

**Municipal commonage administration in the Free
State province: Can municipalities in the current
local government dispensation promote
emerging farming?**

By

Ntobeko Buso

HSRC

October 2003

Table of contents

| | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 1. | Purpose of research | 2 |
| 2. | Scope of research | 2 |
| 3. | Types of departmental policies and beneficiaries | 3 |
| 4. | Salient features of municipal commonage | 4 |
| | 4.1. Camps and sizes..... | 4 |
| | 4.2. Cadastral positions..... | 7 |
| | 4.3. Acquisition of commonage..... | 7 |
| | 4.4. Beneficiary groups..... | 11 |
| | 4.5. Commonage use by commercial farmers..... | 13 |
| | 4.6. Types of stock grazing on commonage..... | 13 |
| | 4.7. Infrastructure on the commonage..... | 13 |
| | 4.8. Condition of infrastructure and responsibility for repairs..... | 15 |
| 5. | Municipal management | 19 |
| | 5.1. Organising beneficiaries..... | 19 |
| | 5.2. Gaining access to land..... | 19 |
| | 5.3. Contracts..... | 20 |
| | 5.4. Supervision of commonages..... | 22 |
| | 5.5. Reporting by users to the municipality..... | 25 |
| | 5.6. Deficient consideration by municipal councils..... | 27 |
| | 5.7. Financial management..... | 30 |
| | 5.8. Payment rate and revenue collection..... | 33 |
| 6. | Support Systems | 40 |
| | 6.1. Technical or financial assistance from external agencies (government departments, NGO's, farmers, etc.)..... | 40 |
| | 6.2. Department of Local Government and Housing..... | 42 |
| | 6.3. Department of Land Affairs..... | 42 |
| | 6.4. Department of Agriculture..... | 43 |
| | 6.5. Commercial farmers as mentors..... | 45 |
| | 6.6. Interdepartmental co-operation..... | 46 |
| 7. | Commonage and Development | 46 |
| | 7.1. Using IDPs to boost commonage..... | 46 |
| | 7.2. Using commonage to boost LED..... | 49 |
| | 7.3. Sustainable environmental management..... | 52 |
| 8. | In-depth interviews and site visits: Case studies | 57 |
| | 8.1. Case study No. 1: Mantsopa Municipality..... | 57 |
| | (a) Usage of municipal commonage in Ladybrand..... | 57 |
| | (b) Usage of municipal commonage in Hobhouse..... | 59 |
| | 8.2. Case study No. 2: Tswelopele Municipality..... | 59 |
| | (a) Usage of municipal commonage in Bultfontein..... | 60 |
| | (b) Usage of municipal commonage in Hoopstad..... | 62 |
| | 8.3. Case study No. 3: Kopanong Municipality..... | 62 |
| | (a) Usage of municipal commonage in Trompsburg..... | 63 |
| | (b) Usage of municipal commonage in Edenburg..... | 64 |
| | (c) Usage of municipal commonage in Reddersburg..... | 64 |
| | (d) Usage of municipal commonage in Philippolis..... | 65 |
| | (e) Challenges facing emerging farmers..... | 66 |
| 9. | Conclusion | 69 |
| 10. | Names of interviewees | 71 |
| | 10.1. Municipal officials interviewed telephonically..... | 71 |
| | 10.2. Municipal officials and commonage users interviewed during site visits..... | 71 |

1. Purpose of research

The primary purpose of doing the research concerned was to establish whether municipalities in the current local government dispensation in the Free State are able to utilise commonage land to promote emerging farmers so effectively that they become viable commercial farmers. The secondary purpose of the study is to outline how, in the event of emerging farmers on municipal commonage becoming successful commercial farmers, the concept would form part of formulating a formal policy for local economic development (LED).

2. Scope of research

Since land reform is a key priority of government policy, municipalities have been restructured to play a developmental role by making land available to communities in order to practise farming in such a way that they eventually become commercial farmers. Municipalities in the Free State own land that has been part of the towns since their inception, while there is also land that has been bought by the Department of Labour (DLA) for municipalities to distribute to emerging farmers. Thus the ultimate aim of making commonage land available to emerging farmers is to create for them a stepping-stone towards becoming fully-fledged commercial farmers.

The research therefore focussed on municipal commonage administration in the 20 local municipalities in the Free State i.e. those of Letsemeng, Metsimaholo, Phumelela, Tswelopele, Mluti-a-Phofung, Mohokare, Mangaung, Mantsopa, Dihlabeng, Moqhaka, Kopanong, Naledi, Masilonyana, Ngwathe, Nala, Mafube, Matjhabeng, Tokologo, Setsoto and Nketoana. Three of these were chosen for in-depth interviews and site visits, viz. Kopanong, Tswelopele and Mantsopa municipalities.

A key element of the research was to assess the effectiveness of municipal commonage administration in the Free State and more specifically to ascertain the extent to which municipalities in their current format promote emerging farmers. The data for the research has been collected from municipal officials of the above – mentioned municipalities. Telephonic interviews were conducted with the officials ranging from the municipal manager to technical staff, depending on whose responsibility it is to manage commonage, while during in-depth interviews and site visits commonage users were interviewed personally. In so doing, the research findings could indicate what developmental role municipalities have to play together with other stakeholders e.g. DLA, DoA, DLGH in formulating a formal policy that will include commonage as a nurturing ground for local economic development.

The data collected in the course of the research is being presented in this report mostly in the form of text and tables.

3. Types of departmental policies and beneficiaries

Municipalities own two types of commonage: There is municipal commonage land that has been part of the towns since their establishment, while on the other hand there is commonage that the Department of Land Affairs (DLA) purchased for municipalities for the purpose of distributing it to emerging farmers. Municipalities are being expected to come up with a structured policy on how to manage commonage.

From the interviews conducted, it transpired that municipal commonage land is used for the following activities, depending on its location.

- Old commonage that has been part of towns since their inception is used mostly for grazing of stock and growing of crops.
- Commonage land that DLA purchased for land redistribution is used for grazing of stock and crop farming.
- Peri-urban municipal land that is used for projects such as vegetable gardens, poultry farming and centres for rehabilitation.

However, most users of commonage practise livestock farming e.g. cattle, sheep, horses and goats. The users of the commonage could be classified as indigent or lower income groups who hope that their stock would grow and place them in a position to generate income from selling. Their livestock is, however, still low in numbers and they have not as yet sold into big markets. Commonage land is also utilized by middle-income groups such as teachers, and, either engaging in livestock farming or in crop farming, but from the interviews it became clear that livestock farming is predominant.

Since communities utilise commonage, some users keep their stock with no intention to become commercial farmers, whereas other users envisage becoming commercial farmers. This diversity of interests creates a problem, because some users do not commit themselves to ensuring that commonage serves as a stepping-stone for commercial farming and this evidently results in conflict.

The challenge is that whilst community members use commonage on a collective farming basis, individuals should be allowed to pursue their particular interests and aspirations. Consequently municipalities should come up with clear policies and guidelines on who should use the commonage and how. This could ease tensions among commonage users with divergent aspirations. Moreover, government departments should assist municipalities in formulating commonage policies so that all stakeholders could adhere to a singular agreed policy.

4. Salient features of municipal commonage

4.1. Camps and sizes

The amalgamation of various towns has resulted in municipalities owning large tracts of land. The size of commonage land varies from one municipality to the other - from 83 hectares in Maluti-a-Phofung municipality to 29 701 hectares in Kopanong municipality. The total size of municipal commonage land in the Free State has been found to be 112 795 hectares.

The table below shows the different sizes of commonage land per municipality.

Methodological note:

The figures in the table below were obtained from the Municipalities. The HSRC cannot vouch for the correctness of these figures.

Table 1. Size of commonage according to Municipality.

| Town/Camps/Fields | Size |
|---|-----------------|
| Letsemeng | |
| Luckhof | 2921 ha |
| Jacobsdal | 4360 ha |
| Oppermansgronde | 3400 ha |
| Total | 10 681 ha |
| Metsimaholo | |
| Oranjeville (comprises of Jacobskraal=177 & Vaaldam Settlement=207) | 384 ha |
| Deneysville | None |
| Sasolburg | Unknown |
| Total | 384 ha |
| Phumelela | |
| Warden (Old commonage=773 and the new commonage=900) | 773 ha + 900 ha |
| Total | 1673 ha |
| Tswelopele | |
| Bultfontein (Old commonage 3206ha + the new commonage 721ha) | 3927 ha |
| Hoopstad (60 ha of grazing in the buffer zone+ 1623 ha of grazing) | 1683 ha |
| Total | 5610 ha |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | |
| Butchers Camp | 15 ha |
| Kestel | 68 ha |
| Phuthaditjhaba | None |
| Tshiame | None |
| Total | 83 ha |
| Mohokare | |
| Zastron | 2172 ha |
| Smithfield | 2952 ha |
| Rouxville | 3392 ha |

| Town/Camps/Fields | Size |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| Total | 8516 ha |
| Mangaung | |
| Unknown | |
| Montsopa | |
| Ladybrand | 728 ha |
| Hobhouse | 1210 ha |
| Thaba Patchoa | 3704 ha |
| Tweespruit | 431 ha |
| Total | 6073 ha |
| Dihlabeng | |
| Clarens | 500 ha |
| Paul Roux | 253 ha |
| Bethlehem | 500 ha |
| Fouriesburg | 600 ha |
| Rosendal | 550 ha |
| Total | 2403 ha |
| Moqhaka | |
| Steynsrus | 1068 ha |
| Kroonstad | 6105 ha |
| Total | 7173 ha |
| Kopanong | |
| Philippolis | 3491 ha |
| Springfontein | 4194 ha |
| Bethulie | 4798 ha |
| Reddersburg | 2259 ha |
| Edenburg | 3477 ha |
| Fauresmith | 4614 ha |
| Gariep Dam | 583 ha |
| Trompsburg | 4118 ha |
| Jagersfontein | 2167 ha |
| Total | 29701 ha |
| Naledi | |
| Elim | Unknown |
| Frankfort | Unknown |
| 1 | 368 |
| 2 | 394 |
| 3 | 161 |
| 4 | 154 |
| 5 | 432 |
| 6 Saailand (For Agriculture) | 47 |
| 7 | 326 |
| Total | 1882 ha |
| Masilonyana | |
| Verkeerdevlei | 520 ha |
| Theunissen | 639 ha |
| Soutpan | N/A |
| Brandfort | 560 ha |

| Town/Camps/Fields | Size |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Winburg | 1180 ha |
| Total | 2899 ha |
| Ngwathe | |
| A | 248ha |
| B | 350 ha |
| C | 301 ha |
| D | 412 ha |
| E | 58 ha |
| J | 13 ha |
| L | 64 ha |
| Total | 1446ha |
| Nala | |
| Bothaville | 1102 ha |
| Wesselsbron | 1175 ha |
| Total | 2277 ha |
| Mafube | |
| 82 camps | 4850 ha |
| Total | 4850 ha |
| Matjhabeng | |
| 41 camps | 8432 ha |
| Total | 8432 ha |
| Tokologo | |
| Boshof | 6327 ha |
| Hertzogville | 2150 ha |
| Dealesville | 1441 ha |
| Total | 9918 ha |
| Setsoto | |
| Ficksburg | 2031 ha |
| Senekal | 2143 ha |
| Clocolan | 2010 ha |
| Marquard | 2010 ha |
| Total | 8194 ha |
| Nketoana | |
| Nketoana | 600 ha |
| Total | 600 ha |
| TOTAL | At least 112 795 ha |

There are, however, enormous discrepancies regarding official information about the size of commonages. In the case of Kopanong Municipality, various sources of information have been uncovered:

Table 2. Different sources of information on commonage in Kopanong

| Town | Summit figures ¹ (1998) | Department of Agriculture ² (2001) | | | Kopanong Municipal figures ³ (2003) | HSRC figures ⁴ (2003) |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| | | Original common age | DLA-funded common age | TOTAL | | |
| Reddersburg | 1997 ha | 1997 ha | 762 ha | 2 759 ha | 1952 ha | 2259 ha |
| Edenburg | 4131 ha | 4131 ha | 1003 ha | 5134 ha | 2634 Ha | 3477 ha |
| Bethulie | 4789 ha | 4 789 ha | 812 ha | 5 601 ha | 1921 ha?? | 4798 ha?? |
| Fauresmith | 5227 ha | | | | 3894 ha | 4614 ha |
| Gariiep Dam | - | | | | 795 | 583 ha |
| Philippolis | 4958 ha | 3958 ha | 600 ha | 4558 ha | 3491 ha | 3491 ha |
| Trompsburg | 4626 ha | 4 626 ha | - | 4626 ha | 4118 ha | 4369 ha |
| Springfontein | 3403 ha | 3 403 ha | 400 ha | 3803 ha | 4194 ha | 1466 ha |
| Jagersfontein | 2188 ha | 2 110 ha | 996 ha | 3106 ha | 2167 ha | 1605 ha |
| TOTAL | 31 319 ha | 30 241 ha | 4 573 ha | 34 814 ha | 22 127 ha | 29 701 ha |

The discrepancies may well be due to additional purchases of commonage land in some communities (mostly DLA-funded). However, there is evidently a real need for a proper municipal data-base and a spatial survey, including a Geographical Information System (GIS). This situation is likely to prevail in almost all municipalities.

4.2. Cadastral positions

Most municipalities are in possession of the cadastral positions of their commonage - mostly in maps and to a lesser extent in aerial photos. Sixteen out of 20 municipalities have cadastral indicators of their commonage. The reason why the other four municipalities do not have cadastral indicators is that during amalgamation of the towns certain information has not been transmitted to the new municipal incumbents.

4.3. Acquisition of commonage

Most municipalities own land that can be referred to as old commonage, i.e. land that had been earmarked for the towns since their establishment and it is now up to the municipal councils to manage this land. As stated, other land derives from purchasing from commercial farmers by DLA with a view to making it available to emerging farmers. In the Free State, DLA has purchased land for 12 municipalities, while the remaining eight has not received any land from DLA.

¹ Drawn from 9 October 1998 summit proceedings.

² Provided to Xhariep DM by Department of Agriculture, November 2001.

³ Drawn from Kopanong survey.

⁴ Drawn from telephonic interviews with Unit Managers.

Table 3. Acquisition of commonage

| Municipality | Acquisition of commonage pre-1994 | Acquired from | Acquisition of commonage post-1994 by DLA | Acquired from |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Letsemeng | | | | |
| Luckhoff | Land purchased when the town was proclaimed | Unknown | None | N/A |
| Jacobsdal | Unknown | Unknown | None | N/A |
| Oppermansgronde | Unknown | The land is all subject to a land claim by Opperman family | None | N/A |
| Metsimaholo | | | | |
| Oranjeville | Land purchased when the town was founded in 1919 | Unknown | None | N/A |
| Deneysville | No commonage has ever been bought | N/A | None | N/A |
| Sasolburg | The farm Amelia was bought in 2002 by the municipality with the help of SASOL | Land purchased on a sale from the sequestered estate of Johan Dannhauser | None | N/A |
| Phumelela | | | | |
| Warden | Old municipal camps acquired when town was founded | Unknown | Langpunt farm bought in 1997 | Mr. Paul Steyn |
| Tswelopele | | | | |
| Bultfontein | Part of the farm when the town was founded | Unknown | 2000 | Unknown |
| Hoopstad | Part of the town since its foundation | Unknown | No | N/A |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | | | | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | None | N/A | All camps are post 1994 camps | These were never purchased but resulted from a grant. Kestell was used by commercial farmers for 3 years before being granted |
| Mohokare | | | | |
| Mohokare | 1992 | Private farmer | No | N/A |
| Mangaung | | | | |
| Mangaung | Fields were bought sometime in the past | Unknown | No | N/a |
| Montsopa | | | | |
| Ladybrand | Land incorporated | Unknown | No | N/A |

| Municipality | Acquisition of commonage pre-1994 | Acquired from | Acquisition of commonage post-1994 by DLA | Acquired from |
|---------------|--|---|--|----------------------------------|
| | when the town was established | | | |
| Hobhouse | Land bought when the town was established | Unknown | Yes | Commercial farmers |
| Thaba Patchoa | Unknown | Unknown | No | N/A |
| Tweespruit | They have always formed part of the town land | Unknown | No | N/A |
| Dihlabeng | | | | |
| Dihlabeng | None | N/A | All camps purchased in 1997 | Commercial farmers |
| Moqhaka | | | | |
| Steynsrus | Land was bought when the town was established | Unknown | Yes | Unknown |
| Kroonstad | The old commonage was bought before 1994 | Unknown | The new commonage was bought in 1999 | Local farmer, Mr. Chris Derkson |
| Kopanong | | | | |
| Philippolis | Unknown | Unknown | Yes | Unknown |
| Springfontein | Fields purchased at the time the town was founded | Unknown | No | N/A |
| Bethulie | Fields purchased at the time the town was established and from the Department of Water Affairs when Gariep Dam was built | Farmers and the Department of Water Affairs | No | N/A |
| Reddersburg | Fields have always been part of the municipal land | Local farmers | The farm Fairview was bought in 1997 | Local farmers |
| Edenburg | The old municipal camps have always been part of municipal land | Unknown | Vaalplaas and Welgeluk were bought in 1999 | Commercial farmers |
| Fauresmith | Fields have always been part of the municipal land | Farmer | No | N/A |
| Gariep Dam | No | N/A | Land was transferred in 1999 | Free State Provincial Government |
| Trompsburg | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Jagersfontein | Unknown | Unknown | Land was purchased | Commercial farmer |
| Naledi | | | | |
| Naledi | Some fields | Unknown | Yes, some fields | Commercial |

| Municipality | Acquisition of commonage pre-1994 | Acquired from | Acquisition of commonage post-1994 by DLA | Acquired from farmers |
|---------------------|---|----------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Masilonyana | | | | |
| Verkeerdevlei | Fields have always been part of the town | Unknown | No | N/A |
| Theunissen | Fields were bought at the time the town was founded | Unknown | No | N/A |
| Soutpan | None | N/A | None | N/A |
| Brandfort | Fields were purchased during the proclamation of the town | Unknown | No | N/A |
| Winburg | Fields were purchased during the proclamation of the town | Unknown | No | N/A |
| Ngwathe | | | | |
| Ngwathe | Fields are owned by the municipality since the establishment of the towns | Unknown | No | N/A |
| Nala | | | | |
| Bothaville | Fields were bought at the time the town was founded | Unknown | No | N/A |
| Wesselsbron | None | N/A | Tybos, Reclain and Lapspruit were bought in 1999 | Commercial farmer |
| Mafube | | | | |
| Mafube | Camps have been part of the town since its establishment | Unknown | None | N/A |
| Matjhabeng | | | | |
| Matjhabeng | Some camps have been part of the town since its foundation | Unknown | Some camps | Commercial farmers |
| Tokologo | | | | |
| Boshof | Camps have been part of the town since its foundation | Unknown | None | N/A |
| Hertzogville | Fields were purchased at the time the town was founded | Unknown | None | N/A |
| Dealesville | Camps have been part of the town since its | Unknown | None | N/A |

| Municipality | Acquisition of commonage pre-1994 foundation | Acquired from | Acquisition of commonage post-1994 by DLA | Acquired from |
|---------------------|---|----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Setsoto | | | | |
| Ficksburg | No | N/A | Fields were purchased in 1997 | Commercial farmers |
| Senekal | No | N/A | Fields bought in 1997 | Commercial farmers |
| Clocolan | No | N/A | Fields purchased in 1997 | Commercial farmers |
| Marquard | No | N/A | Fields bought in 1997 | Commercial farmers |
| Nketoana | | | | |
| Nketoana | No | N/A | Fields purchased in 1998 | Commercial farmer |

4.4. Beneficiary groups

It has been found that commonage is being utilised by both commercial farmers and emerging farmers. However, municipalities are moving towards making more commonage available to emerging farmers through making commonage available to emerging farmers, while new commonage purchased by DLA is also being distributed by municipalities to emerging farmers.

Table 4. Usage of the commonage.

| Municipality | Commercial farmers | Township residents/emergent farmers |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Letsemeng | | |
| Luckhof | None | Yes, ever since 1996 |
| Jacobsdal | Yes | None |
| Oppermansgronde | None | All land is used by Opperman family |
| Metsimaholo | | |
| Oranjeville | None | Yes |
| Deneysville | N/A | N/A |
| Sasolburg | Yes | Yes |
| Phumelela | | |
| Warden | Yes | Yes |
| Tswelopele | | |
| Bultfontein | Yes | Yes |
| Hoopstad | Yes | Yes |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | None | Yes |
| Mohokare | | |
| Mohokare | None | Yes |
| Mangaung | | |
| Mangaung | None | Yes |
| Mantsopa | | |

| Municipality | Commercial farmers | Township residents/ emergent farmers |
|---------------------|--|---|
| Ladybrand | Yes | Yes |
| Hobhouse | No | Yes |
| Thaba Potchoa | Yes | Yes |
| Tweespruit | Yes | No |
| Dihlabeng | | |
| Dihlabeng | None | Yes |
| Moqhaka | | |
| Steynsrus | Yes | Yes |
| Kroonstad | Yes | Yes |
| Kopanong | | |
| Philippolis | Yes | Yes |
| Springfontein | Yes | Yes |
| Bethulie | Yes | No |
| Reddersburg | Yes | Yes |
| Edenburg | Yes | Yes |
| Fauresmith | Yes | Yes |
| Gariiep Dam | Yes | Yes |
| Trompsburg | Yes | Yes |
| Jagersfontein | Yes | Yes |
| Naledi | | |
| Naledi | None | Yes |
| Masilonyana | | |
| Verkeerdevlei | Yes | Yes |
| Theunissen | Yes | No |
| Soutpan | N/A | N/A |
| Brandfort | Yes | Yes |
| Winburg | Yes | Yes |
| Ngwathe | | |
| Ngwathe | Yes | Yes |
| Nala | | |
| Bothaville | Yes, under the banner of emerging farmers | Yes |
| Wesselsbron | Yes, under the banner of emergent farmers | Yes |
| Mafube | | |
| Mafube | Yes | Yes |
| Matjhabeng | | |
| Matjhabeng | Yes | Yes |
| Tokologo | | |
| Boshof | No | Yes |
| Hertzogville | No | Yes |
| Dealesville | No | Yes |
| Setsoto | | |
| Ficksburg | Yes | Yes |
| Senekal | Yes | Yes |
| Clocolan | Yes | Yes |
| Marquard | Yes | Yes |

| Municipality | Commercial farmers | Township residents/ emergent farmers |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Nketoana | | |
| Nketoana | No | Yes |

4.5. Commonage use by commercial farmers

Prior to 1994, commercial farmers used most of the commonage in the Free State. Municipalities would rent out commonage to the commercial farmers, which would thus generate revenue. This meant that the farmers were responsible for the maintenance of commonage infrastructure.

However, after 1994, with the new land reform policy in place, fewer commercial farmers utilise commonage land, because it is to an increasingly extent made available to emerging farmers. Nevertheless, some portions of commonage are still rented to commercial farmers who pay rental to municipalities. What has been found in the research, is that emerging farmers do not keep up their rentals because they are unemployed and this results in a considerable loss of revenue for municipalities.

4.6. Types of stock grazing on commonage

The type of stock that is found on commonage land is mostly cattle, with a small number of sheep, goats and horses.

In Mantsopa Municipality, the municipality owns ostrich and cattle which are kept on the commonage. According to municipal officials, the municipality sells these animals, thereby generating income for their coffers. From the field visits in Mantsopa, Tswelopele and Kopanong municipalities, the cattle farmers prefer cattle grazing because of the abundance of grassland. The cattle is in a healthy condition, but the challenge is to provide water in every camp of the commonage since at present animals have to travel long distances to access water. With smaller numbers of sheep and goats, owners said they do not experience problems, but are still investigating whether these could be bred on commonage on a sustainable basis.

4.7. Infrastructure on the commonage

The table below shows that most of the commonage have infrastructure in the form of windmills, dams, fences, troughs and enclosures. However, during the interviews and site visits, it transpired that there is a problem with maintenance, lack of repairs, vandalism, theft and accountability for the infrastructure.

Table 5. Commonage infrastructure

| Municipality | Infrastructure |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| Letsemeng | |
| Luckhof | Windmills, troughs and some fences |

| Municipality | Infrastructure |
|---------------------|--|
| Jacobsdal | Windmills, troughs, fences and reservoirs |
| Oppersmansgronde | Windmills, troughs and fences |
| Metsimaholo | |
| Oranjeville | Windmills, fences and reservoirs |
| Deneysville | None |
| Sasolburg | Power laid onto the farm, watercourse with a dam, sewage line and fence are in some areas but not the entire farm. |
| Phumelela | |
| Warden | Windmills, fences, reservoirs, dams and electricity transformer |
| Tswelopele | |
| Bultfontein | Windmills, troughs, fences and reservoirs |
| Hoopstad | None |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | Drinking places for cattle, troughs, fences and taps |
| Mohokare | |
| Mohokare | Dams, crush and fences were pulled down |
| Mangaung | |
| Mangaung | Not much infrastructure, only a vandalised fence |
| Montsopa | |
| Ladybrand | Dams, troughs, fences and reservoirs |
| Hobhouse | Dams, fences, boreholes and reservoirs |
| Thaba Patchoa | Windmills, troughs, fences and kraals |
| Tweespruit | Troughs |
| Dihlabeng | |
| Dihlabeng | Fences, electric pump and skid |
| Moqhaka | |
| Steynsrus | Windmills, dams, reservoirs, troughs, fences |
| Kroonstad | Windmills, reservoirs, fences, boreholes, electricity |
| Kopanong | |
| Philippolis | Windmills, troughs, dams, fences |
| Springfontein | Windmills, fences, reservoirs |
| Bethulie | Windmills, troughs, fences, reservoirs |
| Reddersburg | Windmills, troughs, fences, reservoirs |
| Edenburg | Windmills, troughs, fences, reservoirs, sheds |
| Fauresmith | Windmills, troughs, dams. Fences have been stolen |
| Gariep Dam | Fence and dam |
| Trompsburg | Windmills, dams, fence, troughs and enclosures |
| Jagersfontein | Windmills, dams, fence, troughs and enclosures |
| Naledi | |
| Naledi | Windmills, troughs, farm steads, access to electricity |
| Masilonyana | |
| Verkeerdevlei | Windmills, troughs, reservoirs and some fences |
| Theunissen | Windmill, reservoir and trough |
| Soutpan | N/A |
| Brandfort | Windmills, troughs, dams |
| Winburg | Windmills, troughs, dams |
| Ngwathe | |

| Municipality | Infrastructure |
|---------------------|--|
| Ngwathe | Dams, municipal water and some fencing. |
| Nala | |
| Bothaville | Windmills, troughs, fences, electricity, irrigation system and holes |
| Wesselsbron | Windmills, troughs, fences, electricity, irrigation system and holes |
| Mafube | |
| Mafube | Windmills, troughs, fences and dams |
| Matjhabeng | |
| Matjhabeng | Fences, municipal water |
| Tokologo | |
| Boshof | Fences, dams, windmills, troughs |
| Hertzogville | Windmills, dams, vandalised fences, troughs |
| Dealesville | Windmills, vandalised fences, dams, troughs |
| Setsoto | |
| Ficksburg | Fences, dams, windmills, troughs |
| Senekal | Fences, dams, windmills |
| Clocolan | Fences, dams, windmills |
| Marquard | Fences, dams, windmills |
| Nketoana | |
| Nketoana | Fences, dams, windmills |

4.8. Condition of infrastructure and responsibility for repairs

In seven municipalities, infrastructure is in a good condition; in six municipalities the infrastructure is in fair condition; and in seven municipalities it is in a very poor condition.

Infrastructure “in fair condition” means that fences, windmills or troughs need to be repaired but are not posing a serious danger to animals. Infrastructure in “bad condition” means that there is an urgent need to repair the infrastructure.

In seven municipalities, the users of commonage are responsible for repairs of the infrastructure. In six municipalities, the municipality is responsible for repairs and in three municipalities both the users and the municipality are responsible for repairs. In eight municipalities, users pay for repairs whereas in seven municipalities the municipality pay for repairs. In two municipalities, both the municipality and the users are responsible for payment of repairs.

In cases, where the municipality and the users are responsible for repairs, such as Masilonyana and Ngwathe municipalities, the users do the repairs they are able to, e.g. tightening of fences whereas the municipality repairs things that need some technical expertise e.g. the water system.

In Kopanong Municipality, the users are responsible for repairs. In six towns, the municipality is responsible for payments for repairs, while in the other three municipalities the users are responsible for payments. The Madikgetla Farmers

Association in Kopanong municipality stated that they used to pay for infrastructure to the municipality, but since the latter does not repair any infrastructure, they terminated payment. According to the Association, they repair the infrastructure on their own.

Municipal officials said that they would like the users to be responsible for the repairs of the infrastructure because by so doing they would also look after it properly. They maintain that if the users are responsible for infrastructure on the commonage, they (users) would take care and be accountable for the infrastructure. Conversely, if the municipality repairs the infrastructure, the users are unlikely to be responsible for the infrastructure. Thus in a nutshell, the municipalities would like to promote a culture of responsibility amongst users of the commonage and to discourage selfish dependency.

Table 6. Infrastructure condition, party responsible for repairs and payment for the infrastructure

| Municipality | Condition of infrastructure | Party responsible for repairs | Party responsible for payment of repairs |
|---------------------|--|--|---|
| Letsemeng | | | |
| Luckhoff | The users have not complained about the conditions | According to the lease agreement, the users of the land were responsible for maintaining infrastructure, but the town clerk asked engineers to help users with windmills and troughs | Users of the land pay for repairs |
| Jacobsdal | Good condition | One farmer who has hired the land from municipality has asked to do additional repair but decision has not yet been taken | The users of the camp pay for repairs and claim back the amount from the municipality |
| Oppermansgronde | Good condition | The farmers | Users of the land pay for repairs |
| Metsimaholo | | | |
| Oranjeville | Good condition | Users repair the infrastructure | The users pay |
| Deneysville | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Sasolburg | Good condition | N/A because it has not been used yet | The municipality is responsible for maintenance and payment. |
| Phumelela | | | |
| Warden | Good condition | Bambanani Forum takes care for infrastructure | The users pay. |
| Tswelopele | | | |
| Bultfontein | No, some of the fences need to be repaired | The Phahameng CMC is responsible for repairs | The CMC on the land they are renting |
| Hoopstad | No | The users repair | The owner of the land pays |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | | | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | No, because fence is old | Municipality is supposed to repair. With fence, | Municipality |

| Municipality | Condition of infrastructure | Party responsible for repairs | Party responsible for payment of repairs |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | camp owners maintain it. | |
| Mohokare | | | |
| Mohokare | No | Municipality | Municipality |
| Mangaung | | | |
| Mangaung | No | Unknown | Unknown |
| Mantsopa | | | |
| Ladybrand | Fair condition | Unknown | The lessees |
| Hobhouse | No | The council | The council |
| Thaba Potchoa | Reasonable condition | The council | The council |
| Tweespruit | Yes | Unknown | The lessees |
| Dihlabeng | | | |
| Dihlabeng | Good condition | Users with municipal help. | Users with municipal help |
| Moqhaka | | | |
| Steynsrus | Fair condition | The users | The users |
| Kroonstad | Good condition | The lessees | Municipality for the old commonage and CMC for the new commonage |
| Kopanong | | | |
| Philippolis | Fair condition | The users | The users |
| Springfontein | Good condition | The users | The users |
| Bethulie | Good condition | Farmers who use it | Municipality |
| Reddersburg | Good condition | The lessees | Municipality |
| Edenburg | Good condition | The users | Municipality |
| Fauresmith | Bad condition | Commercial farmers | The lessees |
| Gariep Dam | Fair conditions | Users | Users |
| Trompsburg | Fair conditions | Lessees | Lessees |
| Jagersfontein | Good condition | Users | Users |
| Naledi | | | |
| Naledi | Bad condition | Lesedi Farmers Association | Lesedi Farmers Association |
| Masilonyana | | | |
| Verkeerdevlei | Fair condition | Municipality and users | Municipality |
| Theunissen | Fair condition but fences are poor | Municipality | Depends on the contract |
| Soutpan | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Brandfort | Good condition | Municipality | Municipality |
| Winburg | Good condition | Municipality | Municipality |
| Ngwathe | | | |
| Ngwathe | Bad condition | Users & Municipality | Users & Municipality |
| Nala | | | |
| Bothaville | Fair condition | The users | The users |
| Wesselsbron | Fair condition | The users | The users |
| Mafube | | | |
| Mafube | Good condition | The municipality | The municipality and the person found responsible for the damages caused in the commonage. |

| Municipality | Condition of infrastructure | Party responsible for repairs | Party responsible for payment of repairs |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Matjhabeng | | | |
| Matjhabeng | Bad condition | The municipality | The municipality |
| Tokologo | | | |
| Boshof | Fair condition | Municipality | Municipality |
| Hertzogville | Fair condition | Municipality | Municipality |
| Dealesville | Fair condition | Municipality | Municipality |
| Setsoto | | | |
| Ficksburg | Fair condition | The users | The users |
| Senekal | Fair condition | The users | The users |
| Clocolan | Fair condition | The users | The users |
| Marquard | Fair condition | The users | The users |
| Nketoana | | | |
| Nketoana | Fair condition | The users | The users |

5. Municipal management

5.1. Organising beneficiaries

In most municipalities, emerging farmers are organised into stock or crop committees or associations. For example, in Tswelopele municipality there are the Phahameng Rural Association for Stockowners, the Phahameng Farmers Association for Crop Production, the Ithabeng Vegetable Growers and the Magakajane Poultry Company. Two members from each committee get elected and form the Commonage Management Committee (CMC). According to the members of these committees, each member pays an entry fee of R20. The reason behind the formation of associations and committees is that before the municipality gives land to emerging farmers, they must be organised into a structure enabling the municipality to promote communal ownership of the commonage. Commonage is viewed by members of the community as a collective rather than for individual usage.

These committees and associations are evidently not free from conflict, which in turn impacts on the purpose of using commonage as a group. In Kopanong Municipality, there is a committee for emerging farmers in Reddersburg. This committee is characterised by so much by internal conflict that some members want to form a separate committee. The alternatives are that the municipality must either disband the current committee, or not recognise it, or rather endeavour to resolve their conflict through mediation and negotiation. Though municipalities provide land to groups of emerging farmers, the municipalities are faced with a host of problems relating to management of commonages because they are dealing with groups of emerging farmers with differing aspirations and commitments. Therefore again, the challenge for municipalities is to develop a clear and firm policy on how beneficiaries should be organised and act when utilizing commonage land.

5.2. Gaining access to land

Emerging farmers gain access to land through tendering, through negotiations between the municipality and emerging farmers and through applications by emerging farmers to the municipality. Emerging farmers are given land by the municipality in accordance with government 's land reform policy. Municipalities then first interview emerging farmers to check why and how they are to utilise the commonage and on the basis of such interviews decision is taken. The pre-condition is that the emerging farmers should form associations before they could gain access to commonage. Later new members would join the existing association and utilise the commonage.

5.3. Contracts

Thirteen municipalities have signed contracts with the users of the commonages, with only six of the municipalities enforcing such contracts. Five municipalities have not signed any contracts with the users, while eight municipalities do not enforce contracts. Lack of enforcement of contracts put municipalities in a difficult position, because users do not pay and as a result the municipality does not generate revenue. It has even happened that municipalities provided land to emerging farmers without contracts because the municipalities were under pressure both from government and communities to make land available for emerging farming.

To aggravate circumstances, the amalgamation of towns have left municipalities with problems such as missing information, while some towns have only cashiers in the local offices. Such staff do not have the expertise to enforce contracts. Clearly, there is a need in all towns for staff to deliver services to all residents. At Bethulie in Kopanong Municipality, the contracts have expired and the council still has to decide on its relevant policy. The most common way of enforcing contracts is to send reminders in a form of letters to those who do not pay. Since, however, this system does not always generate a positive response, municipalities should be encouraged to come up with clear guidelines on contracts and their enforcement.

Table 7. Existence of signed and enforced contracts

| Municipality | Existence of contracts: Yes/No | Reinforcement of contracts |
|------------------|---|--|
| Letsemeng | | |
| Luckhoff | Yes, contracts were signed before new municipal structure came into being but now she does not know what happened to such contracts | Does not know but she was asked to write a letter to users to inform them about their arrears. |
| Jacobsdal | Yes | Unknown |
| Oppermansgronde | Each user had a contract, but they have expired and they have not been renewed because of the pending land claim. | Unknown |
| Metsimaholo | | |
| Oranjeville | No | No |
| Deneysville | No | No |
| Sasolburg | No long term contracts. Kobus Dannhauser has a one year contract | Unknown |
| Phumelela | | |
| Warden | Yes with emerging and commercial farmers but not with Bamabanani | The contracts are enforced |
| Tswelopele | | |
| Bultfontein | Yes | They are enforced |
| Hoopstad | Yes | They are enforced |
| Maluti-a-Phufung | | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | No | N/A |

| Municipality | Existence of contracts: Yes/No | Reinforcement of contracts |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Mohokare | | |
| Mohokare | No | N/A |
| Mangaung | | |
| Mangaung | Yes | Unknown |
| Mantsopa | | |
| Ladybrand | Unknown | Unknown |
| Hobhouse | No | N/A |
| Thaba Potchoa | Yes | They are enforced |
| Tweespruit | Unknown | Unknown |
| Dihlabeng | | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown | |
| Moqhaka | | |
| Steynsrus | Yes | Unknown |
| Kroonstad | Yes | They are enforced |
| Kopanong | | |
| Philippolis | Yes | Unknown |
| Springfontein | Yes | Unknown |
| Bethulie | All contracts have expired and waiting for Council to finalize the policy | Unknown |
| Reddersburg | Yes | Not enforced |
| Edenburg | Yes | Unknown |
| Fauresmith | Yes | Relatively enforced |
| Gariep Dam | Yes | They are enforced |
| Trompsburg | Yes | Relatively enforced |
| Jagersfontein | Yes | They are enforced |
| Naledi | | |
| Naledi | Yes | They are enforced |
| Masilonyana | | |
| Verkeerdevlei | No | N/A |
| Theunissen | Yes | Not enforced because payments are made regularly |
| Soutpan | N/A | N/A |
| Brandfort | Yes | Enforced |
| Winburg | Yes | Enforced |
| Ngwathe | | |
| Ngwathe | Yes | Relatively enforced |
| Nala | | |
| Bothaville | No | N/A |
| Wesselsbron | No | N/A |
| Mafube | | |
| Mafube | Yes | They are enforced in order to ensure that the requirements in the contracts are meet. |
| Matjhabeng | | |
| Matjhabeng | Yes | Yes |
| Tokologo | | |
| Boshof | Yes | Enforced |
| Hertzogville | Yes | Reletively enforced |

| Municipality | Existence of contracts: Yes/No | Reinforcement of contracts |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Dealesville | Yes | Reletively enforced |
| Setsoto | | |
| Ficksburg | Yes | Contracts are enforced |
| Senekal | Yes | Contarcts are enforced |
| Clocolan | Yes | Contracts are enforced |
| Marquard | Yes | Contracts are enforced |
| Nketoana | | |
| Nketoana | Yes | Contracts are not enforced |

5.4. Supervision of commonages

Most municipalities do not supervise commonage simply because they are understaffed. Municipalities acknowledge that a shortage of staff with necessary skills to supervise the commonage is one of their challenges. Even in those attempting to supervise, staff is not sufficiently skilled. The supervision of infrastructure repairs is done by the technical services department of the municipality. This, cannot however, be regarded as proper supervision because technical staff only repair infrastructure but do not check on how the users utilise the commonage. A supervisor should be somebody with expertise, sharing that with the users and in so doing, empower them.

In Moqhaka Municipality, though there is no skilled municipal staff for supervision, Community Management Committee provides guidance and assistance with decision making on how the commonage should be utilised. Of course, users cannot rely solely on CMC because they are not properly trained, but the municipality should rather devise means of supervising the commonage with qualified agricultural personnel. Municipalities should also provide commonage with a supervisor with business management skills to advise and supervise LED projects initiated at commonages. In Mantsopa Municipality, a piggery project nearly collapsed because the beneficiaries did not have a supervisor. Later, mismanagement of funds aggravated the situation and the municipality had to request additional funding from DPLG in order to rescue the project. Clearly therefore, there is a dire need for proper supervision of commonage land.

In Mangaung Municipality, the staff responsible for the zoo in Bloemfontein do some check-ups on the commonage, but this arrangement is not enough as the municipality requires qualified people to supervise commonage at all times.

The table below shows the shortage of supervision due to lack of capacity from the side of the municipalities and illustrates the need for proper supervision of commonages by qualified personnel.

Table 8. Capacity to supervise the utilization of commonage

| Municipality | Supervision of commonage | Municipal capacity to supervise commonage to staff, time and skills |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Letsemeng | | |
| Luckhoff | No supervision in the new municipal structure whereas in the old structure there was supervision. | Does not have staff. |
| Jacobsdal | No need for supervision as the users (commercial farmers) abide by terms of the contract | N/A |
| Oppermansgronde | No supervision, albeit Boereunie and various committees refer problems to the municipality through their representatives | Does not have staff. |
| Metsimaholo | | |
| Oranjeville | No supervision | No staff |
| Deneysville | N/A | N/A |
| Sasolburg | No supervision | Kobus Dannhauser uses the land responsibly and abides by the terms of the contract |
| Phumelela | | |
| Warden | Supervision is done | Supervision is done by Mr Tobie Swart who is the Municipal Technical manager |
| Tswelopele | | |
| Bultfontein | Co-ordination and liaison | The municipality's community services department co-ordinates and liaises with Phahameng CMC and other government departments |
| Hoopstad | No supervision | N/A |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | No supervision | No staff |
| Mohokare | | |
| Mohokare | There is supervision of stock | Stock inspectors do supervision in the sense that all commonage users bring their stock for supervision and they should produce receipt. Without a receipt the stock is withheld by inspectors |
| Mangaung | | |
| Mangaung | Occasional spot checks | Zoo staff does occasional spot checks, however there is not enough staff |
| Mantsopa | | |
| Ladybrand | No supervision | No staff |
| Hobhouse | No supervision | No staff |
| Thaba Patchoa | No supervision only the Ward councillor keeps an eye | No staff |
| Tweespruit | No supervision | Farmers look after themselves |
| Dihlabeng | | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown | |
| Moqhaka | | |

| Municipality | Supervision of commonage | Municipal capacity to supervise commonage ito staff, time and skills |
|---------------------|--|---|
| Steynsrus | No supervision | No staff |
| Kroonstad | The is input and guidance by the member of CMC and help with decision making | No staff |
| Kopanong | | |
| Philippolis | There is supervision that takes a head count of cattle | No information |
| Springfontein | No supervision | No staff |
| Bethulie | There is supervision | There is supervision through the Technical Supervisor who inspects all camps |
| Reddersburg | Not proper supervision | No staff |
| Edenburg | Not adequate supervision | No staff |
| Fauresmith | No supervision | No staff |
| Gariiep Dam | There is supervision | One councillor and one official control and monitor the commonage |
| Trompsburg | There is supervision | A councillor and one official control and monitor the commonage |
| Jagersfontein | There is supervision | A councillor and one official control and monitor the commonage |
| Naledi | | |
| Naledi | Supervision is through inspection of boundaries/ fences of camps by municipality | Not enough staff |
| Masilonyana | | |
| Verkeerdevlei | No supervision, only the town engineer sees that water is working in the camps | No staff |
| Theunissen | No supervision | Users adhere to terms of contract |
| Soutpan | N/A | N/A |
| Brandfort | No supervision | No staff |
| Winburg | No supervision | No staff |
| Ngwathe | | |
| Ngwathe | Little supervision | No staff |
| Nala | | |
| Bothaville | There is supervision though its not enough | Staff is not enough |
| Wesselsbron | There is supervision though its not enough | Staff is not enough |
| Mafube | | |
| Mafube | No supervision | No staff |
| Matjhabeng | | |
| Matjhabeng | No supervision | No staff, no time and no skills |
| Tokologo | | |
| Boshof | Insufficient | Staff is not enough |

| Municipality | Supervision of commonage | Municipal capacity to supervise commonage to staff, time and skills |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| | supervision | |
| Hertzogville | Insufficient supervision | Staff is not enough |
| Dealsville | Insufficient supervision | Staff is not enough |
| Setsoto | | |
| Ficksburg | No supervision | No staff |
| Senekal | No supervision | No staff |
| Clocolan | No supervision | No staff |
| Marquard | No supervision | No staff |
| Nketoana | | |
| Nketoana | No supervision | Monitoring is the responsibility of DoA |

5.5. Reporting by users to the municipality

No formal reporting mechanism exists between the municipality and the commonage users. However, the latter do informally report to the municipality, and the municipality makes a follow-up. For example, in Mafube Municipality, there was a trough that was broken and when the matter was brought to the municipality, the person responsible was charged to pay an amount to the municipality. Generally, it was found that municipalities do respond to issues that users submit to them.

It needs to be pointed out that in Nala Municipality, a formal reporting mechanism exists in the form of monthly reporting through workshops. The municipality organises workshops monthly for commonage management and during such workshops users report to the municipality about what is happening on the commonage.

In Setsoto Municipality at Senekal, for instance there is no formal reporting mechanism, but the Senekal commonage committee meets with council representatives on commonage issues such as infrastructure and payments. These meetings convene every two months.

It could therefore be concluded that there is a need for a formal reporting mechanism by users so that a municipality could be informed of what is happening on the commonage and to make follow ups if need be. This could avoid instances like in Kopanong Municipality at Reddersburg where the municipality had to intervene and arbitrate in the running disputes between commonage users.

Table 9. Reporting mechanisms to the commonage

| Municipality | Reporting mechanism | Follow-up by municipalities |
|---------------------|--|---|
| Letsemeng | | |
| Luckhoff | None | N/A |
| Jacobsdal | None | N/A |
| Oppersmansgronde | No formal reporting mechanism. Only complaints | Municipality refers stock theft to the SAPS Stock Theft Unit and stolen |

| Municipality | Reporting mechanism | Follow-up by municipalities |
|---------------------|--|--|
| | of various farmers committees | fences to local SAPS who do investigations |
| Metsimaholo | | |
| Oranjeville | None | N/A |
| Deneysville | None | N/A |
| Sasolburg | None | N/A |
| Phumelela | | |
| Warden | None | Plan to meet with Mr. Swart regularly in future |
| Tswelopele | | |
| Bultfontein | None but meetings are held with CMC if there are constraints | Municipal action taken after the meeting |
| Hoopstad | None | N/A |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | None | Unknown |
| Mohokare | | |
| Mohokare | No formal mechanism | A councillor acts in a meeting as a link between municipality and stock committee. |
| Mangaung | | |
| Mangaung | A Peri-Urban Policy has been drafted | Unknown |
| Mantsopa | | |
| Ladybrand | None | N/A |
| Hobhouse | None | N/A |
| Thaba Potchoa | None | The ward councillor gives verbal reports |
| Tweespruit | None | N/A |
| Dihlabeng | | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown | |
| Moqhaka | | |
| Steynsrus | Not clear but reporting is done the head of the unit | Council attends to bigger issues. |
| Kroonstad | None | Not clear, the Council takes decisions |
| Kopanong | | |
| Philippolis | None | N/A |
| Springfontein | None | N/A |
| Bethulie | No reporting from the lessees. Mr. Malefane reports on the camps and the Technical Supervisor reports to the Technical Manager | The municipality asks towns to write down their needs as requests for funding |
| Reddersburg | No official form of reporting | Unknown |
| Edenburg | No formal reporting structure | Unknown |
| Fauresmith | None | Councillor Jonas deals with complaints |
| Gariiep Dam | Monthly reports to the municipality | The municipality makes follow-ups |
| Trompsburg | Monthly reports to the municipality | The municipality makes follow-ups |
| Jagersfontein | Monthly reports to the municipality | The municipality makes follow-ups |

| Municipality | Reporting mechanism | Follow-up by municipalities |
|---------------|--|--|
| Naledi | | |
| Naledi | None | N/A |
| Masilonyana | | |
| Verkeerdevlei | None | N/A |
| Theunissen | None | N/A |
| Soutpan | N/A | N/A |
| Brandfort | None | N/A |
| Winburg | None | N/A |
| Ngwathe | | |
| Ngwathe | None | N/A |
| Nala | | |
| Bothaville | Monthly reports through workshops | Municipality takes action on the matters that need action |
| Wesselsbron | Monthly reports through workshops | Municipality takes action on the matters that need action |
| Mafube | | |
| Mafube | No formal reporting structure, rather those with problems go to the municipality to report | The municipality make follow-ups e.g. there was a trough that was broken and the person responsible was charged a certain amount. |
| Matjhabeng | | |
| Matjhabeng | None | N/A |
| Tokologo | | |
| Boshof | No formal reporting structure, but those with complaints inform the municipality | The municipality makes follow-ups e.g. removal of farmers' horses from community grounds |
| Hertzogville | No formal reporting structure, but those with complaints inform the municipality | Municipality takes action on matters that need action |
| Dealsville | No formal reporting structure, but those with complaints inform the municipality | Municipality takes action on matters that need action |
| Setsoto | | |
| Ficksburg | No reporting | N/A |
| Senekal | No reporting but there is Senekal committee where council representatives meet with members of the committee | Council representatives meet with Senekal committee on issues related to commonage e.g. infrastructure on the commonage and payments |
| Clocolan | No reporting | N/A |
| Marquard | No reporting | N/A |
| Nketoana | | |
| Nketoana | No reporting | The municipality plans to appoint an official who will be responsible for monitoring |

5.6. Deficient consideration by municipal councils

In Maluti-a-Phofung and Mangaung Municipalities, no commonage-related issues were discussed at council level. With other municipalities the scenario is that one or two towns have taken commonage issues to council meeting, whereas other town councils have never discussed commonage related issues.

In municipalities where council discussed commonage related issues, it concerned issues such as empowerment and training of small farmers in order to cope with challenges such as identifying good market, issuing of local economic development grants to emerging farmers, issuing of tenders for commonage users and formulation of a commonage management policy.

In Tswelopele Municipality, council discussed the issue of who and how commonage users should be advised on matters such as prevention of overgrazing, decrease of rental for arable land and provision of more land for township residents, especially in view of an increasing number of people taking up farming.

The table below indicates the kinds of commonage related issues the various councils have discussed.

Table 10. Discussion of commonage related issues in council in the past year

| Municipality | Commonage related issues discussed in council in the past year |
|---------------------|--|
| Letsemeng | |
| Luckhoff | None |
| Jacobsdal | None, because there has been no consultation on commonage issues |
| Oppermansgronde | Council discussed land claim issues and this issue featured prominently on the agenda of the council meeting |
| Metsimaholo | |
| Oranjeville | No commonage issues have been discussed by council |
| Deneysville | Council has discussed no commonage issues. |
| Sasolburg | The council has only taken a decision to buy the farm Amelia for agricultural development for township residents but has not taken a decision on how to manage it. |
| Phumelela | |
| Warden | The council is compiling a report on commonage for the Thaba Mofutsanyane District Council |
| Tswelopele | |
| Bultfontein | Council discussed the issue of overgrazing, decrease of rental for arable land, enlargement of farming land for township residents and the CMC |
| Hoopstad | None |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | None |
| Mohokare | |
| Mohokare | Stock control on the commonage and horses that overgraze the land |
| Mangaung | |
| Mangaung | None |
| Mantsopa | |
| Ladybrand | Yes, but no issues are provided. |
| Hobhouse | Yes, the issue of overgrazing |
| Thaba Potchoa | Yes, but no issues are provided |
| Tweespruit | No |
| Dihlabeng | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown |
| Moqhaka | |
| Steynsrus | None |

| Municipality | Commonage related issues discussed in council in the past year |
|---------------------|--|
| Kroonstad | Yes, the lease agreement and the income from the new commonage |
| Kopanong | |
| Philippolis | None |
| Springfontein | Problems related to commonage are dealt with at ward committee level |
| Bethulie | Residents of Lephoi need grazing land |
| Reddersburg | Mr. Modise does not know what is discussed at Council meetings, as he does not receive the minutes and agenda. |
| Edenburg | None |
| Fauresmith | None |
| Gariiep Dam | Empowerment and training of small farmers |
| Trompsburg | Capacity building of farmers through training in their areas, e.g. crop farming and livestock farming |
| Jagersfontein | Empowerment and training of small farmers |
| Naledi | |
| Naledi | Ways of taking out livestock that is within township |
| Masilonyana | |
| Verkeerdevlei | None |
| Theunissen | Formulation of a policy that focuses on commonage management |
| Soutpan | N/A |
| Brandfort | Issuing of tenders for commonage use |
| Winburg | Issuing of tenders for commonage use |
| Ngwathe | |
| Ngwathe | Capacity building for users and proper usage of the commonage |
| Nala | |
| Bothaville | Local economic development grants, integration of all camps into one Nala commonage, IDP |
| Wesselsbron | Local economic development grants, integration of all camps into one Nala commonage, IDP |
| Mafube | |
| Mafube | The council has never discussed issues related to management of the commonage. Technical Services department discusses such issues. |
| Matjhabeng | |
| Matjhabeng | A policy for the administration of the commonage i.e. working hand in hand with the municipality and the users with the municipality overseeing administration of the commonage. |
| Tokologo | |
| Boshof | Payment from commonage users for livestock farming and repairs |
| Hertzogville | Payment from users for livestock farming and repairs |
| Dealesville | Payment from users for livestock farming and repairs |
| Setsoto | |
| Ficksburg | Policy for administration of commonage and formation of commonage committee |
| Senekal | Policy for administration of commonage |
| Clocolan | Formation of commonage committee |
| Marquard | Formation of commonage committee |
| Nketoana | |
| Nketoana | Policy to recover money from cattle owners who utilize camps but do not pay monthly rentals via credit control measures |

5.7. Financial management

In 11 municipalities, accounts are sent to the users of the commonage on a monthly basis. For the rest of the municipalities, users do not receive any accounts and accordingly they do not pay rentals. The various municipalities levy different levels of rentals. Even within one municipality there are different levels of rentals users are expected to pay. For example, in Kopanong Municipality with nine towns, there are different levels of rentals. In Fauresmith, rentals range between R25. and R41 per number of small livestock, whereas in Gariiep Dam rentals are calculated at the rate of R4 per small livestock per month.

The amount that commercial farmers pay, differ from what emerging farmers are paying. For example in Tswelopele Municipality, a commercial farmer pays R140 000 per ha per year for arable land, whereas emerging farmers pay R25 per ha per year for arable land.

It is therefore deemed advisable that a municipality should have a uniform basis for rentals in its towns so that there could be conformity. If municipalities levy different rentals, they run the risk of losing considerable income because users are refusing to pay different rentals within one municipality.

Table 11. Levels of rentals levied and levels to which accounts are received.

| Municipality | Level to which commonage users receive accounts for their rentals | Levels of rentals levied |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Letsemeng | | |
| Lockhoff | Accounts are sent out on a monthly basis | Five camps are rented out as one unit. The entire area of 2 921 ha is rented out for R1800 per month working out at R7, 39/ha/annum |
| Jacobsdal | None, but only knows of one person who pays for his two camps | N/A |
| Oppermansgronde | Farmers have been given annual accounts in the past every month of June | All land was leased at a rate of R1,50 per hectare per annum |
| Metsimaholo | | |
| Oranjeville | None | None because there are no contracts |
| Deneysville | None | None |
| Sasolburg | Kobus Dannhauser pays six monthly in advance according to the contract | Unknown |
| Phumelela | | |
| Warden | Accounts are sent out. | 461 ha of old commonage is |

| | | |
|------------------|--|---|
| | | leased out at a rate of R60 per hectare while 312 ha is used free of charge. The council has also reduced rental to make land more accessible to emerging farmers |
| Tswelopele | | |
| Bultfontein | No accounts are sent out but they pay according to their lease contracts | Commercial farmers pay R140 000 per ha. per year for arable land and the CMC pay R25 per ha per year for arable land and R10 per ha. per year for grazing |
| Hoopstad | No accounts are sent out but they pay according to their terms of contract | The total income from arable land hired to six commercial farmers is R513 729,66 per year |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | None | None |
| Mohokare | | |
| Mohokare | None | A levy of R5 per herd per month is charged |
| Mangaung | | |
| Mangaung | Accounts are sent out | R2/ ha is the fee charged for rental |
| Mantsopa | | |
| Ladybrand | Accounts are sent out | Accounts per rental agreement |
| Hobhouse | No accounts are sent | N/A |
| Thaba Patchoa | Accounts are sent out | Unknown |
| Tweespruit | Accounts are sent out | Unknown |
| Dihlabeng | | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown | |
| Moqhaka | | |
| Steynsrus | Accounts are sent out | The camp used by the livestock committee is R5 per animal per month |
| Kroonstad | Accounts are sent out | 6ha has a rental of R800., 4,2ha has a rental of R2 and for the new commonage affiliated members pay R10. |
| Kopanong | | |
| Philippolis | They hire the land | They pay according to their contracts |
| Springfontein | Accounts are sent out for commercial farmers only | On 3 595 ha rented out, farmers pay in total R45 606,00 |
| Bethulie | Farmers pay on montly basis as such no accounts are sent out | The rentals are culculated at the rate of R4 per large livestock unit per month |
| Reddersburg | No information | The commercial farmers pay R55 per ha. per year whereas Fairview |

| | | |
|---------------|--|---|
| | | users pay R15 per large livestock |
| Edenburg | No accounts are sent out | Users pay according to the terms of contract |
| Fauresmith | Quarterly accounts are sent out | Rentals range between R25 and R41, 50 per small livestock unit per year |
| Gariep Dam | Accounts are sent out | The rentals are calculated at the rate of R4 per livestock per month |
| Trompsburg | Accounts are sent out | The rate is R4 per livestock per month |
| Jagersfontein | Accounts are sent out | The rate is R4 per livestock per month |
| Naledi | | |
| Naledi | No accounts are given out | Users are not levied |
| Masilonyana | | |
| Verkeerdevlei | None | N/A |
| Theunissen | Farmers pay in advance | Total income from 3 camps rented out to commercial farmers is R50 000. |
| Soutpan | N/A | N/A |
| Brandfort | Accounts are sent out | R25 for grazing camp and R40 for agricultural use |
| Winburg | Accounts are sent out | R25 for grazing camp and R40 for agricultural use |
| Ngwathe | | |
| Ngwathe | Accounts are sent out | R2 for grazing camp and R8 for agricultural use |
| Nala | | |
| Bothaville | No accounts | N/A |
| Wesselsbron | No accounts | N/A |
| Mafube | | |
| Mafube | No accounts are sent out, only the contracts people signed inform them of their payments | Rates vary according to the size of the camps e.g. R300 for a small camp per annum is levied while the biggest camp amounts to R600 per annum |
| Matjhabeng | | |
| Matjhabeng | Accounts are sent out | R5 per large stock unit, with bulls counting as R10 per month |
| Tokologo | | |
| Boshof | Accounts are sent out | R11 per month for cattle and R2 per month for sheep and goats |
| Hertzogville | Accounts are sent out | R11 per month for cattle and R2 per month for sheep and goats |
| Dealesville | Accounts are sent out | R11 per month for cattle and R2 per month for sheep and goats |

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|--|
| Setsoto | | |
| Ficksburg | Accounts are sent out | R10 per month for cattle and R2 per month for sheep and goats |
| Senekal | Accounts are sent out | R10 per month for cattle and R2 per month for sheep and goats |
| Clocolan | Accounts are sent out | R 10 per month for cattle and R2 per month for sheep and goats |
| Marquard | Accounts are sent out | R 10 per month for cattle and R2 per month for sheep and goats |
| Nketoana | | |
| Nketoana | Accounts are sent out | R5 per month for both large and small scale livestock |

5.8. Payment rate and revenue collection

The table below reflects that, in nine municipalities, users pay regularly to the municipality, mostly on a monthly basis. Some municipalities do not receive regular payments and others do not recall getting payments from the users of the commonage. Even within municipalities the payment rate varies from town to town. This might be because of different levels of rates within one municipality and of course as a result of the financial status of users in the municipality.

In municipalities such as Naledi, Maluti-a-Phofung and Mohokare, users of the commonage do not pay either to the municipality or to their committees. In cases where the payment goes to the committee, the committee pays to the municipality on behalf of all its members. This creates problems in the sense that the municipality does not have a contract with the individuals but with the group, and with some members not paying this has disadvantages even for the group itself. For example, in Reddersburg, members of Ikaheng Association raised the alleged misuse of funds by the executive of the committee while the municipality on the other hand wants due payment. The ideal situation would be for the individuals to each pay to the municipality even though they are members of the group.

Table 12. Commonage payment rate

| Municipality | Regular payment/payment culture of commonage users (emerging farmers) | Payment to the municipality or to the users' committee |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Letsemeng | | |
| Lockhoff | Every month | Users committee collects the money |
| Jacobsdal | One person pays regularly; not sure of the others | Payment to the municipality |
| Oppermansgronde | They used to pay directly to the municipality, but since the land claim was submitted, some individuals have not paid at all. | They used to pay directly to the municipality |
| Metsimaholo | | |
| Oranjeville | No payments are made | No payments |

| Municipality | Regular payment/payment culture of commonage users (emerging farmers) | Payment to the municipality or to the users' committee |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Deneysville | N/A | N/A |
| Sasolburg | Regular payments | Payment to the municipality |
| Phumelela | | |
| Warden | Regular payments | Pay to the municipality |
| Tswelopele | | |
| Bultfontein | Regular payments | Pay to the municipality |
| Hoopstad | Regular payments | Pay to the municipality |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | None | None |
| Mohokare | | |
| Mohokare | No regular payments - sporadically | Only Zastron has a plan to pay but whether to municipality or committees is not clear |
| Mangaung | | |
| Mangaung | Regular payments by people who have lease contracts but illegal stock remains a problem | Unknown |
| Mantsopa | | |
| Ladybrand | Regular payments | Municipality |
| Hobhouse | No regular payment | They should pay to the municipality |
| Thaba Patchoa | No regular payments | Unknown |
| Tweespruit | Regular payments | Municipality |
| Dihlabeng | | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown | |
| Moqhaka | | |
| Steynsrus | Regular payments | Municipality |
| Kroonstad | Regular payments | Municipality |
| Kopanong | | |
| Philippolis | Commercial farmers pay regularly whereas emerging farmers do not pay regularly | Municipality |
| Springfontein | Commercial farmers pay regularly whereas township residents refuse to pay. | Municipality |
| Bethulie | Regular payments on monthly basis | Municipality |
| Reddersburg | Commercial farmers pay annually whereas Ikaheng Association no longer pays. | Municipality |
| Edenburg | Regular payments by commercial farmers but Boramehlape members pay their committee | Municipality |
| Fauresmith | Regular payments | Municipality |
| Gariiep Dam | Regular payments | Municipality |
| Trompsburg | Regular payments | Municipality |
| Jagersfontein | Regular payments | Municipality |
| Naledi | | |
| Naledi | None | None |
| Masilonyana | | |
| Verkeerdevlei | None | None |
| Theunissen | Regular payments | Municipality |

| Municipality | Regular payment/payment culture of commonage users (emerging farmers) | Payment to the municipality or to the users' committee |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Soutpan | N/A | N/A |
| Brandfort | Regular payments | Municipality |
| Winburg | Regular payments | Municipality |
| Ngwathe | | |
| Ngwathe | No regular payments - sporadically | Municipality |
| Nala | | |
| Bothaville | Unknown | Pay to their committee |
| Wesselsbron | Unknown | Pay to their committee |
| Mafube | | |
| Mafube | They could pay once a year or twice depending on their financial ability, but whichever way they take, at the end of the day payments must be done. | Pay to municipality |
| Matjhabeng | | |
| Matjhabeng | Regular payments | Municipality |
| Tokologo | | |
| Boshof | Regular payments monthly | Municipality |
| Hertzogville | Regular payment monthly | Municipality |
| Dealesville | Regular payment monthly | Municipality |
| Setsoto | | |
| Ficksburg | Payments are made half yearly | Municipality |
| Senekal | Payments are made half yearly | Municipality |
| Clocolan | Payments are made half yearly | Municipality |
| Marquard | Payments are made half yearly | Municipality |
| Nketoana | | |
| Nketoana | No regular payments | They are supposed to pay to the municipality |

The table below shows that nine municipalities do respond to non-payment. Two municipalities do not have any policy or strategy to respond to non-payment, while other municipalities do not experience a problem with non-payment.

Municipalities dealing with non-payment send out reminders in the form of letters to commonage users. In Tswelopele and Nketoana, users who do not pay, are handed over to the Credit Control department to be dealt with. Ngwathe Municipality cuts services to those who do not pay and reinstall after they have paid. According to municipalities that send reminders, users of the commonage respond positively, with those that cannot pay explaining their situation and paying when their financial status permits – the municipality treats each case on its merit.

Table 13. Response to non-payment

| Municipality | How does the municipality deal with non-payment |
|---------------------|--|
| Letsemeng | |
| Lockhof | Nada (Acting town clerk) has been instructed to send a letter of demand to the users' committee to instruct them to pay their arrears. |
| Jacobsdal | This has not been an issue recently. In the old system, when farmers |

| Municipality | How does the municipality deal with non-payment |
|---------------------|--|
| | were late with their payments interest at bank rates was added to their accounts. |
| Oppermansgronde | In the past warnings were issued, but this no longer applies. Because of the sensitivity of this land, no person was ever taken to court or evicted for non-payment. |
| Metsimaholo | |
| Oranjeville | The municipality does nothing |
| Deneysville | N/A |
| Sasolburg | This has not been a problem so far. |
| Phumelela | |
| Warden | This has not been a problem |
| Tswelopele | |
| Bultfontein | Hand over defaulters to the Credit control Department for follow up and action |
| Hoopstad | This has not been a problem |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | N/A |
| Mohokare | |
| Mohokare | Only Zastron has a plan but not clear as to how the plan works |
| Mangaung | |
| Mangaung | Unknown |
| Mantsopa | |
| Ladybrand | Reminders are sent out |
| Hobhouse | Non-payment problem is not addressed |
| Thaba Patchoa | Reminders are sent out |
| Tweespruit | This has not yet happened |
| Dihlabeng | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown |
| Moqhaka | |
| Steynsrus | Letters are delivered to the persons concerned and if necessary further action is taken |
| Kroonstad | This has not be a problem |
| Kopanong | |
| Philippolis | The municipality does not have ways of dealing with non-payment |
| Springfontein | The municipality does not know how to deal with non-payment problems but the ward councillor convenes meetings to try to resolve problems |
| Bethulie | This has not been a problem |
| Reddersburg | The problem has been referred to the Speaker and the Municipal Manager but no solution has come out so far |
| Edenburg | This has not been a problem |
| Fauresmith | This has not been a problem |
| Gariep Dam | Reminder letters are sent out |
| Trompsburg | Reminder letters are sent out |
| Jagersfontein | Reminder letters are sent out |
| Naledi | |
| Naledi | No strategies in place to deal with non-payment |
| Masilonyana | |
| Verkeerdevlei | No policy in place to deal with non-payment |
| Theunissen | This has not been a problem |

| Municipality | How does the municipality deal with non-payment |
|---------------------|---|
| Soutpan | N/A |
| Brandfort | This has not been a problem |
| Winburg | This has not been a problem |
| Ngwathe | |
| Ngwathe | The municipality cuts services and re-install them after payment |
| Nala | |
| Bothaville | N/A |
| Wesslesbron | N/A |
| Mafube | |
| Mafube | Inform people about the terms of contract they signed and take case by case for those who are really poor |
| Matjhabeng | |
| Matjhabeng | No policy for non-payment, the municipality just send reminders in a form of letter and calls. |
| Tokologo | |
| Boshof | Reminder letters are sent out |
| Hertzogville | Reminder letters are sent out |
| Dealesville | Reminder letters are sent out |
| Setsoto | |
| Ficksburg | No no-payment problem |
| Senekal | No non-payment problem |
| Clocolan | No non-payment problem |
| Marquard | No non-payment problem |
| Nketoana | |
| Nketoana | Enforce credit control measures |

Table 13 below indicates that in 11 municipalities, commonage revenue flows back into the central municipal coffers. In three municipalities the revenue generated from commonage is used to upgrade the commonage, while the other six municipalities bear no knowledge about the commonage revenue and do not receive any such revenue from the commonage. The reason why some municipalities deposit commonage revenue into municipal coffers is that they fund other municipal items with this revenue in the same way as they would take revenue generated from any other source and use it for commonage. This is disadvantageous because the sources of income of the municipalities do not sustain themselves, which means that municipalities would never be sure of how different sources of income contribute to the general municipal revenue account. However, the difficulty with this kind of cross-subsidisation is that accurate, zero-based costings of specific municipal functions are often not done.

Thus in order for municipalities to sustain development programmes initiated by them, revenue from such programmes should be used to maintain and upgrade the very same programmes. Consequently, revenue generated from commonage should be used for commonage issues and in so doing municipalities would know where the problems occur and how to address such problems.

Municipalities could also keep separate budgetary entries for commonage in order to avoid spending commonage revenue on other expenses. It is recommended that this approach be adopted, because there are unavoidably various kinds of commonage items needing to be addressed e.g. new comers into the commonage, maintenance of infrastructure and implementation of developmental projects for the commonage. All of these need money and the best way to fund would be from commonage-generated funds, thus creating a self-driven development process.

Table 14. Commonage revenue: Is it being ring-fenced or not?

| Municipality | Is revenue ring-fenced? |
|---------------------|--|
| Letsemeng | |
| Lockhof | Money flows back into the municipal coffers. |
| Jacobsdal | Money goes into the general municipal coffers. |
| Oppermansgronde | Money is used to improve infrastructure like roads and water provisioning for farmers. |
| Metsimaholo | |
| Oranjeville | No revenue received |
| Deneysville | N/A |
| Sasolburg | Money goes into the general municipal coffers |
| Phumelela | |
| Warden | Money goes into municipal coffers and some goes for repairs |
| Tswelopele | |
| Bultfontein | Money flows into the general municipal coffers |
| Hoopstad | Money goes into the general municipal coffers |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | No revenue is received from rentals |
| Mohokare | |
| Mohokare | Revenue received is too little to have an impact |
| Mangaung | |
| Mangaung | Money goes into the general municipal coffers |
| Mantsopa | |
| Ladybrand | Money goes into central municipal coffers |
| Hobhouse | Money goes into general municipal coffers |
| Thaba Potchoa | Unknown what the money is used for |
| Tweespruit | Money flows into the general municipal coffers |
| Dihlabeng | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown |
| Moqhaka | |
| Steynsrus | Money goes into central municipal coffers |
| Kroonstad | Ring-fenced for the repairs and development of the commonage |
| Kopanong | |
| Philippolis | Money goes into the general municipal coffers |
| Springfontein | Money goes into the general municipal coffers |
| Bethulie | Revenue goes into the central municipal coffers and some is put aside for repairs and maintenance |
| Reddersburg | Revenue goes into the central municipal coffers but expenditure for repairs is debited to this amount when commercial farmers lodge claims. Users of Fairview do not get a share for repairs because they do not pay for rentals |

| Municipality | Is revenue ring-fenced? |
|---------------------|---|
| Edenburg | Money goes into the general municipal coffers |
| Fauresmith | The revenue goes into the central municipal coffers |
| Gariep Dam | The revenue is ring-fenced |
| Trompsburg | The revenue is ring-fenced |
| Jagersfontein | The revenue is ring-fenced |
| Naledi | |
| Naledi | No revenue is received from the rentals |
| Masilonyana | |
| Verkeerdevlei | N/A as there is no income from the commonage |
| Theunissen | Money goes into the general municipal coffers |
| Soutpan | N/A |
| Brandfort | Revenue goes into central municipal coffers |
| Winburg | Revenue goes into central municipal coffers |
| Ngwathe | |
| Ngwathe | Revenue goes back into central municipal coffers |
| Nala | |
| Bothaville | No revenue is received |
| Wesselsbron | No revenue is received |
| Mafube | |
| Mafube | The money they pay once or twice a year goes to municipal coffers |
| Matjhabeng | |
| Matjhabeng | Revenue goes back to commonage for its development and maintenance. |
| Tokologo | |
| Boshof | Revenue used to upgrade the commonage |
| Hertzogville | Revenue used to upgrade the commonage |
| Dealesville | Revenue used to upgrade the commonage |
| Setsoto | |
| Ficksburg | Revenue flows back into central municipal coffers |
| Senekal | Revenue flows back into central municipal coffers |
| Clocolan | Revenue flows back into central municipal coffers |
| Marquard | Revenue flows back into central municipal coffers |
| Nketoana | |
| Nketoana | Revenue flows back into central municipal coffers |

6. Support Systems

6.1. Technical or financial assistance from external agencies (government departments, NGO's, farmers, etc.)

It has been found that seven of the 20 municipalities have received support from external agencies. This does not include the support given by agricultural extension officers, as they are obliged and duty-bound to assist emerging farmers.

Table 14 below shows that emerging farmers have received technical and financial assistance from DoA, DLA and Land Bank. There is a need for government departments and NGOs to assist all the municipalities because municipal officials and emerging farmers need technical and financial help in order to manage commonages. Financial assistance could be of two kinds i.e. lending money and advice on how to access funds. For example in Kopanong Municipality, emerging farmers of Philippolis indicated that they would like to be given advice on how to access funds as they are struggling to pay the municipal rentals.

Table 15. Assistance provided by external agencies

| Municipality | Support from external agencies |
|------------------|---|
| Letsemeng | |
| Lockhoff | Official from DoA visit the town on a fairly regular basis. |
| Jacobsdal | DoA |
| Oppermansgronde | DLA and DoA |
| Metsimaholo | |
| Oranjeville | None |
| Deneysville | None |
| Sasolburg | DoA |
| Phumelela | |
| Warden | DoA advises Bambanani farmers. |
| Tswelopele | |
| Bultfontein | None |
| Hoopstad | None |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | None |
| Mohokare | |
| Mohokare | DoA |
| Mangaung | |
| Mangaung | DLA |
| Mantsopa | |
| Ladybrand | Unknown |
| Hobhouse | DoA |
| Thaba Potchoa | Unknown |
| Tweespruit | Unknown |
| Dihlabeng | |

| Municipality | Support from external agencies |
|---------------------|--|
| Dhlabeng | Unknown |
| Moqhaka | |
| Steynsrus | Not for the new commonage, but for the old commonage, DoA has assisted |
| Kroonstad | DLA and DoA |
| Kopanong | |
| Philippolis | None |
| Springfontein | None |
| Bethulie | DoA assist with municipal problems that are being experienced |
| Reddersburg | None |
| Edenburg | DoA helps with municipal problems |
| Fauresmith | DoA |
| Gariiep Dam | DoA |
| Trompsburg | DoA |
| Jagersfontein | No |
| Naledi | |
| Naledi | No |
| Masilonyana | |
| Verkeerdevlei | No |
| Theunissen | No |
| Soutpan | N/A |
| Brandfort | DoA |
| Winburg | DoA |
| Ngwathe | |
| Ngwathe | Land Bank and DLA |
| Nala | |
| Bothaville | DoA and DLA |
| Wesselsbron | DoA and DLA |
| Mafube | |
| Mafube | No |
| Matjhabeng | |
| Matjhabeng | None |
| Tokologo | |
| Boshof | No |
| Hertzogville | No |
| Dealesville | No |
| Setsoto | |
| Ficksburg | No |
| Senekal | No |
| Clocolan | No |
| Marquard | No |
| Nketoana | |
| Nketoana | No |

6.2. Department of Local Government and Housing

DLGH does not have a concrete policy on how the old commonage should be used and it has been left to municipalities to manage as they deem fit. However, various problems are found to crop up and as a result it would be advisable for DLGH and the municipalities to synergise and develop a concrete and workable policy in this regard.

6.3. Department of Land Affairs

The Department of Land Affairs (DLA) follows a policy of purchasing land from commercial farmers and giving it to municipalities for emerging farmers. This land, referred to as “new commonage”, forms part of land reform. According to DLA, the new commonage should be seen as a stepping-stone by emerging farmers towards becoming eventually viable commercial farmers and ultimately owners of the land.

The DLA stipulates that the land it is buying should be allocated to hitherto disadvantaged communities so that they could practise farming with a view to improve standards of living. To achieve this goal, DLA encourages disadvantaged groups (unemployed poor people) to apply for land reform funding. On the basis of the application an applicant obtains a sum of R20 000 enabling him/her to commence farming.

After emerging farmers have acquired the land, DoA through extension officers assists them with farming knowledge and skills. Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) is the vehicle that DLA uses to participate in land reform by making funds available for emerging farmers to start farming. DLA and DoA assist emerging farmers to cope with the challenges that confront them.

LRAD seeks to encourage emerging farmers to increase their stock, to strive to acquire their own farms and to become commercial farmers after a period of five years. DoA also assists with funding so that when the emerging farmers have acquired land they could start projects that will generate income. However, many emerging farmers have not as yet reached the stage where they could be self-sustaining and they still farm on commonages as groups, especially because many emerging farmers are cattle farmers and cattle take longer time to breed and expand.

Though DLA assists emerging farmers with acquisition of new land, there is a critical need for after care. Many emerging farmers raised the concern that after they have been given land, there is no after care and this makes farming difficult because they still have much to learn and vast experience to be gained.

Municipalities are expected to administer and be responsible for commonages, but they do not have the skilled personnel to supervise the commonages. This results in a host of problems, for example in many instances emerging farmers are at loggerheads with municipalities over maintenance of the commonage infrastructure, non-payment of

rentals and contracts not clearly defining the respective roles of the municipality, DLA and the emerging farmers. This scenario places municipalities in a difficult position because DLA does not keep track of what is happening in the commonage. Also the municipalities are expected to respond to other developmental initiatives required from them by government with the result that municipalities are carrying a heavy onus. Therefore again, DLA, DoA and municipalities should together devise means to provide the necessary aftercare and training to emerging farmers.

6.4. Department of Agriculture

The Department of Agriculture (DoA) is involved in commonage in two ways. Firstly, DoA provides Community Project Funds (CPF) to communities to start projects in the commonages and also with seeds. Secondly, the extension officers of DoA assist emerging farmers with agricultural skills e.g. prevention of overgrazing, marking of stock, ploughing of suitable crops during suitable seasons and disease control. DoA policy is that such CPF funds should be allocated to disadvantaged people in order to start beneficial projects.

In Tswelopele Municipality, a poultry project, a vegetable garden project and crop farming have been funded by CPF from DoA. All these projects are aimed at helping poor communities to earn a living. However, the vegetable garden project nearly collapsed because of a lack of project management skills from the beneficiaries. So it is the duty of DoA to ensure that the beneficiaries of the projects are trained so that the projects could achieve the desired goals. Apart from CPF funds, DoA also assists communities by giving them seeds to plant.

It has been found that while extension officers serve as mentors for commonage users and municipal officials responsible for commonage, emerging farmers have indicated that extension officers seldom visit the camps and advise them. This makes farming difficult for emerging farmers as they still have a lot to learn. To remedy this, extension officers should provide guidance to both the municipal officials responsible for commonage and the emerging farmers. This would assist both the municipal official and emerging farmers about how the commonage could be utilized to improve the standard of living of people by way of agricultural projects. In this regard both DLA and DoA could play a much larger beneficiary role.

Table 15 below clearly shows that DoA has not as yet extended its support to all the municipalities, e.g. eight of the 20 municipalities have not as yet received any assistance from DoA. Again, DoA should assist the municipal officials and commonage users to the extent that they would be able to earn a living from the commonage and become viable commercial farmers serving as an example to other emerging farmers and motivating them to follow in their footsteps.

Table 16. Support from DoA and other departments

| Municipality | Technical assistance received from DoA/ any other departments |
|---------------------|--|
| Letsemeng | |
| Luckhoff | Officials from DoA pay visits to the towns, but Nada personally is not aware of any technical advice given to the municipality |
| Jacobsdal | The two officials left in the office at Jacobsdal do not see any one from DoA because it is only a pay point. In contrast, when the vineyard for emerging farmers was established, Mr Hoffman used to frequently see Jannie Koch from DoA. |
| Oppermansgronde | DLA deals with the land claims and pays regular visits while DoA advises the municipality on the matter of overgrazing. |
| Metsimaholo | |
| Oranjeville | None |
| Deneysville | None |
| Sasolburg | DoA on the development of the land |
| Phumelela | |
| Warden | DoA advises Bambanani farmers not the municipality |
| Tswelopele | |
| Bultfontein | DoA closed certain camps that have been overgrazed |
| Hoopstad | No |
| Maluti-a-phofung | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | No |
| Mohokare | |
| Mohokare | DoA gave advice on breeding |
| Mangaung | |
| Mangaung | DLA gives support |
| Mantsopa | |
| Ladybrand | Unknown |
| Hobhouse | DoA but did not tell how |
| Thaba Potchoa | Unknown |
| Tweespruit | Unknown |
| Dihlabeng | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown |
| Moqhaka | |
| Steynsrus | No |
| Kroonstad | DoA but not enough support |
| Kopanong | |
| Philippolis | No |
| Springfontein | No |
| Bethulie | A facilitator from DoA helps the municipality |
| Reddersburg | No |
| Edenburg | Christo Geldenhuys from DoA helps commonage users |
| Fauresmith | DoA has assisted farmers to brand their livestock |
| Gariep Dam | DoA has assisted with ploughing of the land |
| Trompsburg | DoA has assisted with marking of stock |
| Jagersfontein | No |
| Naledi | |
| Naledi | No |
| Masilonyana | |
| Verkeerdevlei | No |

| Municipality | Technical assistance received from DoA/ any other departments |
|---------------------|--|
| Theunissen | No |
| Soutpan | N/A |
| Brandfort | DoA assisted with the development of the land |
| Winburg | DoA assisted with the development of the land |
| Ngwathe | |
| Ngwathe | DoA helped during the initial stages of the commonage implementation |
| Nala | |
| Bothaville | DoA helps to educate users about prevention of overgrazing |
| Wesselsbron | DoA helps to educate users about prevention of overgrazing |
| Mafube | |
| Mafube | DoA helped users to draft business plans |
| Matjhabeng | |
| Matjhabeng | DoA helped during the initial stages of the commonage implementation |
| Tokologo | |
| Boshof | DoA helped by recommending certain crops to be ploughed during suitable season |
| Hertzogville | DoA helped by recommending certain crops to be ploughed during suitable season |
| Dealesville | DoA helped by recommending certain crops to be ploughed during suitable season |
| Setsoto | |
| Ficksburg | Extension officer from DoA assisted on rehabilitation of land |
| Senekal | Extension officer from DoA assisted on rehabilitation of land |
| Clocolan | No assistance |
| Marquard | No assistance |
| Nketoana | |
| Nketoana | Little assistance from DoA which focused on farming of poultry |

6.5. Commercial farmers as mentors

Commercial farmers could be of great assistance to emerging farmers by serving as mentors, because the former have experience in farming and some of the farms that the emerging farmers now utilize used to belong to commercial farmers. Commercial farmers could also assist emerging farmers in identifying good markets for their production and stock. A case in point here is that of Kopanong Municipality where at Philippolis, emerging farmers who own goats co-operate with the commercial farmer by transporting their goats to the market in Kimberley and thereby together obtaining income.

Also in Mantsopa and Tswelopele Municipalities, emerging crop farmers co-operate with a commercial farmer because the commercial farmer has got all the necessary machinery to plough big fields. The agreement is that the commercial farmer gets 85 % while emerging farmers get 15 % of the total produce. While the emerging farmers have indicated that this arrangement does not suit them well because they are getting only 15 %, the fact is that they still managed to purchase their own tractor, and are hoping to buy more machinery so that they could become self-sustaining. Thus

evidently, though the emerging farmers complain about the percentage they get, it is better than nothing.

Good working relations between the commercial farmers and emerging farmers could lessen the burden on government departments and the municipality because services such as mentoring and identification of good market could be provided by commercial farmers. Clearly therefore, there is a need for a formal arrangement by all stakeholders of the commonage to use the existing expertise of the commercial farmers for the benefit of emerging farmers. It would consequently be in the interest of stakeholders to work out some form of compensation for commercial farmers who assist emerging farmers.

6.6. Interdepartmental co-operation

With the Department of Local Government and Housing (DLGH) leaving old commonage land with municipalities to manage, municipalities have come under a lot of pressure from communities because the latter do not only want land but still have to be monitored and advised on how to utilise commonage effectively. This means that the municipalities must come up with clear guidelines on who exactly has access to the commonage, how should it be utilized, for what purposes and above all at what stage should a self-reliant farmer leave the commonage in order to make room for new community members who want to start farming. Municipalities do indicate that demands from communities for more commonage land are increasing.

On the other hand, while DLA and DoA do provide some support regarding new commonage, this is by far not sufficient because commonage users lack know-how, finance and business skills. DLGH, DLA, DoA, municipalities and emerging farmers should therefore develop a concrete common policy for all stakeholders towards achieving the desired goals of the commonage.

7. Commonage and Development

7.1. Using IDPs to boost commonage

The table below indicates that commonage is included in most municipal IDP's. The issues that are discussed include policy to access commonage, usage of the commonage, making more commonage available for new farmers, training of emerging farmers and how commonage needs could be provided for in the municipal budget.

Table 17. Commonage as featuring in the IDP's

| Municipality | Are commonage related issues included in the IPD? | If so, what are the proposals in terms of development of the commonage? |
|---------------------|--|---|
| Letsemeng | | |
| Luckhoff | Yes | Unknown |
| Jacobsdal | Yes | Only a need for a commonage for township residents |
| Oppersmansgronde | Yes | Support for land claims so that the farmers could own the land and get individual title deeds for allotments |
| Metsimaholo | | |
| Oranjeville | Not yet | N/A |
| Deneysville | No | N/A |
| Sasolburg | Yes | Seek funding for proper investigation and feasibility study on how best to develop Amelia |
| Phumelela | | |
| Warden | Unknown | None |
| Tswelopele | | |
| Bultfontein | No | N/A |
| Hoopstad | No | N/A |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | Yes | Improve access to commonage and grazing areas. Identify more land for commonage and apply for grants from the DLA |
| Mohokare | | |
| Mohokare | No | N/A |
| Mangaung | | |
| Mangaung | Yes | Spatial development framework has been approved by council |
| Mantsopa | | |
| Ladybrand | Yes | Policies for future utilization of commonage |
| Hobhouse | Yes | Policies for future utilization of commonage |
| Thaba Potchoa | Yes | Policies for future utilization of commonage |
| Tweespruit | Yes | Policies for future utilization of commonage |
| Dihlabeng | | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown | |
| Moqhaka | | |
| Steynsrus | Yes | Policies for future use of commonage |
| Kroonstad | Yes | Proposals on uniform economic and infrastructural development |
| Kopanong | | |
| Philippolis | Yes | Included in the overall IDP |
| Springfontein | Yes | Included in the overall IDP |
| Bethulie | Yes | Land should be made available for Lephoi residents |
| Reddersburg | Yes | Development issues for the commonage |
| Edenburg | Yes | Unknown |
| Fauresmith | Yes | More land should be put aside for housing construction |
| Gariiep Dam | Yes | Unknown |
| Trompsburg | Yes | Unknown |
| Jagersfontein | Yes | Unknown |

| Municipality | Are commonage related issues included in the IPD? | If so, what are the proposals in terms of development of the commonage? |
|---------------------|--|---|
| Naledi | | |
| Naledi | Yes | Apply for funding from the DoA for managing the commonage and review policy on commonage |
| Masilonyana | | |
| Verkeerdevlei | Unknown | N/A |
| Theunissen | Yes | Unknown |
| Soutpan | N/A | N/A |
| Brandfort | Yes | Development of small scale farmers through training and funding |
| Winburg | Yes | Development of small scale framers through training and funding |
| Ngwathe | | |
| Ngwathe | Yes | Assisting emergent farmers to become commercial farmers and market their produce |
| Nala | | |
| Bothaville | Yes | Inclusion of commonage in municipal capital and operational budget so as to keep the commonage going and improve infrastructure |
| Wesselsbron | Yes | Inclusion of commonage in municipal capital and operational budget so as to keep the commonage going and improve infrastructure |
| Mafube | | |
| Mafube | Yes | Inclusion of commonage in municipal capital budget so as to keep the commonage infrastructure and development operating. |
| Matjhabeng | | |
| Mathjabeng | Yes | Establishment of a training centre for farmers in a defunct mine property |
| Tokologo | | |
| Boshof | Yes | Capital budget for infrastructure and assisting farmers to sell their produce in markets |
| Hertzogville | Yes | Capital budget for infrastructure and assisting farmers to sell their produce in markets |
| Dealesville | Yes | Capital budget for infrastructure and assisting farmers to sell their produce in markets |
| Setsoto | | |
| Ficksburg | Yes | Upgrading of the commonage infrastructure |
| Senekal | Yes | Capital budget for commonage management |
| Clocolan | Yes | Upgrading of commonage infrastructure and capital budget for commonage |
| Marquard | Yes | Capital budget for the commonage management |
| Nketoana | | |
| Nketoana | | Working with commonage users to come up with projects that need to be implemented in the commonage e.g. piggery and poultry |

7.2. Using commonage to boost LED

The table below illustrates the wide variety of ideas that municipalities entertain in utilizing commonage to boost local economic development. Many municipalities are of the opinion that commonage should be used as an income base for unemployed poor people. Commonage users should sell their production and stock to bigger markets in order to generate income.

In Mantsopa Municipality, commonage land is used for a piggery and vegetable gardening. The beneficiaries sell the pigs and pork to generate income, likewise with vegetable growers they sell to schools, clinics, households and the hospital. In Tswelopele municipality, there is a poultry project and a vegetable garden, with beneficiaries selling their production to generate income. However, these projects have not achieved the set goals due to problems ranging from misuse of funds to lack of business skills, but if these projects could be run effectively, the commonage could indeed boost local economic development.

Table 18. Commonage featuring in LED policies

| Municipality | Commonage as part of LED: ideas |
|---------------------|--|
| Letsemeng | |
| Luckhoff | Land could be used for the development of small-scale farmers and must get enough support. |
| Jacobsdal | If township residents had land they could use it for farming which would be a valuable source of income. |
| Oppermansgronde | Farmers should get official titles to the land and use irrigation water for production of irrigated crops. |
| Metsimaholo | |
| Oranjeville | Cattle should be removed from municipal area and the camps hired to commercial farmers. Cattle owners who are Metsimaholo residents should be assisted to purchase their own farms. |
| Deneysville | After the disaster at Refenghotso, there is no future for communal farming |
| Sasolburg | Communal farming is unsuccessful. Individuals should farm on a small scale and emerging farmers should be established around the township in order to produce fruit, vegetables, poultry, and milk. |
| Phumelela | |
| Warden | Investment should be directed in training and skills development of commonage users. Commonage should be used for commercial farming and not subsistence farming. The Cornelia River and the engineering plan could be used to develop irrigation. |
| Tswelopele | |
| Bultfontein | Ensure access to commonage by different levels of income groups, enlarge the commonage land, secure funding to buy the necessary equipment and train the commonage users to ensure effective farming |

| Municipality | Commonage as part of LED: ideas |
|---------------------|--|
| Hoopstad | Ensure access to commonage by different levels of income groups, enlarge the commonage land, secure funding to buy the necessary equipment and train the commonage users to ensure effective farming |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | Opening up of commonage to more people would almost surely result in many economic activities being taken up leading to economic development of the commonage |
| Mohokare | |
| Mohokare | Purchase more land and utilise it properly, thus solving the problem of overgrazing. |
| Mangaung | |
| Mangaung | Empowerment of commonage farmers by government in order to be skilful. More staff is needed. Experts in agriculture and economics should be employed. |
| Mantsopa | |
| Ladybrand | Not sure, maybe specialized inputs could be of value |
| Hobhouse | Not sure, maybe specialized inputs could be of value |
| Thaba Potchoa | Not sure, maybe specialized inputs could be of value |
| Tweespruit | Not sure, maybe specialized inputs could be of value |
| Dihlabeng | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown |
| Moqhaka | |
| Steynsrus | Feasibility studies to be done in conjunction with the DoA that will be also involved in skills training. The land should be sub-divided and be leased out to the users. |
| Kroonstad | Sufficient support through intensive training for staff on agricultural products and also trained to monitor and evaluate projects. Commonage users to be taught about marketing products |
| Kopanong | |
| Philippolis | Commonage should be used by emerging and small scale farmers for income generation and creation of jobs to be managed properly |
| Springfontein | Commonage should be used for job creation and development |
| Bethulie | Much land should be made available for agricultural projects as this will contribute to job creation |
| Reddersburg | Intensive training is needed for residents so that they could start farming and then develop economically |
| Edenburg | More land, capital and skills development should be made available for emerging farmers so that they could develop economically |
| Fauresmith | More land and skills training should be made available for emerging farmers so that they could practise farming properly |
| Gariep Dam | Commonage should be used for job creation and development |
| Trompsburg | Commonage should be used for job creation and development |
| Jagersfontein | Commonage should be used for job creation and development |
| Naledi | |
| Naledi | Community must be aware of the commonage activities. Experts on |

| Municipality | Commonage as part of LED: ideas |
|---------------------|---|
| | stock farming from the DoA should give advice on stock management and farming issues. Creation of centre or office for referral of problems recommended |
| Masilonyana | |
| Verkeerdevlei | The users should be properly organized and trained so as to use the land efficiently. Users should pay for the land they use and this could contribute in economic growth thereby improving employment levels |
| Theunissen | Unable to offer opinion |
| Soutpan | N/A |
| Brandfort | Division of camps into small plots so that there could be more users benefiting from farming |
| Winburg | Division of camps into small plots so that there could be more users benefiting from farming |
| Ngwathe | |
| Ngwathe | Vegetable producers to be more commercial and should assist in food security programmes and be participants in bigger markets |
| Nala | |
| Bothaville | There has to be an establishment of local economic development agency through section 21 company so that commonage users could form partnership with service providers thereby sharing resources |
| Wesselsbron | There should be establishment of a local economic development agency through section 21 company so that commonage users could form partnership with service providers thereby sharing resources |
| Mafube | |
| Mafube | DoA should provide commonage users with skills, training and funding. Much as the commonage appear in local municipal IDP, DoA should have hard and fast rules and policies for the commonage and take necessary steps in the event of matters not being up to standard |
| Matjhabeng | |
| Matjhabeng | Coupling commonage use with formal training of emerging farmers at training centres would empower them in their areas of interests so that they could graduate into viable commercial farmers |
| Tokologo | |
| Boshof | Many people should be encouraged to start farming in the commonage, use camps effectively and be trained and be supported financial so that they could produce and earn a livelihood |
| Hertzogville | Many people should be encouraged to start farming and use camps effectively and be trained and be supported financially so that they could produce and earn a livelihood |
| Dealesville | Many people should be encouraged to start farming and use camps effectively and be trained and supported financially so that they can produce and sell their production and earn a livelihood |
| Setsoto | |
| Ficksburg | Commonage users should be trained in a sustainable manner so that they could participate in job creation opportunities. |

| Municipality | Commonage as part of LED: ideas |
|---------------------|---|
| Senekal | Commonage users should be trained to acquire skills for job creation initiatives |
| Clocolan | Training of commonage users to acquire job initiative skills and assist poor rural people in upstream economic development |
| Marquard | Training commonage users to get skills so that they could initiate jobs hence participating in economic development |
| Nketoana | |
| Nketoana | The commonage users should be trained technically to have business plan skills that will serve as strategic guiding force on how to be productive and sustainable in farming. Instead of the users having mixed breeds, they can focus and form partnership around one breed and identify market and start selling to such a market. The problem now is that they are engaged in mixed breeds that the market does not demand |

7.3. Sustainable environmental management

Most of municipal commonages have experienced problems of overgrazing and soil erosion. This is due to the fact that commonage users do not receive the necessary training and information on how to farm proactively. Since the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) does not assist all municipalities with environmental problems, there is a need for DLA, DoA, DLGH, municipalities and emerging farmers to bring DEAT on board to assist with environmental issues facing commonages.

For example, in Kopanong Municipality, at Philippolis stock farmers indicated that they are facing a problem with pig owners not wanting to put their pigs inside the commonage thus leading to pigs roaming around town and the township, creating negative environmental effects in the community as a whole. It is seen as the task of the municipality to request environmental consultants to get pig owners to understand and comply with environmental policies.

Table 19. Commonage use and environmental degradation

| Municipality | Has commonage usage led to the degradation of the natural environment? | Have steps been taken to remedy this? | Has any assistance come forward from the Dept of Environmental Affairs? |
|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Letsemeng | | | |
| Luckhoff | Overgrazing which leads to soil erosion is a problem | DoA had a meeting with the commonage users to discuss overgrazing | No |
| Jacobsdal | No | Not necessary | No |
| Oppermansgronde | Overgrazing which leads to soil erosion is the problem | DoA has sent persons to spray noxious weeds | Officials from the Dept of Environmental |

| Municipality | Has commonage usage led to the degradation of the natural environment? | Have steps been taken to remedy this? | Has any assistance come forward from the Dept of Environmental Affairs? |
|---------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | Affairs visited the area once in the last five years |
| Metsimaholo | | | |
| Oranjeville | No, rather the camps are under utilized | Not necessary | No |
| Deneysville | N/A | N/A | No |
| Sasolburg | No | N/A | Council works with the Department of Environmental Affairs on air pollution that is generated by SASOL |
| Phumelela | | | |
| Warden | Yes, some camps near Ezenzeleni township are overgrazed | No because the municipality does not have the necessary information | There used to be a visit by the Dept of Environmental Affairs, but since he moved to Qwaqwa, there are no more visits |
| Tswelopele | | | |
| Bultfontein | Yes, overgrazing is a problem | Yes, grazing in overgrazed areas is prohibited | No |
| Hoopstad | Yes, overgrazing is a problem | Meetings are held with users to tell them to stop overgrazing | No |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | | | |
| Maluti-a-Phofung | Yes, overgrazing is a problem | DLA inspected the land and advised on resting the land for recovery | No |
| Mohokare | | | |
| Mohokare | Overgrazing which has led to soil erosion is a problem | Stock limits were set but were never enforced | No |
| Mangaung | | | |
| Mangaung | Illegal grazing is a problem | Urban rangers have been trained. | Urban rangers have been trained by the Dept of Environmental Affairs |
| Mantsopa | | | |
| Ladybrand | Yes, there is overgrazing | No | No |
| Hobhouse | Yes, overgrazing is the problem | No | No |
| Thaba Potchoa | Overgrazing is a problem | No | No |
| Tweespruit | Overgrazing is problematic | No | No |

| Municipality | Has commonage usage led to the degradation of the natural environment? | Have steps been taken to remedy this? | Has any assistance come forward from the Dept of Environmental Affairs? |
|---------------------|---|---|---|
| Dihlabeng | | | |
| Dihlabeng | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| Moqhaka | | | |
| Steynsrus | Overgrazing is a problem | No | No |
| Kroonstad | Overgrazing is a problem in old commonage | Some camps have been closed to allow them to grow grass | Inspectors from Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism pay regular visits to municipal property and make recommendations |
| Kopanong | | | |
| Philippolis | There is proliferation of noxious weeds | Yes, the municipality has assisted users to spray weeds and chop them out | Yes, the Department of Environmental Affairs has advised users on the eradication of these weeds and supplied herbicide. |
| Springfontein | Overgrazing is a problem | No | No |
| Bethulie | Overgrazing is a problem | Yes, the farmers were advised that they should not use the camp for a specific period in order to allow the camp to be restored | Yes the Department of Environmental Affairs helped with overgrazing problem |
| Reddersburg | Overgrazing and noxious weeds are problematic in Fairview but no problems with commercial farmers | No | No |
| Edenburg | No | N/A | No |
| Fauresmith | Overgrazing and soil erosion are problematic | Two years ago an official came to assist with spraying of Boetebos, but since then nothing has happened | No |
| Gariep Dam | No | N/a | No |
| Trompsburg | No | N/A | No |
| Jagersfontein | No | N/A | No |
| Naledi | | | |
| Naledi | Soil erosion and proliferation of noxious weeds | Rotation system of grazing is used | Some information on environmental management was once given |
| Masilonyana | | | |
| Verkeerdevlei | There is severe | No | No |

| Municipality | Has commonage usage led to the degradation of the natural environment? | Have steps been taken to remedy this? | Has any assistance come forward from the Dept of Environmental Affairs? |
|---------------------|---|---|---|
| | overgrazing and noxious weeds | | |
| Theunissen | No | Not necessary | No |
| Soutpan | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Brandfort | No | N/A | No |
| Winburg | No | N/A | No |
| Ngwathe | | | |
| Ngwathe | Overgrazing and soil erosion are problems | Users were told to stop grazing in overgrazed camps | Yes |
| Nala | | | |
| Bothaville | Overgrazing is a problem | DoA helps to educate users about prevention of overgrazing | No |
| Wesselsbron | Overgrazing and soil erosion are problems | DoA helps to educate users about the prevention of soil erosion and overgrazing | No |
| Mafube | | | |
| Mafube | Noxious weeds have been a problem | The municipality and the DEAT assisted in identifying such weeds and the municipality removed them | Yes, identifying noxious weeds and educating users as well as the municipality on the side effects of such weeds. |
| Matjhabeng | | | |
| Matjhabeng | Overgrazing and noxious weeds are a problem | Users are being warned of the adverse results of overgrazing | No |
| Tokologo | | | |
| Boshof | Noxious weeds are a problem | Removal of noxious weeds | Yes, through identification of noxious weeds |
| Hertzogville | Overgrazing and noxious weeds are a problem | Monitoring that the number of livestock using the camp are not overwhelming and also removing noxious weeds | Yes, through educating farmers not to overgraze the camps and also identification of noxious weeds |
| Dealesville | Noxious weeds are a problem | Removal of noxious weeds | Yes, through identification of noxious weeds |
| Setsoto | | | |
| Ficksburg | Overgrazing is partly a problem | DoA extension officer gives advice on land rehabilitation | No |
| Senekal | Soil erosion is partly a problem due to heavy rains and | DoA extension officers advise on how to deal with soil | No |

| Municipality | Has commonage usage led to the degradation of the natural environment? | Have steps been taken to remedy this? | Has any assistance come forward from the Dept of Environmental Affairs? |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | winds | erosion | |
| Clocolan | Overgrazing and soil erosion are problematic | DoA extension officers advise on how to prevent overgrazing that leads to soil erosion | No |
| Marquard | Overgrazing and soil erosion are problematic | DoA extension officers provide advice on how to prevent overgrazing and soil erosion | No |
| Nketoana | | | |
| Nketoana | The commonage has not experienced environmental deterioration because the municipality and DoA always advise farmers on prevention of overgrazing and to keep a limited number of stock in a camp. | N/A | No |

8. In-depth interviews and site visits: Case studies

8.1. Case study No. 1: Mantsopa Municipality

Mantsopa Municipality consists of four towns viz. Ladybrand (capital), Hobhouse, Thaba Patchoa and Tweespruit. Towns that were visited for in-depth interviews and site visits were Ladybrand and Hobhouse. The reason why these two towns were selected is that besides practicing livestock and crop farming on municipal commonage, there are also LED projects underway.

(a) Usage of municipal commonage in Ladybrand

The municipal commonage land in Ladybrand is used for stock farming, crop farming, the Vumani project as a centre for street kids and the Ikaheng project as a centre for disabled children. Both emerging and commercial farmers use municipal commonage land. Commercial farmers hire the ploughing fields from the municipality, while emerging farmers, organized into an association called Mafa Farmers Association, practice livestock as well as crop farming on the commonage. Mafa Farmers Association has 60 members, of which 40 practice crop farming and 20 stock farming.

The chairperson of Mafa Association, Mr. M. Moliane, said that in the year 2000 they formed a group of 10 people and approached the municipality for grazing land. The municipality interviewed them, enquiring how they were to use the commonage and after learning that they were to practice stock farming, they were given land and the municipality further advised them to consider crop farming. After a year, when new members had joined the association, some members started crop farming.

Mr. Moliane said that the main problem facing stock farmers is a lack of drinking water for livestock. Furthermore, fences are not in a good condition and as a result their livestock becomes involved in road accidents as the camps are adjacent to the tarred road. According to him, they have reported the matter to the municipality, but nothing has happened yet. Shortage of water and bad condition of fences are disturbing issues for stock farmers because they pay R2 400 per month to the municipality and as such expect the municipality to assist them with the maintenance of infrastructure. According to Mr. Moliane, stock farmers approached DoA to provide water for livestock, but up to now nothing has materialized.

Mr. Moliane said that they have signed a contract of 10 years with the municipality, with a view to deciding thereafter whether they could still use the commonage or otherwise open the way for other people who want to start farming. There is no formal policy spelling out the number of cattle a user should attain before becoming compelled to look for his own land. Emerging farmers buy medicines for livestock at their own cost. The only way that stock farmers generate income is through selling their stock to

surrounding households. Crop farmers are also part of the 10-year contract. Crop farmers co-operate with one commercial farmer because he has the necessary experience in crop production and above all he has the machinery to plough big fields. Emerging crop farmers have signed a three-year contract with the commercial farmer and of the total production, they receive 15% while the commercial farmer gets 85%. Produce is sold to the market and the 15% they get amounts in total to R62 000. From their 15% share, they have managed to buy one tractor. They would like to acquire their own machinery so that they could benefit from the total production. It transpired that crop farmers also use their 15% to buy seed. There is a need for them to become self-sustaining so that they could benefit from the entire production. Mr. Moliane said that crop farmers pay the municipality about R26, 000 per month. The main challenge facing crop farmers is to secure funding in order to buy their own machinery.

Municipal commonage land has a centre for street children called the Vumani project. Within the centre, there is a vegetable garden which street kids work on when not at school. The Department of Social Welfare funded the centre. Currently, 17 children are staying in the centre. The centre has formed a partnership with Chinese people working with rehabilitation centres and who assist them with seeds to grow vegetables in the centre. These are then sold to surrounding areas as well as used for domestic consumption at the centre. The amount of funding put into the centre is unknown. A local social worker and Community Policing Forum assisted in identifying street kids for the centre, while a volunteer looks after the children.

Challenges facing the centre include lack of funding to initiate projects that will keep the children busy e.g. sport events, as well as lack of funding to maintain the centre. Some children do not participate in the vegetable garden and others do not attend school. Another challenge is that some children go back to streets in town and only come back during the evening to sleep. The centre does not pay any rental to the municipality.

The Ikaheng project is a centre for disabled children on the municipal land. There are about 34 people who stay in the centre. The building was constructed by the municipality and an amount of R15 000 was donated by the municipality for basic needs. An amount of R35 000 was donated by the Department of Social Welfare for basic needs of the centre, which also paid R31 000 in response to a claim on behalf of disabled people. Supervisors in the centre submit reports to the various funders on how money is spent. Supervisors are volunteers who have received training on home-based care from the Department of Labour. A local social worker regularly visits the centre and monitors it's operation. The centre has a vegetable garden and volunteers from the community work on it. The centre pays an amount of R50 to the municipality monthly.

The main challenge facing the centre is to obtain more funding to extend the building in order to accommodate more people.

(b) Usage of municipal commonage in Hobhouse

At Hobhouse, municipal commonage land is used for cattle grazing by emerging farmers and for a piggery project. Cattle owners pay to the municipality a sum of R2, 20 per head per month for 1-5 heads of cattle, R8, 55 per head for 6-9 heads of cattle and R11 per head per month for 10 and more heads of cattle. There is no formal association that they belong to. Commonage camps experience a shortage of water and fences are in poor condition. Since the users do not have a formal association, it is difficult for the municipality to assist them because they are not organised.

The piggery project has been funded from an LED fund and a sum of R1 million was donated. Beneficiaries were selected on the basis of their business plans.

During the initial stages of the project, there were 15 people but now only three are left. Botle Consultants of Botshabelo assisted beneficiaries with the business plans. The project started in year 2000 and did not sustain itself because beneficiaries did not have the required experience and business management skills, while material for the pigsty got lost. The manager of the project was paid R1500 a month while workers were paid R400 but when the money dried up, the project was nearly closed. The municipality requested for more funding from DPLG, in response to which a sum of R300 000 was donated from LED fund to sustain the project. Presently, three people are left, but they do not receive any salaries because the available money is being used to buy feed for the pigs and electricity being used in the pigsties. An amount of R200 is being paid to the person who looks after the pigs at night. The remaining three people were part of the initial group, but agreed to work on the project only as volunteers. The municipality is considering these persons as committed and experienced from past mistakes. There are about 126 pigs, 2 boars, 18 sows, 32 weaned piglets, 21 market pigs and 62 unweaned piglets. Pork is sold to butcheries but little income is generated because of lack of transport to butcheries elsewhere. The municipal bakkie is not suitable for the purpose. Moreover, there is a need to improve the gates of the pigsties, because it often results in pigs going missing.

The solution would seem that in order for the projects to be sustainable, beneficiaries should be trained in project management, business management conflict resolution and marketing skills. There should be constant monitoring and evaluation by funders so that whenever problems occur, they could be addressed before a project collapse.

8.2. Case study No. 2: Tswelopele Municipality

Tswelopele municipality is made up of two towns, namely Bultfontein (as capital) and Hoopstad. Both towns were visited for in-depth interviews and site visits. The municipal commonage land is used for livestock farming, crop farming, vegetable gardening and a poultry project.

(a) Usage of municipal commonage in Bultfontein

In Bultfontein, municipal commonage land is used for cattle farming, crop farming, vegetable gardening and growing of poultry. Emerging farmers practicing cattle farming are organised into the Phahameng Rural Association, while those growing maize and sunflower are organised into the Phahameng Farmers Association. Those involved in poultry are organised into the Magakajeng Poultry Association, while vegetable growers are organised into the Ithabeleng Vegetable Garden. Two members from each association get elected to the Commonage Management Committee.

Mr. M.D. Panyane, who is a member of the Phahameng Rural Association, said that each member pays to the municipality a sum of R10 per hectare annually. A sum of R20 is payable to the committee for membership. According to Mr. Panyane, livestock farmers own cattle only. The association is made up of 120 members. The users obtained access to the camps after having approached the municipality, which responded together with DoA. The latter was involved because it provides Community Project Funds (CPF) to people to start projects on municipal commonage. The condition was that people had to belong to an association hence the formation of the Phahameng Rural Association. The contract that the association has with the municipality is for 10 years, after which the CMC will meet with the municipality and shed more light on the future usage of the commonage.

DoA supports emerging farmers through prescribing to them good medicines for their livestock and marking of the stock. Marking is done in order to assist the owners to identify their stock easily. DLA assist cattle owners by building kraals in the commonage so that livestock could be kept in. According to the cattle owners, they generate income through selling their cattle but do not supply butcheries with beef because their stock is still growing. Once one owner has more than 20 heads of cattle and the abattoir is available, such an owner could start selling meat to the butcheries.

The main challenge facing livestock farmers is the shortage of water for their cattle. Another challenge is that fences are stolen. This leads to a situation where the cattle move around and cause road accidents. Shortage of fences also leads to stock theft, with the police not responding quickly when cattle owners report acts of theft. According to cattle farmers, they have approached the municipality to assist with water, but the municipality has not yet helped them. On the other hand, the municipality wants to develop a pound so that stray animals could be confined.

Crop farmers are organized into the Phahameng Farmers Association. This association consists of 20 members and they produce wheat and sunflowers. They have a contract with one commercial farmer who assist them with his labour and machinery e.g tractors. Produce is sold into big markets at Bultfontein and Kimberley. Of the total produce, emerging farmers get 18% while the rest goes to the commercial farmer. Mr. Mchachu, CMC member, said that last season they generated R46 000

from wheat sold and they have a bank account with ABSA. With the money generated, they managed to buy a tractor and would like to buy more machinery. They have a contract for 3 years with the commercial farmer. According to Mr. Mchachu, crop farmers do not generate enough income from the partnership with the commercial farmer because a substantial share goes to the latter. However, the contract with the commercial farmer expires at the end of October 2003 and they intend that for future arrangements they would hire and pay the farmer as and when needed, succeeding in so doing to generate profit.

Poultry farmers are organized into the Magakajeng Poultry Association. There are eight houses for chickens, but only five are being used because of the limited number of chickens. There is thus a need for more stock. When this project started, there were 32 people but now only 10 are left because of expected levels of income not realised.

A total of 32 people approached DoA for funding, obtaining R320 000 from CPF for buildings and infrastructure. The requirement was that they contribute 5%. To obtain this, some members worked in Welkom in a project to pack books that government is distributing to schools. In this way the R32 000 was raised as the 5 % for CPF. Each member contributed R100 hence the 5 % target was met and CPF issued the funding. Initially, Eskom assisted with electricity, but at present the project has to generate funds to sustain itself, which is however not happening because there are no abattoirs and no market to sell to. The little that is generated goes for electricity and feed. Mr. Nkoi, LED Officer, said that the profit is very low, and accordingly there is a need to identify a big market and to supply local butcheries. This has, however, not materialised as yet because people working in the project are not skilled enough to do market research. Nevertheless, the municipality together with the Department of Labour intends training the 10 people left in business management skills so that they could become self-reliant and be able to maintain the project. According to Mr. Nkoi, people on the project used to earn R150 per month, but this has now stopped because the project does not generate sufficient funds.

The residents need more funding to buy more chickens and to construct abattoirs. These people said that they do not receive any remuneration, but are hopeful that with the necessary business management skills the project could sustain itself and they too could earn a living. According to them, it is better to work on the project, with no financial remuneration, rather than staying idle in the township.

People growing vegetables are organized into the Ithabeng Vegetable Garden. There were about 17 people when the vegetable garden started, but presently only three are left. The project was originally funded by CPF to the tune of R90 000 and they also supplied seeds. The project collapsed because of lack of management skills. There was no aftercare because the extension officer from DoA was working mainly in Hoopstad. People paid themselves while the project was not generating income.

Money was spent on infrastructure e.g. fences, while payment for water was done to the municipality. It seems on the whole, the project collapsed because of the misuse of funds and a lack of skills. The municipality consequently disbanded the association and currently only three people are growing vegetables. They sell to the local clinics, schools and households, but profit is low. These people are working on condition that they can use their equipment for a trial period of three months, after which, if the municipality is convinced that they are committed, they would be supplied with equipment to grow more vegetables. The viewpoint of the municipality, based on past experience, is that they want only people with commitment.

According to the people currently working in the garden, their main challenge is to obtain water for irrigation purposes and in this regard wish the municipality to subsidise them.

(b) Usage of municipal commonage in Hoopstad

Municipal commonage in Hoopstad is used for cattle grazing, but because there is no organized structure as such, the municipality finds it difficult to assist emerging farmers. Be as it may, the municipality is encouraging emerging farmers to form associations so that they could apply for funding to start projects. The policy of the government is that people should be organised so that they could benefit from government-initiated projects as groups and not as individuals. The municipality, together with DLA and DoA, is planning a meeting with stockowners in order to formulate a policy on usage of commonage at Hoopstad.

8.3. Case study No. 3: Kopanong Municipality

Kopanong municipality is made up of the nine towns of Trompsburg (capital), Edenburg, Reddersburg, Philippolis, Jagersfontein, Springfontein, Bethulie, Gariiep and Faresmith. The towns visited for in-depth interviews and commonage site visits are Trompsburg, Edenburg, Reddersburg and Philippolis.

Mr. P. M. Makau (Manager: Technical Services) said that commonage management is not included in the Kopanong IDP. According to him, the company that was contracted to assist the municipality with IDP formulation did not pay attention to the commonage; it only focused on amalgamation issues. The name of the company is Africon and is based in Bloemfontein. The municipality has since realised that there is a pressing need to have a concrete policy on commonage and therefore during the review of the IDP, commonage is to be included. Council is still to decide on a company to assist in the review of the IDP.

There are unit supervisors in most of the towns, except Jagersfontein and Springfontein, while in Edenburg there is a temporary supervisor. Unit supervisors are responsible for commonage management and use their discretion regarding

infrastructural maintenance, e.g. they could authorise repairing of pipes but when it comes to more substantial issues, e.g. issuing out of contracts, they report to head office. Technical supervisors in outlying towns report to the technical manager for any job they do.

Regarding the appointment of unit supervisors in Springfontein, Jagersfontein and Edenburg, the municipal manager is planning to appoint such candidates and submit a report to Council.

(a) Usage of municipal commonage in Trompsburg

In Trompsburg, municipal commonage land is used for livestock farming, e.g. cattle and sheep farming. According to Mr. Malherbe, unit supervisor, there are five municipal farms in Trompsburg. Both the commercial farmers and emerging farmers utilize the farms.

Mr. T. Monyetsane and Mr. J. Ntlati (both emerging farmers) said that they are organised into the Madikgetla Farmers Association, and utilize three camps, i.e. Bakalskorp camp, Grasfontein camp and a Location camp, all of which are used for cattle grazing. There are fields that are not ploughed because of lack of irrigation water. Madikgetla Farmers Association consists of 44 members. The number of head of cattle per person varies in that some people own five while others have 20. Each cattle owner pays a sum of R30 per head and with this money the association purchases medicine for the stock. The association keeps an account at First National Bank and spends money on medicine for stock.

The association obtained access to the camps after approaching the municipality. The prerequisite was that emerging farmers be organised because commonage land is for collective use. No policy stipulates how many cattle one should have in order to leave the commonage and rent private land. Since there are three farms, stock are rotated around the farms in order to avoid overgrazing. The DoA extension officer provides advice on the prevention of overgrazing and marking of the stock. According to Madikgetla representatives, the main problems in the camps are scarcity of water and fences in poor condition. They received the camps with these problems and when they report to the municipality, they do not get assistance and therefore refuse to pay any rentals. Instead they repair fences on their own and only pay when the municipality assists them in improving the condition of the camps. They would like to plough the fields but are hampered by a lack of machinery and water. All these concerns have been laid before the municipality but to no avail. Therefore the only way they at present see clear, is to generate income through selling stock to local residents.

The main challenge facing Madikgetla Association is a need for more camps with water and proper infrastructure because stock is expanding. They would like to start ploughing the fields, provided water for irrigation is available.

(b) Usage of municipal commonage in Edenburg

There are eight municipal commonage farms in Edenburg, with three rented out to commercial farmers, while emerging farmers use five farms. According to Mr. T. Hobe (acting unit supervisor), commercial farmers are supposed to pay to the municipality between R10, 379, 70 and R18, 645,45 depending on the size of the hectares, while emerging farmers are supposed to pay between R1 337,80 and R2 205, 00. Both groups last paid the municipality in March 2002. The municipality has sent them reminding letters, but to no avail.

Emerging farmers are organised into the Dihwai Farmers Association with 50 members practicing livestock farming e.g. cattle, sheep and horses. After negotiations between the DLA and the municipality, emerging farmers were given land on condition that they would pay rent to the municipality. Emerging farmers have been using the farm for the past three years. The contract stipulates that when a farmer has accumulated more than 40 heads of cattle, he should look for his own land, thus creating space for new emerging farmers on the commonage.

Selling of cattle and wool is the means through which emerging farmers generate income. This is because they are still developing and do not have the number of livestock justifying selling to big markets.

Challenges facing emerging farmers include a need for more camps as a result of increasing farmers, a need for tractors to plough fields and a need for water for livestock and crops. The municipality has promised to assist them with more watered camps but nothing has materialised yet. Therefore, emerging farmers feel that they have been thrown into the deep end, because the municipality, DLA and DoA have all failed to support them.

(c) Usage of municipal commonage in Reddersburg

Four municipal commonage camps are rented to commercial farmers, who pay according to the size of camps. Commercial farmers have contracts of three years. On the other hand, emerging farmers use two municipal farms that are divided into 14 camps. They do not pay. Emerging farmers are organized into Ikaheng Animal Emerging Farmers and use the commonage mostly to graze their stock. According to Mr. M. Modise, unit supervisor, in 1999 a poultry project funded from the LED fund collapsed as a result of mismanagement of funds and lack of business management skills. Ever since emerging farmers utilize the commonage mostly for livestock grazing and to a lesser extent for crop farming.

Ikaheng Association is made up of 47 members, 41 being cattle and sheep owners while six practice crop farming. Emerging farmers got access to the camps after approaching the municipality when it was announced that commonage land was

available to prospective farmers. The precondition was again that people should be organized into an association, as commonage is meant for community utilisation and not individuals.

According to a sheep owner of the Ikaheg Association, he used to pay the association an amount of R30 but this has stopped because there is no financial accountability by the executive. According to him, he started with sheep farming because sheep grow fast enabling him to generate funds with a view to buying cattle for cattle farming. However, these plans have not been realized because the association is characterised by internal squabbling to the extent that members have reported the matter to the municipality in order to obtain separate camps. The municipality referred them to the Speaker of the municipality and a meeting is scheduled for the near future. Since the Speaker is a farmer, he is regarded as in a better position to attend to the matter. It should be observed, however, that emerging farmers are not happy about this decision because the Speaker is regarded as a political figure with no real expertise in farming.

The desire expressed by emerging farmers is to have the association disbanded because it does not serve their needs and interests. They said the chairperson favours certain people informing them about new developments and leaving others uninformed. The unit supervisor agreed that emerging farmers are not united, but said he cannot do anything as the matter is to be handled by the municipal Speaker. According to the unit supervisor, the association has to be separated and those who are committed to do farming should be protected by a commonage policy while the municipality should take steps against those who utilize commonage irresponsibly. The general feeling amongst emerging farmers is that the municipality must adopt a clear policy on how to encourage communal farming and how to deal with people with selfish interests.

(d) Usage of municipal commonage in Philippolis

In Philippolis, municipal commonage is divided into five camps and used for stock farming. Users of the commonage are organised into a stock committee of 35 members, with seven members forming an executive council and each member paying R120 subscription monthly. Users keep a bank account with First National Bank. Users of the commonage gained access to commonage land through council resolution that commonage be made available to an organised group of emerging farmers. Emerging farmers obtained access to one camp in 1993 and to other camps during the following years.

The stock committee consists of owners of sheep, goat and cattle. There are about 80 heads of cattle, 25 cows and +- 800 sheep and goats together. Individual ownership varies from five to 10 heads of cattle while with sheep other users own 100 each. According to Mr Khooa, chairperson of the stock committee, they use the subscription fee to pay the municipality and buy medication for their stock. The contracts do not

spell out as to what stage exactly a user should leave the commonage and become self-reliant. According to Mr. Khooa, there is a dire shortage of camps because users own large numbers of sheep and goats. The stock committee has requested more camps from the municipality but nothing has transpired. The committee is open and accommodative in the sense that people who used to work for commercial farmers but have lost their jobs are welcome to join the committee provided they produce a formal letter of request. Such people come with their stock and on the basis of their formal letters they are accepted to the committee.

The committee pays an amount of R11 000 to the municipality per annum. According to Mr. Sobantu, a member of the stock committee, the latter has requested the municipality to disband the current contract because it was concluded when the erstwhile Transitional Local Councils were still operational. However, it is felt that after the amalgamation process, there should be a new contract similar to that for the other towns of Kopanong Municipality. Another concern of the committee is that the amount they pay to the municipality is too much and differs from other towns. Mr. Sobantu said that they have proposed to the municipality that a clear policy on commonage be adopted with similar levels of rentals for all Kopanong towns. As yet no response has been forthcoming from the municipality.

Emerging farmers did indicate that they have good working relations with white commercial farmers who advise them on farming related issues. Emerging farmers said that they generate income through selling their stock. According to Mr. Khooa, emerging farmers breeding goats co-operate with a commercial farmer who transports their goats to the Kimberley market. Mr. Khooa sells mutton to butcheries in Philippolis and Colesberg. 1 kg costs R18, 60 while a whole sheep costs R400. Mutton is in demand and therefore has a good market. However, for emerging farmers who do not have transport, it is difficult to sell to surrounding areas.

(e) Challenges facing emerging farmers

One of the challenges facing emerging farmers is a need for more camps in order to accommodate more stock coming with newcomers as well as the ever-expanding sheep and goat numbers of the old members of the stock committee. A further challenge relates to vandalism on the commonage. Fences get stolen while people from the township cut down trees for personal use. This is because community members have a misperception that commonage land belongs to the whole community and hence every community member could do as he or she pleases. This has a negative impact on because stock moves around with out being protected by fence and easily get stolen. Users have reported the matter to the municipality but nothing has as yet been done. Mr. Khooa indicated that commonage users repaired some 500m to 800m of fence that was stolen. Water pipes are also in poor condition, with the matter reported to the municipality but to no avail. Mr. Khooa said as a consequence he decided to rather install his water pipes himself.

Another challenge facing emerging farmers relates to township residents who own pigs but do not want to join the stock committee in order for their pigs to be kept in the commonage. According to stock committee members, people who own pigs refused to join the stock committee because they did not want to pay a subscription fee of R120. They argue that their pigs have nothing to feed on in the commonage and that they rather keep them in their backyards in order to feed them. However, such pigs contribute to making the town untidy and environmentally unhygienic. It is difficult to assist pig owners on how to prevent and cure diseases because the owners are not part of the committee. Pigs also spread diseases because they move around the whole area. Stock committee has reported the matter to the municipality and requested the municipality to invite environmental officers to workshop pig owners on environmental risks as a result of their pigs moving around residential areas.

Emerging farmers have moreover to cope with the problem of dogs killing their sheep. Since some fences are stolen, dogs easily access commonage and kill sheep. Some boys from the township go hunting on commonage with their dogs. Mr. Khooa indicated that he has lost 50 sheep to dogs. The committee has reported the matter to the municipality, South African Police Services and the magistrate but nothing has happened yet. To resolve the matter, the committee has called the boys and told them that they should not hunt on the commonage as this is against municipal regulation. It should be mentioned that this is not a solution to the problem because at times dogs just go to the camps and kill sheep, so there is a need for a comprehensive approach by all interested parties to combat these losses.

According to the stock committee, they find it difficult to raise the money that they are supposed to pay to the municipality and that consequently they resort to selling their stock in order to raise the funds. So, there is a need for the municipality to lower rates and establish a uniform level of rentals for all towns. Emerging farmers indicated that they approached the Land Bank to secure funding but were not successful because they were expected to pay during the first month without having generated profit. So they felt this result in exacerbating poverty. Members of the stock committee indicated that they need advice on how to secure funding, while DoA should make its extension officers available to offer agricultural assistance.

Members of the stock committee further expressed the need to undergo skills development programmes. According to them, development programmes in southern part of Kopanong Municipality are few and far between, while they feel the treatment they receive from DoA is different from that of white farmers. For example, if a white farmer has lost some stock due to drought or theft, DoA compensates such a farmers with funds whereas emerging farmers do not receive anything. For instance, Mr. Khooa said that dogs killed 50 of his sheep but he never received any compensation.

Seven emerging farmers are maintaining a dairy with machinery and cows purchased by DoA from a commercial farmer. According to these farmers, the dairy has a good income-yielding potential but the problem is that DoA does not assist with funding with the result that the little they get from selling milk is spent on feed for the cows. One barrel of feed costs R22 and cows need 10 barrels a day. According to the stock committee, they would like to start crop farming but the question is how to procure machinery to plough fields. If this could be done they would also grow feed for their dairy cows. They said they brought these issues to the attention of the municipality and DoA, but to no avail.

Members of the stock committee noted that there is a gap between their committee and the municipality. They said that they would like to work with the municipality in a constructive way and wish that communication with the municipality be improved. According to the members of the committee, they have proposed the formation of a committee that would be representative of all nine towns and which would discuss issues relating to commonage development and management. According to them, there is no platform where they could discuss commonage issues with the municipality. So far their submissions to the municipality have not yet elicited any response.

Conclusion

The land reform policy of the government has placed municipalities at the forefront of redistributing land to previously disadvantaged communities. In this respect, municipalities are expected to make their commonage land available to emerging farmers so that they could earn a livelihood from farming and become viable commercial farmers.

Amalgamation of municipalities has put municipal land in a new context, as municipalities now have to develop and implement administrative and developmental programmes for their residents. In this transformation process municipalities are expected to be developmental driving forces for their residents. To this end, commonage – old and new – is one of the programmes that municipalities should utilise to ensure that land is not only redistributed, but also serves to improve the lives of people.

Some of the challenges facing municipalities originate from a lack of support by DLA, DoA, DLGH and DEAT. In practice these government departments have a definite role to play in ensuring that commonage management is successful and that the desired goals are met. DLA, DoA and DLGH in particular should assist municipalities with policies directing who has access to the commonage and how the commonage should be utilised, taking into consideration the differing interests of commonage users. Such policies should provide a framework within which the users would utilise commonage.

Municipalities also lack qualified personnel to administer and manage commonage usage, while moreover they experience a chronic lack of funds. Municipalities need officials with agricultural background to effectively deal with commonage management. Municipalities furthermore experience contractual problems with users of the commonages in the sense that commonage land is given to groups not individuals, and that the municipalities do not have the policies in place to provide guidance on how different groups should utilize the same commonage. It goes without saying that it is more difficult to enter into a contract with a group of people rather than with one individual. This has especially been evident where commonage users did not pay the municipality and could not be followed up because the contract is with the group and not with an individual. Another problem concerns funding generated from commonage being used for other municipal items. It is therefore advisable that income generated from commonage should be used to train and educate emerging farmers and also maintain and upgrade commonage thus reaching development goals through the commonage itself.

Another practical problem manifests with government departments initiating projects on commonage but failing to provide the necessary back-up support, expecting that to

come from municipalities. It needs therefore to be stated unequivocally that efficient, viable and sustainable commonage management is the inevitable joint task of municipalities, the relevant government departments, NGOs, commonage users and civil society in order that commonage could assume its rightful role as a strategic means to improve the standard of living of people.

10. Names of interviewees

10.1. Municipal officials interviewed telephonically

| Municipality | Name | Position | Telephone |
|---------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Letsemeng | Ms. N. Bloem | Acting Town Clerk | (053) 205 0007 |
| 2. Metsimaholo | Mr. A. Cronje | Head Admin. Unit | (016) 976 0029 |
| 3. Phumelela | Mr. P. Cindi | Coordinator | (058) 913 1222 |
| 4. Tswelopele | Mr.A Lobuschagne | E.H. Practitioner | (051) 853 1111 |
| 5. Maluti-a-Phofung | Mr. Nyende | Corporate Services | (058) 622 1061 |
| 6.Mohokare | Mr. L. Higgs | Housing Official | (051) 673 1018 |
| 7. Mangaung | Mr. Matlole | Corporate Services | (051) 405 8911 |
| 8. Mantsopa | Mr. M. Mashapha | Technical Services | (051) 924 0654 |
| 9. Dihlabeng | Mr. M.Molaba | ActingCommonage Manager | (058) 303 5732 |
| 10. Moqhaka | Mr. S.S. Brits | Head: Admin. Unit | (056) 216 9911 |
| 11. Kopanong | Mr. J. Bhoshoff | Ass. Manager: Technical Services | (051) 713 9200 |
| 12. Naledi | Mr. R. Moche | Administrator | (051) 541 0012 |
| 13. Masilonyana | Mr. Moletsane | Municipal Manager | (057) 733 0106 |
| 14. Ngwathe | Mr. M. Mapena | CommunityService | (056) 811 2131 |
| 15. Nala | Mr. M.Moletsane | Municipal Manager | (056) 5149200 |
| 16. Mafube | Mr. K. Mahlangu | Municipal Manager | (058) 8131051 |
| 17. Matjhabeng | Mr. F. Nieuwoudt | Manager: Projects | (057) 3921500 |
| 18. Tokolong | Mr. Lehloenya | Municipal Manager | (053) 5410014 |
| 19. Setsoto | Mr. Mokwane | Corporate Services | (051) 9332322 |
| 20. Nketoana | Mr. Maxatshwa | Municipal Manager | (058) 8632811 |

10.2.Municipal officials and commonage users interviewed during site visits

| Municipality | Name | Position | Telephone |
|---------------|-------------------|---|------------|
| 1. Mantsopa | Mr. Mashapa | Head: Technical Dept. | 0824518857 |
| | Mr. P. Chalale | LED Officer | 0844510627 |
| | Ms. M. Khaile | Beneficiary on piggery project | N/A |
| | Ms. M. Majola | Beneficiary on piggery project | N/A |
| | Mr. M. Moliane | Chairperson of Mafa Farmers Association | N/A |
| 2. Tswelopele | Mr. M. Mahlanyane | Head: Community Services | 0827716880 |
| | Mr. P.J. Nkoi | LED Officer | 0732344048 |
| | Mr. Z.G. Mchachu | CMC member | 0834761003 |
| | Mr. M.D. Panyane | CMC member | N/A |
| 3. Kopanong | Mr. M. P. Makau | Manager: Technical Services | 0832575570 |
| | Mr. L. Jwaxa | Assistant Manager: Technical Services | 0832575567 |

| Municipality | Name | Position | Telephone |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|------------------|
| | Mr. T. Monyetsane | Chairperson of Madikgetla Farmers Association | N/A |
| | Mr. J. Ntlati | Deputy Chairperson of Madikgetle Farmers Association | N/A |
| | Mr. Malherbe | Unit Supervisor: Trompsburg | (051) 7139200 |
| | Mr. M.T. Hobe | Acting Unit Supervisor: Edenburg | (051) 7431658 |
| | Mr. M. Modise | Unit Supervisor: Reddersburg | (051) 5530011 |
| | Mr. Madingiza | Emerging farmer | |
| | Mr. Khoa | Chairperson stock committee: Philippolis | N/A |
| | Mr. J. Samson | Member of stock committee: Philippolis | N/A |
| | Mr. J. Reid | Member of stock committee: Philippolis | N/A |
| | Mr. A.J. V. Sobantu | Member of stock committee: Philippolis | N/A |