



ANNUAL REPORT

2021/22

Return of land is fundamental to
the transformation of our society



ANNUAL REPORT

Commission on Restitution of Land Rights



1 April 2021–31 March 2022



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 2022 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
Chief Land Claims Commissioner
August 2022

Table of contents

Letter of transmission	i
Abbreviations, acronyms and terminology	1
Minister's foreword	3
Overview by the Chief Land Claims Commissioner	5
Accounting Officer's Statement	7
Part A: General information	8
Contact details	9
Strategic overview: Vision, Mission and Values	10
Legislative and other mandates	10
Organisational structure and Restitution Management Team	12
Part B: Performance information	13
Service delivery environment	14
Organisational environment, developments and changes	14
Inter-Ministerial Committee on Land Reform	17
Strategic outcome-oriented goals	18
Overall performance and delivery in terms of the Annual Performance Plan	19
Performance information per province	22
Eastern Cape	23
Free State	27
Gauteng	28
KwaZulu-Natal	33
Limpopo	37
Mpumalanga	40
North West	46
Northern Cape	49
Western Cape	53

Part C: Financial information

55

Introduction	56
Financial performance overview	56
Report of the Auditor-General to Parliament on the Commission on Restitution of land Rights	59
Annual Financial Statements	62

Part D: Governance

76

Introduction	77
Risk management	77
Internal audit and audit committees	77

Part E: Human resource management

78

Introduction	79
Human resource operations	79
Expenditure on personnel	79
Reconfiguration through the National Macro Organisation of Government Programme	79
Historical and current information in respect of the CRLR's establishment	80
Positions filled and vacancies	81
Filling of senior management service posts	81
Age distribution and people with disabilities	82
Termination of service during the period under review	82
Employment equity: Gender and race distribution	83
Performance management	83
Employee health and wellness	83
Annexure A	84

Abbreviations, acronyms and terminology

AGSA	Auditor-General of South Africa
APP	Annual Performance Plan
CLCC	Chief Land Claims Commissioner
CoE	Compensation of employees
CPA	Communal Property Association
CPI	Consumer Price Index
CRC	Claims Research Committee
CRLR	Commission on Restitution of Land Rights
DG	Director-General of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform
DALRRD	Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development
DRDLR	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform
EHW	Employee Health and Wellness
FAR	Financial Accounting and Reporting
GRAP	Generally Recognised Accounting Practice
HR	Human Resources
IMC	Inter-Ministerial Committee on Land Reform
LAMOSAS	Land Access Movement of South Africa
LCC	Land Claims Court
LDS	Land Development Support
MCS	Management Control System
NBV	Net Book Value
NMOG	National Macro Organisational Restructuring of Government
OVG	Office of the Valuer-General

PAA	Public Audit Act
PERSAL	Personnel Salary
PFMA	Public Finance Management Act
PMDS	Performance Management Development Strategy
PMO	Project Management Office
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
PSSC	Provincial Shared Service Centres
PTO	Permission to Occupy
RLCC	Regional Land Claims Commissioner
SMS	Senior Management Service
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
SPP	Surplus People Project
SSO	Standard Settlement Offer
LAMOSAS 1	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.
LAMOSAS 2	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 LAMOSAS and Others.
The Constitution	The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (Act No. 108 of 1996)
The Restitution Act	Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act No. 22 of 1994), as amended
Old-order claims	Land restitution claims submitted prior to 31 December 1998
New-order claims	Land restitution claims submitted between 1 July 2014 and 28 July 2016
Phased claims	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.
Settled claims	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.
Finalised claims	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



While there is an increasing realisation that land reform is costly and that targets for settling claims and expediting land reform broadly needs to be balanced with the realistic national macroeconomic constraints, there is consensus that the country has made marked progress in the following areas:

- The development of land reform legislation
- The delivery of programmes for land restitution, redistribution and tenure reform; these were delivered with some success and lessons were learnt from these experiences
- The recognition of the importance of land administration, while noting the enormity of the task for its establishment
- The development and institutionalisation of the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act, Act No. 16 of 2013, has shown marked progress with the introduction of planning principles, the review of spatial development plans and the embedding of spatial development frameworks in the national, provincial and municipal spheres to guide long-term spatial planning and introduce the Regional Spatial Development Framework to deal with areas in the country that have particular characteristics that need protection or development
- Associated developments such as the National Development Plan (2010) and the District Delivery Model, among others, which constitute an impressive land reform planning architecture

While noting this, the 2019 Report of the Presidential Advisory Panel on Land Reform and Agriculture (Presidential Advisory Panel) indicated that, combined, both land restitution and redistribution had, over the past 25 years, secured and transferred to black beneficiaries

less than 10% of commercial agricultural land. The report, while highlighting the need to upscale land reform and specifically land acquisition, also noted the need for a properly coordinated farmer or producer support programme.

With respect to restitution, the Presidential Advisory Panel underscored the need for the CRLR to be capacitated to expedite the settlement and finalisation of old-order land claims. In this regard, I am happy to note, as outlined below and elaborated further in the Chief Land Claims Commissioner's overview, that the Commission is making strides towards settling the outstanding claims.

REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE IN THE PRECEDING PERIOD

Like all other state entities, the Commission has been operating under the conditions of Covid-19 and the Disaster Management Act Regulations that have tended to have adverse effects on organisational performance.

The Commission submitted the sixth report to the Land Claims Court on 29 June 2022. It indicated that a total 6 685 land claims constitutes the remaining old-order outstanding claims. An accumulative total of 82 549 claims have been settled to date. A total of 3,8 million hectares of land has been secured at a cost of over R24 billion. Financial compensation awards totalling R19 billion have been paid out to date.

These land and financial compensation awards have benefitted a total of 447 807 households, constituting a total of 2 242 689 beneficiaries. Of this number, 172 458 are female-headed households, while 1 212 are people living with disabilities.

The Commission has settled 262 claims against the target of 240, and finalised 442 claims against a target of 316 in terms of the 2021/22 Annual Performance Plan.

LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY DEVELOPMENTS SUPPORTING LAND RESTITUTION

It is common knowledge that a properly executed land restitution programme requires a supportive broader government policy landscape. This further requires complementarity between the various land reform programmes. The following policy developments are highlighted as they support restitution.

Review of the Property Valuation Act

In response to the 2019 Presidential Advisory Panel's recommendation to review the operations of the Office of the Valuer-General (OVG) by aligning it with the requirements of section 25(3) of the Constitution, and responding to other queries from clients of the OVG, the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD), under my direction, appointed a panel charged with the responsibility to review the OVG's legislative and policy mandates. The panel has conducted stakeholder hearings and will shortly be proposing desirable amendments and other related changes.

Land Donations Policy

As part of endeavours to strengthen land redistribution by diversifying approaches to land access, the Department developed a Land Donations Policy, which has since been approved by Cabinet. Among other things, this policy seeks to lessen the burden of state costs associated with land acquisition for land reform.

Land Redistribution Beneficiary Selection and Allocation Policy

Similarly, in response to the Presidential Advisory Panel, which highlighted inefficiencies and incidents of malfeasance in the current land redistribution beneficiary selection, the Department has developed a new Beneficiary Selection Policy that seeks to create a more streamlined, coordinated, participatory and transparent beneficiary selection and land allocation process. This policy has also been approved by Cabinet.

Land Redistribution Policy Framework

Furthermore, the Presidential Advisory Panel identified the need to align the land redistribution legislation and policy with the constitutional requirements contained in section 25(5) as urgent. In this regard, the Department is in the early stages of consultations on how this could be accomplished. A draft Land Redistribution Policy Framework discussion paper has been developed, and internal discussions are taking place.

As alluded to earlier, there is a growing body of knowledge that shows that weaknesses in the land redistribution programme put pressure on the programme, as disillusioned "would be land redistribution applicants" often resort to the restitution programme with baseless land claims. A well-structured and functioning land redistribution programme is also key to the country's quest for a fairer distribution of land, as it contributes directly to land acquisition without the option of financial compensation applicable to restitution.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Both the Presidential Advisory Panel on Land Reform and the Land Access Movement of South Africa (LAMOSA) Constitutional Court judgements of 2016 and 2019 impress upon the Commission and the state to take all necessary measures to ensure that the processing and settlement of old-order claims are expedited. The Department owes this to those land claimants who have been waiting far too long since they lodged land claims before 31 December 1998. To achieve this outcome, the Department is supporting the measures that the Commission is undertaking to make it an entity that works smarter and faster. Such measures are contained in the Chief Land Claims Commissioner's overview.

Finally, in presenting this 2021/22 Annual Report of the Commission, my staff and I wish to thank the Portfolio Committee for its continuous guidance in the valuable oversight provided to date and in the future.



Honourable Ms Thoko Didiza (MP)
Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development

Overview by the Chief Land Claims Commissioner



The year 2019 came with two significant and related developments that, combined, brought remarkable impetus to the country's land restitution trajectory. On 19 March 2019, upon the realisation that Parliament had not succeeded in enacting a new law that would have allowed for the processing of newly lodged land claims, the Constitutional Court upheld the interdict preventing the processing of newly lodged claims, and more significantly, in what is akin to putting the Commission under administration, ordered the Commission to report to the Land Claims Court on the progress made with the settlement of old-order claims at six monthly intervals until all outstanding claims have been settled or referred to the Land Claims Court.

The Presidential Advisory Panel on Land Reform called, among other things, for the Commission to focus on the processing and settlement of old-order claims.

In many respects, as we have reported before, the Presidential Advisory Panel echoed prior performance reviews that inform the work being done in the turnaround project, Project Kuyasa. The need to settle and finalise all outstanding old-order claims is indisputable. What matters now is the strategies and means by which this is enabled. This overview, apart from outlining targets, also reviews progress being made in the interventions associated with Project Kuyasa.

Progress on Project Kuyasa's deliverables

As mentioned, Project Kuyasa represents corrective action undertaken by the Commission based on the various reviews mentioned earlier. To recap, before delving into the progress being made, we report on the various subprojects and what they seek to achieve.

Organisational Form

To deal with the organisational structure that does not accord with sections 4 and 21 of the legislation that

envisions an autonomous entity, Project Kuyasa instituted an organisational form subproject, the outcome of which seeks to transform the Commission into a schedule 3 public entity.

To date, a business case, which details the proposed design and cost implications of setting up the Commission as an autonomous entity, has been developed and submitted to both the Department of Public Service and Administration and National Treasury for further processing. In the meantime, the Minister has approved an interim Commission structure which begins to introduce some level of operational autonomy, as well as the introduction of several regional land claims commissioners based on a cluster of provinces. This will also go a long way in alleviating the current problem of the centralisation of the powers of the Regional Land Claims Commissioner (RLCC).

Backlog Reduction Strategy

As mentioned, this strategy aims to mainstream project management and monitoring tools in the processing of claims. This includes the identification of realistic target times to settle all outstanding claims.

In the Backlog Reduction Strategy:

- A plan in which, resources being available, projects were developed to settle all outstanding claims in the next five years
- A project reporting and monitoring tool was developed, which allows management to monitor the processing of claims at any given time
- Related, and as a reinforcement to this project, was the mandatory use of the backlog strategy figures in all reports on outstanding claims
- An approved research strategy was developed, which projects the completion of all research on outstanding claims by 2023. This strategy also introduces mandatory specialised research units within all the Commission's offices with significant numbers of outstanding claims.

Business Process Improvement

The following progress has been made with this subproject:

- A final business process has been developed and approved.
- Standard operating procedures have been developed across the entire business process, and have been workshopped with implementers. They are now ready for piloting in identified pilot sites.

People Management

The following progress has been made with this subproject:

- A "to be" organisational design has been finalised and signed off.
- Job descriptions for new and amended roles have been completed, informed by the organisational form.

Settlement Model

While the Commission is not responsible for post-settlement matters, it has created a business process that allows for land development planning prior to the settlement of a claim. As deliverables in the Settlement Model sub-project, the Commission has organised stakeholder engagements to develop claim settlement models suited to various land uses.

The following progress has been made with this subproject:

- The following stakeholder engagements were held: Sugarcane claims in KwaZulu-Natal, mining claims in the Northern Cape, forestry claims in Mpumalanga, conservation-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 is being rolled out in the same identified provinces with an intention to move towards consensus on the most suitable model.

Financial Models

Lastly, the Financial Models subproject completed the development of draft financial award strategies.

While reflecting on the progress being made through Project Kuyasa, we cannot over-emphasise the importance of a properly capacitated and well-functioning OVG. In this regard, we take note of the steps that the Ministry is taking to properly position the OVG to conduct land valuations expeditiously and within the constitutional framework.

Budgetary constraints with respect to the settlement of claims

The independent financial forecasting conducted under Project Kuyasa indicates that an estimated amount of approximately R65 billion will be required to settle all outstanding old-order claims.

PERFORMANCE REVIEW RELATING TO THE PRECEDING PERIOD

The Covid-19 pandemic continued to wreak havoc throughout the period of 2021/22 and saw the most vicious Delta variant sweeping through the country. Building on past experience and lessons learnt in controlling the numbers when performing such operations, such as claimant verification, the Commission has been able to operate fairly well.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS FOR THE PERIOD AHEAD

Noting that the country is still subject to the unpredictable Covid-19 pandemic, the Commission has settled a total of 262 claims against a target of 240, and finalised a total of 442 claims against a target 316 according to the 2021/22 Annual Performance Plan.

My staff and I are appreciative of the continued support and guidance provided by the Minister in the formulation of this Annual Report.



Ms Nomfundo Ntloko
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 2022.

Yours faithfully

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

Mr M Ramasodi
Accounting Officer: Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development





PART A

GENERAL INFORMATION

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
Email: nomfundo.ntloko@dalrrd.gov.za

Acting Deputy Land Claims Commissioner

Ms Cindy Benyane
Email: cindy.benyane@dalrrd.gov.za

Regional Land Claims Commissioner

Mr Lebjane Maphutha
Email: lebjane.maphutha@dalrrd.gov.za

REGIONAL OFFICES

Eastern Cape

Chief Director: Land Restitution Support
Ms Zama Memela
Email: 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
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

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

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

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

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

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

Dr Mangalane du Toit

Email: 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

Postal address: Private Bag X9163, Cape Town, 8000

Physical address: 14 Long Street, Cape Town

Tel: 021 426 2930

Strategic overview

Vision

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

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, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended.

Values

We uphold the following 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 CRLR 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

Mandate

The CRLR is meant to be an autonomous institution established by the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 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).

Constitutional mandate

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.”

Legislative mandate

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, 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 an LCC; and to provide for matters connected therewith.”

The Restitution Act also empowers the Minister of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development, 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, 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 Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD).

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 intends processing them, with an anticipated date of completion. The CRLR should also indicate the nature of any constraints, whether budgetary or otherwise, it has 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. The fourth report to the LCC was submitted on 30 June 2021. The fifth report to the LCC was submitted on 14 December 2021. The sixth report to the LCC was submitted on 29 June 2022.

Organisational structure



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
Chief Director: Eastern Cape	Mr Zama Memela
Chief Director: Northern Cape	Dr 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 CLCC 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 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.



Service delivery environment

During the period under review, the CRLR operated as Programme 3 of the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development. It succeeded in settling 262 claims against a target of 240, and finalised 442 claims against a target of 316.

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.

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 on the following pages.



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 has been 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 have provided 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 standard operating procedures (SOPs), which will set out 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 aimed at providing support in developing compensation models for the land restitution process and developing 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 aimed at enhancing 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 to ensure the on-time delivery of quality results for each workstream. The core responsibility of the Project 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.

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 during the period under review, especially the increased focus on restoration and the transfer of state land.

In the 2021/22 financial year, a total of 58 state land properties were transferred, measuring 60 599,5353 ha in extent.

The breakdown of the land parcels transferred are indicated in the tables below:

Table 1: List of 261 properties transferred (section 42D already settled)

Province	Properties transferred to claimants	Extent
Eastern Cape	1	149,9536 ha
Free State	0	0
Gauteng	0	0
KwaZulu-Natal	1	61,462 ha
Limpopo	0	0
Mpumalanga	0	0
Northern Cape	0	0
North West	14	2355,6141 ha
Western Cape	1	3,8544 ha
Total	17	2570,8841 ha

Table 2: List of 278 properties transferred (section 42D still to be approved)

Province	Properties identified	Properties transferred to claimants
Eastern Cape	0	0
Free State	0	0
Gauteng	0	0
KwaZulu-Natal	0	0
Limpopo	3	205,7358 ha
Mpumalanga	0	0
Northern Cape	0	0
North West	2	3392,4837 ha
Western Cape	2	0,2417ha
Total	7	3598,4612ha

Table 3: List of additional properties transferred (state land claims prioritised for settlement and transfer)

Province	Properties transferred to claimants	Extent
Eastern Cape	1	685,9394 ha
Free State	0	0
Gauteng	5	12,2072 ha
KwaZulu-Natal	3	50 291,3769 ha
Limpopo	0	0
Mpumalanga	1	192,2690 ha
Northern Cape	0	0
North West	21	3247,8566 ha
Western Cape	1	0,5409 ha
Total	34	54 430,1900 ha

Table 4: List of properties transferred

Province	Transferred from 261 list	Transferred from 278 list	Additional list	Total	Hectares
Eastern Cape	1	0	1	2	835,893 ha
Free State	0	0	0	0	0
Gauteng	0	0	5	5	12,2072 ha
KwaZulu-Natal	1	0	3	4	50 352,8389 ha
Limpopo	0	3	0	3	205,7358 ha
Mpumalanga	0	0	1	1	192,2690 ha
Northern Cape	0	0	0	0	0
North West	14	2	21	37	8995,9544 ha
Western Cape	1	2	3	6	4,637 ha
Total	17	7	34	58	60 599,5353 ha

The Commission continued to experience delays from stakeholders that play an important role in the land transfer process to claimants such as municipalities with regard to rates clearance figures and certificates, interference from chiefs and tribal authorities with the registration of legal entities to receive the transfer of land, the issuing of vesting certificates and processes with regard to Regulation 68(1) of the Deeds Registries Act, Act No. 47 of 1937. The intention is to engage our stakeholders to shorten their response times so that the transfer process can be accelerated.

Previous lessees of some of the state land properties refused to vacate the properties and some properties have become invaded by illegal occupiers. These instances have been referred to the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure’s Legal Unit for intervention.

Strategic outcome-oriented goals

In line with the outcomes of government and as contained in the CRLR’s Strategic Plan of 2021–2024, the Commission identified three strategic goals to be achieved in the period of this plan and beyond, as set out below:

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

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
- 2** Lodgment of restitution land claims reopened for people who did not meet the 1998 deadline

Solicit and receive claims for the restitution of land rights by 30 June 2019
- 3** Organisational change management

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 2021–2024 were to settle and finalise claims.

Strategic Goal 2 fell away following LAMOSA 1 in 2016.

Strategic Goal 3 is directly linked to Project Kuyasa, which aims to standardise business processes in all provinces, improve information and project management, improve governance and communication, and 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 (APP) 2021/22 is contained in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Report against the Annual Performance Plan

Performance indicator	Actual performance against target		Reasons for variance
	Target (2021/22)	Actual (2021/22)	
Number of land claims settled	240	262	The approval of projects consisting of multiple claims (Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo, Mpumalanga and North West) led to additional claims being settled.
Number of land claims finalised	316	442	The non-compliant claims in terms of Section 2 of Restitution of Land Rights Act (Act No. 22 of 1994) led to more claims being finalised. Some were finalised by the Commission through the declaration of funds, which also reduced the commitments.

Table 6: Number of land claims settled: 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022

Province	Target	Actual performance	Performance percentage	Variance on annual total
Eastern Cape	39	29	74%	10
Free State	-	-	0%	-
Gauteng	13	13	100%	-
KwaZulu-Natal	40	55	138%	15
Limpopo	64	68	106%	4
Mpumalanga	35	43	123%	8
North West	2	11	550%	9
Northern Cape	5	2	40%	3
Western Cape	42	41	98%	1
Total	240	262	109%	22




Table 7: Number of land claims finalised: 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022

Province	Target	Actual performance	Performance percentage	Variance on annual target
Eastern Cape	69	53	77%	16
Free State	12	3	25%	9
Gauteng	12	86	717%	74
KwaZulu-Natal	60	71	118%	11
Limpopo	32	95	297%	63
Mpumalanga	36	43	119%	7
North West	16	19	119%	3
Northern Cape	9	14	156%	5
Western Cape	70	58	83%	12
Total	316	442	140%	126





Table 8: Number of land claims settled and finalised per province: 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022

Province	Claims settled		Claims finalised	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Eastern Cape	39	29	69	53
Free State	-	-	12	3
Gauteng	13	13	12	86
KwaZulu-Natal	40	55	60	71
Limpopo	64	68	32	95
Mpumalanga	35	43	36	43
North West	2	11	16	19
Northern Cape	5	2	9	14
Western Cape	42	41	70	58
Total	240	262	316	442



Number of beneficiaries and hectares awarded per quarter

During the year under review, **36 094** beneficiaries benefitted through the award of a total of 66789,6948 hectares.

Quarter	Beneficiaries	Hectares awarded
Quarter 1	3 707	370,7660 ha
Quarter 2	14 471	45494,1687 ha
Quarter 3	6 429	3542,0736 ha
Quarter 4	11 487	17382,6865 ha
Total	36 094	66789,6948 ha

Table 9: Selected performance statistics per province

Province	Hectares awarded	Land cost	Financial compensation	Grants	Solatium	Total award
Eastern Cape	-	R239 370 096,39	-	-	-	R239 370 096,39
Free State	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gauteng	-	-	R 44 070 057,76	-	-	R 44 070 057,76
KwaZulu-Natal	5269,7970 ha	R111 050 000,00	R603 990 413,70	-	R45 000,00	R715 085 413,70
Limpopo	25338,4636 ha	R91 308 000,00	R387 441 646,46	-	-	R478 749 646,46
Mpumalanga	20149,8182 ha	R368 877 620,00	R73 616 934,21	-	-	R442 494 554,21
Northern Cape	9523,4662 ha	R9 074 000,00	R15 607 285,70	R15 752 050,00	-	R40 433 335,70
North West	6354,8939 ha	R79 293 886,00	R51 323 453,92	R10 723 433,50	-	R141 340 773,42
Western Cape	153,2559 ha	R107 400,00	R63 690 900,93	R60 800 000,00	-	R124 598 300,93
Total	66789,6948 ha	R899 081 002,39	R1 239 740 692,68	R87 275 483,50	R45 000,00	R2 226 142 178,57

The information in Table 9 reflects the statistics for all approvals in 2021/22, inclusive of phased approvals and addenda, which are not included in the Annual Performance Plan reporting.

Table 10: Number of settled claims in rural, urban, female-headed households and for people living with a disability

Province	Claims	Rural	Urban	Dismissed	Households	Female-headed households	People living with a disability
Eastern Cape	29	23	6	27	885	257	-
Free State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gauteng	13	12	1	6	848	480	2
KwaZulu-Natal	55	21	34	43	2 697	1 395	14
Limpopo	68	67	1	-	1 941	1 006	-
Mpumalanga	43	42	1	12	552	130	-
Northern Cape	2	2	-	12	242	98	3
North West	11	10	1	-	137	39	-
Western Cape	41	2	39	19	262	105	-
Total	262	179	83	119	7 564	3 510	19

Performance information per province

The Annual Report provides a selection of highlights of claims settled and finalised during the 2021/22 financial year. A comprehensive list of settled and finalised claims is included in Annexure A.

EASTERN CAPE

Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, the Eastern Cape projected settling 39 land claims and finalising 69 claims during the 2021/22 financial year. It succeeded in settling 29 land claims and finalising 53 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

R239 370 096,39

Land claims settled

29	39
ACTUAL	TARGET

Land claims finalised

53	69
ACTUAL	TARGET



EASTERN CAPE

PHASE 1 OF THE MATTER OF THE FIVA COMMUNITY CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The dispossession of the Fiva community of their rights in land occurred in different phases. It started in 1883 when the land of Morosi in Matatiele was bought under the administration of the British.

The land was surveyed for individual farmers under quitrent tenure in terms of Act No. 14 of 1878. This Act stipulated that the land would be for private ownership. Quitrent titles were issued in terms of Act No. 15 of 1887 and Act No. 40 of 1895. In 1911, a resolution was taken to fence locations in Matatiele. The intention of the fencing was to separate the boundaries of the native areas and farms. Ludidi location is among the locations that were identified for fencing.

Gazette Notice No. 186 of 1921 was published in 1921. Its purpose was to collect tax from the taxpayers that would be affected by the erection of the new fencing boundaries. Ludidi location was among the affected areas. The fencing was based on the Fencing Act of 1921.

Subsequently, under the Development Trust Land Act, Act No. 18 of 1936, the area was proclaimed a scheduled area for black occupation. In terms of the proclamation, existing black landowners were forced to sell their land back to the state and hand it over for use as trust farms under the South African Development Trust.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The Fiva community claim was gazetted by the Office of the RLCC for the Eastern Cape in accordance with section 11(1) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, and was published in Government Gazette No. 41498 as Notice No. 221 of 2018, dated 16 March 2018.

It must be noted that the Gazette notice only reflects an extent of 1 134 ha, which is for the privately owned land. However, the Portion of Morosi B was covered in the property description as per the attached Gazette notice.

The Office of the RLCC invited interested parties to submit their comments and objections regarding the lodged claim. However, the office did not receive any responses or objections to the Gazette notice



THE SETTLEMENT

Based on the rights lost in each of the dispossession categories, the financial implication is R26 976 264,00 and an offer to this effect has been approved by the Office of the RLCC and accepted by the Fiva community as Phase I of its settlement.

The total restitution award for Phase 1 of the Fiva community claim is R26 976 264,00 and will be divided among the fully verified beneficiaries in accordance with the approved award in each of the three categories.

HOLY CROSS PARISH LAND CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The dispossession of the Holy Cross Parish of their rights in land started in 1951 when the Minister made an application for a certificate of a registered crown title to be issued in favour of the Union of South Africa. This was approved, and the land was registered under Crown Title 91/51.

In 1957, the land was transferred to Department of Health through a Permission to Occupy (PTO) certificate. It was used as a state hospital.

In 1966, the rights in land in Mkambati were transferred and vested in the Government of Transkei by Proclamation No. R93 of 1966 in terms of section 59 of the Transkei Constitution Act, Act No. 48 of 1963. The rights in land were later transferred to the Transkei Department of Health in terms of section 67 of the same Act.

In 1976, the Mkhambati Leprosy Institute was closed, and the land was transferred to the then Department of Agriculture and Forestry of Transkei.

In 1977, the area was proclaimed as a nature reserve by Government Gazette Notice No. 45, dated 27 April 1977, in terms of the Transkei Conservation Act, Act No. 6 of 1971.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The Holy Cross Parish's land claim was gazetted by the Office of the RLCC for the Eastern Cape in accordance with section 11(1) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, and was published in Government Gazette No. 41456 as Notice No. 133 of 2018, dated 23 February 2018.

The Office of the RLCC for the Eastern Cape invited interested parties to submit their comments and objections regarding the lodged claim. However, the office did not receive any responses or objections to the Gazette notice.

The church representatives were workshopped on the available options within the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, and each option was explained in detail with its merits and demerits.

The church has opted for financial compensation as a form of redress for the rights they lost as a result of the dispossession.



THE SETTLEMENT

The DALRRD, as facilitated by the Office of the RLCC, paid financial compensation of R20 746 528,65 to the Holy Cross Parish in respect of the claimed property in full and final settlement of this claim.

TAPOLENG COMMUNITY CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The Tapoleng community was affected by the dispossession that happened in 1967 as a result of the implementation of the Rehabilitation Policy, also known as the "Betterment Policy".

The primary legislative basis for the dispossession of the Tapoleng community of their land was the implementation of Native Trust and Land Act, Act No.18 of 1936, and further effected through the pronouncement of Proclamation 116 of 1949.

Proclamation 116 of 1949 is widely known as the cornerstone of the implementation of the Rehabilitation or Betterment Policy, commonly known as the trust system.

Through the implementation of the abovementioned policies, most rural settings were reorganised under the pretext that land was being degraded as a result of the use of unconventional agricultural practices by most Africans. Households were either permanently removed from their original settings with both land and improvements affected, or their residential or arable sites were affected.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The Tapoleng community claim was gazetted by the Office of the RLCC for the Eastern Cape in accordance with section 11(1) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, and was published in Government Gazette No. 42286 as Notice No. 320, dated 8 March 2019.

The Office of the RLCC for the Eastern Cape invited interested parties to submit objections and comments on the Gazette notice. However, the office did not receive any objections.

THE SETTLEMENT

All relevant parties have agreed to the settlement of the claim and a settlement agreement has been drafted to outline the points of agreement for the settlement of this claim.

In terms of the proposed settlement, the DALRRD, as facilitated by the Office of the RLCC for the Eastern Cape, shall pay the sum of R22 480 220,00 to the Tapoleng community as financial compensation for the loss of their rights in respect of the claimed property in full and final settlement of the claim.

The agreement between the Office of the RLCC for the Eastern Cape and the Tapoleng community is subject to the approval of this submission by the CLCC.



FREE STATE

Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, the Free State projected finalising 12 land claims during the 2021/22 financial year. It succeeded in finalising three claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

R435 600,00

Land claims settled

—	—
ACTUAL	TARGET

Land claims finalised

3	12
ACTUAL	TARGET



GAUTENG

Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, Gauteng projected settling 13 land claims and finalising 12 claims during the 2021/22 financial year. It succeeded in settling 13 land claims and finalising 86 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

R44 070 057,76

Land claims settled

13	13
ACTUAL	TARGET

Land claims finalised

86	12
ACTUAL	TARGET



NYANYUYE WILLIAM NTULI FAMILY CLAIM

THE HISTORY

The first registration of the farm Wolvengat 126 (now 224 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. The land has never been transferred to any black person. Portion 0 (remaining extent) of the farm Hartebeestfontein 441 JR appears to have been under white ownership before it was acquired by the Suid-Afrikaanse Ontwikkelingstrust in 1985 by deed transfer T9046/1985.

During oral interviews with the land claimants, it was mentioned that their grandfather, Rooibok Mbuthelwa Ntuli, arrived on the farm in 1875, together with his two spouses: Noskotshi Ntuli (his first wife) and Sarah Ntuli (his second wife). According to information provided by the land claimant, his grandparents were the first occupiers of the land before the arrival of white people, and were later surprised by the white farmer who claimed to be the owner of the land. According to the claimant, the Ntuli Family members were labour tenants of Mr Jackson on a contract of three months, which was later changed to four months.

Their verbal agreement was to work on the farm in exchange for shelter on the land they had occupied long before the arrival of the white owner, for the cultivation of crops, grazing of livestock and for burial rights. Mr Jackson would collect them to work on his other farm in Brits (Pretoria). He had big fields and a dairy. After the expiry of their contracts, members of the family were at liberty to find casual jobs elsewhere and return to work after the expiry date of their contract. The land claimant mentioned that his grandparents, Rooibok Mbuthelwa Ntuli and Sarah Ntuli, had been blessed with six children: four boys and three girls, who were all born on the farm. All the boys worked on the farm and got married on the farm.

The originally dispossessed persons had acquired unregistered rights to the property. The Ntuli Family is claiming labour tenancy and beneficial occupational rights for occupying the land for a continuous period of more than ten years from 1875 until 1967.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The claim was published in Government Gazette No. 40058 as Notice No. 696 of 2016, dated 10 June 2016. It was never part of blanket gazetting. The landowners were served with a notification letter and gazette notice in terms of section 11(6) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended. There were no objections or representations from the landowners. The claim was also presented to the Claims Research Committee (CRC) for compliance purposes, although the claimants have opted for financial compensation.



THE SETTLEMENT

The Office of the RLCC for Gauteng engaged the Ntuli Family regarding the restitution option desired for the settlement of its land claim. Options ranging from original land restoration, financial compensation and alternative land were discussed. The beneficiaries have opted for financial compensation for the settlement and finalisation of their land claim.

At the time of land dispossession, the claimed land was used for residential, cultivation, grazing and burial purposes. The calculation of financial compensation is based on the land use of the property at the time of dispossession, and also as per the recommendations of the OVG. The average Consumer Price Index (CPI) of 2016 was used to escalate the historical land valuation obtained in order to arrive at a current value. The recommended historical value in terms of PVA 17 of 2014, as of 1967, is R14 100,00 for the 51,1339 hectares previously used by the Ntuli Family.

The financial implications of this submission only entail a financial compensation award of R1 814 747,35 for the Ntuli Family for its land claim.

MS ZODWA REBECCA MTSHWENI FAMILY CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The farm Olievenhoutbosch 552 (later changed to 389) was given to DJ Oosthuizen as a government grant (government transport) on 16 December 1859 under Government Grant G276/19. The land had a white owner for 69 years. On 20 September 1906, the first land ownership exchange transaction entry was made, whereby Portion B, measuring 1499,179 morgens (1 284 ha) was transferred from the estate of the late LE Erasmus to Martha Francina Erasmus by deed of transfer T 6878/1906 on 20 September 1906. Other portions were also transferred to different private white individuals. Based on the farm register, it is clear that the claimant families never had registered rights of the claimed land.

The oral evidence for the subject claim was provided by the land claimant, Ms Zodwa Rebecca Mtshweni. She is the fifth-born child of the late Mr Nyawuza Phineas Mthethwa and his late spouse, Ms Evelyn Mthethwa. According to the claimant, her late grandfather, Mr Jacob Mthethwa, was the first member of the family to arrive on the claimed property. Unfortunately, she does not know the exact year of his arrival, as she had not been born yet. The claimant's grandfather, Mr Jacob Mthethwa, worked for a landowner known to the family as Mr Jan Malunda. The landowner financially remunerated the claimant's grandfather for his labour. The claimant's grandfather resided with his late spouse, Ms Letia Mthethwa, and their children on the farm.

The claimant's grandparents had owned a house, livestock and a small piece of land that they utilised for subsistence farming. According to the claimant, the family had a good relationship with the landowner. The other families who resided on other portions of the farms were the Sithole, Ramatlo and Lebelwane families. The claimant's grandparents died on the farm and were both buried there. During inspection, the claimant pointed out her grandparents' grave site. Unfortunately the graves have since been exhumed and the remains reburied at Olievenhoutbosch cemetery. The claimed area has now been developed into a residential area.

The claimant's uncle, Mr Ben Vukaibambe Mthethwa, continued to work on the farm following his father's death. Other children of the claimant's grandparents used to sell peaches at Alexander Township. In 1967, government officials driving government vehicles arrived at Randjesfontein and informed the family to leave. The claimant's family was informed to immediately remove all their belongings from the houses that were immediately demolished.

The family enjoyed labour tenancy, as well as beneficial occupational rights for having occupied the property for a continuous period of more than ten years from before 1925 until dispossession in 1967. The rights in land enjoyed by the Mthethwa Family includes the residential, cultivation, grazing and burial rights of the forefathers. The Mthethwa Family is only qualified to claim 13,05187 ha for their rights lost. This extent comprises 2,779879 ha for residential rights, 5,294147 for cultivation rights and 4,977844 ha for grazing rights for the five dispossessed households.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The claim was part of a blanket gazetting, first published in Government Gazette No. 32483 as Notice No. 1089 of 2009, dated 14 August 2009. It was also published in Government Gazette No. 41704 as Notice No. 594, dated 15 June 2018, in terms of section 11 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended. The landowners were notified of the land claim in terms of section 11(6) of the Restitution Act. A stakeholder's meeting was held. The stakeholders did not object to the land claim.



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 Mthethwa Family members are not considering going back to the farm.

The financial implications of this submission only entail a financial compensation award. The total settlement cost for the land claim is R2 458 333,00 for the Mthethwa Family with regard to portions 606 (now County View Extension 3) and 906 (now Sagewood Extension 1) of the farm Randjesfontein 405 JR and Erf 130 County View Township, situated in the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality, and the former portions 271 (now Kosmosdal Extension 13), 366 (now Kosmosdal Extension 75) and 371 (a portion of Portion 272) (now Kosmosdal Extension 74) of the farm Olievenhoutbosch 389 JR.

SUHLA MICHAEL MAPHOSA FAMILY CLAIM



THE HISTORY

According to the information obtained in the farm book register, the farm Trigaardspoort 451 JR (formerly number 156) was first transferred by the government via a deed of grant to Willem Gerhardus Engelbregt on 29 October 1874. The farm was later subdivided into portions and transferred to individual private owners on 14 May 1888. A portion measuring 366 morgen and 425 square roods was transferred to Hendrick Frederick Opperman by deed of transfer T 1322/1888. A portion measuring 215 morgen and 538 square roods was acquired by Hendrik Andriaan Engelbrecht via deed of transfer T 1323/1888. A portion measuring 532 morgen and 402 square roods was transferred to Jan Engelbrecht and Jan H Steenkamp by deed of transfer T c1324/1888. A portion measuring 1 015 morgen and 301 square roods was transferred to Paul Johanna Christiaan Engelbrecht and Jeremia J Potgieter by deed of transfer T 1325/1888.

During oral interviews with the land claimant, he alluded that his grandparents, the late Sarah Skosana and her late husband, who had arrived on the land in 1927. They arrived together with Mr Van der Merwe as their employer. At the time of arrival, the land was unoccupied and they both settled on and cohabited it. The land was later bought by Mr Spitz.

The family stayed on the farm under a labour tenancy contract and utilised the land for grazing and cultivation. Later, the land was bought from Mr Spits by a certain Mr Van Wyk, who ordered the family to leave the farm with immediate effect and evicted the claimant's father, Mr David Mbotswa Maphosa, in 1940.

The dispossession of the Maphosa Family led them to suffer material losses as they lost cattle due to their hasty exit from the farm. The family had to leave behind unharvested crops and was exposed to extended period of hunger. The family members were never compensated for the loss of rights they had in the land for the years they had occupied it between 1927 and 1940.

The family indicated that, since they had not been provided with alternative accommodation or land or been compensated financially, they had to find themselves an alternative place to stay on an adjacent portion of the Trigaardspoort Farm until they could find themselves a permanent place to stay. They left graves and ruins behind as proof of occupation, and prefer financial compensation as a form of redress for the right lost in the land since they had lost an interest in farming.

The Maphosa Family lost their beneficial occupational rights of the properties for a continuous period of more than ten years between 1927 and 1940. The claimant's ascendants also had labour tenancy rights.



THE ADMINISTRATION

Detailed research was conducted as contemplated in section 11(1)(a), (b) and (c) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended. The claim was duly accepted as compliant in terms of Rule 5 of the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission. The claim was published in Government Gazette No. 40593 as Notice No. 92, dated 3 February 2017.

All affected parties (claimants and landowners) were notified in writing as required in terms of section 11(6) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended. No objection was received in terms of the lodged land claim.



THE SETTLEMENT

The Commission engaged the claimants regarding the restitution option desired for the settlement of their land claim. Options were discussed with them, which ranged from original land restoration, financial compensation and alternative land.

The Financial Compensation Policy was also discussed with the claimants so that they could make an informed decision. The land claimants have opted for financial compensation for the settlement of their land claim

A settlement award of R3 228 001,57 was approved in accordance with the agreement reached by the parties in terms of section 42D of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994.



KWAZULU-NATAL

Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, KwaZulu-Natal projected settling 40 land claims and finalising 60 claims during the 2021/22 financial year. It succeeded in settling 55 land claims and finalising 71 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

R715 085 413,70

Land claims settled

55	40
ACTUAL	TARGET

Land claims finalised

71	60
ACTUAL	TARGET



KWAZULU-NATAL

OKHALWENI COMMUNITY LAND CLAIM



THE HISTORY

According to oral history gathered from the claimant community, the original dispossessed individuals grew up on the claimed properties herding cattle and practising subsistence farming. The claimant community further indicated that Mr Mackenzie, who owned the land at the time, informed them that the claimed properties had been sold to a company owned by Billy Shaw. The previous owner, Mr Mackenzie, had given them rights to reside on the farm in exchange for working on the farm. Those refusing to work on the farm were forced to leave. Hard changes began when the new landowner began to set strict regulations on the claimant community. The community was not allowed to practise subsistence farming. The then landowner furthermore destroyed their houses and forced the community members to live in compounds. The claimant community was forced to work for the timber company. Women were only allowed three weeks' maternity leave. Mr Shaw was not happy about the number of their livestock, and reduced this number by reducing their grazing and ploughing fields, which resulted the claimant community being forced to sell their livestock. Removals started in the 1930s until the later part of the 1990s.

The land distribution and allocation were aimed at demeaning the status of black people, a clear-cut racial practice by the government. The Development Trust and Land Act, Act No. 18 of 1936, manifested a basic environment from which a plethora of racially discriminatory land laws would be enacted, which began to affect the Okhalweni community. It had an impact in terms of providing an environment where most black people's tenures were seriously threatened. This Act forbade any ownership and/or purchase of land by "natives" outside stipulated reserve areas. The Native Services Contract Act of 1932 reduced the claimants' status to that of labour tenants. They were forced to provide labour to the new "owners" of the land, if they were to remain in the area. Consequently, the new landowner of the claimed properties forced the indigenous population to become what is commonly referred to as labour tenants.

Although the community members were removed by the private owners of the land, they were practically evicted under the Group Areas Act Framework.

The community lost unregistered beneficial occupation rights in the claimed properties. These rights were later turned into labour tenancy upon the arrival of white farmers on the claimed properties.



THE ADMINISTRATION

This claim meets the acceptance criteria as required by section 11(1), read together with Section 2 of the Restitution Act, and amplified by Rule 3 and 5 of the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission in that:

- The landowner lost his 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 or practices.
- The claim is not frivolous or vexatious.

A notice was published in Government Gazette No. 42839 as Notice No. 609 of 2019, dated 15 November 2019, in terms of section 11(1) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994.



THE SETTLEMENT

The Commission engaged the Okhalweni community regarding the restitution option desired for the settlement of their land claims. Options, ranging from original land restoration to financial compensation and alternative land, were discussed with the community. The claimant beneficiaries have opted for financial compensation for the settlement and finalisation of their land claims.

The claimants have opted for financial compensation as full and final settlement of their claims. The RLCC has issued an offer of R57 485,134,00. The claimants have accepted this offer as a token and an acknowledgement by the state of the injustices of the past in respect of the land rights lost.

HATHENI RIVER COMMUNITY LAND CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The Phatheni River community had occupied the claimed properties under an indigenous tenure system for as long as they can remember. They enjoyed beneficial occupational rights in the claimed land, which included grazing, hunting and ploughing. The land was awarded as a grant by Queen Victoria to a white farmer who had fought in the World War. Although this property had been registered under a white landowner as early as 1900, he never took physical occupation of the farm and the community continued to enjoy all the rights they had in the land. The land was traditionally composed of wards, known as Pateni, Mkobeni, Simozomeni and Ntubeni, all falling under the jurisdiction of one chief. However, during the early 1930s, Roy McKenzie, who claimed to be the owner of the farm, arrived in the area. Some families were removed from the farm (Pateni) immediately to limit the number of people residing on the farm. Those who remained were turned into labour tenants and harsher rules were imposed upon them in terms of livestock, ploughing and boundaries. In order to continue residing on the land, they had to provide labour and abide by the rules imposed upon them.

Around the mid-1950s, Roy McKenzie sold the farm to a company called Springbok Timbers. The company forcefully removed all the households who were residing in all the wards forming the farm owned by Roy McKenzie, and relocated them to one ward, Ntubeni. At this point, Ntubeni was already overpopulated due to the number of people who had been moved from all the wards and squeezed into the small ward of Ntubeni. Livestock and ploughing fields became a thing of the past. As the households grew, there was much demand for access to land. Timber was planted in all the wards except for Ntubeni, and the community continued to reside there until the late 1960s when the company wanted to extend its timber plantation and wanted more land. The community was again forcefully removed from this ward, and had to seek alternative accommodation in the nearby tribal areas of Mgxobeleni and KwaMafunze, as well as other areas.

According to archival research in the form of the Surplus People Project (SPP) report, the development of conservation and forestry has occasioned large-scale removals in KwaZulu-Natal. Conservation and development planning in the region was conceived and implemented with little or no regard for the people already living there. As early as the 1930s, threats of eviction have been evident. According to a preliminary anti-soil erosion report by Mr Roy McKenzie to the Native Commissioner, "incipient in cultivated lands, such lands are being gradually put down to grasses". The further cultivation of land by the community was causing soil erosion. In 1951, the area of Richmond was declared a Soil Conservation District, which resulted in the further elimination of the livestock and crop fields of the tenants.



THE ADMINISTRATION

This claim meets the acceptance criteria as required by section 11(1), read together with Section 2 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, and amplified by Rule 2 of the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission in that:

- The claimant lost their 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 or practices.
- No just and equitable compensation was received.
- The claim is not frivolous or vexatious.

A notice was published in Government Gazette No. 42608 as Notice No. 411 of 2019, dated 2 August 2019 in terms of section 11(1) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994.



THE SETTLEMENT


During the options workshop conducted with the community and the name verification. Some members of the community signed option forms.

The committee furthermore signed a resolution confirming the restitution award as opted for by the community.

The total monetary value of the claim is R85 103 690,00, which was paid over to the beneficiaries.

An agreement to be entered into between the state and the claimants has been drawn up and is to be signed by each claimant or their representative after the approval of the S42D submission.

The claimants have accepted this offer as a token and an acknowledgement by the state of the injustices of the past in respect of the land rights lost.



LIMPOPO

Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, Limpopo projected settling 64 land claims and finalising 32 claims during the 2021/22 financial year. It succeeded in settling 68 land claims and finalising 95 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

R478 749 646,46

Land claims settled

68	64
ACTUAL	TARGET

Land claims finalised

95	32
ACTUAL	TARGET

BHAMJEE FAMILY CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The property was owned by Mr Pieter Johannes Lodewik Venter. In 1945, he sold the property to Lilly Bhamjee (formerly Ahrens). The property was registered under title deed T14731/1945. In 1982, the executor of the estate of Lilly Bhamjee sold the property to the Town Council of Pietersburg for R1 400,00.

The claimant attested in the affidavit and the information contained in the title deed of the Bhamjee Family that an amount R1 400,00 was offered as payment for the claimants. The purchase price was not negotiated with them. They feel that the amount offered to the family was under the market value of the property in 1982.

The claimant indicated that she had been forced to sell the claimed property to the Town Council of Pietersburg. She indicated that the reasons for their removal was that Pietersburg was declared white area under the Group Areas Act, Act No. 36 of 1966. Based on the fact that members of the Bhamjee family are Indian, they were not allowed to occupy properties located in Pietersburg.

The purpose of the removal was in furtherance of the objects of racially discriminatory laws as contemplated in section 2.1 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, which would have been in conflict with the provision of section 9 of the South African Constitution, Act No. 108 of 1996.

The family enjoyed registered rights on the said property on which they lived for many years before being forcefully removed. They utilised the property for residential and business purposes. The total extent of the land lost by the claimants is R1 428 0000 SQM.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The land claim form submitted substantially meets the requirements of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended. The land claim was lodged with the Commission before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998.

The Commission has accepted the land claim by the family on Portion 1 of Erf 124, 17 Market Street, Polokwane as being prima facie valid, in terms of section 2 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, read with Rule 3 and 5 of the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission. The land claim was first published in Government Gazette No. 30022 as Notice No. 812 of 2007. The notice was later amended in 2013 and published in Government Gazette No. 39943 as Notice No. 464 of 2016.



THE SETTLEMENT

The land under claim is not feasible for restoration. The land is currently being utilised for commercial purposes by the Polokwane Municipality. The claimants have opted for financial compensation in settlement of their claims. The Commission will compensate the Bhamjee Family as per the settlement agreement in full and final settlement of their land claim. The Commission will award financial compensation of R446 760,56 to the Bhamjee Family in full and final settlement of their land claim.

MAHATLANI COMMUNITY LAND CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The community alleged that they originally came from Mozambique to South Africa in 1800. This community forms part of the people who came with João Albasini. They went to settle with Albasini before they were allocated their own land. They did not settle for long there before moving to a place called Rosin, which used to form part of the farms Hoogmoed 69 LT and Ossenhoek 70 LT.

According to the affidavit deposed by Khosa Miluva, members of the Mahatlani tribe were removed from the farm Ossenhoek 70 LT in 1966. The affidavit by Mukalanga Siremba revealed that some members of the Mahatlani communities were also removed from the farm Hoogmoed 69 LT.

Information sourced from the claim form revealed that the Mahatlani community had been dispossessed from the subject properties between 1950 and 1954. However, investigations conducted by the Office of the RLCC for Limpopo discovered that the community had been removed in 1966. The Mahatlani tribe had been removed based on the Betterment Policy, which was the apartheid government's plan for spatial planning in the former homeland and black areas since the 1930s, which aimed to regulate the area and land usage.

The Betterment Policy forced people to settle together in new areas and it managed to disrupt the social structure of the community of Mahatlani. Members of the Mahatlani community alleged that, during the forced removal, their community homes were destroyed, and they were not given material to rebuild their homes.

The Mahatlani tribe had unregistered rights in the form of beneficial occupation as they had used the land for a continuous period of more than 10 years.

The claimed property was used for burial, grazing and residential purposes. The area was also used for collecting honey from bees, as well as for hunting and burial purposes.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The land claim was lodged before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998, i.e. on 13 September 1995 and 24 October 1995. No compensation was paid at the time of the dispossession. The claimants were not given an opportunity to negotiate compensation.

The dispossession was 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 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act No. 108 of 1996.

The Commission has accepted the land claim by Mr Mafemani Frank Sibisi as being prima facie valid, as provided for by section 2 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, read with Rule 3 and 5 of the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission.

The Mahatlani community land claim was published in Government Gazette No. 35535 as Notice No. 589 of 2012, dated 27 July 2012.



THE SETTLEMENT

The land under claim is not feasible for restoration and is used for farming and residential purposes by the Ntshuxi, Ribungwane, Tiyani, Masakona, Njhakanjhaka and Majosi communities. However, the Mahatlani community has opted for financial compensation as full and final settlement of their claim.

The RLCC has certified in writing, as provided for in terms of section 14(3) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, that he is satisfied with the agreement to be entered into for the settlement of the Mahatlani community land claim, that such agreement ought not to be referred to court, and that such agreement be effective from the date of signature by the parties.

An amount of R134 881 320,00 is required for the financial compensation of the 420 households that are in the full and final submission of the Mahatlani community land claim.

MPUMALANGA

Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, Mpumalanga projected settling 35 land claims and finalising 36 claims during the 2021/22 financial year. It succeeded in settling 43 land claims and finalising 43 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

R442 494 554,21

Land claims settled

43 | **35**
ACTUAL | TARGET

Land claims finalised

43 | **36**
ACTUAL | TARGET



MDLULI MATSAFENI COMMUNITY CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The Mdluli Matsafeni community are the descendants of Mdluli Matsafeni, who was the leader of a secessionist group that broke away from the Swazi Kingdom in the last century. Mdluli Matsafeni fought with the expanding Sotho groups that had their military post stationed in the Blyde River Canyon, now called Mariepskop, which was named after the Sepedi Chief Maripe.

His descendants, the members of the Mdluli Matsafeni community, occupied the farm Matsafeni in about 1840. The said farm consisted of what is now called Riverside 308 JT, Woodhouse 309 JT, Dingwell 276 JT, Marathon 275 JT and Boschrand 283 JT. The Mdluli Matsafeni community mainly used the land for residential, burial, customary, grazing and agricultural purposes. This included the planting of crops and keeping of livestock for household activities, which provided both their own subsistence and a source of income.

On or about in 1880, a certain white man by the name of HL Hall and his family requested permission from Mdluli Matsafeni to stay on the farm. The said permission was granted. In about 1905, with the passing of time, HL Hall became a successful businessman and was a supplier of food to the mines and to the people who worked on the railways. Because of his contribution to the railway, the railway administration recognised Mr. Hall as the de facto owner of the abovementioned farms.

Mr HL Hall established a company by the name of HL Hall and Sons (Pty) Ltd. On or in about 1921, the said company became the registered owner of the abovementioned farms and took transfer of the properties. The said farms were registered in the company's name. The members of the Mdluli Matsafeni community were then told that, for them to stay on the said farms, they had to work for the said company. The company used mainly the provision of the Transvaal Squatter Law 21 of 1895, which stipulated that persons were to be subjected to labour tenancy if required to do so by permission of the farmowner or face eviction from the land.

The other Acts that were used to dispossess the Mdluli Matsafeni community of their land were the 1913 Land Act and the 1936 Land Act. The fact that the said farms were not declared a released area in terms of the 1936 Land Act meant that their customary law rights over the said farms were not recognised.

All the successive governments only recognised common law ownership based on freehold title as an appropriate legal basis for landholding. These forms of landholding were reserved predominantly for whites. The conditions of labour tenancy imposed on the Mdluli Matsafeni community were so intolerable to the extent that some of them were forced to move away because they could not subject themselves to the conditions of labour tenancy on the land that they regarded as their own. On or in about 1950, most of the members of the Mdluli Matsafeni community, who resisted to work for the company, were evicted from the said farm.

The Stock Limitation Act of 1950 was used to dispossess the Mdluli Matsafeni community of their rights. The Act implicitly meant forced removal or the slaughter of cattle belonging to African reservists. The Mdluli Matsafeni community was forced to leave the farm as they were accused of having their livestock overgraze the farm.

The Bantu Amendment Act of 1965 was used to dispossess the families of their rights. This Act "empowered the government to expel any African from any of the towns or the white farming areas at any time". It was "the most rigid of the apartheid legislation so far. It provided the legal framework for stripping blacks of most of their remaining rights in white areas in return for independence in their own tribal homelands. The Minister of Bantu Administration was empowered to establish "proscribed areas" in which he could limit both the total number of black workers and the number of blacks employed in any industry. He could also ban the further use of black labour in any geographical area and send surplus black workers to the bantustans".

The Mdluli Matsafeni community was stripped off their ownership rights through the Native Land Act, Act No. 27 of 1913, which prohibited blacks from occupying land only classified for white occupation. In the event blacks occupied such areas, they were regarded as occupying a black spot and removed.

These claimants can be regarded as having had unregistered rights to the land as they had worked and lived on the farms for many years. Their parents' graves are still evident on the farms.

The claimants therefore lost burial rights, grazing rights and unregistered land ownership rights on the property.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The claim does meet the acceptance criteria as required by section 2, read together with section 11(1) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, and amplified by Rule 3 and 5 of the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission in that the claim has met the acceptance criteria as set out in section 2 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act and the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission. The claim pertaining to this submission was subjected to a validation process to ensure its compliance with the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, and was accepted.

The land claim was processed in terms of the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission. The RLCC for Mpumalanga is satisfied that the claim conforms to the acceptance criteria.

The original dispossessed person was dispossessed of their land rights after 19 June 1913.

The dispossession was as a direct result of racial discriminatory laws or practices. The claim was lodged before 31 December 1998.

The LCC has not yet made any order in respect of the land under claim. The claim was accepted in terms of section 2 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act.

The land claim was published in Government Gazette No. 22560 as Notice No. 1827 of 2001, dated 17 August 2001.



THE SETTLEMENT

The restitution option considered for the settlement of Mdluli Matsafeni community is equitable redress in the form of restoration to the original land, as contemplated in section 42D(1)(a) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended.

During an options workshop held with the community, all the information about restitution options was provided to the restitution beneficiaries. The three options available to restitution beneficiaries, such as the restoration of the original land, financial compensation, alternative land or a combination of the three was discussed. The community opted for restoration of their original land.

The OVG appointed a service provider to conduct a valuation of the farm, the remaining extent of the farm Marathon 275 JT, a portion to be subdivided (in extent 683,5800 ha) and the remaining extent of portion 14 of the farm Boschrand 283 LT and erven 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 46 and 47 of Mattafin Township, which were valued at R336 550 000,00.

In line with the valuation certificate, an offer was made to HL Hall and Sons on 11 May 2020. Negotiations were entered into with HL Hall and Sons, the RLCC and senior managers in the regional and national offices of the Commission for the duration of 2020.

The offer to purchase the remaining extent of the farm Marathon 275 JT, a portion to be subdivided (in extent 683,5800 ha) and the remaining extent of portion 14 of the farm Boschrand 283 JT and erven 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 46 and 47 of Mattafin Township for an amount of R336 550 000,00 was accepted by the land owner on 20 April 2021.

RAMARUMO FAMILY CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The Ramarumo Family was originally from a place called Codrington near Warmbaths and Leone train station. The Ramarumo Family was not the first occupiers of the farm Pankoppen 36 JR. They arrived on the farm Pankoppen 36 JR around the early 1800s. Upon arrival on the farm, they found a landowner who was known as Cruickshank or Cruchshed. They were offered a place to stay on the farm on condition that they work for three months every year without a salary. He also allowed them to practice subsistence farming on the farm on a small scale.

The family acquired residential, cropping, grazing and burial rights on the farm Pankoppen 36 JR. On the same land, they paid homage to their ancestors. They were entitled to plant crops and to graze their livestock as Mr Cruchshed showed them the field that they were permitted to plough and on which they were permitted to graze their livestock. The family resided on the farm under the labour tenancy system. The relationship between Mr Cruchshed and the family was a healthy one.

After the death of the landowner, Mr Cruchshed, the family continued to enjoy their rights on the farm. They continued to live on the farm, doing their farming activities without any restrictions.

Around 1945, a lot of things changed on the farm. Mr Maloka was Chief of the Bakgatla Ba Mocha tribal authority that had been given powers by the apartheid government to control the natives and impose certain rules on the people who were living on the farm. The then government acquired land and transferred it to a trust, which was created to control the land. This was done in terms of the Native Trust and Land Act, which formalised the separation of white and black rural areas. The Act established a South African Native Trust, which purchased all reserve land not yet owned by the state, and had a responsibility for administering African reserve areas.

The family's chickens were also poisoned through the use of a helicopter that sprayed a poisonous substance aimed at killing the chickens. This was a strategy to force the family to leave the farm.

The Ramarumo Family could not own land in which they could exercise control as a result of the Native Administration Act, Act No. 38 of 1927. The Native Administration Act of 1927 was used to dispossess the family of their rights in land. The legislation at the time of dispossession "set up a separate legal system for the administration of African law and made proclaimed black areas subject to a separate political regime from the remainder of the country, ultimately subject only to rule by proclamation, not Parliament. This Act was a measure that was primarily designed to accord with the grand design of territorial segregation rather than enhancing traditional authority per se".

The Ramarumo Family was also required to reduce their livestock because they did not own the land. The family was forced to sell their cattle through auctions at very low prices against their will in terms of an order that was issued for the family to reduce their livestock to five. The Stock Limitation Act of 1950 was used to dispossess the Ramarumo family of their rights. The Act implicitly meant that the family should leave the farm as they were not prepared to reduce their livestock.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The claim submitted meets the acceptance criteria as required by section 2, read with section 11 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act, No. 22 of 1994, as amended, and amplified by Rule 3 of the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission in that the claim was lodged on a prescribed claim form, and it substantially met the requirements of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended.

The claimants were dispossessed of their rights in land in 1963, which is the date after 19 June 1913, as required by section 2(1)(a) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended.

The claimants did not receive any form of compensation at the time of dispossession



THE SETTLEMENT

The claimants have resettled in various areas around Mpumalanga, Limpopo and Gauteng; hence, they opted for financial compensation in lieu of the claimed land in full and final settlement of their land claim.

In determining the land value, the OVG conducted a historical valuation of the property. The Office of the RLCC for Mpumalanga used the OVG's recommended amount and subjected it to the approved CPI to determine the value of the property. The OVG indicated that the value of the land at the time of dispossession (1963) was R32 400,00 x 122.0 / 1.5, which has been escalated to R2 635 200,00 using the MVOC escalation calculator.

The standard settlement offer (SSO) for improvements in an amount of R160 573,00 x 7 households = R1 124 011,00 in total was added to the R2 635 200,00. The total financial compensation offer for the Ramarumo family is calculated as follows: R2 635 200,00 (land value) + R1 124 011,00 (improvements for seven households) = R3 759 211,00.

The Ramarumo family accepted the offer of R3 759 211,00 in writing as full and final settlement of their claim.

MR BUSANE ELIJAH MAHLANGU FAMILY CLAIM

THE HISTORY

The Mahlangu family originated from the farm Geluk and moved to the farm Van Wyksvlei in search of greener pastures. They arrived on the farm Van Wyksvlei in 1929 and found a white farmer, Konie Groenewald, and families such as the Mahlangu and the Mtsweni families. They were offered a place to live and work for the farmer Konie Groenewald in return for their labour.

The Mahlangu Family used the land for residential and agricultural purposes. The rights they enjoyed on the claimed land were grazing rights, burial rights, hunting rights and beneficial occupation for a period of more than 10 years, and the right to perform rituals.

Based on oral research conducted with the claimants, the status of the claimants was gradually degraded, and they were losing their privileges as labour tenants day by day. The conditions became difficult when Mr Groenewald, the owner of the property, ordered them to reduce their livestock, citing issues of overgrazing.

This practice continued over time, even by other white farmers who were staying adjacent to Van Wyksvlei 407, which affected black people on white-owned farms as they were unable to provide their families with meat and milk as they did not have enough livestock left.

The Mahlangu Family attested that Mr Ernest van der Berg had a clash with the family over their refusal to work for him for their stay on the land as the claimants wanted to work outside the farm for remuneration. He cited issues of overpopulation on the land with insufficient labour. The children were also required to work on the farm without any remuneration, denying them opportunities to attend school.

In 1989 the Mahlangu Family finally succumbed to the pressure and bad treatment they were subjected to by the landowner, Mr Ernest van der Berg. They had to sell their belongings, such as livestock and things that they could not carry when moving from the farm. They left their houses intact with most of their furniture as the relocation was urgent.

The Mahlangu Family relocated to Thembaletu (Zenzele section) in the former Kwa-Ndebele homeland situated in the Thembisile Hani Local Municipality in Nkangala District. The claimant, Mr Busane Elijah Mahlangu, and his family were forced to seek alternative settlement on their own. He maintained that resettlement was never easy for him and his family because wherever they settled, there was not enough space for grazing and the cultivation of crops.

The claimants had enjoyed the following unregistered land rights before dispossession: cropping rights, grazing rights, residential rights and burial rights.



THE ADMINISTRATION

It is submitted that the land claim meets the acceptance criteria as required by section 2, read together with section 11(1) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, and amplified by Rule 3 and 5 of the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission in that it is evident that the dispossession of rights in land was due to racially discriminatory laws and practices, and the Mahlangu Family is entitled to restitution in terms of the Restitution Act.

The original dispossessed person was dispossessed of land rights after 19 June 1913. The dispossession was as a direct result of racial discriminatory laws or practices. The land claim was lodged before the cut-off date of 31 December 1998.

The LCC has not made any order in respect of the land under claim.



THE SETTLEMENT

Preliminary feasibility was conducted in-house and the claimed land was rendered feasible to be restored in terms of section 33(cA) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended. It was presented to the claimants. During option workshops, the Mahlangu Family opted for land restoration.

The restitution option considered for the settlement of the late Mr Busane Elijah Mahlangu's land claim on Portion 9 of the farm Van Wyksvlei 407 JT, measuring 189,4417 ha, is equitable redress in the form of restoration to the original land, as contemplated in section 42 D(1)(a) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended. However, the rights lost by the Mahlangu Family on the subject property have been excised to 62,6319 ha.

Tenure reform implementations under the Provincial Shared Service Centre (PSCC) have conducted a land rights enquiry in the form of an in-loco inspection to determine whether there are any farm occupiers on the claimed land. It transpired that no-one is currently residing on the land. No labour tenancy claim has been lodged against Portion 9 of the farm Van Wyksvlei 407 JT.

In light of the above, the land will be transferred to the name of the state. The land will be subdivided before registration of the two new portions, and 62,6319 ha will be transferred to the Mahlangu Family. The remaining 126,8098 ha will be transferred to the state to be used to settle other claims or used for other land reform programmes.

The OVG recommended that Portion 9 of the farm Van Wyksvlei 407 JT should be valued at R3 336 000,00. The offer was accepted by the landowner, Mr Ernest van der Berg as per his signed letter of acceptance dated 8 February 2021.



NORTH WEST

Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, North West projected settling two land claims and finalising 16 claims during the 2021/22 financial year. It succeeded in settling 11 land claims and finalising 19 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

R141 340 773,42

Land claims settled

11	2
ACTUAL	TARGET

Land claims finalised

19	16
ACTUAL	TARGET

RYSMIERBULT COMMUNITY CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The Rysmierbult community was the first to occupy the claimed properties in 1866 with unregistered rights. Around the 1940s, white people flocked into the area as it had been proclaimed an alluvial digging area. Section 23(1) and 24(1) of the Native Trust and Land Act, Act No.18 of 1936, states that no person should reside and/or prospect in a digging area without written permission, which was called digger's certificate. Black people could not obtain a digger's certificate, but could only remain in the area through a certificate of character, as set out in section 60 of the Precious Stone Act, Act No. 44 of 1927, which served as a permit for those black people who were seen as desirable and proper, and who could therefore remain in the area.

The community continued to reside on the farm until 1965. In 1965, the local police wrote to the Commissioner of Native Affairs that the black people should be moved from the area. The police wanted the Native Trust and Land Act of 1936 to take precedence over the Precious Stone Act, which would lead to the disposal of a certificate of character. The Native Trust Land Act was then be used as a tool to remove black people from the area.

The Native Affairs Commissioner responded to the letter by stating that by the end of 1965, no house owned by a black person should be left in the area. The police, assisted by white farmers, forcefully removed all black people from the area.



THE ADMINISTRATION

This claim has met the acceptance criteria as set out in section 2 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, and the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission. The land claim was subjected to a validation process to ensure that it complied with the Act and was accepted as prima facie valid.

This claim was processed in terms of the Rules Governing the Procedures of the Commission. The RLCC for North West is satisfied that it conforms to the acceptance criteria in that the original owners were dispossessed of their land rights after 19 June 1913; the dispossessions were as a direct result of racially discriminatory laws or practices; the claim was lodged before 31 December 1998; and the claimants did not receive just and equitable compensation at the time of dispossession.

The claim was published in Government Gazette No. 27352 as Notice No. 392 of 2005, dated 11 March 2005. It was later amended in Government Gazette No. 27892 as Correction Notice No. 1410 of 2005, dated 19 August 2005, in terms of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended.

Soon after the publication of the claim in the Government Gazette, interested parties were notified directly and indirectly. Direct notification took place by means of registered mail and at the first stakeholders meeting. Indirect notification took place by means of posters that were put up in the vicinity of the claimed property. In other instances, gazette notices and notification letters were hand-delivered to interested parties.



THE SETTLEMENT

The Rysmierbult community requested financial compensation on two remaining portions – Portion 10 and Portion 15 (a portion of Portion 1) of the farm Rysmierbult 88 IQ, measuring 531,7967 ha in extent. It must be noted that the submission only talked to financial compensation and withdrawal of other portions in replacement of the already restored Zamekomst 86 IQ, which was additional land. A total amount of R39 179 812,00 is to be paid as financial compensation to the 122 households towards the settlement of the land claim.

MEKGARENG COMMUNITY CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The research findings indicated that claimants held unregistered rights. A variety of historical accounts embrace the inhabitation of those properties by the claimant community of Mekgareng. One such account is traced as far back as the 19th century. This is around the same era as the initial arrival of white Afrikaners on an escape route from British Colonial rule from the Cape Colony. It is in the same era of Mfecane in which Mzilikazi was on a rampage in pursuit of creating a super tribe of Ndebeles by conquering smaller tribes towards the Western Transvaal.

According to the oral information from the forefathers of Mekgareng, out of desperation and due to the imminent defeat they were faced with from Mzilikazi, the claimants' forefathers sought an uneasy alliance with the Afrikaner "Voortrekkers". Mzilikazi and his army were subsequently defeated and force from the area. After the war, the community saw an additional influx of Boers into their territory. The establishment of the Boer controlled territory was officially implemented through the creation of the Western Transvaal, which incorporated most of the lands of this community. A campaign in pursuit of the acquisition of black-owned land was waged and implemented through the Natives Land Act of 1913 and the Native Trust and Land Act of 1936. It should be noted that, prior to the implementation of the above two racially motivated legislations, white people had already commenced with the process of accumulating and subdividing the land among themselves. Prior to the arrival of white Afrikaners, the land was held communally. However, this arrangement was changed upon their arrival as they began to subdivide and register individual titles in their favour. The situation became unbearable to the majority of the members of the community and a huge exodus from their beloved land followed.

The abovementioned scenario compelled blacks to vacate their own area because, if they did not do so, they would have been deemed trespassers and be subjected to criminal proceedings. The only ones to be left behind were labour tenants who operated as farm labourers on white-owned properties. No equitable alternative land was designated for the land claimants. The community lost their ancestral rights and beneficial occupational rights in the land. Traditional and customary rituals could no longer be practised. The entire social fabric of the community was depleted as a result of the removal.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The Commission has accepted 17421,7146 ha as valid restitution in terms of section 2 of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, on behalf of the Mekgareng community. The Commission has, to date, acquired 389,1013 ha through a section 42D memorandum.

The reason for the acquisition of the above hectares as being in Phase 5 is due to the fact that the claimed land is smallholdings, and private landowners are disputing the merits of the land claim. The matter has been referred to the LCC for adjudication. The acquired properties from Phase 1 to 5 as section 42D have been transferred in title to the Mekgareng Communal Property Association (CPA) as the entity registered to administrate land on behalf of the community.



THE SETTLEMENT

A section 42D submission for Phase 1 and 2 was approved with grants to the value of R4 770 040,00, which was never released for the Mekgareng CPA. During a meeting held between the Office of the RLCC and the Mekgareng CPA, the CPA indicated that it needed funds for the running of the resort and that the resort was dilapidated. The Commission agreed that development grants would be released to assist in the running of the Oberon Resort. The resort was donated by the Department of Public Works and Infrastructure for restitution purposes. This amounts to R72 348 646,00 for the purchase of 10% equity in the Sangiro Abattoir, and an amount of R4 770 040,00 for the running of the Oberon Resort.

The total amount for the settlement of this claim will be R77 118 686,00. The Land Development Support (LDS) Unit will be responsible for assisting the claimants with the implementation of the business plan for both the Sangiro Abattoir and the Oberon Resort.

NORTHERN CAPE

Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, the Northern Cape projected settling five land claims and finalising nine claims during the 2021/22 financial year. It succeeded in settling two land claims and finalising 14 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

R40 433 335,70



Land claims settled

2

ACTUAL

5

TARGET

Land claims finalised

14

ACTUAL

9

TARGET

LOUW FAMILY CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The farm was first given as a perpetual quitrent crown grant to Albert Louw Senior in terms of title deed FT 930 on 19 August 1893. Mr Louw occupied the farm Dyson's Klip for a continuous period from 1893 until his death in 1915.

Under typical and dubious circumstances, Dyson's Klip was signed away on two occasions: first on 17 January 1912 and then on 15 July 1914.

According to the Deed's Office information, half of the farm Dyson's Klip was sold by Albert Louw to Richard Walter Freyer on 17 January 1912 for £650 under deed of transfer 5864/1912. The remaining half of the farm was also sold by Albert Louw to Richard Walter Fryer Steyn and his brother Frederich Philip Steyn on 15 July 1914 for £2 000 under deed of transfer 7367/1914.

However, it was alleged that Albert Louw's handwriting was forged on the power of attorney attached to the transfer deeds. This claim was evidently repeated in the interview with the claimants.

Nonetheless, the sale of 1912 falls outside the terms of the legislation on the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, because it occurred before the cut-off date (19 June 1913).

As such, the claimant (descendants) can only receive restitution for the sale of 1914, which is half of the farm Dyson's Klip No. 454, as it meets the prescripts of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, in that the sale was concluded after 19 June 1913 and was as a result of past racial discriminatory practices.

Based on the information indicated above and the comprehensive research findings by Prof Martin Legassick, it seems most likely that the forgery was carried out by the firm of Schroder and Van Coppenhagen. Mr Van Coppenhagen, in his certification, was acting as a public official: Secretary of the Upington Divisional Council. At the time (and from 1910 to 1935), Mr Van Coppenhagen was Mayor of Upington. The forgery and fraud committed was a severe dereliction of duty.

Mr Albert Louw Senior was dispossessed of registered ownership rights on one half of an undivided share of the farm Dyson's Klip No 454, measuring 2971.104 ha of farmland registered under FT 930/ 1893.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The Commission is satisfied that the claims were lodged as prescribed and are compliant with the provisions of section 2(1) and 11(1) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, and as provided for by section 25 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act No. 108 of 1996, as the results of the claim were thereafter gazetted and published in the Government Gazette.

The claim was researched, validated and subsequently gazetted and published in the Government Gazette as Notice No. 1204 of 2015.

This land claim was lodged by Mr David George du Plessis on behalf of the descendants of the late Albert Louw Senior. After his death, Ms Nicolene Louw was nominated to pursue the claim on behalf of the descendants of Albert Louw. The claimant family had been dispossessed of their registered ownership rights in land on an undivided half share of the farm Dyson's Klip No. 454. The claimed land is situated in the Khara Hais Local Municipality within the ZF Mgcawu District in the Northern Cape.



THE SETTLEMENT

The restitution option considered by the claimants for settlement of the Louw Family land claim is equitable redress in the form of financial compensation as contemplated in section 42D(1b) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended.

The Commission presented an offer for R7 645 333,33 as approved by the RLCC, which was accepted by the claimant.

According to his family tree, Albert Louw Senior had five children, of which one daughter (Elizabeth Louw) died without any descendants. In order not to delay the settlement of the claim, it is proposed that the restitution award be paid to those verified beneficiaries for the monetary value of the claim, as determined by the historical valuation.

The restitution award of R7 645 333,33 will be divided between four households since it has been established that Elizabeth Louw died without descendants. Each household is therefore entitled to R1 911 333,33 from the restitution award as determined by the historical valuation.

PIET AND ELIZABETH REUN FAMILY CLAIM



THE HISTORY

Farm Zwartkop's history can be traced back to the 1880s after a slave by the name of Mr Frans Moolman had been set free. He established himself on the land by building houses, kraals, waterholes and a graveyard that were later destroyed by whites who came to own those properties.

According to witness testimonies, during the Anglo-Boer War (1899), soldiers used to march through the Farm Zwartkop. These soldiers used to rob some of the inhabitants in the area of their livestock to satisfy their hunger. The one person who was mostly affected by this action was Mr Frans Moolman and his family. At the time, there were no white people living in the area. Mr Frans Moolman and his family were later joined by other coloured families, such as Hans Cloete, Daniel Lukas and others.

According to the land register, Portion 19 of the Farm Zwartkop No. 341, which was 300,0000 morgen in extent, was registered in the name of Elizabeth Reun (maiden name Moolman) and Piet Reun in 1956.

Since the arrival of whites in and around the Zwartkop area, coloured families were forced to sell their properties. In correspondence between the Department of Lands and an attorney representing whites, it was clearly indicated that officials from the Department of Lands were requested to bend the rules in favour of white buyers in order to allow the transfer and registration of land, and in some instances the consolidation of properties.

The attorney representing the whites who wanted to buy properties owned by coloured families in the area wrote numerous letters to the then Department of Lands. In one of the letters, he requested the Group Areas Executive Council to apply the Group Areas Act, Act No. 41 of 1950, in the area occupied by coloured families in Zwartkop.

Coloured families were pressured and, in some instances, forced to sell their properties. During these forced sales, coloured families were told by whites that they could continue to graze their livestock on the land. They were also told that they would be allowed to fetch firewood from the said properties. Unfortunately, none of the promises were kept after the whites acquired these properties. Immediately after the registration of these properties, the coloured families were forced to vacate these properties, with some not even being given a chance to collect all their livestock, including their personal belongings.

In accordance with the information obtained from the National Archives in Cape Town, it was clear that an attorney named Mr Carel J van Zyl wrote a letter to the then Department of Lands. In his letter, he requested the Group Areas Executive Council to apply the Group Areas Act, Act No. 41 of 1950, in the area owned by Mr Frans Moolman and Mr Jan Cloete, who were the co-owners of Portion 23 (formerly known as Erf 73 Zwartkop) at the time. This action also affected Mr Piet Reun, the owner of Erf 92.



THE ADMINISTRATION

The Commission was satisfied that these claims were lodged as prescribed and are compliant with the provisions of section 2(1) and 11(1) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, and as provided for by section 25 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act No. 108 of 1996.

The validation memo for these claims was approved by the erstwhile RLCC, Mr Sidney Hlongwane, on 19 October 2007. However, this approval did not include all the properties under the claim. The initial notice was published in the Government Gazette as Notice No. 1405 of 2009. An amendment was made to the original Gazette so as to include the rest of the other properties under claim.

On 27 October 2016, the RLCC approved the memorandum to amend the gazette notice so as to include all the affected properties.

The notice of amendment in terms of section 11(a) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended, was published in the Government Gazette as Notice No. 233 of 2017.





THE SETTLEMENT

The restitution option considered for the settlement of the Reun Family claim is equitable redress in the form of financial compensation as contemplated in section 42D(1b) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended.

An agreement for the settlement of this claim was arrived at based on the claimants' option for equitable redress in the form of financial compensation.

The Reun Family will be paid an amount of R3 041 285,71 as a restitution award for ownership rights lost. The total settlement amount is confirmed as R3 041 285,71.



WESTERN CAPE

Summary of performance

In its Annual Performance Plan, the Western Cape projected settling 42 land claims and finalising 70 claims during the 2021/22 financial year. It succeeded in settling 41 land claims and finalising 58 claims.

The total expenditure for claims finalised was

R124 598,93

Land claims settled

41 | **42**
ACTUAL | TARGET

Land claims finalised

58 | **70**
ACTUAL | TARGET

WESTERN CAPE

ST. STEPHEN PARISH (PAARL) CLAIM



THE HISTORY

The original dispossessed properties, the remainder of Erf 335 and Erf 336, Paarl, were acquired and registered in the name of the St. Stephen Parish (Paarl) through deed of registration TD169/1884 and TD191/1870, respectively.

The St. Stephen Parish (Paarl) was expropriated through caveat 339/1958 and forced to sell its properties to the Community Development Board through expropriation caveat 339/1958 in terms of TD 15392/1977.

The properties were dispossessed in terms of the Group Areas Proclamation 158 of 1972 as the congregants were members of the “coloured group” and the area was declared a “white group” area



THE ADMINISTRATION

M. Robert S Rogerson lodged a claim on behalf of the Board of Trustees of the Diocese of Cape Town for the St. Stephen Parish (Paarl) with the Office of the RLCC for the Northern and Western Cape on 2 December 1996.

This date is within the period of the lodgment of claims as provided for in section 2(1)(e) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended.

This claim was found to be prima facie compliant in terms of the prescripts – sections 2(1)(a – e) and 2(2) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act No. 22 of 1994, as amended.

The St. Stephen Parish (Paarl) has appointed Gavin Cupido and Charles J Williams to act on behalf of the church in this claim.



THE SETTLEMENT

In terms of the deed of dispossession, the compensation received by the Board of Trustees of the Diocese of Cape Town for the St. Stephen Parish (Paarl) was R112 000,00 for the loss of land rights.

As per the historical valuation certificate received from the OVG, the value of the dispossessed properties was R141 600,00. The church had been under-compensated by an amount of R29 600,00.

This amount of R29 600,00 is then escalated to the current value through the application of the CPI.

The RLCC for the Western Cape has arrived at the final settlement award of this claim after commissioning the execution of a historical valuation.

Any position adopted by the Commission is strictly without prejudice and is subjected to approval by the CLCC, as delegated by the Minister, until officials are duly mandated and authorised to sign such a formal agreement.

In the view of the Commission, the Board of Trustees of the Diocese of Cape Town for the St. Stephen Parish (Paarl) was denied the rights to own the subject property because of the Group Areas Act.

The financial offer accepted by the Board of Trustees of the Diocese of Cape Town for the St. Stephen Parish (Paarl) for the amount R976 000,00 is for the full and final settlement of this claim



PART C

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

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 also largely in line with the requirements of section 40(1) and (3) of the PFMA. The Public Service Regulations, 2001, prescribes that human resource information is included in the annual report. 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 expect the annual report to be published by 1 June 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 Branch Restitution 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.

Financial performance: Restitution Branch

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

Table 11: Summary of budget expenditure for the 2021/22 financial year

Economic classification	2021/22						
	Adjusted appropriation	Shifting of funds	Virement	Final appropriation	Actual expenditure	Variance	Expenditure as a percentage of final appropriation
	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	
Current payments	641 373	29 773	(52 184)	618 962	618 962	-	100.0%
Compensation of employees	365 079	24 348	-	389 427	389 427	-	100.0%
Goods and services	276 294	5 425	(52 184)	229 535	229 535	-	100.0%
Interest and rent on land	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transfers and subsidies	2 856 583	(833 709)	-	2 022 874	1 974 005	48 869	97.6%
Provinces and municipalities	7 385	118	-	7 503	7 339	164	97.8%
Households	2 849 198	(833 827)	-	2 015 371	1 966 666	48 705	97.6%
Social benefits	1 434	481	-	1 915	1 915	-	100.0%
Other transfers to households	2 847 764	(834 308)	-	2 013 456	1 964 751	48 705	97.6%


Economic classification	2021/22						
	Adjusted appropriation	Shifting of funds	Virement	Final appropriation	Actual expenditure	Variance	Expenditure as a percentage of final appropriation
	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	
Payments for capital assets	8 194	648 503	-	656 697	656 697	-	100.0%
Buildings and other fixed structures	-	90 919	-	90 919	90 919	-	100.0%
Machinery and equipment	7 301	421	-	7 722	7 722	-	100.0%
Land and sub-soil assets	893	557 163	-	558 056	558 056	-	100.0%
Payments financial assets	0	316	-	316	316	-	100.0%
Total	3 506 150	(155 117)	(52 184)	3 298 849	3 249 980	48 869	98.5%

Table 12: Project expenditure summary per province for the 2021/22 financial year

Office	Land purchase	Land and subsoil	Recapitalisation	EBT	Lists	Total
	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000
Eastern Cape	2 520	350	21	26 925	516 028	545 844
Free State	5 381	0	0	192	0	5 573
Gauteng	0	0	3	18 327	24 392	42 722
KwaZulu-Natal	70 169	1 659	146 102	29 566	547 383	794 879
Limpopo	27 337	0	0	3 073	218 437	248 847
Mpumalanga	356 012	7 970	952	1 785	177 754	544 474
Northern Cape	8 167	0	59 413	13 434	3 597	84 611
North West	76 836	0	100 102	7 438	38 897	223 273
Western Cape	1 841	549	90 438	29 291	35 223	157 342
Total	548 262	10 528	397 032	130 031	1 561 711	2 647 564

Table 13: Commitment reduction breakdown between backlog and new claims for the 2020/21 financial year

Province	Expenditure – claims approved prior to 2021/22	Expenditure – claims approved in 2021/22	Total expenditure
	R'000	R'000	R'000
Eastern Cape	438 267	107 556	545 823
Free State	5 573	0	5 573
Gauteng	24 010	18 560	42 570
KwaZulu-Natal	277 074	517 805	794 879
Limpopo	78 971	169 876	248 847
Mpumalanga	142 609	401 864	544 473
Northern Cape	39 264	39 526	78 790
North West	119 544	103 728	223 272
Western Cape	70 929	86 444	157 373
Total	1 196 241	1 445 359	2 641 600



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 63 to 75, which comprise the statement of financial position as at 31 March 2022, 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 2022, and its financial performance and cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with the Standards of Generally Recognised Accounting Practice (GRAP).

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 International Independence Standards) (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 8 to the financial statements, the corresponding figures for 31 March 2021 were restated as a result of errors in the financial statements of the unlisted entity at, and for the year ended, 31 March 2022.

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 GRAP 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 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. The entity is not required to prepare a report on its performance against predetermined objectives, as it does not fall within the ambit of the PFMA and such reporting is not required in terms of the entity's specific legislation.

Other information

13. 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.
14. My opinion on the financial statements and findings on compliance with legislation does not cover the other information and I do not express an audit opinion or any form of assurance conclusion on it.
15. 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.
16. I did not receive the other information prior to the date of this auditor's report. When I do receive and read the information and, 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 the auditor's report and re-issue an amended report as appropriate. However, if it is corrected this will not be necessary.

Internal control deficiencies

17. I considered internal control relevant to my audit of the financial statements. However, my objective was not to express any form of assurance on it. I did not identify any significant deficiencies in internal control.

Auditor-General

Pretoria

31 July 2022



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.

Financial statements

2. In addition to my responsibility for the audit of the financial statements as described in this auditor's report, I also:
 - 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 unlisted 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 Commission on Restitution of Land Rights 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 an unlisted 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 accounting officer 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.

Annual Financial Statements

CONTENTS

1. Statement of Financial Position	63
2. Statement of Financial Performance	64
3. Statement of Changes in Net Assets	65
4. Cash Flow Statement	65
5. Statement of Comparison of Budget and Actual Amounts	65
6. Notes to the Financial Statements	66

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION AS AT 31 MARCH 2022

	Notes	2022 R '000	Restated – 2021 R '000
Non-current assets		449	562
Property, plant and equipment	3	449	562
Current assets		-	-
TOTAL ASSETS		449	562
Net assets		449	562
Accumulated surplus/(deficit)		449	562
Liabilities			
Non-current liabilities			
Current liabilities		-	-
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS		449	562

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE AS AT 31 MARCH 2022

	Notes	2022 R '000	Restated – 2021 R '000
Revenue			
Revenue for non-exchange transactions			
Government grants	4	29 145	26 036
TOTAL REVENUE		29 145	26,036
Expenses			
Employee-related costs	5	(13,116)	(12,735)
General expenses	6	(15,960)	(13,205)
Depreciation	7	(183)	(172)
TOTAL EXPENSES		(29,258)	(26,112)
Continuing operations surplus/(deficit) before tax		(113)	(76)
Taxation		-	-
Continuing operations surplus/(deficit) after tax		(113)	(76)
Discontinued operations surplus/(deficit) after tax		-	-
Total surplus/(deficit) for the period net of tax		(113)	(76)

STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS AS AT 31 MARCH 2022

	Note	Accumulated surplus R '000	Total net assets R '000
Balance at 31 March 2020		757	757
Changes in net assets			
Movement in PPE: Prior-period error	8	(119)	(119)
Movement in cumulative impact of employee cost and revenue from non-exchange transactions	8	0	0
Balance at 31 March 2020		638	638
Changes in net assets			
Restated surplus/(deficit) for the year – restated		(76)	(76)
Balance at 31 March 2021		562	562
Changes in net assets			
Surplus/(deficit) for the year		(113)	(113)
Balance at 31 March 2022		449	449

CASH FLOW STATEMENT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2022

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 Commission on Restitution of Land Rights does not operate a bank account and does not hold any cash and cash equivalents. All cash flows pertaining to the Commission are accounted for in the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development.

STATEMENT OF COMPARISON OF BUDGET AND ACTUAL AMOUNTS

GRAP 24 requires a comparison of budget amounts and the actual amounts arising from the execution of the budget to be included in the financial statements of entities that are required to, or elect to, make publicly available their approved budget(s) and for which they are, therefore, held publicly accountable. This Standard also requires disclosure of an explanation of the reasons for material differences between the budget and actual amounts.

The Commission on Restitution of Land Rights does not have a budget specifically allocated to the entity. The budget is part of the Restitution allocation for Programme 3 and the budget for the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights cannot be practically isolated.

Therefore, it is not practical for the Commission to have a Statement of Comparison of Budget and Actual Amounts that meets the requirements of GRAP 24.

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 Generally Recognised Accounting Practice (GRAP), including any interpretations, guidelines and directives issued by Accounting Standards Board in accordance with section 91(1) of the Public Finance Management Act (Act 1 of 1999).

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 one thousand rand (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 Annual financial statements

The same accounting policies and methods of computation are followed in the annual financial statements as compared with the most recent annual financial statements.

1.3 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.

1.4 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.

1.5 Employee benefits

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

1.5.1 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.

NOTES TO THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Short-term employee benefits include items such as:

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

1.5.2 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.

1.6 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 criteria, 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.

1.6.1 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.

1.6.2 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.

NOTES TO THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

1.6.3 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:

- Administration Service
- Accommodation Services
- Information Technology
- Staff Training

1.6.4 Debt forgiveness and assumption of liabilities

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

Revenue arising from debt forgiveness is measured at the carrying amount of debt forgiven.

1.6.5 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.

1.6.6 Services in-kind

The entity recognises services in-kind that are significant to its operations and/or service delivery objectives as assets and recognise 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.

1.7 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.

NOTES TO THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

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 to their estimated residual value.

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

Item	Depreciation method	Estimate useful life
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 residual value and 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 and/or residual value 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.

1.8 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 are disclosed, 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 only exists 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.

NOTES TO THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Management is 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.

1.9 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.

1.10 Budget information

An 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 2021 to 31 March 2022.

The audited 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.

NOTES TO THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

2. 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

3. Property, plant and equipment

Carrying value of property, plant and equipment

	Cost R '000	Accumulated depreciation R '000	Carrying value R '000
Carrying value as at 31 March 2022			
Computer equipment	1 015	(891)	124
Furniture and fittings	718	(394)	325
	1 734	(1 285)	449
Carrying value as at 31 March 2021			
Computer equipment	952	(777)	175
Furniture and fittings	712	(325)	387
	1 664	(1 102)	562

Reconciliation of property, plant and equipment as at 31 March 2022

	Computer equipment R '000	Furniture and fittings R '000	Total R '000
Carrying value as at 31 March 2021	175	387	562
Additions	63	6	69
Depreciation	(114)	(69)	(183)
Cost	1 015	718	1 734
Accumulated depreciation	(891)	(394)	(1 285)
Carrying value 31 March 2022	124	325	449

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

	Computer equipment R '000	Furniture and fittings R '000	Total R '000
Carrying value as at 31 March 2020	182	456	638
Additions	96	-	96
Depreciation	(103)	(69)	(172)
Cost	952	712	1 664
Accumulated depreciation	(777)	(325)	(1 102)
Carrying value 31 March 2021	175	387	562

NOTES TO THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

4. Revenue

Revenue from non-exchange transactions	2022 R '000	2021 R '000
Government grants	29 145	26 036
Major classes of services received in-kind		
Research services received in kind	10 893	8 372
Revenue for non-exchange transactions arising from liabilities assumed by the Department		
General expenses	15 960	13 205
Employee-related costs	13 116	12 735
Purchase of property, plant and equipment	69	96
	29 145	26 036

Services received in-kind not recognised (not significant to the 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

5. Employee-related costs

	2022 R '000	2021 R '000
Salaries and wages	8 262	7 954
Performance and other bonuses	619	641
UIF, pension and medical aid	1 245	1 212
Allowances	2 103	1 594
Housing benefits and allowances	263	277
Other employee-related costs	2	1
Provision for leave pay	622	1 055
	13 116	12 735

NOTES TO THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

6. General expenses

	2022 R '000	2021 R '000
Audit fees	711	25
Accounting fees	590	132
Consulting and professional fees	13 341	11 002
Conferences and seminars	352	559
Telephone and fax	93	173
Transport and freight	445	738
Travel – local	429	575
	15 960	13 205

7. Depreciation

Depreciation	2022 R '000	2021 R '000
Depreciation for the year	183	172
	183	172

8. Prior-period error

In the 31 March 2021 financial year, the following accounting errors were made in the preparation and compilation of the annual financial statements:

8.1 Revenue for non-exchange transactions and general expenses

Revenue from non-exchange transactions earned by the Commission was understated in the prior year by R243 000 due to an omission of accounting fees, audit fees, telephone and fax, travel costs, conferences and seminar expenditure paid on behalf of the Commission. General expenses were also understated by R243 000.

The comparative figures for the 31 March 2021 financial statements have been restated. The effects of the restatement in the financial statements are summarised below:

	2021 R '000
Increase in revenue for non-exchange transactions	(243)
Increase in general expenses	243
Increase in accumulated surplus/deficit	0

NOTES TO THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

8.2 Property, plant and equipment

During the year ended 2021/22, it was noted that property, plant and equipment was, in some instances, overstated and, in some instances, understated in prior year and outer years.

The comparative figures for both the 31 March 2021 financial year and the effects on accumulated surplus have been adjusted retrospectively. The effects of the restatement in the financial statements are summarised below:

	2021 R '000
Statement of Financial Position	
Increase in computer equipment cost	37
Accumulated depreciation: Computer and equipment	(62)
Decrease in furniture and fittings cost	(184)
Decrease in accumulated depreciation: Furniture and fittings	68
Total effect	(141)
Statement of Financial Performance	
Increase in depreciation: Computer and equipment	16
Decrease in revenue	20
Decrease in depreciation: Furniture and equipment	(14)
Total effect	23
Effect on opening accumulated surplus	
Net effect	119
	0

8.3 Revenue for non-exchange transactions and employee costs for 2020/21

Revenue from non-exchange transactions earned by the Commission was understated in the 2020/21 financial year due to omissions of employee-related costs in the prior-year period with an amount of R519 000. Further performance bonuses were incorrectly recorded in the current year, which related to the prior year.

Revenue from non-exchange transactions earned by the Commission were understated in the 2019/20 and prior years (R211 000) due to a payment made in the current year relating to the 2019/20 financial year for employee-related costs that were also understated by the same amount (R211 000).

The comparative figures for the 31 March 2021 financial statements have been restated. The effects of the restatement in the financial statements are summarised below:

	2021 R '000
Increase in revenue for non-exchange transactions	(519)
Increase in employee-related costs	519
Impact on accumulated surplus for 2020/21	-
Increase in revenue for non-exchange transactions	(10)
Increase in performance bonus	10
Impact on accumulated surplus for 2020/21	-

NOTES TO THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The comparative figures for the 31 March 2019 financial statements have been restated. The effects of the restatement in the financial statements are summarised below:

	2021 R '000
Increase in revenue for non-exchange transactions	211
Increase in employee-related costs	(211)
Impact on accumulated surplus for 2019/20	-

9. Related parties

Relationships

Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development

The Commission on Restitution of Land Rights is a branch that operates under the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development and, 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:

	2022 R'000	2021 R'000
Related-party transactions		
Revenue for non-exchange transactions	29 145	26 036
Research services received in-kind	10 893	8 372
Assets acquired through non-exchange transactions	69	96

Key management

As at 31 March 2022

Name	Basic salary R'000	Bonuses and performance-related payments R'000	Other short-term employee benefits R'000	Post-employment benefits R'000	Total R'000
Ntloko, NS	247	-	555	-	1 801
Maphutha, LH	821	121	372	107	1 421
Benyane, CJ	846	70	404	110	1 430
	2 913	191	1 330	217	4 651

As at 31 March 2021

Name	Basic salary R'000	Bonuses and performance-related payments R'000	Other short-term employee benefits R'000	Post-employment benefits R'000	Total R'000
Ntloko, NS	1 114	-	477	-	1 591
Maphutha, LH	809	67	367	105	1 348
Benyane, CJ	846	122	383	110	1 461
	2 768	190	1 227	215	4 401

10. Events after the reporting date

No adjusting or significant non-adjusting events have occurred between 31 March 2022 and the date of the authorisation of these financial statements.



PART D

GOVERNANCE

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 DALRRD, the CRLR participates in all governance fora, and submits statutory and governance plans and reports to the DALRRD. 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.

Risk management

The CRLR complies with and adheres to the DALRRD'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 14.

Table 14: Strategic risk assessment and mitigation

Risk type	Risk	Risk response/mitigation plan
Financial risks		
Budgetary risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under-spending 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly expenditure monitoring and cash flow revision(s) to be done
Institutional risks		
IT systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of effective information and records management system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of standardised business process to be fed into the project and management information system Apply change management principles during implementation
Human resource risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ineffectual human resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of a revised institutional form and continual training
Process risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays in implementation of settlements No standardised business process with time frames 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed a detailed business process that is elaborated into SOPs and time frames. Implementation of reviewed settlement models
External risks		
Reputational risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reputational risk linked to delays in the settlement of claims 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clear and definite mandate of the CRLR (e.g. scope creep into post-settlement issues) Litigation risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify mandate in the context of future autonomy and develop plans to ensure integration with the DALRRD's processes Improvement of tracking and management of matters in court Compliance checklist and quality control by quality assurance Increased quality assurance capacity

Internal audit and audit committees

The Internal Audit Plan was approved on 29 July 2021 and the Chief Directorate: Internal Audit conducted an audit within the Branch: Restitution on the following areas:

- Performance Audit
- Information Technology Audit
- Operational and Compliance Audit



PART E

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

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.

Human resource operations

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 DALRRD's National Office and Provincial Shared Service Centres.

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 within the CRLR 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.

Expenditure on personnel

Table 15 shows the expenditure on Compensation of Employees (CoE) during the period under review for the Branch: Restitution. The Branch spent 107% of the CoE budget.

Table 15: Expenditure per office on compensation of employees

Province	Budget (R)	Expenditure (R)	Percentage expenditure
Eastern Cape	36 261 000	34 698 883	96%
Free State	15 721 000	17 165 247	109%
Gauteng	28 603 000	33 344 117	117%
KwaZulu-Natal	56 185 000	62 872 835	112%
Limpopo	43 508 000	52 720 376	121%
Mpumalanga	51 951 000	59 608 722	115%
Northern Cape	16 727 000	17 807 663	106%
North West	30 745 000	33 861 997	110%
Western Cape	28 644 000	33 391 051	117%
National Office	56 734 000	43 956 503	77%
Total	365 079 000	389 427 393	107%

Reconfiguration through the National Macro Organisation of Government Programme

The new Cabinet was announced on 29 May 2019, with the start of the sixth administration. The President announced the configuration of departments on 14 June 2019, in which several changes to the national executive and departments were introduced.

The Presidency led the reconfiguration of the executive and departments to be completed through the National Macro Organisation of Government (NMOG) Programme.

Public Service Sectoral Bargaining Council (PSCBC) Resolution 1 of 2019, clause 7.2.2, determines that, only after completing the migration process and after all employees have been matched, including those initially identified as additional to the post establishment, may all funded vacancies that exist in the Department be advertised and filled according to the departmental recruitment and selection processes.

To give effect to the migration of staff to the newly approved start up organisational structures, PSCBC Resolution 1 of 2019 was entered into between public service labour unions and the Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA) as the employer. Resolution 1 provides guidelines on the identification, transfer and placement of staff in a transparent, fair and inclusive process that allows meaningful participation and consultation with all stakeholders. The General Public Service Sectoral Bargaining Council (GPSSBC) established the Departmental Task Team (DTT) to unpack and implement Resolution 1. The task team included union and employer representatives.

The DTT undertook the matching and placement exercise of members of the Senior Management Service (SMS) and lower-level employees in accordance with the approved macro and micro structure. This process was finalised on 6 January 2022, after which approval was obtained from the Minister.

The DALRRD issued Circular 13 of 2022, which provides a way forward on the filling of funded and prioritised vacant posts on salary levels 12 and below. The circular granted authority to branches to fill the vacancies on salary level 12 and below in line with applicable prescripts.

Historical and current information in respect of the CRLR's establishment

Historically, the CRLR had an overall number of 1 442 positions on the approved version 2.9 departmental structure. The CRLR had a total of 750 approved, funded positions on the version 2.9 departmental structure.

The CRLR has 663 funded and filled positions, as per the current structure approved on 11 December 2020. A total of 80 positions are vacant on PERSAL in terms of the current structure.

A total of 59 critical, urgent and priority positions, amounting to R31 650 284,00, were identified in terms of the available budget, out of the 80 funded vacant positions, both at SMS level and levels 1–12. The approval for filling these positions represents a very small amount compared to what is needed or expected for the Branch: Restitution to operate optimally.

The CRLR adopted a Business Improvement Project, Kuyasa. One of its purposes is organisational structure design to support the newly proposed operating model.

The Minister approved the request for the CRLR to continue with further consultation on the draft Public Entity 3A strategy and the interim structure on 28 April 2021.

Ensuing from the approval, extensive engagements have unfolded with the DPSA to canvass the establishment of the Commission as an autonomous entity, and to consult on the proposed organisational structure in line with Project Kuyasa. The proposed structure is in line with the fit-for-purpose approach, which will strengthen the Commission, building on its core strength and addressing issues that require attention.

Table 16 shows the staff complement per office with a total headcount of 663 individuals as opposed to a total of 743 funded posts. The highest vacancy rate is in the Northern Cape (28%). The offices with the lowest vacancy rate are Limpopo and Mpumalanga (7%). The total vacancy rate for all offices is 11%, which is above the 10% preferred vacancy rate as prescribed by National Treasury.

Table 16: Status of positions and vacancies per office

Office	Number of funded posts	Number of posts filled	Number of posts vacant	Percentage vacancy rate	Head count
National Office	82	65	17	25%	65
Eastern Cape	68	59	8	10%	59
Free State	30	27	3	13%	27
Gauteng	65	58	7	14%	58
KwaZulu-Natal	112	102	11	8%	102
Limpopo	98	92	6	7%	92
Mpumalanga	113	105	8	7%	105
Northern Cape	35	29	6	28%	29
North West	72	65	7	9%	65
Western Cape	68	61	7	13%	61
Total	743	663	80	11%	663




Table 17: Number of staff and vacancies per salary band

Salary band (permanent employees)	Number of permanent posts	Head count
Salary levels 1–12	627	75
Senior management (levels 13–16)	36	5


Filling of senior management service posts

There were 36 SMS positions on the establishment and five vacancies during the year under review. The SMS vacant positions comprised the following:

- Deputy Chief Land Claims Commissioner: Interviews held on 27 September 2022
- Chief Director: Land Restitution Support: Eastern Cape – filled
- Director: Restitution Policy – filled
- Director: Quality Assurance: National Office – filled
- Director: Legal: Limpopo – filled

Although there were five vacancies at SMS level during the period under review, four of the vacancies have since been filled and the one outstanding is at an advanced stage of the recruitment and selection process.

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 14 staff members with disabilities, which constitutes 2% of the total.

Termination of service during the period under review

There were 16 terminations of service during the period under review. The breakdown per province and in the national office is as follows:

Region or office	Type of termination
Office of the Chief Land Claims Commissioner	Resignation
Office of the Chief Land Claims Commissioner	Resignation
Free State	Ill health retirement
Free State	Resignation
Gauteng	Resignation
KwaZulu-Natal	Death
KwaZulu-Natal	Mandatory retirement
KwaZulu-Natal	Mandatory retirement
Limpopo	Resignation
Limpopo	Death
Limpopo	Death
North West	Resignation
North West	Resignation
Northern Cape	Resignation
Northern Cape	Resignation
Western Cape	Resignation

Employment equity: Gender and race distribution

Female staff members comprise 56%, with 44% being male.





Table 18: Employment equity numbers per salary level, race and gender

Salary levels	African		Coloured		Indian		White		Total
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	
4	0	6	-	1	-	-	-	-	7
5	50	28	12	2	3	2	-	1	98
6	55	31	10	-	3	-	3	-	105
7	50	32	8	1	1	1	1	-	97
8	56	53	4	1	-	-	2	-	119
9	16	13	1	1	-	-	1	-	32
10	60	50	1	2	3	1	-	1	118
11	12	5	1	1	-	1	1	-	21
12	12	23	1	1	1	-	1	-	39
13	4	15	-	2	-	-	3	1	25
14	1	5	1	1	1	1	-	-	10
15	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total	317	261	39	13	12	6	12	3	663

Employment in the SMS cadre is skewed towards males. Of the 36 senior managers, just over 72% are male.



Performance management

The CRLR adheres to the DALRRD's approved Performance Management Development Strategy (PMDS) for 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 those in the SMS.

Employee health and wellness

Employee health and wellness (EHW) within the CRLR utilises the services of the DALRRD and service providers where necessary for this activity. No wellness activity took place during the 2021/22 financial year. Employees were encouraged to utilise telephonic services to receive the necessary counselling and support. However, no referrals were recorded.

Annexure A

Table 19: List of settled claims

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Solatium (R)	Total award cost (R)
EASTERN CAPE						
Lee (Harmse) Family claim	1	-	894 271,63	-	-	894 271,63
Makhetha Family claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Holy Cross Parish claim	1	-	20 746 528,65	-	-	20 746 528,65
Wicks Family claim	1	-	4 474 621,11	-	-	4 474 621,11
Ntentezi Family land claim	1	-	1 355 555,56	-	-	1 355 555,56
Ngcanga Family claim	1	-	1 316 583,33	-	-	1 316 583,33
Kate Family claim	1	-	712 766,00	-	-	712 766,00
Du Randt Family land claim	1	-	481 719,00	-	-	481 719,00
Sipolweni Community claim	1	-	38 216 374,00	-	-	38 216 374,00
Tapoleng Community claim	1	-	22 480 220,00	-	-	22 480 220,00
Mbonjwa Family claim	1	-	807 418,18	-	-	807 418,18
Phono Family claim	1	-	342 616,67	-	-	342 616,67
Matrose Family claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Wynne Family Claim	1	-	335 500,00	-	-	335 500,00
Mkhundu Family Claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Ngcayisa Family claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Van Wijk claim	1	-	642 292,00	-	-	642 292,00
Dingiswayo Family claim	1	-	637 270,59	-	-	637 270,59
JD Green land claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Bell Family claims	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Shogole Family claim	1	-	2 489 816,67	-	-	2 489 816,67
Makhanda Family claims	1	-	366 000,00	-	-	366 000,00
Rutherford land claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Lusaseni Family	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Tambokiesvlei Community claim	5	-	39 500 958,00	-	-	39 500 958,00
Total	29	-	138 048 533,39	-	-	138 048 533,39
GAUTENG						
Portion 121 of Leeuwfontein 299 JR – Serithi Family	1	-	650 510,65	-	-	650 510,65
Portion 293 (a portion of portion 292) of farm Derdepoort 326 JT (now described as Eersterust Township Ext 6) – Mngomezulu Family	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Portion 2 of the farm Boschkop 543 JR – Sibiya Family	1	-	963 438,00	-	-	963 438,00

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Solatium (R)	Total award cost (R)
Portions 5 and 6 of Erf 581 and portion of Loskop Street, Newlands JR Pretoria (formerly known as remaining portion of Lot 12 Paul Street, Newlands) – Moses Family	1	-	678 642,41	-	-	678 642,41
Rustfontein 616 JR, portions 0, 9,10,11,12 and Portion 0 (RE) of Ekangala 610 JR – Maseko Family	1	-	2 248 022,00	-	-	2 248 022,00
Portions 606 (now County View Extension 3) of the farm Randjesfontein 405 JR and Erf 130 County View Township and the former portions Portions 271 (now Kosmosdal Extension 13), 366 (now Kosmosdal Extension 75) and 371 (a portion of Portion 252) (now Kosmosdal Extension 74) of the farm Olievenhoutbosch 389 JR – Mthethwa Family	1	-	2 458 333,00	-	-	2 458 333,00
Portion 0 (RE) of the farm Hartebeestfontein 441 JR and Portion 0 (RE) of the farm Wolvengat 442 JR – Ntuli Family	1	-	1 814 747,35	-	-	1 814 747,35
Portion 14 and 15 of the farm Trigaardspoor 451 JR – Maphosa Family	1	-	3 228 001,57	-	-	3 228 001,57
Portions 10 and 68 of the farm Tweefontein 413 JR – Singuana Family	1	-	443 234,97	-	-	443 234,97
Portion 34 (Remaining Extent) of the farm Kameelzynkraal 547JR – Mnguni Family	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Portion 9 of the farm Tweefontein 541 JR – Mahlangu Family	1	-	1 089 128,56	-	-	1 089 128,56
Portions 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35 and 36 of the farm Groenfontein 526 JR – Ntuli Family	1	-	2 868 904,27	-	-	2 868 904,27
Portion 5 of the farm Tweefontein 541 JR – Sibanyoni Family	1	-	642 292,00	-	-	642 292,00
Total	13	-	17 727 546,78	-	-	17 727 546,78

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Solatium (R)	Total award cost (R)
KWAZULU-NATAL						
Colvelle Family claim	1	-	-	-	-	-
Ingwavuma Community (Phase 2) – previously settled as Ngwavuma Community	3	-	-	-	-	-
Singh Family	1	-	1 626 666,67	-	-	1 626 666,67
Mtolo Family land claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Dlamini Family claim	1	-	642 292,00	-	-	642 292,00
Bassa Family	2	-	12 420 951,39	-	-	12 420 951,39
Two batched Cato Manor tenants	2	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Nkabinde Family claim	1	-	1 605 730,00	-	-	1 605 730,00
Maphanga Family land claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Vahed Family land claim	1	-	2 372 222,22	-	-	2 372 222,22
Khosi Victoria Zwane on behalf of the Zwane Family land claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Zwane Family claim	1	-	607 129,41	-	-	607 129,41
Goolam Yasseen	1	-	235 053,33	-	-	235 053,33
Pillay Family land claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Bernadette Ignatia Tandi Mzimba on behalf of the Mkhwanazi Family land claim	1	-	571 181,82	-	-	571 181,82
The Mtshali Family claim	1	-	443 317,50	-	-	443 317,50
Ntshangase Community v Harloo Estates (Pty) Ltd & Others, LCC 49/2008 (full and final settlement) – part of Ntshangase Golela	1	-	-	-	-	-
Pappaya Family	1	-	617 625,00	-	-	617 625,00
Ngema Family land claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Ramsoomar Family	1	-	466 614,12	-	-	466 614,12
Reddy Family land claim	1	-	521 011,76	-	-	521 011,76
Padayachee Family	4	-	7 117 064,09	-	-	7 117 064,09
Dladla Family land claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Late Sababathy Moodley land claim	1	-	2 756 928,89	-	-	2 756 928,89
Chetty Family land claim	1	-	2 042 377,60	-	-	2 042 377,60
Lalbahadoor Family land claim	1	-	288 709,41	-	-	288 709,41
Ramnanan Family land claim	1	-	1 168 732,58	-	-	1 168 732,58
Waag Alles Family claim (three batched)	3	-	1 917 377,69	-	-	1 917 377,69
Hansa Family claim	1	-	1 287 777,78	-	-	1 287 777,78
Mthiyane Group land claim (Phase 2)	1	-	4 817 190,00	-	-	4 817 190,00

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Solatium (R)	Total award cost (R)
Okhalweni Community land claim	3	-	57 485 134,00	-	-	57 485 134,00
Hajee Shah Goolam Mohamed Trust (Section 35)	4	-	2 062 882,00	-	45 000,00	2 107 882,00
Phatheni River Community land claim	1	-	85 103 690,00	-	-	85 103 690,00
Ngcongo Family land claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Two batched Cator Manor tenants	2	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Ngcobo and Cele Family Cato Manor land claims	4	-	642 292,00	-	-	642 292,00
Govender Family	1	-	342 743,75	-	-	342 743,75
Total	55	-	191 410 717,01	-	45 000,00	191 455 717,01
LIMPOPO						
Mengoai Family land claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Mathale Makgopo Rachel	1	-	642 292,00	-	-	642 292,00
Ha-Mutsha (Pfumbida) Community land claim – KRP 11096	1	-	9 955 526,00	-	-	9 955 526,00
Ndlovu Nyanisi land claim – KRP 3717	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Phase 2 Ramonanyane Families land claim – KRP 11157	1	-	6 101 774,00	-	-	6 101 774,00
Khosa Family land claim (Phase 2)	1	-	963 438,00	-	-	963 438,00
Marumbe Mahlangu land claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Komape Family land claim	1	-	5 138 336,00	-	-	5 138 336,00
Mahatlani Community	1	-	134 881 320,00	-	-	134 881 320,00
Ha-Mutsha (Mapheveni) community land claim – KRP 11096 and 5331	2	-	12 845 840,00	-	-	12 845 840,00
Mashaba land claim	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Mabusela and other families land claim	1	-	6 422 920,00	-	-	6 422 920,00
Dumisa Mayephu Samuel land claim	1	-	1 605 730,00	-	-	1 605 730,00
Mphahlele Family land claim	2	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Aphane Simon Fana land claim – KRP 1484	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Ga-Mabohlajana individuals land claim	3	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Steelpoortdrift individuals land claims	44	-	9 955 526,00	-	-	9 955 526,00
Shihmabanyisi Community Phase 2 – KRP 779	1	-	2 248 022,00	-	-	2 248 022,00

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Solatium (R)	Total award cost (R)
Bhamjee Family land claim – KRP 7033	1	-	446 760,56	-	-	446 760,56
Mosesi Family land claim	1	-	1 926 876,00	-	-	1 926 876,00
Semorishi (Ga-Seema) land claim – KRP 11119	1	-	32 756 892,00	-	-	32 756 892,00
Total	68	-	228 139 274,56	-	-	228 139 274,56
MPUMALANGA						
Masimula Family land claim (Phase 2 full and final settlement) – KRP 11369	1	-	27 429,14	-	-	27 429,14
Busane Elijah Mahlangu's land claim – full and final settlement, Portion 9 of the farm Van Wyksvlei 407 JT – KRP 9766	1	3 336 000,00	-	-	-	3 336 000,00
Ngobe Pomo Frank (full and final settlement) – KRP 9067	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Mazibuko Family (full and final settlement) – KRP 10042	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Phakathi Family claim – Remainder of the farm Zankraal 99 HT (KRP 10999) – Phase 2 (full and final settlement)	1	-	234 142,06	-	-	234 142,06
Lukhele Family (full and final settlement) – KRP 8139	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Mdluli Family (full and final settlement) – KRP 10650	1	-	642 292,00	-	-	642 292,00
Ms Ndeisi Sarah Thubane in her capacity as original dispossessed person – Phase 2 full and final settlement	1	-	370 737,86	-	-	370 737,86
Mkhatshwa, Mdhului, Mapanga, Mthethwa and Mhlongo families' land claim (full and final settlement) – KRPs 2451, 2120, 10041, 2370 and 2369	5	-	1 605 730,00	-	-	1 605 730,00
Radebe Family claim – KRP 3807	1	-	784 925,94	-	-	784 925,94
Mathebula Family land claim: full and final settlement – KRP 6642	1	-	675 684,11	-	-	675 684,11
Nkosi Family land claim – KRP 6493 (full and final settlement)	1	-	105 465,73	-	-	105 465,73
Ndala Community land claim, Portion 1 of the farm Weltevreden 158 JR (Phase 2 Settlement) – KRP 355	1	-	7 155 135,14	-	-	7 155 135,14

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Solatium (R)	Total award cost (R)
Maluleke Family claim – Remaining extent of the farm Arthursseat 214 KU (full and final settlement) – KRP 2018	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Mahlangu Family land claim (full and final settlement, the remaining extent of Portion 9 of Boschpoort 211 IR Farm – KRP 10156	1	-	3 942 573,00	-	-	3 942 573,00
Mokoena Family claim – Portion 1 of the farm London 496 KT (full and final settlement) – KRP 1910	1	-	963 438,00	-	-	963 438,00
Shai Family claim – remaining extent of the farm Zoeknag 500 KT (full and final settlement) – KRP 6436	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Mashigo Family claim – remaining extent of the farm London 496 KT (full and final settlement) – KRP 6433	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Mnguni Family land claim – full and final settlement – KRP 9934	1	-	3 241 944,43	-	-	3 241 944,43
Maluka Family claim – remaining extent of the farm Agincourt 254 KU and remaining extent of the farm Newington 255 KU (full and final settlement) – KRP 9757	1	-	1 926 876,00	-	-	1 926 876,00
Ramarumo Family (full and final settlement)	1	-	3 759 211,00	-	-	3 759 211,00
Monareng Family claim – Onverwacht 501 KT (full and final settlement) – KRP 10972	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Madlopo Family land claim (full and final settlement) – KRP 80 and 2038	2	-	544 393,22	-	-	544 393,22
Radebe Family land claim: Phase 2 and final – KRP 671	1	-	334 370,37	-	-	334 370,37
Mahlangu Family claim (full and final settlement) – alternative land – KRP 11723	1	1 774 570,00	0,00	-	-	1 774 570,00
Machitele and Maunya families' claim – Welgevonden 465 KT (full and final settlement) – KRP 6590 and 9543	2	-	642 292,00	-	-	642 292,00
Seluma Family land claim (full and final settlement) – KRP 1369	1	-	762 422,60	-	-	762 422,60

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Solatum (R)	Total award cost (R)
Kabini Family land claim (full and final settlement) – KRP 548	1	-	1 712 327,25	-	-	1 712 327,25
Msibi Family: Phase 2 (full and final settlement) – KRP 9119	1	-	544 933,33	-	-	544 933,33
Joubert Family claim (full and final settlement) – KRP 6183	1	-	212 487,89	-	-	212 487,89
Maila Family claim: Phase 2 (full and final settlement) – KRP 344	1	-	4 737 864,08	-	-	4 737 864,08
Aboobaker Family (full and final settlement) – KRP 12165	1	-	1 003 050,78	-	-	1 003 050,78
Manana Family land claim (full and final settlement) – KRP 9351	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Phakathi Family land claim (full and final settlement) – KRP 2039	1	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Sibanyoni Family (full and final settlement) – KRP 1360	1	-	434 272,28	-	-	434 272,28
Masango Family land claim (full and final settlement) – KRP 11435	1	-	642 292,00	-	-	642 292,00
Moreipuso Community (full and final settlement) – KRP 9366	1	-	0,00	-	-	0,00
Total	43	5 110 570,00	39 896 604,21	-	-	45 007 174,21
NORTHERN CAPE						
Van Wyk Family land claim	1	-	8 743 333,33	-	-	8 743 333,33
Farm Zwartkop No. 341 (Piet and Elizabeth Reun Family)	1	-	3 041 285,71	-	-	3 041 285,71
Total	2	-	11 784 619,04	-	-	11 784 619,04
NORTH WEST						
Botha Family	1	-	1 420 208,42	-	-	1 420 208,42
Bakgatla Ba Kgafela Community land claim – Amendment	10	-	10 723 433,50	10 723 433,50	-	21 446 867,00
Total	11	-	12 143 641,92	10 723 433,50	-	22 867 075,42
WESTERN CAPE						
Bessick Family (ownership) (urban claim)	1	-	40 143,75	-	-	40 143,75
Rix Family (urban claim) –R107	1	-	1 020 947,37	-	-	1 020 947,37
Mdala Family claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Greef Family land claim	1	2 000,00	-	-	-	2 000,00
Vallie Family claim	1	100 000,00	-	-	-	100 000,00

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Solatium (R)	Total award cost (R)
Petersen Family (urban claim) – P302	1	-	1 571 360,00	-	-	1 571 360,00
Andreas Family (urban claim) – M4060	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Parker Family (urban claim) – P506	1	-	922 625,00	-	-	922 625,00
District Six Development claims (urban) – Phase 8	3	-	-	-	-	0,00
Kula land claim (urban claim)	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Fakier Family land claim	1	-	-	-	-	0,00
Estate Late Omar Latooe land claim – L47	1	5 400,00	-	-	-	5 400,00
Cloete Family claim – C444	1	-	283 470,59	-	-	283 470,59
Celestine Maslamoney Family claim – M1491	1	-	3 481 859,20	-	-	3 481 859,20
The Late Alfred Kistnasamy – C60	1	-	1 065 894,74	-	-	1 065 894,74
Dorman, Kramer and Robinson families (urban claim)	1	-	965 202,67	-	-	965 202,67
Van Harte Family claim (urban) – V231	1	-	1 855 684,21	-	-	1 855 684,21
Jezile Family claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Alexander Family (urban claim)	1	-	793 000,00	-	-	793 000,00
Estate of the Late Stephen David Abraham Martin Claim (urban claim)	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Estate Late Frank Marinus Family land claim	2	-	-	-	-	0,00
Petersen Family claim (urban) – S722	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
St. Stephen Parish (Paarl) – R112	1	-	976 000,00	-	-	976 000,00
Stockenstrom Uniting Reformed Church and Friemersheim Tenant Community (LCC85/2017) – S35	2	-	2 500 000,00	-	-	2 500 000,00
Tahier Family (1) (urban claim) – P30	1	-	4 778 333,33	-	-	4 778 333,33
Parenzee, Appollis, Meyer and Paulsen families (1) (urban claim)	1	-	333 193,18	-	-	333 193,18
Miller Family claim (urban) – M341	1	-	498 166,67	-	-	498 166,67
April Family individual claim (Kraaibosh individual claims Batch 5)	1	-	115 459,64	-	-	115 459,64

Claim (Project)	Number of claims settled	Land cost (R)	Financial compensation (R)	Grants (R)	Solatum (R)	Total award cost (R)
Estate of the Late Johannes Jantjies claim	1	-	160 573,00	-	-	160 573,00
Winston Coleridge Layne Family claim – D642	1	-	516 281,82	-	-	516 281,82
Parker Family (1) urban claim	1	-	597 739,67	-	-	597 739,67
Swart Family Land Claim	1	-	80 286,50	-	-	80 286,50
Parker Family (1) (urban claim)	1	-	174 866,67	-	-	174 866,67
The Estate of the Late Dorothy Kriel (urban claim)	1	-	229 647,06	-	-	229 647,06
District Six (two tenants) Batch 25 claims	2	-	321 146,00	-	-	321 146,00
Phase 2 of Constantia Development claims concerning matter of Solomon Family claim – S85	1	-	-	-	-	0,00
Total	41	107 400,00	24 245 319,07	-	-	24 352 719,07

Table 20: List of claims finalised

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
EASTERN CAPE					
Sikotoyi Family claim	2016/08/18	1	7	Rural	31 881,10
Sifumba Family claim	2020/03/20	1	15	Rural	20 071,63
Amatshatshu Community	2021/06/29	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Tsomo Mission Community (Erf 465 Mkwinti Location)	2021/06/29	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Qayi land claim	2021/06/29	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Card Family	2021/06/29	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Xhokonxa land claim	2021/06/29	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Manintshana Family	2021/07/14	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Swartbooi, Roberts, Potgieter and Tamboer/ Ngcayisa Family claims (four Hankey individual family claims)	2019/01/22	1	12	Urban	6 163,72
Dick Family land claim	2017/12/18	1	35	Rural	124 188,26
Dubana Community claim	2021/11/08	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Arends Family claim	2021/11/08	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Hyde Family claim	2021/11/08	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Tobo Family claim	2020/11/16	1	17	Rural	321 146,00
Adams Family claim	2018/06/15	1	11	Rural	35 321,92
Sodlala Family claim	2020/12/14	1	8	Urban	13 381,09
Waterford Group claim: M Allah	2014/12/22	1	4	Rural	7 432,47

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Ngubane Family claim	2020/03/10	1	18	Rural	20 874,49
Waterford Group claim: NB Luzwana	2014/12/22	1	7	Rural	7 432,47
Booyesen Family claim	2017/09/29	1	13	Rural	12 768,24
Williams/Groepe Family claim	2018/02/13	1	23	Rural	9 258,17
Malgas Family land claim	2018/09/30	1	7	Rural	111 945,30
Sobhuza Family claim	2021/02/23	1	28	Rural	6 524,88
Mabhongo Family claim	2021/02/23	1	37	Rural	238,95
Amagwall Tribe land claim	2021/06/29	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Mpaphla Family land claim	2021/06/29	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Thwasha Family land claim	2021/09/30	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Holy Cross Parish claim	2021/12/06	1	1	Urban	20 746 528,65
Lee (Harmse) Family claim	2021/12/04	1	6	Urban	894 271,63
Thwaku Family	2022/02/23	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Bosman Family	2022/02/23	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Zola Dryfus Jonas Family claim	2022/02/23	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Dekker Family	2022/01/06	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Juries Family claim	2021/09/21	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Gower Family claim	2021/09/21	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Manqola Family claim	2021/09/21	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Ms BN Sipamla on behalf of Anta Family	2021/09/21	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Bukwana Family claim	2021/09/21	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
Mrs Monica Francis Boucher on behalf of the Rawlans and Bekker families	2021/09/21	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
North and South End Group claim (4)	2018/07/26	4	51	Urban	16 183,03
Maye Family claim	2020/11/16	1	10	Urban	398 045,33
Liwani Family land claim	2020/03/31	1	4	Rural	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Makhetha Family claim	2021/12/05	1	10	Rural	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Wicks Family claim	2021/12/21	1	7	Rural	4 474 621,11
Yeza Family claim	2022/03/22	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Kenneth Edmund Prince Family claim	2022/03/24	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Simanga Family land claim	2022/02/28	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Ndyebo Farming Association land claim	2022/02/28	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Walsh Family land claim	2022/03/22	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Du Randt Family land claim	2021/12/21	1	1	Rural	481 719,00
Total		53	332		27 739 997,44

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
FREE STATE					
Farm Hetloo No. 178 land claim (Matjeka Family)	2020/06/24	1	218	Rural	403 600,00
Marabastad	2006/10/23	2	1	Urban	32 000,00
Total		3	219		435 600,00
GAUTENG					
Ellison & Steynberg	2000/07/07	1	1	Rural	Transfer of state land
Benoni Location land claims	2003/10/01	15	15	Urban	Claims finalised through a declaration of funds
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	2021/03/05	1	10	Urban	1 030 474,48
Portion 26 of the farm Vlakfontein 453 JR: Masombuka Family	2021/03/05	1	8	Rural	155 213,90
Kliptown (Klipriviersoog)	2004-02-19 2020-09-10	1	1	Urban	95 227,00
Erf 1074 Regent Street, Yeoville IT – Williams Family	2021/06/03	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Bantule	2004/07/21	1	1	Urban	3 333,33
Meyerton land claim	2021/03/27	1	1	Urban	6 666,67
Meyerton land claim	2021/03/27	1	1	Urban	15 000,00
Meyerton land claim	2021/03/27	1	1	Urban	3 750,00
Meyerton land claim	2021/03/27	1	1	Urban	6 666,67
Meyerton land claim	2021/03/27	1	1	Urban	2 500,00
Meyerton land claim	2021/03/27	1	1	Urban	30 000,00
Portions 5 and 6 of Erf 581 and portion of Loskop Street, Newlands JR Pretoria (formerly known as remaining portion of Lot 12 Paul Street, Newlands) – Moses Family	2021/06/29	1	1	Urban	678 642,41
Portion 121 of Leeuwfontein 299 JR: Serithi Family	2021/06/28	1	39	Rural	650 510,65
Portion 2 of the farm Boschkop 543 JR – Sibiya Family	2021/06/29	1	26	Rural	963 438,00

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Portions 606 (now County View Extension 3) of the farm Randjesfontein 405 JR and Erf 130 County View Township and the former portions 271 (now Kosmosdal Extension 13), 366 (now Kosmosdal Extension 75) and 371 (a portion of Portion 252) (now Kosmosdal Extension 74) of the farm Olievenhoutbosch 389 JR – Mthethwa Family	2021/07/17	1	35	Rural	737 499,90
Eastern Native Township Claims: Lot 624 Zondani Street	2003/07/31	1	1	Urban	4 166,68
Meyerton land claim: Lot 369 7th Street	2021/03/27	1	1	Urban	2 224,00
Portions 10 and 68 of the farm Tweefontein 413 JR – Singuana Family	2022/02/06	1	1	Rural	443 234,97
Portion 14 and 15 of the farm Trigaardspoot 451 JR – Maphosa Family	2021/09/26	1	26	Rural	38 428,59
Portion 9 of the farm Tweefontein 541 JR – Mahlangu Family	2022/02/06	1	7	Rural	1 089 128,56
Portion 0 (remaining extent) of the farm Hartebeestfontein 441 JR and Portion 0 (remaining extent) of the farm Wolvengat 442 JR – Ntuli Family	2021/09/26	1	44	Rural	1 814 747,35
Dukathole/Alberton – Mr Rasia Paulus Mpsa	2022/03/22	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Portion 12 of the farm Witfontein 510 JR – Mabena Family	2021/03/05	1	7	Rural	764 533,40
Tweefonteing 413 JR (Gcukumeni Family)	2021/05/06	1	1	Rural	Non-compliant
Portion 6 of the farm Stinkwater 97 JR (Deane Family)	2021/05/06	1	1	Rural	Non-compliant
Lot 43 1st Street Meyerton	2004/04/20	1	3	Urban	15 000,00
Lots 6 and 10, Mkhize Street, Edenvale	2004/07/21	2	1	Urban	40 000,00
Lot 90 and 100 Malepa Street Madubulaville, Randfontein	2004/05/25	1	1	Urban	31 340,00
Lot 21 Racecourse Kliptown	2004-02-19 2020-09-10	1	1	Urban	761 280,00

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Lot 204 Riverside	2004/06/03	1	1	Urban	6 260,95
Lot 206 Asiatic Bazaar (I1087)	2004/04/20	1	1	Urban	38 200,00
Lot No. 537 (217), 690 (310) and 558 (238) Pageview	2001/05/28	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 537 (217), 690 (310) and 558 (238) Pageview	2001/05/28	1	-	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 414 (94) and 334 (28) Pageview	2001/05/28	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot 414 (94) and 334 (28) Pageview	2001/05/28	1	-	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 423, 463 (143), 469 (149) and 605 (285) Pageview	2001/05/28	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 60 (380) and 436 (116) Pageview	2001/05/28	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 332 (14), 414 (94), 640 (320) and 599 (279) Pageview	2001/05/28	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 423, 463 (143), 469 (149) and 605 (285) Pageview	2001/05/28	1	-	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No.174 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No.1/4 share of 115 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 229 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 49 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 116 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Half share of Lot No. 4 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Remaining extent of Lot 143 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 97 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 43 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 8 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 43 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 42 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Lot No. 93 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 225 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No.135 Eastwood	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Remaining extent of Lot No. 118 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Half share of Lot No.76 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 35 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 76 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Portion 1 of Lot No. 71 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Remaining extent of Lot No. 56 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 156 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 219 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 160 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Half share of Lot No. 42 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Remaining Extent of Lot No. 30 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Lot No. 154 Eastwood Township	2001/06/06	1	1	Urban	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Portion 4 (remaining extent) of the farm Knoppiesfontein 549 JR – Mashiane Family	2022/02/02	1	1	Rural	Non-compliant
Schietpoort 507 JR – Nduli Family	2022/02/09	1	1	Rural	Non-compliant
Portion 293 (a portion of Portion 292) of the farm Derdepoort 326 JT (now described as Eersterust Township Ext 6) – Mngomezulu Family	2021/06/29	1	17	Rural	26 762,17
Total		86	293		9 454 229,68

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
KWAZULU-NATAL					
Bobat Family	2020/09/10	1	8	Urban	355 833,33
Bluff, Isipingo, Riet River, Tongaat and Westville: Chetty Family	2006/01/17	1	1	Urban	50 000,00
Remainder of Erf 928 and Sub 1 of Erf 928: [Pathmanathan Runganthan Naidoo] – Naidoo Family	2007-01-31 2021-04-09	1	1	Urban	1 407 664,70
Ensengeni Community claim	2019/11/21	1	171	Rural	244 211,95
Juluku Family land claim	2021/02/23	1	79	Rural	580 000,00
Two batched Cato Manor tenants – Mthembu ME	2019/10/22	1	42	Urban	160 573,00
Poobalan Padayachee	2021/02/26	1	16	Urban	813 333,33
Mr Msikelwa Henry Msimangao (Platt Estate No. 17608)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
MR RW Pleydell-Bouverie (Farm Alkerton No. 10921 and Farm Longford No. 8890)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Ms Raleie Natalie Sesebi (Kwamadundube – Prospect Farm, Lower Tugela)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Dr John Moshesh (Hillside Farm)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Ms Sybel Nonhlanhla Nxumalo (Lots 10 and 14 of A of Johnstown No. 8799)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Dr FT Mdlalose (Sub 1 of Kliprand 8627 and Sub 2 of Kromdraai 8626)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Ms Sibongile Olga Kunene (Lot 1 of the farm Kopij Alleen No. 8816)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr MC Cele (Mpunzi Drift Location 3)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr NG Bircher and DB Bircher (Lot 2 of Umtamvuna Drift No. 3830, Lot 3 of Umtamvuna Drift No. 14059, Delhi No. 13017, remainder of Gun Drift No. 10956, Farm Webster's Drft No. 14059 and Portion F1 No. 6305 of the farm Agra No. 13018)	2021/08/26	2	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr RW Bester and G Masson (Lot 6 North Barrow No. 10533)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr Velile Victor Ngubelanga (Kwamachi Administration, Nhlokoyenkomo Ward)	2021/08/26	1	-	N/A	Non-compliant
MR RHO Williams – sub 4 (a Sub of 4) of the farm Pleyel No. 10469	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Mr Dahl (Lot 3 of Farm Wartle)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Nomathemba Xaba (Umvoti Mission/Groutville)	2021/08/26	2	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr SOP Mbambo (Groutville Mission Reserve – Lower Tugela)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Chinsamy Govender on behalf of Muniamma Govender (Sub 24 of Lot EE of the farm Melkhout Kraal)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr Dlowakhe Ngcobo (Umsinsini Farm, Umzumbe)	2021/08/26	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Entembeni Zulu Royal House Community (Final Phase) – S35	2019/11/20	1	287	Rural	891 729,10
Chetty Family land claim	2021/09/26	1	1	Rural	2 042 377,60
Ramnanan Family land claim	2021/09/30	1	1	Rural	1 168 732,58
Ramsoomar Family	2021/08/18	1	16	Urban	466 614,12
Padayachee Family	2021/08/18	4	12	Urban	7 117 064,09
Alijahn, Ebrahim and Alli Hoosen land claim	2020/12/14	2	21	Urban	156 611,64
Three batched Cato Manor tenants: Mfunanfuthi Petrobus Sibiya	2020/12/11	1	7	Urban	45 878,00
Ngcobo Family land claim	2019/10/20	1	17	Urban	81 379,06
Mr Alec Brownley Stuart (different properties)	2022/02/23	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr G Chetty (Sub (a road) of 32 A of 2 of Zeekoe Valle)	2022/02/23	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr D Ramjathan (Rem of Sub A of 3 of B of 34 of Lot 18A No. 1542)	2022/02/23	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr Yunus Essop Moosa (Sum 318 or Piesang)	2022/02/23	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Dr Sathyapual Jhilmeet (Residenc: Msinga District)	2022/02/23	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
R Goodahi (Springvale situated under eThekweni District Municipality)	2022/02/23	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr CP Minnaar: The Land Service Movement (RS Skinner Campsite on the Cedara Agricultural College Farm)	2022/02/23	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Van Wyk and Louw (application to use Hilder Farm 2046)	2022/02/23	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Amawushe Community land claim (C/O Chief Zwelidumile Bly)	2022/02/23	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Jongilizwe Tribal Authority land claim (C/O Nombulelo Ngwadla)	2022/02/23	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Ms C Malamba (Lot 8 of the farm Shakaskraal No. 865)	2022/02/23	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr ES Kharwa (Droogsrpuit Farm Bo. 4935, County of Weenen)	2022/02/23	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr Mabuzen Zwane (Farm Doornkraal, Klipriver 1137, Subdivision Riddel)	2022/02/23	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr Jaikharan Emichand (Subs of Farm Joan No. 9220, Hibberdene)	2022/02/23	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr Mthunzi Robinson Manzi	2022/02/23	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Inkosi GS Zondi	2022/02/22	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr Justice Phumelele Sosibi	2022/02/22	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr Cullen Perry Knox Gore (The National Marine, Lot 2211, Lot 201, Lot 2102, Uvongo)	2022/02/22	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr NM Heymans (Sub 3 of Tempe 2129)	2022/02/22	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr Peter Gallagher/ Attorney Neil Bowles (Maphendleni Tweefontein)	2022/02/22	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr Bhekabambo Mkhize (Emkhovini, Qadini, Kwatshobho)	2022/02/22	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr SM Ngcobo (Esidumbini, Nkunbanyuswa)	2022/02/22	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
MR NRV Sihawu (Erf 2144, Kokstad)	2022/02/22	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr AKM Vadwa (Sub 76 of Lot K of the farm Cato Mano No. 812)	2022/02/22	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Nkabinde Family claim	2021/06/28	1	9	Rural	1 605 730,00
Hansa Family claim	2021/11/15	1	15	Urban	1 287 777,78
Reddy Family land claim	2021/08/18	1	10	Rural	521 011,76
Zwane Family claim	2021/07/17	1	7	Rural	607 129,41
Khosi Victoria Zwane on behalf of the Zwane Family land claim	2021/07/17	1	11	Rural	160 573,00
Dlamini Family claim	2021/06/29	1	20	Rural	45 878,00
Lalbahadoor Family land claim	2021/09/26	1	3	Urban	288 709,41
Bhejane Community land claim	2018/06/15	1	282	Rural	73 964,90
Vahed Family land claim	2021/07/17	1	12	Urban	2 372 222,22
Total		71	1 049		22 544 998,98

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
LIMPOPO					
Moopong Mmanyakane land claim	2021/01/23	1	7	Rural	321 146,00
Tshikonelo Community	2019/03/19	2	261	Rural	221 894,00
Hendriksplaats individual land claims	2021/01/23	2	20	Rural	642 292,00
Kabini Jaftha and Ndebele Tribal Authority Community land claim (Phase 1)	2020/11/16	1	150	Rural	4 040 000,00
Ontevreden individual land claims	2021/01/23	50	404	Rural	16 581 838,45
Ontevreden individual land claims	2021/01/23	15	-	Rural	4 817 190,00
Mahlangu Sanyana John land claim	2020/09/30	1	8	Rural	321 146,00
Nthite Family	2020/10/30	1	24	Rural	321 146,00
Muzilela Ronny Mboweni Family	2017/12/18	1	7	Rural	31 699,14
Ontevreden individual land claims	2021/01/23	8	-	Rural	3 470 160,96
Ontevreden individual land claims	2021/01/23	7	-	Rural	3 959 016,51
Ga Pamosa Community land claim	2020/10/29	1	153	Rural	640 000,00
Ndlovu Nyanisi land claim	2021/06/28	1	5	Rural	321 146,00
Mathale Makgopo Rachel	2021/06/28	1	8	Rural	642 292,00
Ontevreden individual land claims	2021/01/23	2	-	Rural	1 364 870,49
Marumbe Mahlangu land claim	2021/08/21	1	3	Rural	321 146,00
Total		95	1 050		38 016 983,55
MPUMALANGA					
Zwane Family land claim (Portion 100 Witbank 262 IT)	2020/06/24	1	40	Rural	21 409,75
Mabuza Family (Portion 5 Balstrana 339 IT)	2015/04/08	1	70	Rural	Transfer of state land
Mrs Fanezile Sarah Matshiane on behalf of the Matshiane Family – Portion 1 Driefontein 372 JS	2021/03/04	1	8	Rural	727 861,61
Mbonani Family claim (Portion 2 of Leeuwkloof 235 JS)	2020/12/11	1	26	Rural	4 865,84
Mona family claim – Portion 5 of the farm Evert 5 JU	2021/03/04	1	7	Rural	321 146,00
Amanzimnyama residents land claim (remaining extent of Portion 4 and remaining extent of Portion 6 of the farm Nomandie 178 HT)	2018/09/11	1	279	Rural	1 070 000,00

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Mr Sonnyboy Paulus Msiza in his capacity of the original dispossessed person (Phase 2 settlement) Portion 22 and 23 of the farm Keerom 374 JS	2021/03/26	1	9	Rural	1 568 571,43
Mnguni Family (Deelkraal)	2021/06/03	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Monoge family claim – Rietfontein 375 KT	2019/10/20	1	18	Rural	35 683,20
Zondo Family land claim	2019/01/31	1	20	Rural	8 875,76
Themba Family claim – Weltevreden 229 JU	2021/03/05	1	14	Rural	13 381,08
Mr Saul Gordon/ Peter Jaftha (Portion 15 of Uitvlugt 380 JS)	2021/11/19	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mr Matusu Joseph Mthombeni (Portion 24 of De Suikerboschkop 361 JS)	2021/11/18	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Ms Ndeisi Sarah Thubane	2021/08/21	1	21	Rural	370 737,86
Ngobe Pomo Frank (Farm No. 73 JU)	2021/08/18	1	1	Rural	321 146,00
Lukhele family (Farm No. 73 JU)	2021/08/18	1	3	Rural	321 146,00
Bembe family – Ms Elsie Sibongile Mahlangu, Portion 2 (remaining extent) of Witbank 82 IT	2021/12/07	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mashilwane Family – Ms Mpumi Christinah Mashilwane, Portion 2 (Remaining Extent) of Witbank 82 IT	2021/12/07	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Magagula Family – Mr Sakhile Phineas Magagula, Portion 2 (remaining extent) of Witbank 82 IT	2021/12/07	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Sikhosana family – Mr Themba Petrus Mahlangu, Portion 2 (remaining extent) of Witbank 82 IT	2021/12/07	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Nkambule Family – Mr Mpostoli Samuel Nkambule, Portion 2 (remaining extent) of Witbank 82 IT	2021/12/07	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Kumalo Family – Mr Ndomane Elias Kumalo, Portion 2 (remaining extent) of Witbank 82 IT	2021/12/07	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mashiloane Family – Mr Jan Mashiloane, Portion 2 (remaining extent) of Witbank 82 IT	2021/12/07	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Nkabinde Family claim (full and final settlement) – KRP 10899	2019/03/29	1	16	Rural	10 632,43
Malinga Family land claim	2019/03/29	2	53	Rural	946,55
Masuku Family land claim (full and final settlement)	2019/05/21	1	26	Rural	Claim finalised through a declaration of funds
Mkhatshwa, Mdhluli, Mapanga, Mthethwa and Mhlongo families' land claim	2021/09/26	3	42	Rural	963 438,00
Shai Family claim – remaining extent of the farm Zoeknog 500 KT	2021/12/04	1	1	Rural	321 146,00
Ms Nomoya Emma Mthimunye (Mthimunye Family land claim) – Farm 202 Bronkhorstspuit	2021/11/18	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Ntlatleng Family land claim	2022/01/06	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mnguni Family land claim	2021/12/06	1	20	Rural	3 241 944,43
Madlopo Family land claim	2021/12/21	2	1	Rural	544 393,22
Masimula Family land claim	2021/06/29	1	100	Rural	19 151,15
Monareng Family claim	2021/12/21	1	5	Rural	321 146,00
Radebe Family land claim	2021/12/21	1	7	Rural	334 370,37
Ramarumo Family	2021/12/21	1	84	Rural	3 759 211,00
Mokoena Family claim	2021/12/04	1	8	Rural	963 438,00
Machitele and Maunya families	2021/12/21	1	14	Rural	321 146,00
Mkhatshwa, Mdhluli, Mapanga, Mthethwa and Mhlongo families' land claim	2021/09/26	1	-	Rural	321 146,00
Total		43	893		15 906 933,68
NORTH WEST					
Bakgatla Ba Kgafela Community (Batch 2) – Buffelshoek 53 JQ	2017/09/29	6	-	Rural	Transfer of state land
Stand No.1 Makweteng Old Location, Schweizer Reneke	2004/06/03	1	2	Urban	18 266,00
Stand No. 1 Makweteng Old Location, Schweizer Reneke	2004/06/03	1	1	Urban	4 566,67
Legonyane Community (Elandsfontein 180 JQ)	2018/09/19	1	-	Rural	1 331 364,00
Botha Family	2021/07/16	1	1	Urban	1 420 208,42
Lot No. 136 C Street Makweteng, Lichtenburg	2004/05/25	1	7	Urban	105 000,00
Lichtenburg urban claims: Lot No. 175 D Street, Makwateng	2004/05/25	1	1	Urban	15 000,00
Mooke Community (portions 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 29, 32, 33, 36, 37 and 42 of Blokspruit 158 JQ)	2008/01/08	4	336	Rural	Transfer of state land

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Vryburg: Erf 420 Ferris Street	2004/05/25	1	1	Urban	47 330,00
Sefanyetso Family claim	2019/11/21	1	16	Rural	1964,38
Baphiring Community (Phase 5)	2020/02/13	1	291	Rural	Transfer of state land
Total		19	656		2 943 699,47
NORTHERN CAPE					
Mr PG De Wet (Farm Wortel No. 54)	2020/05/06	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Ms Olga Moira Samuels (42 farms of gold and diamond fields)	2021/06/30	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Ms S M Loots (Portion 1 of the farm March Bo. 54 also known as the farm Seldsaam)	2021/11/09	1	1	Rural	Non-compliant
JH Loots (Farm Ruthvern 51/1 and Farm Peryn No. 52)	2022/01/19	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Vaalharts Community claim	2022/02/28	2	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Vaalharts Community claim	2022/02/28	4	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Mrs Anna Damoense (Erf 95, 106, 107 and 108 Longlands)	2022/03/15	1	-	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr Albert David Farmer (Langeberg No. 21)	2022/03/15	1	-	Rural	Non-compliant
Farm Zwartkop No. 341 (Piet and Elizabeth Reun Family)	2021/12/21	1	11	Rural	3 041 285,71
Van Wyk Family land claim	2021/12/04	1	148	Rural	8 743 333,33
Total		14	160		11 784 619,04
WESTERN CAPE					
De Freitas Family claim	2017/05/23	1	11	Urban	Transfer of state land
The Hanief Family individual claim	2013/02/27	1	8	Urban	Transfer of state land
Bailey Family claim	2020/10/30	1	4	Urban	41 746,88
Protea Village Community claim (Batch 2)	2006/07/18	1	344	Urban	Transfer of state land
Carolessen Family	2020/08/21	1	8	Urban	160 573,00
The Estate of the Late Hassan Ahmed Parker land claim	2021/02/26	1	1	Urban	312 783,60
Ismail Family land claim	2021/01/23	1	4	Urban	160 573,00
Nederduitse Gereformeerde Sendinggemeente Grabouw Church	2020/02/28	1	1	Urban	481 719,00
Steurhof Group Claims: DG Sassman	2006/11/21	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
The Independent Church of Oudtshoorn	2020/02/28	1	1	Urban	4 434 622,17
Rix Family claim	2020/09/30	1	1	Urban	1 156 560,00

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Welcome Estate 4 Development Group Claim: MH Sunday	2012/03/09	1	6	Urban	Transfer of state land
Steurhof Group Claims: Caesar Family	2006/11/21	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
African Methodist Episcopal Church	2021/02/25	1	1	Urban	481 719,00
Maqoko Family land claim	2021/03/08	1	1	Urban	160 573,00
Sesoai Family land claim	2020/02/13	1	1	Urban	Transfer of state land
Adriaanse and Canterbury families	2021/03/27	1	6	Urban	355 617,02
Brown Family claim	2020/10/14	1	7	Urban	Transfer of state land
Isaacs Family claim	2019/09/11	1	5	Urban	Transfer of state land
Appolis Family claim	2020/10/14	1	35	Urban	Transfer of state land
Booley Family claim	2013/11/13	1	3	Urban	15 054,00
Hendricks Family claim	2021/02/26	1	6	Urban	1 459 514,98
Tiwani Family claim	2019/03/06	1	4	Urban	160 573,00
Allie Family land claim	2021/03/24	1	6	Urban	Transfer of state land
Lena Cameron Family claim	2018/03/13	1	9	Urban	12 327,44
Estate of the Late John Carruthers Jansen claim	2021/01/23	1	1	Urban	183 000,00
Daries Family land claim	2020/06/24	1	1	Urban	160 573,00
Mrs Gadija Osman (Osman Family) – Erf 79366, Diep River	2021/06/29	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr G Gideon (Gideon Family) – Erven 2354, 2355 and 2357, Grassy Park	2021/06/29	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr J Bullet Family Claim (1074 Corner of 3rd Avenue and Hopefield Chatsworth, Malmesbury	2022/01/06	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
MF Gassiep (Gassiep Family) – 69 Surrey Street, Claremont	2022/01/06	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mdala Family claim	2021/07/16	1	1	Urban	160 573,00
African Methodist Episcopal Church	2019/10/22	1	1	Urban	5 058 520,00
Lukas Family claim	2011/12/11	1	18	Urban	Transfer of state land
Mr IT Gihwala (Erven 6706, 6869, 8792, 8796, 6814, 6899, 6907 and 6879 District Six)	2021/09/01	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Jaftha Saaiman (Solomons) claim	2021/03/27	1	1	Urban	863 595,51
Pinto Family land claim	2021/03/27	1	12	Urban	1 024 061,89
Raban Family (ownership)	2021/03/27	1	10	Urban	160 573,00
Late William Peter Johnson Family claim	2021/03/27	1	10	Urban	160 573,00

Name of project/claim	Approval date	No of claims finalised	No of beneficiaries finalised	Type of claim	Expenditure on finalised claims (R)
Rix Family claim	2021/07/16	1	1	Urban	1 020 947,37
Ms Arshadiya Abdullah/ Davids Family claim	2021/11/09	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr Ebrahim van der Fort (Strand/ Hudson Street, Strand)	2022/02/04	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Andreas Family	2021/09/30	1	4	Urban	160 573,00
Bessick Family	2021/06/29	1	8	Urban	40 143,75
Celestine Maslamoney Family claim	2021/11/15	1	1	Urban	3 481 859,00
Kula land claim	2021/09/30	1	7	Urban	160 573,00
Sharbaan Solomon (1 and 2 Cole Point Road, Simon's Town 1100 1118)	2022/02/23	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Ms Anne Lorraine Van Wyk (Carlton through to Hamptead Roads, Claremont Erf 53698)	2022/02/23	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr A Achmat (Bordering Drapper, Fir and Hemlock Streets, Claremont Erf 58221)	2022/02/23	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr SHM Allie (55-56 Lansdowne Road, Claremont Erf 52882)	2022/02/23	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr Johaar Salie Shabodien (Simon's Town)	2022/02/23	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mrs WS Lawrence (200 Goodwood Street and 2021 Beaufort Street, Goodwood)	2022/02/28	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Messrs Y Abdullatief and MP Davids (38 Stegman Road, Claremont)	2022/02/28	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr C Esau (Ayeshire Street, Rondebosch)	2022/02/28	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr G Jansen (Adelaide c/o Staines Road, Plumstead)	2022/02/28	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr D Witbooi (Rural Bufferstrook presently Jakarandastraat)	2022/02/28	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr E Boswell (139 Paarl Street, Vasco/ Goodwood, 7490)	2022/02/28	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Mr Nazeem Taliep (Zonnerstrall Cor, Alphen Hill and Constantia Road, Constantia)	2022/03/22	1	1	Urban	Non-compliant
Total		58	570		22 029 521,61

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

Toll free contact number: 0800 007 095

RP245/2022

ISBN: 978-0-621-50557-3

ISBN 978-0-621-50557-3



9

780621

505573