the asset is disposed of or when there are no further economic benefits or service potential expected from the use of the asset.

The gain or loss arising from the derecognition of an item of property, plant and equipment is included in surplus or deficit when the item is derecognised. The gain or loss arising from the derecognition of an item of property, plant and equipment is determined as the difference between the net disposal proceeds, if any, and the carrying amount of the item.

## 1.7 Related parties

Where the entity has had related-party transactions during the period covered by the financial statements, it discloses the nature of the related-party transaction during the period covered by the financial statements, the nature, information about those related-party transactions and outstanding balances, including commitment.

A related party is a person or an entity with the ability to control or jointly control the other party, or exercise significant influence over the other party, or vice versa, or an entity that is subject to common control, or joint control.

Control is the power to govern the financial and operating policies of an entity to obtain benefits from its activities.

Joint control is the agreed sharing of control over an activity by a binding arrangement and exists only when the strategic financial and operating decisions relating to the activity require the unanimous consent of the parties sharing control (the ventures).

A related-party transaction is a transfer of resources, services or obligations between the reporting entity and a related party, regardless of whether a price is charged.

Significant influence is the power to participate in the financial and operating policy decisions of an entity, but is not control over those policies.

Management are those persons responsible for planning, directing and controlling the activities of the entity, including those charged with the governance of the entity in accordance with legislation in instances where they are required to perform such functions.

Close members of the family of a person are those family members who may be expected to influence, or be influenced by, that management in their dealings with the entity.

The entity is exempt from disclosure requirements in relation to related-party transactions if that transaction occurs within normal supplier and/or client/recipient relationships on terms and conditions no more or less favourable than those that it is reasonable to expect the entity to have adopted if dealing with that individual entity or person in the same circumstances, and terms and conditions are within the normal operating parameters established by that reporting entity's legal mandate.

Where the entity is exempt from the disclosures in accordance with the above, the entity discloses narrative information about the nature of the transactions and the related outstanding balances to enable users of the entity's financial statements to understand the effect of related-party transactions on its unaudited annual financial statements.

### 1.8 Events after the reporting date

Events after reporting date are those events, both favourable and unfavourable, that occur between the reporting date and the date when the financial statements are authorised for issue. Two types of events can be identified:

- Those that provide evidence of conditions that existed at the reporting date (adjusting events after the reporting date)
- Those that are indicative of conditions that arose after the reporting date (non-adjusting events after the reporting date)

The entity will adjust the amount recognised in the financial statements to reflect adjusting events after the reporting date once the event occurred.

The entity will disclose the nature of the event and an estimate of its financial effect or a statement that such estimate cannot be made in respect of all material non-adjusting events, where non-disclosure could influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements.

### 1.9 Budget information

The entity is typically subject to budgetary limits in the form of appropriations or budget authorisations (or equivalent), which is given effect through authorising legislation, appropriation or similar.

General purpose financial reporting by the entity shall provide information on whether resources were obtained and used in accordance with the legally adopted budget.

The approved budget is prepared on an accrual basis and presented by economic classification.

The approved budget covers the fiscal period from 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021.

The unaudited annual financial statements and the budget are on the same basis of accounting. Therefore a comparison with the budgeted amounts for the reporting period have been included in the Statement of Comparison of Budget and Actual Amounts.

### 1.10 GRAP Standards approved and not yet effective

The following standards have been approved, but are not yet effective, and have not been adopted by the entity:

- GRAP 25 – Employee Benefits
- GRAP 104 – Financial Instruments

The following standard has been approved, but is not yet effective, and the entity has decided to early-adopt it:

- GRAP 20 - Related-party Disclosure

## 2. Property, plant and equipment

### Carrying value of property, plant and equipment

	Cost	Accumulated depreciation	Carrying value
<b>Carrying value as at 31 March 2020 – restated</b>			
Computer equipment	799	(632)	166
Furniture and fittings	896	(305)	590
	<b>1 694</b>	<b>(938)</b>	<b>757</b>
<b>Carrying value as at 31 March 2021</b>			
Computer equipment	915	(715)	200
Furniture and fittings	896	(392)	503
	<b>1 811</b>	<b>(1 108)</b>	<b>703</b>

### Reconciliation of property, plant and equipment as at 31 March 2021

	Computer equipment	Furniture and fittings	Total
Cost	799	896	1 694
Accumulated depreciation	(632)	(305)	(938)
<b>Carrying value 31 March 2020</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>757</b>
Additions	117	-	117
Disposals	-	-	-
Depreciation	(83)	(87)	(170)
<b>Carrying value 31 March 2021</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>703</b>
Accumulated depreciation	(715)	(392)	(1 108)
Cost	915	896	1 811

## 3. Revenue

Revenue from non-exchange transactions	2021	Restated – 2020
Government grants	25 284	26 801
<b>Major classes of services received in-kind</b>		
Research services received in kind	8 372	12 649
<b>Revenue for non-exchange transactions arising from liabilities assumed by the Department</b>		
General expenses	4 590	5 072
Employee-related costs	12 206	8 979
Purchase of property, plant and equipment	117	102
	<b>25 284</b>	<b>26 801</b>

## Services received in kind not recognised (not significant to service delivery objectives of the Commission)

Shared services (Finance, Human Resources, Supply Chain Management)

Office accommodation

Audit fees and Audit Committee fees

Stationery and consumables

Other administrative expenses

## 4. Employee benefits

### Employee-related costs

Employee benefits	2021	Restated - 2020
Salaries and wages	7 643	6 173
Performance and other bonuses	631	420
UIF, pension and medical aid	1 169	867
Allowances	1 429	1 077
Housing benefits and allowances	277	215
Overtime payments	-	26
Other employee-related costs	1	1
Provision for performance bonus	-	124
Provision for leave pay	1 055	78
	<b>12 206</b>	<b>8 979</b>

## 5. General expenses

General expenses	2021	Restated - 2020
Advertising	-	-
Cleaning	-	52
Consulting and professional fees	11 002	14 937
Consumables	-	-
Entertainment	-	14
Conferences and seminars	551	861
Printing and stationery	-	-
Subscriptions	-	-
Telephone and fax	99	75
Transport and freight	736	1 112
Travel – local	574	625
Theft and loss	-	45
Depreciation of property, plant and equipment	170	232
	<b>13 132</b>	<b>17 952</b>

## 6. Prior-period error

In the financial year of 31 March 2020, the following accounting errors were made in the preparation and compilation of the annual financial statements:

- Employee benefits related to employees seconded to the Commission were erroneously not recognised in the audited financial statements as at 31 March 2020.
- Revenue for non-exchange transactions earned by the Commission were erroneously misstated in the audited financial statements as at 31 March 2020.
- Property, plant and equipment transferred to the Commission were erroneously not recognised in the audited financial statements as at 31 March 2020.
- General expenses incurred by the Commission were erroneously misstated in the audited financial statements as at 31 March 2020.
- Financial liabilities were erroneously recognised in the audited financial statements as at 31 March 2020.

The comparative figures for the 31 March 2020 financial statements have been restated. The effects of the restatement in the financial statements are summarised below:

	2020
Decrease in current liabilities	108
Increase in employee-related costs	5 938
Increase in revenue for non-exchange transactions	(21 048)
Increase in carrying value for property, plant and equipment	757
Increase in general expenses	15 198
<b>Increase in accumulated surplus/deficit</b>	<b>953</b>

## 7. Related parties

### Relationships

#### Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development

The CRLR is a branch that operates under the DALRRD. As such, some transactions rendered between the Department and the Commission are in-kind and/or not at arm's length. Those services or goods received in kind that are quantifiable are disclosed below:

	2021 R'000	Restated – 2020 R'000
<b>Related-party transactions</b>		
Revenue for non-exchange transactions	25 284	26 801
Research services received in kind	8 372	12 649
Assets acquired through non-exchange transactions	117	102

As at 31 March 2021

	Basic salary	Bonuses and performance-related payments	Other short-term employee benefits	Post-employment benefits	Total
	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000
<b>Name</b>					
Gobodo, NS	1 114	-	477	-	1 591
Maphutha, LH	809	67	367	105	1 348
Benyane, CJ	846	122	383	110	1 461
	<b>2 768</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>1 227</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>4 400</b>

As at 31 March 2020

	Basic salary	Bonuses and performance-related payments	Other short-term employee benefits	Post-employment benefits	Total
	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000
<b>Name</b>					
Gobodo, NS	1 114	-	477	-	1 591
Maphutha, LH	809	124	367	105	1 404
	<b>1 923</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>844</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>2 996</b>

8. Events after the reporting date

No adjusting or significant non-adjusting events have occurred between 31 March 2021 and the date of authorisation of these financial statements.

# PART D

## GOVERNANCE



*The CRLR remains committed to maintaining the highest standards of governance fundamental to the management of the public finances and resources allocated to it.*

## 24. Introduction

The CRLR remains committed to maintaining the highest standards of governance fundamental to the management of the public finances and resources allocated to it. As a programme of the DRDLR, the CRLR participates in all governance fora, and submits statutory and governance plans and reports to the DRDLR. In addition, and as per the requirements of the Restitution Act, the commissioners meet at least once every quarter for a statutory meeting attended by the CRLR's executive managers to provide direction and review policies as may be applicable.

## 25. Risk management

The CRLR complies with and adheres to the DRDLR's Risk Management Policy and Strategy, and partakes in the Risk and Compliance Management Committee.

A summary of the strategic risks and mitigation plan is outlined in Table 13.

**Table 13: Strategic risk assessment and mitigation**

Risk type	Risk	Risk response/mitigation plan
<b>Financial risks</b>		
Budgetary risks	Limited budget	Offers to be negotiated and linked to the recommendations of the Valuer-General. Annual submissions to National Treasury to indicate funds required in adjustment and Medium-term Expenditure Framework cycle
Expenditure risks	Under-spending	Monthly expenditure monitoring and cash flow revision(s) to be done
<b>Institutional risks</b>		
IT systems	Lack of effective information and records management system	Development of standardised business process to be fed into the project and management information system Apply change management principles during implementation
Human resource risks	Ineffectual human resources	Development of revised institutional form and continual training
Process risks	Delays in implementation of settlements No standardised business process with time frames	Developed detailed business process that is elaborated into SOPs and time frames. Implementation of reviewed settlement models
<b>External risks</b>		
Reputational risks	Reputational risk linked to delays in the settlement of claims	Statutory Commission meetings to be held with formal and widespread communication aims, including media, as well as quarterly statistics releases. Communication process underway in collaboration with the Government Communication Information System.
Legal and regulatory risks	No clear and definite mandate of the CRLR (e.g. scope creep into post-settlement issues) Litigation risks	Clarify mandate in the context of future autonomy and develop plans to ensure integration with the DRDLR's processes Improvement of tracking and management of matters in court Compliance checklist and quality control by quality assurance Increased quality assurance capacity

## 26. Internal audit and audit committees

As per the revised plan that was approved on 6 December 2018, the DRDLR's Internal Audit Unit performed the following three audits under the Restitution Branch:

- Restitution management
- Performance information (service delivery reporting)
- Management accounting and internal reporting

# PART E

## HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT



*The CRLR has made progress towards filling prioritised critical posts in an equitable manner*

## 27. Introduction

The information contained in this part of the annual report will be covered fully in the Annual Report of the DALRRD and in terms of the details prescribed by the Minister for Public Service and Administration for all departments in the public service.

## 28. Human resource statistics

The CRLR's human resources (HR) management function is performed as a coordination and oversight function at the National Office and much reliance is placed on the DRDLR's National Office and Provincial Shared Service Centres (PSSCs).

The DALRRD manages the Personnel Salary (PERSAL) system, and key HR information on behalf of the CRLR, including labour relations. A very small team of HR practitioners assists the DALRRD in its recruitment and performance management processes. The DALRRD's Chief Directorate: Human Resources Management and Organisational Development is acknowledged as a strategic partner and plays a vital role in the achievement of the CRLR's goals by rendering effective and efficient HR advice and services.

### 28.1 Expenditure on personnel

Table 14 shows the expenditure on compensation of employees (CoE) during the period under review. The CRLR spent 91% of the CoE budget for the year under review.

**Table 14: Expenditure per office on compensation of employees**

Province	Budget (R)	Expenditure (R)	Percentage expenditure
Eastern Cape	47 624 000	33 565 701	70%
Free State	18 458 000	18 456 916	100%
Gauteng	32 810 000	31 687 055	97%
KwaZulu-Natal	64 618 000	61 916 726	90%
Limpopo	52 894 000	52 889 267	100%
Mpumalanga	59 428 000	59 108 997	99%
Northern Cape	18 033 000	17 236 358	90%
North West	36 672 000	33 163 726	90%
Western Cape	32 797 000	32 111 414	98%
National Office	56 721 000	41 636 530	73%
<b>Total</b>	<b>420 055 000</b>	<b>381 772 690</b>	<b>91%</b>

## 28.2 Employment and vacancies

Critical, urgent and priority posts were identified in 2018 within the then available budget for filling. The result of this prioritisation process was finalised late in 2018 when the former acting Director-General granted approval for the filling of those posts.

The recruitment process of these posts were at an advanced stage with some appointments finalised and some at the verge of appointment letters being issued when the Minister placed a moratorium on the filling of posts on 11 July 2019 in terms of Circular 54 of 2019, following the announcement by the President of the National Macro Organisational Restructuring of Government (NMOG), primarily due to the pending amalgamation of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, and the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.

In terms of Circular 54, “any matter relating to [the moratorium on the filling of posts] that could not wait” could be submitted to the Minister via the Director-General for consideration. Said submission was forwarded to the Minister in September 2019, as a special request to fill five critical senior management service (SMS) posts. Concomitant approval was granted. These posts were never filled due to the subsequent COVID-19 pandemic that led to the temporary closure of the Department, following which the CRLR was instructed not to fill SMS posts as the Department had to prioritise the filling of SMS posts through the supernumerary process.

These critical posts are discussed under SMS positions.


Table 15 shows the staff complement per office with a total headcount of 688 individuals, instead of 768 funded posts. The highest vacancy rate is in the National Office at 24%. The office with the lowest vacancy rate is Limpopo, at 4%. The total vacancy rate for all offices is 10%, which is the preferred vacancy rate as prescribed by National Treasury.

**Table 15: Status of posts and vacancies per office**

Office	Number of funded posts	Number of posts filled	Number of posts vacant	Percentage vacancy rate	Employees additional employed	Head count
National Office	87	66	21	24%	0	66
Eastern Cape	70	62	8	11%	0	62
Free State	34	34	0	5.88%	1	34
Gauteng	66	60	6	9%	0	60
KwaZulu-Natal	111	101	10	9%	1	101
Limpopo	100	96	4	4%	0	96
Mpumalanga	116	107	9	8%	0	107
Northern Cape	38	32	6	16%	0	32
North West	74	66	8	11%	0	66
Western Cape	72	64	8	11%	1	64
<b>Total</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>688</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>688</b>

**Table 16: Number of staff and vacancies per salary band**

Salary band (permanent employees)	Number of permanent posts	Number of posts vacant	Vacancy rate	Number of posts filled additional to the establishment
Lower skilled (levels 1–2)	0	0	N/A	0
Skilled (levels 3–5)	123	15	12.20%	0
Highly skilled production (levels 6–8)	365	43	11.78%	0
Highly skilled supervision (levels 9–12)	240	31	12.65%	3
Senior management (levels 13–16)	40	5	13%	0




### 28.3 Filling of senior management service posts

There are 40 SMS posts on the establishment of the CRLR.

There is a vacancy rate of 13% in the SMS cadre. The vacant posts are as follows:

- Deputy Chief Land Claims Commissioner: National Office
- Chief Director: Land Restitution Support: Eastern Cape
- Director: Project Management: National Office
- Director: Quality Assurance: National Office
- Director: Legal: Limpopo

### Age distribution and people with disabilities




The average age of all staff members is just over 35 years. The average age of SMS members is slightly higher at 49 years. The age composition is therefore relatively young, considering the high number of skilled and highly skilled staff members.

There are 13 staff members with disabilities, which constitutes 1.85% of the total.

### Termination of service during the period under review

There were 15 terminations of service during the period under review, which resulted in 15 vacant posts arising that could not be filled due to the 2020 moratorium on the filling of posts.

Of the terminations of service, 40% were resignations. Resignations of 40% of the total number of staff employed shows that the turnaround of staff due to resignations is very high.




### Employment equity: Gender and race distribution

Female staff members comprise **56%** or 387 of all staff, with **44%** or 301 of the staff component being male.

**Table 17: Employment equity numbers per salary level, race and gender**

Salary levels	African		Coloured		Indian		White		Total
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	
4	1	6	-	1	-	-	-	-	8
5	52	29	12	3	3	2	-	1	101
6	56	33	10	-	3	-	3	-	105
7	50	40	8	1	1	1	1	-	102
8	55	56	4	-	-	-	2	-	117
9	12	13	2	-	-	-	-	-	27
10	62	52	-	3	3	1	-	1	122
11	12	6	1	-	-	1	2	-	22
12	14	25	2	1	1	-	-	-	43
13	3	16	-	1	-	-	2	1	23
14	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	-	11
15	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>688</b>

Employment in the SMS cadre is skewed towards males. Of the 35 senior managers, just over 72% are male, with the race distribution as shown in the figure below.




## 29. Performance management

The CRLR applies the DALRRD's approved Performance Management Development Strategy (PMDS) to all staff. All CRLR staff members are required to enter into performance agreements within three months of their appointment. In the SMS cadre, the submission of performance agreements was 100% in compliance with the policy.

Performance assessments were conducted on time and all performance incentives were paid before the end of the calendar year, excluding that of the SMS.

## 30. Employee Health and Wellness

Employee Health and Wellness (EHW) within the CRLR utilises the service of the DALRRD and service providers where necessary for this activity. No wellness activity took place during the 2020/21 financial year due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Employees were encouraged to utilise telephonic services to receive the necessary counselling and support; however, no referrals were recorded.



# Annexure A

Table 18: List of settled claims

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Total award cost (R)
<b>Eastern Cape</b>					
Qhoboshane Community Claim	1	-	130 064 130,00	-	130 064 130,00
Norman Family Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Gwaba Community Claim	1	-	18 305 322,00	-	18 305 322,00
Rosedale Community Claim	1	-	4 977 763,00	-	4 977 763,00
Mguda Family Claim	1	-	3 630 086,53	-	3 630 086,53
Zixesha Family	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Mxoli Family	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Tshutshumeza Family Claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
Tshaya Family Claim	3	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Rufane Ulrich Arendse Land Claim on behalf of Arendse Family	1	-	501 555,56	-	501 555,56
Upper Hukuwa Community Land Claim (Phase 2)	1	-	4 817 190,00	-	4 817 190,00
Bulembu Community Claim (Phase 2)	3	-	26 333 972,00	-	26 333 972,00
Jewell Family Land Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Gloria Hitzeroth Land Claim on behalf of descendants of Adam & Mabel Jenneker	1	-	481 719,00	-	481 719,00
Gulidenge Family Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Highbury Community claim	1	-	8 670 942,00	-	8 670 942,00
Tobo Family Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Manitshana family	1	-	235 921,28	-	235 921,28
Ndatyana (Tshaya) Family Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Maye family claim	1	-	398 045,33	-	398 045,33
Narotam Family Claim	1	-	642 292,00	-	642 292,00
Bamoespruit Community Claim Phase 3 (Final Phase)	1	-	22 270 686,15	-	22 270 686,15
Sodlala Family Claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
Benjamin Family Claim	1	-	2 168 550,00	-	2 168 550,00
Mxaxo Community Claim	1	-	36 450 071,00	-	36 450 071,00
Sobhuza Family Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Ngesi Family Land Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Mabhongo Family Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Total award cost (R)
Matshikiza Family Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Nohako Land Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Noncampa Community Claim	1	-	23 122 512,00	-	23 122 512,00
Jongilanga Community Claim	1	-	35 326 060,00	-	35 326 060,00
Pirie-Nakani Community Community Claim (Phase 2)	1	-	2 248 022,00	-	2 248 022,00
Congoskraal Community Claim	1	-	44 639 294,00	-	44 639 294,00
Gwaba and Mtyana Community Claim	2	-	36 931 790,00	-	36 931 790,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>406 711 967,85</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>406 711 967,85</b>
<b>Free State</b>					
Farm Hetloo No. 178 Land Claim (Matjeka Family)	1	7 846 000,00	-	-	7 846 000,00
Groenhof and Geluksvlei land claim (Phase 2 full and final submission)	1	5 530 000,00	-	-	5 530 000,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13 376 000,00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>13 376 000,00</b>
<b>Gauteng</b>					
Rodman Community-Vygeboschlaagte 236 JQ Ptn 1,3,6 and 7 (Full and Final Settlement)	1	-	836 775,49	-	836 775,49
Portion 0 (remaining extent) of erf 61 of Waterkloofpark Extension 2 JR and portion 2 of erf 39 of Waterkloofpark JR- Thabathe Family	1	-	322 320,14	-	322 320,14
Portion 1 of farm Roodekopjes 546 JR: Mahlangu Family	2	-	888 503,94	-	888 503,94
Portion 1 of the farm Tweefontein 552 JR: Khomo Family	1	-	642 292,00	-	642 292,00
Portion 0 of farm Technikonrand 604 JR (Former Lot 116 in Mpepeto Street, Bantule Location)- Bopape Family	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Portion 332 (remaining extent) of Knopjeslaagte 385 JR: Motswene Family	1	-	1 913 520,37	-	1 913 520,37
Portion 5 (Remaining Extent) of the farm Welgedacht 130 JR- Mabena Family	1	-	3 444 576,14	-	3 444 576,14
Portion 5 of farm Brakfontein 559 JR: Tholo family	1	-	804 461,89	-	804 461,89
Portion 0 (RE) of the farm Groenfontein 526 JR: Mahlangu Families	1	-	2 890 314,00	-	2 890 314,00

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Total award cost (R)
Portion 0 (remaining extent) of the farm Boschkop 369 JR and portion 58 of the farm Klipkop 396 JR: Skosana Families	1	-	2 806 509,43	-	2 806 509,43
Portion 14 of the farm Klein Zonder Hout 519 JR- Mnguni Family	1	-	1 459 812,67	-	1 459 812,67
Portion 30 of the farm Vlakfontein 453 JR- Chilli/Maphosa Family	4	-	1 284 584,00	-	1 284 584,00
Portions 11 (Remaining Extent) and 13 of Vlakfontein 453 JR: Mahlangu Family	2	-	963 438,00	-	963 438,00
Portion 12 Witfontein 510 JR: Mabena Family	1	-	764 533,40	-	764 533,40
Portion 26 of the farm Vlakfontein 453 JR: Masombuka Family	1	-	1 241 711,21	-	1 241 711,21
Portions 8 (remaining extent) and 20 (a portion of portion 9) of the farm Blesbokfontein 558 JR: Mabena Family	1	-	2 835 063,96	-	2 835 063,96
Erf 3558, Garsfontein Extension 8 (Previously Erf 2251 and Erf 2252 Alex Miller and Hartmann Streets and originally the remaining extent of Lot 216 and the remaining extent of Lot 218 First street in the Former Eastwood Township)- Motau Family	1	-	1 030 474,48	-	1 030 474,48
Portion 0 (remaining extent) of Hartbeestfontein 441 JR and Portion 0 (remaining extent) of Wolvengat 442 JR: Maphosa Families	2	-	3 223 083,30	-	3 223 083,30
Riverside Land Claim	6	-	483 927,97	-	483 927,97
Meyerton Land Claim	16	-	461 497,91	-	461 497,91
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>28 618 546,30</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>28 618 546,30</b>
<b>KwaZulu-Natal</b>					
Naicker Family land claim (Phase 2)	1	-	102 056,39	-	102 056,39
Lawrence family claims	6	-	0,00	-	0,00
Bobat Family	1	-	355 833,33	-	355 833,33
Dhooma Family Land Claim	1	-	1 178 409,09	-	1 178 409,09
Hassim Family Land Claim	1	-	1 779 166,67	-	1 779 166,67
Perumal Rajendran Pillay	1	-	4 082 861,57	-	4 082 861,57
Purmasir Family Land Claim	1	-	435 387,50	-	435 387,50
Nzama family land claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
3 Batched Cato Manor Tenants	3	-	642 292,00	-	642 292,00
Latiff Moosa Family	1	-	6 248 911,76	-	6 248 911,76
Naidoo Family Land Claim	1	-	1 235 250,00	-	1 235 250,00

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Total award cost (R)
Alijahn, Ebrahim and Alli Hoosen Land Claim	2	-	2 013 000,00	-	2 013 000,00
4 Batched Cato Manor Tenants	4	-	802 865,00	-	802 865,00
Nkomo Family Land Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Boodhoo Family Claim	1	-	8 703 985,83	-	8 703 985,83
Thagarajan Chetty	1	-	437 764,71	-	437 764,71
Asmal Family Land Claim (Ladysmith)	1	-	554 545,45	-	554 545,45
Mbokazi Family Land Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Rosentein Group	2	-	18 947 614,00	-	18 947 614,00
2 Batched Cato Manor Tenants	2	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Nyembe Community Land Claim (Phase 6)	1	4 199 725,00	0,00	-	4 199 725,00
Juluku Family land claim	1	5 800 000,00	0,00	-	5 800 000,00
Poobalan Padayachee	1	-	813 333,33	-	813 333,33
Waterval Community / Group of Families Claim	1	-	15 093 862,00	-	15 093 862,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>9 999 725,00</b>	<b>64 551 149,63</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>74 550 874,63</b>
<b>Limpopo</b>					
Vreemdeling Community Land Claim	2	-	62 944 616,00	-	62 944 616,00
Nkuna Heyden Daniel Land Claim	1	-	5 459 482,00	-	5 459 482,00
Borchers Land Claim	1	-	73 542 434,00	-	73 542 434,00
Mahlangu Sanyana John Land Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Ga Pamosa Community Land Claim: KRP 2071	1	6 400 000,00	0,00	-	6 400 000,00
Nthite Family (KRP 11189)	1	-	321 446,00	-	321 446,00
Maila SV Land Claim	1	-	642 292,00	-	642 292,00
Kabini Jaftha & Ndebele Tribal Authority Community Land Claim (Phase 1)	1	40 400 000,00	0,00	-	40 400 000,00
Ontevreden Individual Land Claims	100	-	32 114 600,00	-	32 114 600,00
Hendriksplaats Individual Land Claims	2	-	642 292,00	-	642 292,00
Moopong Mmanyakane Land Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>46 800 000,00</b>	<b>176 309 454,00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>223 109 454,00</b>
<b>Mpumalanga</b>					
Zwane Family Land Claim (Full and Final Settlement)- KRP 9099	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Total award cost (R)
Mabuza Family Land Claim (Full and Final)- KRP 5271	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Ms Lena Mtsweni (Full and final settlement)- KRP 1410	1	-	1 104 943,37	-	1 104 943,37
Phokwane Family Claim (Phase 2 Final Settlement) - Ref No KRP 12150	1	-	2 320 975,61	-	2 320 975,61
Duba Family Land Claim (Full and final settlement)	1	-	870 636,36	-	870 636,36
Mabena Family Land Claim		-		-	
(Phase 2 Full & Final)- KRP 9127	1	-	1 014 382,02	-	1 014 382,02
Mahlangu Family Land Claim (Full and Final Settlement)- KRP 6606	1	-	2 914 444,44	-	2 914 444,44
Mr Lakusa David Masombuka (Phase 2 full and final settlement)- KRP 10697	1	-	644 857,14	-	644 857,14
Mmamathethe Community Claim (Full and Final)- KRP 312	1	-	47 208 462,00	-	47 208 462,00
Sibanyoni Family Land Claim- Full and final settlement (KRP 12147)	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Fakude family claim- Stonehaven 226 JU (Full and Final)- KRP 11107	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Makhubu Family Land Claim- Full and final settlement (KRP 328)	1	-	0,00	-	0,00
Simelane Family Land Claim- Phase 2 full and final settlement (KRP 6980)	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
Phase 2 and final settlement for Dindela Community Land Claim	4	-	0,00	-	675 000,00
Mtsweng Family Land Claim (Phase 2 full and final settlement)- KRP 2289	1	-	574 292,68	-	574 292,68
Ngwenya Family Land Claim (Full and Final Settlement)- KRP 10912	1	-	769 035,71	-	769 035,71
Masilela families (full and Final Settlement)	2	5 520 000,00	0,00	-	5 520 000,00
Masombuka Family Land Claim: Full and Final Settlement (KRP 9125)	1	-	1 376 385,67	-	1 376 385,67
Ngwenya Family Land Claim (Full and final)- KRP 6164	1	311 000,00	0,00	-	311 000,00
Mbonani Family Claim (Full and Final)- KRP 10270	1	0,00	963 438,00	-	963 438,00
Mnguni family- full and final, Portion 12 of the farm Roodepoort 259 JS (KRP 522)	1	3 235 000,00	0,00	-	3 235 000,00

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Total award cost (R)
Ndlangamandla and Shabangu Family Land Claim (KRP 1719)	1	-	642 292,00	-	642 292,00
Mabena Family Claim (Phase Two and Final)- KRP 11480	1	-	2 928 000,00	-	2 928 000,00
Abram Tshabangu on behalf of the Tshabangu family (Phase 2)- Portion 7 Dorstfontein 71 IS.	1	-	1 023 225,81	-	1 023 225,81
Sigudhla Family Claim (Phase 2 full and final settlement)- KRP 11220	1	-	586 698,00	-	586 698,00
Mona family claim- Portion 5 of the farm Evert 5 JU (Full and Final)- KRP 10277	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Mrs Fanezile Sarah Matshiane on behalf of the Matshiane Family (Phase 2- final settlement)- KRP 9762	1	-	727 861,61	-	727 861,61
Themba family claim- Weltevreden 229 JU (Full and Final)- KRP 10190	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Aphane Family Claim, Portion 15 of the farm Klipspruit 245 JR (Full and Final Settlement)- KRP 12530	1	-	2 569 168,00	-	2 569 168,00
Mthimunye family (Full and Final)	2	-	13 488 132,00	-	13 488 132,00
Mr Sonnyboy Paulus Msiza in his capacity of the Oriignal Dispossessed Person (Phase 2 settlement) Portion 22 and 23 of the farm Keerom 374 JS	1	-	1 568 571,43	-	1 568 571,43
Kubeka Fani on behalf of the Kubeka family- KRP 10902 and Nkosi Jacob Hannes on behalf of the Nkosi family- KRP 9070 (Full and Final settlement)	2	-	1 926 876,00	-	1 926 876,00
Masombuka Family Land Claim (Full and Final), Portion 3 of farm Parys 84 JS, KRP 1159	1	-	3 211 460,00	-	3 211 460,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>9 741 000,00</b>	<b>90 521 586,85</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100 262 586,85</b>
<b>Northern Cape</b>					
Phase 3 (Full and Final) Rooipoort Land Claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Ruiter's Family Land Claim	1	-	0,00	-	0,00
Phase 2 (Full and Final) Richards Family Land Claim (Groenkloof No. 133)	1	-	321 146,00	-	321 146,00
Van Wyk & Van Zyl Family Claims	3	-	2 385 777,78	-	2 385 777,78
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3 028 069,78</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3 028 069,78</b>

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Total award cost (R)
<b>North West</b>					
Bakwena Ba Modimosana Ba Matlhaku (Phase 5- Final)	2	37 317 079,00	-	312 709,15	37 629 788,15
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>37 317 079,00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>312 709,15</b>	<b>37 629 788,15</b>
<b>Western Cape</b>					
Daries and September Families Claims (Urba)- REF D363 & WC141	2	2 790,00	0,00	-	2 790,00
Marra Family Claim	1	3 600,00	0,00	-	3 600,00
Daries Family Land Claim (Urban Claim)	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
Joseph Family (Urban Claim)	1	-	165 058,00	-	165 058,00
Alexander Family (Urban Claim)	1	-	1 355 555,56	-	1 355 555,56
Carolessen Family (Urban Claim)	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
Northern Suburbs Three (3) Group Claim Batch Four (4)	3	-	0,00	-	0,00
Robertson Family Land Claim	1	-	0,00	-	0,00
Sedeman Family (1) urban claim	1	-	423 395,45	-	423 395,45
Cook Family Claim (Urban) (WC114)	1	-	390 400,00	-	390 400,00
Congregation Pentecostal Mission Church	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
Rix Family (Urban Claim)	1	-	1 156 560,00	-	1 156 560,00
Adams Baba & Swano Family Claims	2	-	438 461,89	-	438 461,89
Appolis Family Land Claim	1	1 600,00	0,00	-	1 600,00
Cupido Manuel Family Claim (A921)	1	-	2 899 872,22	-	2 899 872,22
Brown Family Claim	1	42 795,00	0,00	-	42 795,00
Bailey Family (1) urban claim	1	-	41 746,88	-	41 746,88
Ismail Family Land Claim (Urban Claim)	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
Estate of the Late John Carruthers Jansen Claim (Urban Claim)	1	-	183 000,00	-	183 000,00
African Methodist Episcopal Church [S393]	1	-	481 719,00	-	481 719,00
Hendricks Family Claim	1	-	1 459 514,98	-	1 459 514,98
The Estate of the Late Hassan Ahmed Parker Land Claim (Urban Claim)	1	-	312 783,60	-	312 783,60

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Total award cost (R)
Simon's Town Community (1) urban claim	2	-	1 605 730,00	-	1 605 730,00
Maqoko Land Claim (Urban Claim)	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
Allie Family Land Claim (T37)	1	5 000,00	0,00	-	5 000,00
Pinto Family Land Claim (Urban Claim)	1	-	1 024 061,89	-	1 024 061,89
Raban Family (Ownership) (Urban)	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
Solomon and Davids Family Claim Urban Ref S850	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
Late William Peter Johnson family claim (J492)	1	-	160 573,00	-	160 573,00
Bastiaan Family (Urban Claim) W355	1	-	228 750,00	-	228 750,00
Jaftha Saaiman (Solomons) Claim (M477)	1	-	863 595,51	-	863 595,51
Adriaanse and Canterbury Families (1) urban claim	1	-	355 617,02	-	355 617,02
Batch 2 Constantia (03) Development Group Claims	3	-	0,00	-	0,00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>55 785,00</b>	<b>14 670 406,00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>14 726 191,00</b>

Table 19: List of claims finalised

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
<b>Eastern Cape</b>					
Majebe Family Claim	30 June 2016	1	8	Rural	12 327,45
12 Oysterbay Individual Family Claims (MP Jacobs)	19 September 2019	1	2	Rural	2 973,57
Sijaku and Bell Families (Hankey)	21 December 2018	1	1	Rural	385,24
Mazibu Family Claim	10 March 2020	1	9	Rural	321 146,00
Poultney Family Claim	20 February 2020	1	1	Rural	6 002 484,06
Visagie family	10 March 2020	1	1	Urban	321 146,00
Nhlapo Family Claim	28 May 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Botha Family	28 May 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Bofolo Community	24 May 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Nciza Family Claim	19 December 2019	1	17	Urban	321 146,00
Five Stockenstroom Individual Land Claims (Willie Steward)	6 November 2017	1	11	Rural	49 021,16
Pennington family	10 March 2020	1	5	Rural	321 146,00
Cakwebe Family Claim	10 March 2020	1	4	Urban	160 573,00

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Thomson Family Claim	21 March 2020	1	1	Urban	274 500,00
Vena Family	04 March 2020	1	4	Rural	321 146,00
George Family Land Claim	2020/07/22	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mtyaphi Family Land Claim	22 July 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Sibeko Family Land Claim	22 July 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Kota Family Land Claim	22 July 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Sifumba Family Land Claim	22 July 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Klopper Family Claim	3 August 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Zenani Family Land Claim	25 August 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Cupido Family Land Claim	10 September 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Singiswa Family Land Claim	14 September 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Romanslaagte Family Claim	14 September 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Fodo Family Land Claim	18 September 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Coetzee family	5 December 2019	1	1	Urban	344 813,65
Spaansrietfontein/Bultfontein Group (7) Claim- Daniel De Klerk	8 December 2017	1	1	Rural	7 379,81
2 Oysterbay Individual Family Claim	20 March 2020	2	29	Rural	642 292,00
12 Oysterbay Individual Family Claims: Xolile Skosana	19 September 2019	1	6	Rural	10 704,86
Jewell Family Land Claim	15 September 2020	1	11	Rural	321 146,00
Gloria Hitzeroth Land Claim on behalf of descendents of Adam & Mabel Jenneker	30 September 2020	1	5	Urban	481 719,00
Mdutyana Family Claim	19 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Narotam Family Claim	10 December 2020	1	2	Urban	642 292,00
Benjamin Family Claim	14 December 2020	1	5	Urban	2 168 550,00
Plaatjies Family	10 December 2020	1	2	Urban	160 573,00
Lutchman Family Claim	31 March 2020	1	3	Urban	321 146,00
Xhamlashe Family Claim	5 December 2019	1	15	Rural	396 500,00
Maphambana Family Claim	29 March 2019	1	6	Rural	83 210,25
Nelani Family Claim	20 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Njatyela Family Land Claim	20 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Ndlambe Tribe Land Claim	20 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Petzer Family Land Claim	20 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Abrahams Family Claim	20 November 2020	1	0	Urban	Non-Compliant
Mandla Family Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Kwinana Family Claim	20 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Breetzke Family Claim	20 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Mabengeza Land Claim	20 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mqhaba Family Land Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mdingane Family Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Gquma Land Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Gwayi Family Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mangwelana Tribe Land Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Manangana Land Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Nikani Family Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Faku Family Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mallza Family Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Toba Family Land Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Tutu Family Land Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Tshitiza Family Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Stofile Family Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Gcememe Family Land Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Gcememe Family Land Claim	17 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mxoli Family	10 September 2020	1	1	Rural	321 146,00
ZixeshaFamily	10 September 2020	1	3	Rural	321 146,00
Tshaya Family Claim	10 September 2020	3	8	Rural	321 146,00
Tshutshumeza Family Claim	10 September 2020	1	4	Rural	160 573,00
Rufane Ulrich Arendse Land Claim on behalf of Arendse Family	10 September 2020	1	3	Urban	501 555,56
Njambatwa Family Claim	18 December 2017	1	11	Rural	221 894,00
Marafu Family	3 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>74</b>	<b>182</b>		<b>15 856 927,61</b>
<b>Gauteng</b>					
Portions 1 (RE), 3, 6 (RE), 7 and 12 to 26 of the farm Klopperbos 128 JR and Porions 6, 7, 25, 28 to 31, 37, 38, 39, 43 and 44 of the farm Paardefontein 282 JR - Mr Johannes Strephanus Kruger Family	9 June 2020	1	1	Rural	Non-Compliant
Er 561 Shop A 3 Asian Complex - Mr Ahmed Moosa	24 June 2020	1	1	Urban	Non-Compliant
Portion 0 (remaining extent) Of the farm Witblits 613 JR- Mnguni Family	31 March 2020	2	168	Rural	2 745 034,82
Roodepoort	5 April 2011	1	1	Urban	10 000,00
Edenvale	21 July 2004	1	1	Urban	4 444,50

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Ntuli and Mtsweni Family Claims on Portion 8 of the farm Leeuwfontein 492 JR	29 March 2018	1	64	Rural	18 491,16
Portion 5 of farm Brakfontein 559 JR: Tholo family	10 September 2020	1	30	Rural	804 461,89
Portion 5 (Remaining Extent) of the farm Welgedacht 130 JR- Mabena Family	10 September 2020	1	31	Rural	3 444 576,14
Kafferskraal Community- Portions 2, 11(R/E), 15(R/E), 34(R/E), 35, 37, 44(R/E), 45,49, 59, 63, 65, 70, 78 and 86 of the farm Kafferskraal 475 JR	7 July 2017	1	1719	Rural	Claim finalised through declaration of funds
Portion 0 of farm Technikonrand 604 JR (Former Lot 116 in Mpepeto Street, Bantule Location)- Bopape Family	10 September 2020	1	13	Urban	34 790,81
Portion 0 (RE) of the farm Groenfontein 526 JR: Mahlangu Families	10 September 2020	1	158	Rural	2 890 314,00
Portion 30 of the farm Vlakfontein 453 JR- Chilli/Maphosa Family	30 September 2020	4	38	Rural	1 284 584,00
Portion 14 of the farm Klein Zonder Hout 519 JR- Mnguni Family	10 September 2020	1	24	Rural	1 459 812,67
Portion 332 (remaining extent) of Knopjeslaagte 385 JR: Motswene Family	10 September 2020	1	29	Rural	1 913 520,37
Portion 0 (remaining extent) of the farm Boschkop 369 JR and portion 58 of the farm Klipkop 396 JR: Skosana Families	10 September 2020	1	52	Rural	2 806 509,43
Portions 11 (Remaining Extent) and 13 of Vlakfontein 453 JR: Mahlangu Family	30 September 2020	2	18	Rural	963 438,00
Eastwood	6 June 2001	1	1	Urban	2 500,00
Portion 70 of the farm Kloppersbos 128 JR and Portion 13 of the farm Leeuwkloof 285 JR: Kgosana, Matjeni and Komane Families	28 June 2019	1	104	Rural	190 000,20
Portion 18 of the farm Witfontein 521 JR: Kabini Family	19 December 2019	1	24	Rural	30 107,43
Benoni	1 October 2003	1	1	Urban	50 000,00
Kliptown	19 February 2004	1	2	Urban	50 000,00
Riverside	3 June 2004	1	3	Urban	65 640,00
Mabena Families- Portion 9 of the farm Bossemanskraal 538 JR	13 February 2018	1	190	Rural	34 670,94

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Ngodela Family (portions 4, 28 & 29 of the farm Vlakfontein 453 JR)	9 November 2020	1	1	Rural	Non-Compliant
Portion 1 of farm Roodekopjes 546 JR: Mahlangu Family	21 August 2020	2	12	Rural	888 503,94
Eastwood	6 June 2001	1	11	Urban	45 833,34
Ellison & Steynberg	7 July 2000	1	1	Rural	Transfer of state land
Klipriviersoog (Kliptown)	11 July 2003	1	2	Urban	212 050,00
	19 February 2004				
Klipriviersoog (Kliptown)	11 July 2003	1	2	Urban	560 484,64
	19 February 2004				
	10 September 2020				
Ellison & Steynberg	7 July 2000	1	1	Rural	Transfer of state land
Ellison & Steynberg	7 July 2000	1	1	Rural	Transfer of state land
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>37</b>	<b>2 704</b>		<b>20 509 768,28</b>
<b>KwaZulu-Natal</b>					
Entembeni Community (Final Phase)- S35	20 November 2019	32	487	Rural	22 202 109,10
Emakhasaneni Community (Final Phase)- S35	20 November 2019	2	650	Rural	1 525 634,50
KwaThunzi Tenants Community Land Claim	17 March 2017	1	129	Rural	Claim finalised through declaration of funds
Enos Bathengi Hlubi Family Land Claim	22 October 2019	1	8	Rural	5 456 111,12
Isizwe Sakwa-Dludla Community (Final Phase)- S35	20 November 2019	1	320	Rural	7 503 777,60
Neil Bowles Attorneys (Subdivision of the farm Alkerton No. 10921)	3 August 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Ganie Mohammed Rashid (Lot 102, Stanger)	3 August 2020	1	0	Urban	Non-Compliant
Mrs JP Sosibo ((Land in Highflats/ Ixop)	3 August 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr KA Mbanjwa (Spitzkop Farm, Mount Currie)	3 August 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Bhagwandeem Family Land Claim	22 October 2019	1	1	Urban	963 438,00
Naidoo Family Land Claim	20 March 2019	1	9	Urban	188 609,55
Timol Family Land Claim	28 February 2020	1	4	Urban	2 168 888,89

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
5 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Kubeka Layekile Julia	29 March 2019	1	5	Urban	110 947,00
Ramcharan Family	19 March 2019	1	6	Urban	551 870,59
Cassim Norath Land Claim	22 February 2019	1	40	Urban	2 079 545,00
Hassim Family Land Claim	30 September 2020	1	1	Urban	1 779 166,67
PK Sikhosana Family	3 December 2019	1	5	Rural	256 916,80
6 Batched Cato Manor Tenants:	22 October 2019	5	5	Urban	883 151,47
MW Zondi					
ND Zindela					
FA Maphanga					
TG Kanyile					
M Mtolo					
Dhooma Family	10 September 2020	1	16	Urban	1 178 409,09
Naicker Family land claim (Phase 2)	21 August 2020	1	7	Urban	102 056,39
Purmasir Family Land Claim	30 October 2020	1	10	Urban	435 387,50
Durmaselen Pillay's Land Claim	4 June 2019	1	26	Urban	106 185,20
Perumal Rajendran Pillay	29 October 2020	1	13	Urban	4 082 861,57
Boodhoo Family Claim	23 January 2021	1	16	Urban	8 703 985,83
Thagarajan Chetty	23 January 2021	1	3	Urban	437 764,71
Mbokazi Family Land Claim	23 January 2021	1	1	Rural	321 146,00
3 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Masuku ZP	11 December 2020	1	1	Urban	160 573,00
Nkomo Family Land Claim	23 January 2021	1	3	Rural	321 146,00
Lutchman Family Land Claim	18 December 2019	1	8	Urban	556 896,11
Ndlanzi Family Land Claim	29 March 2019	1	5	Rural	221 894,00
Sewpersad Family Land Claim	30 March 2020	1	7	Urban	160 573,00

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
13 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Kubheka Family	31 March 2020	1	1	Urban	1 043 703,82
13 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Mabhida Family	31 March 2020	1	1	Urban	
13 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Ngiba Family	31 March 2020	1	1	Urban	
13 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Mkhize Family	31 March 2020	1	1	Urban	
13 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Mthabela Family	31 March 2020	1	1	Urban	
13 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Mzobe Family	31 March 2020	1	1	Urban	
13 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Mzolo Family	31 March 2020	1	1	Urban	
13 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Zuma Family	31 March 2020	1	1	Urban	321 446,00
13 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Cebekhulu Family	31 March 2020	1	1	Urban	
10 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Dlamini Family	22 October 2019	1	1	Urban	1 198 502,73
10 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Jwara Family	22 October 2019	1	1	Urban	
10 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Khanyile Family	22 October 2019	1	1	Urban	
10 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Nkomo Family	22 October 2019	1	1	Urban	999 280,16
10 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Shezi Family	22 October 2019	1	1	Urban	
10 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Nxumalo Family	22 October 2019	1	1	Urban	
8 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Nala Family	22 October 2019	1	1	Urban	598 564,54
8 Batched Cato Manor Tenants: Masondo Family	22 October 2019	1	1	Urban	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>84</b>	<b>1 803</b>		<b>66 620 541,94</b>
<b>Limpopo</b>					
Resomate John Baloye Land Claim	4 December 2019	1	7	Rural	321 146,00
Dimbanyika Clan and Other Families Land Claim	4 December 2019	1	290	Rural	321 146,00
Mawayi Family Land Claim	4 December 2019	1	38	Rural	4 174 898,00
Mushwana Family Land Claim	4 December 2019	2	10	Rural	642 292,00
Mosehla David Ditabeng	10 March 2020	1	6	Rural	321 146,00
Machaba Family Land Claim	21 November 2019	1	48	Rural	642 292,00
Ghoord Land Claim	11 March 2020	1	235	Urban	3 321 111,11

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Gatta Iqbal	31 March 2020	1	7	Urban	160 573,00
Phakula Family Land Claim	31 March 2020	1	6	Rural	321 146,00
Madzivandlela Nyanisi Nkuna Family Land Claim	31 March 2020	1	2	Rural	321 146,00
Salomon Mathibela Kekana Individual Land Claim	20 March 2020	1	4	Rural	321 146,00
Raphael Family Land Claim	28 February 2020	1	12	Urban	3 141 161,11
Maake Family Land Claim	10 March 2020	1	12	Rural	321 146,00
Mabulelong Family Land Claim	10 March 2020	1	4	Urban	608 902,00
Baloyi Risenga Hendrik Land Claim	31 March 2020	1	30	Rural	1 926 876,00
Mabasa Risenga Freddie Land Claim	10 March 2020	1	7	Rural	321 146,00
6 Dwarsrivier individual claims	20 March 2020	6	49	Rural	1 926 876,00
Nkuna Heyden Daniel Land Claim	21 August 2020	1	119	Rural	5 459 482,00
Ms Nkuna Mbazima Sarah	30 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Moshoane Family Land Claim	10 March 2020	1	45	Rural	1 926 876,00
Ngobeni Family	31 March 2020	1	54	Rural	1 926 876,00
Mulwanndwa Family Land Claim	4 December 2019	1	15	Rural	321 146,00
Moholoa Joseph Edison Land Claim on behalf of Moholoa Family	5 December 2019	1	49	Rural	642 292,00
Maranzhe Community Land Claim	4 December 2019	1	112	Rural	2 248 022,00
Borchers Land Claim	7 September 2020	1	676	Rural	2 569 168,00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>31</b>	<b>1 837</b>		<b>34 208 011,22</b>
<b>Mpumalanga</b>					
Mahlomuza and Mthimunye Family Claims: Mthimunye Stuurman	21 May 2019	1	11	Rural	5 734,78
Mabuza and Dhlamini Family Land Claims- Mabuza Family	4 December 2019	2	21	Rural	578 062,80
George Johannes Mtsweni on behalf of the Mtsweni Family (Phase 2 final settlement) Portion 7 & 10 of Doornboom 248 JS	20 March 2020	1	14	Rural	2 711 111,11
Simelane, Dlodlu and Nkosi Families Land Claims- Dlodlu Jabulani Zephaniah	22 October 2019	1	17	Rural	160 573,00
Thathambane Petrus Mabena on behalf of the Mabena Family (Phase 2) Portion 12 Groenfontein 206 IR	19 December 2019	1	3	Rural	714 571,43
Richmond Community Land Claims: Silau Benson Richard	24 May 2018	1	16	Rural	340 035,88

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Mahlangu Family and Others, Portion 12 (R/E) of the farm Berg-en-dal 378 JT (full and final)	5 August 2019	1	104	Rural	455 100,00
Mashele family claim- Portion R/E of 65, 66, R/E of 67 and R/E of 68 of the property White River 64 JU	30 March 2020	1	14	Rural	2 844 573,00
Eley Family Land Claim	28 February 2020	1	25	Rural	642 292,00
Mthombeni Family Land Claim	10 March 2020	1	7	Rural	642 292,00
Skosana Family Claim	28 February 2020	1	3	Rural	321 146,00
Thwala Family Land Claim	19 December 2019	2	23	Rural	629 819,49
Mabuza and Dhlamini Family Land Claims- Dhlamini Family	24 December 2019	2	0	Rural	64 229,20
Vilane Family Claim- R/E of Portion 61 of the farm Kromkrans 208 IS	28 February 2020	1	3	Rural	651 870,30
Mtshweni Family Claim, Portion 2 of the farm Hartebeestspuit 361 JR	19 December 2019	1	11	Rural	1 624 573,00
Mlima family claim- Mbuyane 960 KU and Zwelisha 88 JU	19 March 2019	1	22	Rural	210 799,30
Hlakaova Family Land Claim	31 March 2020	1	14	Rural	321 146,00
Maimela Family Land Claim	31 March 2020	1	10	Rural	321 146,00
Sibande family claim- R/E of the farm Eureka 294 JU	20 March 2019	1	4	Rural	36 982,33
Duba Family Land Claim	21 August 2020	1	14	Rural	870 636,36
Ms Lena Mtsweni	21 August 2020	1	17	Rural	1 104 943,37
Mabuza Family Land Claim (Full and Final)	21 August 2020	1	6	Rural	321 146,00
Shongwe Family Land Claim (Portion 4 of Rietvlei 475 JT)	9 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Jan Masilela (Portion 20 of Elandskloof 321 JT)	30 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mahlangu Family and Mthimunye Family (Full and Final)- 3 KRPs	21 August 2019	3	44	Rural	195 000,00
Thabethe family land claim	19 March 2019	1	22	Rural	18 491,17
Fakude family claim- Stonehaven 226 JU	10 September 2020	1	6	Rural	321 146,00
Simelane Family Land Claim- Phase 2 full and final settlement)	17 September 2020	1	18	Urban	160 573,00
Mtsweng Family Land Claim (Phase 2 full and final settlement)	30 September 2020	1	1	Rural	574 292,68
Mr Motau Tsetla Abram (Portion 3 of Witklip 391 JS)	10 February 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Kakarasa Jan Tobana (Portion 8 of Witklip)	8 February 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Mr Alfred Moteke Mahlangu (Portion 8 of Witklip 391 JS)	10 February 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Mahlangu Kolberg Pickup (Portion 8 of Witklip 391 JS)	12 February 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Mschika Mechata Koos (Portion 8 of Witklip 391 JS)	10 February 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Msiza Layedwa Oogies (Portion 8 of Witklip 391 JS)	10 February 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Tlou Amos Frans and Tlou Daniel Jabulane (Winnaarspoort 350 JT)	8 February 2021	2	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Letswani Philemon (Portion 22 and 23 of Hartebeestspruit 434 JR)	8 February 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Mcondo Joseph Banda (Portion 7 of De-Kroon 363 JT)	9 February 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Maphoko Jappie Mahlangu (Hartebeestspruit 434 JR)	9 February 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Muset Mtsweni (Portion 17 of Uitvlugt 380 JS)	9 February 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Kleinbooi Kelenkisi Masango (Klipddrift 252 JR)	8 February 2021	2	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mabena Family Land Claim (Phase 2 Full & Final)	21 August 2020	1	6	Rural	1 014 382,02
Ndlangamandla and Shabangu Family Land Claim	14 December 2020	1	13	Rural	642 292,00
Mabena Family Claim (Phase Two and Final)	23 February 2021	1	5	Rural	2 928 000,00
Abram Tshabangu on behalf of the Tshabangu family (Phase 2)- Portion 7 Dorstfontein 71 IS.	23 February 2021	1	23	Rural	1 023 225,81
Mr Abram Granny Masango (Remaining Extent of Portion 2 of Haasfontein 28 IS)	11 March 2021	2	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Elliot Mfanyana Mdhluli	15 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Ndabazabantu Eneas Hlababe on behalf of the Mduli Tribal Authority	15 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Evans Bangers	15 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Akios Makhubebu	15 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Albert Patrick George Kirk	19 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Ms Ntombenhle Lydia Ngobeni	19 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr James M Mnisi	19 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Mashumi Norman Shabangu	19 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Sydney George Hutchinson	19 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Reginald Onick Sihlangu	19 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Msibi Land Claim (Rural Area)	25 May 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Mr Lakusa David Masombuka (Phase 2 full and final settlement)	10 September 2020	1	4	Rural	644 857,14
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>66</b>	<b>501</b>		<b>23 095 043,17</b>
<b>North West</b>					
Wagenboomsop 415 JP and Doornkom 418 JP Land Claim (Mositla Community)	2 December 2012	1	900	Rural	5 772,09
Portion 4, Portion 5 of 4, Portion 6,7,8,9,10 & 11 of the farm Uitvalgron 416 JQ (Bapo Ba Mogale Community)	22 July 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Willem Klopperville Restitution Claimants	24 March 2001	1	1	Urban	40 000,00
Dikgwatlhe family	29 March 2019	1	12	Rural	221 894,00
Lot 925, 944 & 945 Bethlehem	08 March 2005	1	1	Urban	7 500,00
Esterhuizen Family	20 October 2019	1	5	Rural	921 367,67
Bakgatla Ba Kgafela (Buffelskloof 52JQ)	10 September 2018	7	0	Rural	Transfer of state land
Lot 925, 944 & 945-Bethlehem	8 March 2005	2	22	Urban	31 428,56
Kgangwane Community	18 January 2013	1	418	Rural	10 688,95
Vryburg; Erf 418	25 May 2004	1	4	Urban	Claim finalised through declaration of funds
Schweizer Reneke: Stand number 276, Makweteng Township	3 June 2004	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through declaration of funds
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>1 364</b>		<b>1 238 651,27</b>
<b>Northern Cape</b>					
Jood Family Claim	22 October 2019	1	60	Rural	1 195 500,00
Maluleke Seriti Matlala Inc. (Farm Vooruitzicht)	11 August 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr FE Dames (Lot 172, Die Erwe)	11 August 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr CJ Basson (Bassonsdrift Kloof No. 479)	11 August 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr HJ Galama (Lot 1, Rietrivier-nedersetting)	11 August 2020	1	0	Urban	Non-Compliant
Mr B Leburu (Farm Khais No. 245)	12 August 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Andrew Serei (69 Ngada Street, Galeshewe)	18 September 2020	1	0	Urban	Non-Compliant

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Rooipoort Land Claim	10 September 2020	1	150	Rural	321 146,00
Mr W van Wyk (Rooikopjes No.416 and Water Erf 24)	23 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr JJ Jansen (Keikaries 484 and Erf No. 18 formerly known as Erf No. 1)	23 November 2020	2	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Gert Fritz (Uitzip No. 413)	9 November 2020	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
Holpan Community Claim	2 June 2016				
	31 March 2017	1	2955	Rural	Non-Compliant
Mr Barend Van Wyk (Griqualand West Gebied van Andries Waterboer and Campbell Gronde)	19 March 2021	1	0	Urban	Non-Compliant
Mr Barend Van Wyk (Bo Karro Streekdienste Raadsgebied: Plase and Stadlandbou Gronde)	19 March 2021	1	0	Rural	Non-Compliant
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>3 165</b>		<b>1 516 646,00</b>
<b>Western Cape</b>					
Smith Family claim	22 October 2019	1	15	Urban	144 515,70
Abrahams Family Land Claim (Alternative Land: Erf 12517)	9 March 2012	1	11	Urban	Transfer of state land
Covie Community	9 April 2009	1	771	Rural	Transfer of state land
Gelderbloem Family	18 September 2019	1	6	Urban	160 573,00
Marney Family Claim	19 December 2019	1	8	Urban	160 573,00
Oliver Family	28 February 2020	1	4	Urban	404 226,67
Josephs Family	21 November 2019	1	5	Urban	549 000,00
Amlay Family	31 March 2020	1	3	Urban	284 260,00
Stynder Family Claim	28 February 2020	1	24	Urban	160 573,00
Claasen Family	28 February 2020	1	1	Urban	160 573,00
The Uniting Reformed Church, Wellington	20 March 2020	1	1	Urban	1 442 599,83
Southgate, Hare and Gabriels Family Claims in Retreat: Hare Family	9 March 2015	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six (245) Owners: Chavda Family	25 Febraury 2017	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six 1698 Tenants: AA Ebrahim	26 November 2000	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six (245) Owners: F Nassiep	25 Febraury 2017	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
District Six 1698 Tenants: Y Abrahams	26 November 2000	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six (245) Owners: MR Behardien	25 February 2017	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six (245) Owners: Ariefdien Family	25 February 2017	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
United Congregational Church (In Uniondale)	31 March 2020	1	1	Urban	190 625,00
Saint John Anglican Church, Clanwilliam	28 February 2020	2	1	Urban	502 495,39
Sauer Family Claim	21 May 2019	1	7	Urban	26 762,16
Gordon Family	20 March 2020	1	1	Urban	289 750,00
C.P.J van Vuuren family claim	21 November 2019	1	5	Urban	330 271,43
Stephanus Appolis Family claim	28 February 2020	1	10	Urban	160 573,00
Borochowitz Family Claim	29 March 2019	1	1	Urban	377 482,35
Scholtz Family Claim	6 June 2017	1	2	Urban	66 235,84
District Six (3) Batch 18 (Urban): Boyes Family	22 October 2019	1	1	Urban	160 573,00
District Six Owners Batch 17 Individual Claim: De Bidaph Family	31 May 2019	1	1	Urban	8 095,23
District Six (3) Batch 18 (Urban): Anthony Family	22 October 2019	1	1	Urban	160 573,00
District Six (245) Owners: N Adams	25 February 2017	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six (245) Owners: GH Ally	25 February 2017	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six (245) Owners: S Hendricks	25 February 2017	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six (245) Owners: AHJ Khalfe	25 February 2017	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six Owner (1) Batch 20 Individual Claims: A Tassiem	31 March 2020	1	25	Urban	418 491,86
Smith Family Land Claim	28 February 2020	1	6	Urban	160 573,00
Mr Jacobus Streicher Janse van Noordwyk (Gedeelte van Lot C van die plaas Corinthe Rivier and Gedeelte van die plaas Assegay Bosch, Distrik Riversdal)	27 January 2021	1	1	Urban	Non-Compliant
Mr MA Moss (No 8 Baba's Land Off Draper Street, Claremont)	10 February 2021	1	1	Urban	Non-Compliant
Mr I Murison (Third Avenue Draper Street, Claremont)	10 February 2021	1	1	Urban	Non-Compliant
Sedeman Family	10 September 2020	1	1	Urban	423 395,45

Name of project/claim	Approval date	Number of claims finalised	Number of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Mrs Regina Mapata (Newerkoort Plaas, Caledon)	24 February 2021	1	1	Urban	Non-Compliant
Joseph Family	21 August 2020	1	9	Urban	165 058,00
Bhawoodien Family Claim	22 October 2019	1	23	Urban	160 573,00
Salie Family Claim	28 February 2020	1	7	Urban	338 888,89
Ladies Mile Constantia 6 Families	27 February 2013	6	224	Urban	1 160 442,40
Ladies Mile Constantia 6 Families (G Cornelius)	24 March 2014	1	45	Urban	Restoration
District Six (245) Owners:A Isaacs	25 February 2017	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six 1698 Tenants: Gafieldien Family	26 November 2000	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six 1698 Tenants: Mrwebi Family	26 November 2000	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six 1698 Tenants: G Waggie	26 November 2000	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six (245) Owners: Al Isaacs	25 February 2017	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
District Six (245) Owners: Manley Family	25 February 2017	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
Frizlat Family (District Six)	Not indicated	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
Kassiem Family (District Six)	Not indicated	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
Darius Family Claim	31 March 2020	1	1	Urban	160 573,00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>60</b>	<b>1 244</b>		<b>8 728 326,20</b>



## NATIONAL OFFICE

**Postal address:**

Private Bag X833, Pretoria, 0001

**Physical address:**

8th Floor, Centre Walk Building, cnr Pretorius and

Thabo Sehume Streets, Pretoria

Tel: 012 407 4400/4402

**Contact us:**


Website: [www.dalrrd.gov.za](http://www.dalrrd.gov.za)

Toll free contact number: 0800 007 095

RP151/2021

ISBN: 978-0-621-49439-6

ISBN 978-0-621-49439-6



9

780621

494396