THE ROLE OF AGRICULTURE IN STRENGTHENING RURAL LIVELIHOODS

A participatory action research in the

HESSEQUA MUNICIPALITY

1. **Introduction**

During 2010 and 2011 the SCLC, together with the 12 black small-scale farmer groups within the Hessequa Municipality and farm dwellers from 24 farms undertook research into the role of small-scale agriculture in the livelihoods of rural people and the labour rights and livelihoods of farm dwellers within the municipality.

The purpose of the research is to **inform action** towards strengthening small-scale agriculture and the rights of farm dwellers and workers in Hessequa municipality. The findings of the research will be used by the farmers and farm dwellers to develop an action plan aimed at strengthening rural livelihoods through small-scale agriculture, the promotion of food sovereignty and secure tenure and labour rights on farms.

The Southern Cape Land Committee has identified 3 municipal sites where the organisation will support small-scale agricultural producers. Hessequa municipality is one of these sites. SCLC’s role is to facilitate better organisation amongst small-scale producers in order to strengthen voice and influence the local and national context and policy in favour of small-scale agricultural production. SCLC also supports farm dwellers and workers in organizing themselves through area farm committees towards mobilizing for fair labour and living conditions and more secure tenure rights on farms. SCLC will also use the findings of the research to inform the organisation’s work.

The research will also inform a national perspective on the role of small-scale agriculture in rural livelihoods and conditions on commercial farms through the Tshintsha Amakhaya network. TA is a collaborative initiative bringing together 9 land service organizations with the objective of realizing food sovereignty and agrarian change through small-scale agriculture. The TA partners are each
undertaking research in various sites throughout the country to inform advocacy and mobilization strategies. The Southern Cape Land Committee will share lessons from the Hessequa site.

2. **Methodology**

A mix of research methods was used including participatory action research methods, household questionnaires and qualitative group interviews.

- These are representatives of 12 small-scale producer groups

The **Participatory Action Research** focussing on small-scale agricultural producers was undertaken from April – August 2010 by a team of 5 SCLC staff members and 17 youth from communities within Hessequa Municipality. Research methods used included:

- Semi-structured interviews with farmers and stakeholders
- Transect walks
- Mobility maps
- Venn diagrams

The findings of the PAR were presented to a task team consisting of representatives of each of the farmer groups in Hessequa. A joint analysis was undertaken of the research and lessons and recommendations were extracted. These were presented to relevant stakeholders and used to influence municipal buy-laws and processes like the impoundment policy.

A **desk top analysis** was undertaken of relevant statutory documentation to ascertain the opportunities and challenges for agrarian transformation within the municipality and the attitude, budgets, programmes and policies of the relevant state departments. This analysis was shared with the task team who have engaged the municipality on the Impounding and Commonage by-laws:

- Hessequa Municipality IDP, the third review, 2010 / 2011
- Eden District Municipality IDP, annual review, 2010 / 2011
- A Socio Economic Survey for Hessequa Municipality compiled for the Eden District Municipality by Distinctive Choice Unit for Religion and Development Research Stellenbosch University (undated)
- The Hessequa Commonage Policy 2008
- The Impounding Policy 2008

**Structured household questionnaires** were completed with a total of 281 people. Of these 169 farmers were interviewed representing 12 small-scale producer groups and 112 farm dwellers from 24 farms. Of those interviewed 253 were men and 26 women. The findings of the questionnaires were shared with the task team for joint analysis.

**Qualitative interviews** were conducted with the task team to deepen analysis, content of information and lessons and to ID mobilization issues.
3. **Overview of the Hessequa Municipality**
(See situational analysis for more detail)

Hessequa Municipality\(^1\) falls within the Eden District Municipality, in the Western Cape Province of South Africa (Figure 1). It occupies an area of about 5730 km\(^2\). The name Hessequa, meaning "people of the trees", refers to the tribe of Khoikhoi people that used to live in the region.

**Figure 1: Location of Hessequa municipality, Western Cape**

Riversdale is the municipal seat, and other towns in the municipality are Albertinia, Heidelberg, Slangrivier, Stilbaai (which includes Jongensfontein and Melkhoutfontein), Vermaaklikheid and Witsand (Figure 2). As with most areas there is growing urbanisation, with inland towns shrinking and coastal towns growing. The influx of retirees to the coastal towns has slowed over the past years as a result of escalating land prices.

\(^1\)www.hessequa.gov.za
According to the Hessequa Municipality IDP, Hessequa has a population of around 48,000\(^2\). The Eden District Municipality IDP put the figure at 39,081 in 2007 (an increase of 22% from 2001-2007). The majority of the population are ‘coloured’, with Afrikaans the most dominant language.

### 3.1. Social conditions

The biggest social challenge of the municipality is **unemployment**. Eden District Municipality is the poorest district in the Western Cape Province, and Hessequa Municipality has high levels of poverty. Hessequa poverty indicators are: 33% of households have no income, 33% households are women headed, 32% unemployed, 31% illiterate. The majority of households earn between R801-R1600 with more than 8,000 households living below the subsistence level. Women, as the household members primarily responsible for feeding the family, bear the brunt of unemployment and poverty.

The municipality has a low number of people in the 20-40 age group, compared with other age groups. Youth are leaving the municipality due to lack of tertiary training institutions and high levels of unemployment.

Employment opportunities are mainly in unskilled jobs, particularly on farms, as domestic workers and in the tourism industry. At ward level the statistics for unemployed are up to 50%. The municipality has a visible gap between the rich and the poor, with white residents earning up to four times more on average than black residents. Poverty and unemployment are aggravated by a decline in fishing, drought and the seasonal nature of work in agriculture and tourism.

According to the Hessequa IDP, the DWAF website and the responses to the household questionnaires **service provision** within the municipality is on track. All urban households in the municipality are recorded as having adequate electricity and water supply. However it must be noted that within the informal settlements like Kwanokuthula households are still sharing central

\(^2\) Information for these paragraphs was drawn from Hessequa IDP 2008, Eden District IDP 2006-11 and Socio-Economic Survey for Hessequa Municipality, 2006/07 published by Eden Municipality unless otherwise specified.
taps and it is unclear if these households are included in the statutory statistics. The water supply in the municipality is not secure and during times of drought severe water restrictions are imposed.

During the process of completing questionnaires amongst farm dwellers and of supporting area farm committees it is apparent that one of the challenges for farm dwellers is the lack of adequate services. Although the majority of farm workers have access to clean drinking water some farms in the Hessequa Municipality do not have decent services and there are cases where farm dwellers still share water sources with livestock or have to fetch water from a central tap. Houses are often in a bad condition and do not meet the requirements of the Sectoral Determination for Agriculture. Farm dwellers struggle with transport and access to services like schools and clinics. Farm dwellers are either dependent on the mobile clinic which comes around once a month or are forced to hitchhike to the nearest town to attend clinics.

One of the rural development priorities noted in the Hessequa IDP is to provide water tanks on farms. However there have been no tanks provided to small-scale producers in the municipality and less than 1% of farmers are harvesting water.

3.2. Spatial development

Riversdale is recognized as one of the developmental nodes/economic drivers of the Eden District (according to the Provincial Spatial Development Framework) and it is recommended that future development and infrastructural investment take place in Riversdale. This has implications for the location of agricultural up-scaling industry. Priorities within the Eden District IDP are listed as the provision of sustainable employment opportunities; up-skilling of the population; development which considers and minimizes the impact of climate change; and the protection of the natural resources of the area.

The primary priority noted in both the Eden and Hessequa Municipal IDPs in terms of spatial development is sustainable methods of agricultural production. This is directly in line with the vision for agrarian transformation and food sovereignty. There is a repeated emphasis on protection of natural resources of the region and the need to take into account the effects of climate change. As such farmers and food producers should be able to secure political buy-in and support for agro-ecological production projects.

The IDP’s land use management plans include undertaking a vacant land audit on the urban edges. The purpose is to prioritize vacant land with the most potential, analyse why land is vacant or underutilized, develop proposals for how land could be better utilized, and set clear timeframes for making use of the land. This provides some opportunities for small-scale producers to lobby for vacant land to be used for agriculture. Other plans within the IDP include densification of urban areas to prevent urban sprawl, to maintain urban edges and promote mixed use areas (both physical and socio-economic). Limiting development to within the urban edges is important to protect agricultural land however this could have a negative impact on the development of agri-villages for farm dwellers and on the existing Transnet settlements within the municipality.

The ever widening economic gap and patterns of spatial development between rich and the poor is referred to in the Eden District Municipality IDP. This provides some opportunities to continue to raise awareness around the root causes of poverty and the systems and policies which underpin the accumulation of wealth by a few at the expense of the majority.
3.3. **Agro-ecology**

The municipal area has **high potential soil for agriculture** especially in the regions known as Bokkeveld shale. The primary commercial agriculture activities are wheat, beef and mutton production. However in line with global trends the commercial farming practises are not conducive to small-scale, resource poor farmers.

The municipality is recognised as being rich in biodiversity. The Eden District Municipality supports a number of **biodiversity protection initiatives** within Hessequa Municipality which could have a negative impact on small-scale producers or could have some benefits. These include the Gouritz Catchment, the GouritzRiver Initiative and the Eden Coastal Management Plan.

The Eden Municipality notes that there should be more emphasis on environmentally sustainable projects. Thus there is potential for the municipality to support land use practises like agro-ecological production.

Other **environmental protection projects** which have potential to impact on small-scale producers within the municipality include Working for Wetlands and the Working for Water programme.

3.4. **Agriculture, land reform and rural development**

The Hessequa Municipality is **primarily an agricultural region**. Commercial agriculture is the main economic activity with a number of black farmer groups also aspiring to generate livelihoods through small-scale agriculture. The basic requirement for agrarian transformation is a more equitable access to and control over the means of production, land and water. While the majority of resources are owned and controlled by the minority, skewed patterns of accumulation will not be challenged and agrarian transformation will not be possible. In Hessequa, as with other regions of South Africa, there has been limited land redistribution with most land still owned by commercial farmers. Currently there are few **land reform projects**. These are a mix of SLAG projects including land for settlement and agriculture, LRAD and PLAS farms and welfare type projects.

- **Vermaaklikheid** is a SLAG project. The settlement part of the project has been fairly successful with an improved quality of houses being built. The agricultural land is infested with aliens and there has been no post settlement support provided to clear and use this land. There are currently 4 farmers who are growing food on the banks of the river.

- The **Gracia land reform project** is a SLAG project where the Gracia forestry settlement has been transferred under the auspices of a community Trust. There are 6 cattle farmers using 10 hectares of the Trust land. 5 hectares are under irrigation for crop production but are not being used effectively and are rapidly becoming overgrown with weeds and aliens. The primary challenge in Gracia which is paralysing progress has been with institutional arrangements, a Trust which is not accountable and is accused of corruption and structures which are not functioning. Besides an initial injection of resources and infrastructure Gracia had no post settlement support.

- The **Vetterivier farmers of Riversdale** who have acquired plots of approximately 0.5 hectares along the Goukou River which they are using to farm cattle. Currently the farmers are grazing individually, which is placing limits on the number of livestock. The group also grow luscern communally on one of the plots as feed for the cattle.
• The Sleeping Beauty farmers of Riversdale are beneficiaries of a new land reform project where a farm of over 300 hectares has been transferred to 12 beneficiaries (6 households). The farmers have been promised livestock and infrastructure from the DAFF. With support of DAFF the farmers have prepared the farm for the livestock by erecting fencing and camps and making access roads. The group will need a lot of post settlement support. At present the Sleeping Beauty farmers are resisting working with other farmer groups and are not members of the farmer’s task team.

• The Melkhoutfontein CPA has taken transfer of land on behalf of 68 beneficiaries, of which 18 are currently active in agriculture. The land is divided into individual camps which are too small for grazing and there is no water on the land for crop production. Thus the majority of farmers are currently not using the land and are grazing livestock in the town. The CPA is busy developing land use rules and investigating ways of getting water to the sites.

• There are two food security projects within Hessequa supported by the DAFF: The Haqua food security project which is a youth project growing vegetables and Soeterus in Melkhoutfontein producing vegetables and luscern. DAFF has provided the fencing, water tanks and extension services.

The other black farmer groups in Hessequa are using commonage, Act 9 or privately owned land either with formal lease arrangements or without any lease. There are no standard land use agreements or commonage management plans in place. Although the municipality acknowledge the importance of small-scale agriculture production in combating poverty there is a lack of capacity or dedicated support for small-scale farmers. To date the municipality has failed to provide an audit of commonage land and there is a perception that large portions of commonage are leased to white commercial farmers. Mobilizing for access to additional commonage and developing integrated land use management systems has been identified by the farmers as one of the priority focus areas.

Large commercial farmers and agri-business control the agro-food production systems in the region. They have influence over political decision-makers and dominate water forums and other strategic structures which control use of natural resources. There is minimal co-operation between commercial farmers and emergent farmers and there is a perception that emergent farmers are not being encouraged to develop. Emergent farmers recognize the importance of mentoring and skills sharing and would like to strengthen relationships with commercial farmers.

Within Hessequa, as is the trend nationally, there is a lack of integrated support to rural development and agrarian reform. In response to the mobilisation of farmers through the regional task team stakeholders have verbally indicated support for a municipal agricultural forum.

Other challenges to agriculture and food production identified in state district plans and farmers include the ongoing development in rural areas and conversion of agricultural land. In particular the development of golf estates and private game reserves which incorporate large portions of agricultural land. These developments remove land from agricultural production for the use of an elite few compounding patterns of spatial apartheid development and land shortages.

There are very few opportunities for up-scaling of agricultural products. Some of the farmers of Melkhoutfontein and Vetterivier are producing and bottling honey which is sold at various commercial outlets and directly from the farmers. There are also a group of women in Albertinia producing jam and preserves which they sell at local markets and food festivals. There is a charcoal production enterprise, supported by the NDA, using wood from alien vegetation to produce charcoal currently being rolled out in Riversdale. However the majority of farmers are not up-scaling produce
and a vegetable processing factory in Heidelberg with potential to process vegetables produced by small-scale farmers is currently being used by commercial farmers to produce cheese.

The small-scale farmers struggle to access markets. Existing markets used are mainly informal including street trading stalls for vegetables and meat sold from the house or from a bakkie on “All Pay” days. One of the opportunities farmers maximize on is their flexibility to sell on account / “on the book” a service which consumers are not able to lever at supermarkets. The majority of the livestock farmers sell their livestock at monthly auctions in Riversdale. Access to abattoirs is difficult due to high costs of transportation and low prices offered. Some of the farmers are already selling fresh produce to tourism markets on an ad hoc basis. There is also potential to establish agricultural markets in the urban centres.

3.5. Institutional considerations

The primary stakeholders within the municipality of relevance to small-scale agriculture are:

- The **Hessequa Municipality** with the mandate to address poverty within the municipality the institution is failing to provide sufficient support or to prioritize small-scale agricultural projects. The municipality own the commonage which most of the farmers are using but in the absence of accountable land management systems and land use agreements commonage within Hessequa is not managed effectively.

- The **Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF)** has an office within Hessequa but lack capacity with only one senior extension officer, one advisor and one administrator. The department is frustrated by the lack of integrated stakeholders support for small-scale agriculture.

- The **Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR)**. As noted above there have been some land reform projects facilitated by the department and the TRAANCA process within the Act 9 community of Slangriver is still underway guided by a consultant appointed by DRDLR. There is no real presence of DRDLR within the municipality with other stakeholders complaining that the department does not contribute sufficiently to agrarian reform.

- The majority of black farmers are affiliated to the **African Farmers’ Association of South Africa (AFASA)**. The objective is that AFASA will strengthen the voice of farmers however farmers find that AFASA is unwilling to recognise the role of other structures like the Hessequa emergent farmer task team.

- **Garden Route Agri** has an outlet in Riversdale but the small, black farmers are not members of the co-op

- **South African Police Service (SAPS)** does not offer good service to farmers.

3.6. Levels of organisation and education

In 2010 when the research was initiated **levels of organisation** amongst black, small-scale producers in Hessequa were generally low with no regional structure operating at a municipal level and low levels of organization within the various groups. The majority of the farmer groups are male dominated and even where women are involved, their decision-making roles are uncertain. It must be noted that there has been an improvement in levels of organisation over the last two years with a municipal emergent farmer task team elected and institutional arrangements within the groups being put into place.

**Educational levels** are generally low (between grade 1 and 9). There is a wealth of agricultural experience amongst the members but administrative skills are lacking.
4. **Baseline information for small-scale agricultural producers of Hessequa**

4.1. **Demographic data of respondent groups**

- In total 169 farmers were interviewed (respondent 1). Of these 148 were men and 21 women (this is due to less women being involved in agriculture than men). 678 individuals (respondents) are represented by the affected households.

- The samples were taken in the following geographical areas:
  - Albertinia – 15 men and 2 women
    - Albertinia Emergent Farmers – 3 men and 2 women
    - Sizanane – 12 men
  - Melkhoutfontein – 13 men
  - Riversdale – 59 men and 11 women
    - Sleeping Beauty – 1 man
    - Garcia – 6 men
    - Vermaaklikheid - 6 men and 2 women
    - Kwanokuthula – 21 men and 7 women
    - Riversdale/Vetterivier – 25 men and 2 women
  - Heidelberg – 42 men and 5 women
    - Heidelberg Emergent Farmers - 22 men and 4 women
    - Saambou – 13 men and 1 woman
    - Duivenhoks – 7 men
  - Slangriver – 19 men and 3 women

The number of farmers is in line with the size of the towns. Riversdale, being the largest town in Hessequa, has the greatest number of small-scale farmers while Melkhoutfontein, being the smallest town, has the least number of farmers within the Municipality. Although Slangriver is a smaller settlement than Albertinia there are more farmers (13% vs 10%) this is due to the agricultural nature of Slangriver which is a rural Act 9 settlement with a history and culture of farming.

**AGES**

Respondents 7 – 11 are all scholars between the ages of 0 – 18 years
Although the majority of farmer activities are focussed on subsistence agriculture / producing “for the pot” half of the farmers (49%) interviewed are at the prime income generating age, between 19 – 59 years of age. During qualitative interviews farmers indicated that many people are engaging in agriculture due to the lack of other employment opportunities or as a result of being boarded from jobs due to injury or ill-health without adequate compensation. Farmers further noted the need to strengthen and up-scale agricultural production to effectively challenge unemployment and the effects of poverty.

21% of farmers are 60 years of age and over. Many of these farmers noted that they farm to keep motivated and as a hobby however there are older farmers who are forced to practise small-scale agriculture in order to supplement insufficient pensions and to cater for the needs of families.

Only 1% of the farmers are under the age of 18. Youth are generally not interested in pursuing a career in agriculture particularly as they have observed their parents’ struggle to expand agricultural activities and generate income there from. Schools do not offer agriculture as a subject and there are no tertiary agricultural training institutions within Hessequa. Older farmers note that it is difficult to encourage youth when there is already such a shortage of agricultural land. – “I have given two young boys some pigs and permission to use a portion of my land but I cannot accommodate more people.”

**HOUSEHOLD SIZES**
The majority of households represented by the farmers consist of 4 members or less. 17% of households have over 10 people living in the household demonstrating how farmers must sustain large households. 9% of the household members (respondents 3 – 6) are pensioners staying with other family members.

**EMPLOYMENT**

Unemployment is one of the primary challenges within Hessequa Municipality with the Municipal IDP quoting conservative figures of 33% unemployment at municipal level and 50% at WARD level.
Of the farmers interviewed more women (25%) reported no external sources of income than men (10%). One option to combat the effects of unemployment is small-scale agriculture. 18% of farmers interviewed regard themselves as full time farmers however only 7% consider themselves as running their own business. During qualitative interviews farmers noted that this was due to the fact that agriculture was not generating income but primarily used to supplement household food.

4% of farmers are employed in agriculture and 22% are employed elsewhere / outside of agriculture. This casts some doubt on the ability of commercial agriculture to address the unemployment challenges.

HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Category R1 – R25 920 is based on state grants for two household members.
3% of households have no fixed income making agriculture very important as a source of food. 31% of households have an annual income of between R1 and R25 920 with the average income being R16 108, these are primarily households with an income of one state grant per month. State grants play a very important role in rural livelihoods. 4% of households receive an annual income of over R150 001 indicating that there are members of the household who are employed elsewhere or that there are a number of grants coming into the household.

**EDUCATION LEVELS OF RESPONDENT 1**

Half of the farmers only have a primary school education. Although 36% men and 29% of women have some form of secondary school education few farmers have matric qualification, indicating a
high drop out of learners in secondary school. Only 3% of men and no women have some form of tertiary qualification. 14% of women and 3% of men have no formal education. In general men still receive more formal education then women. The low levels of formal education hamper farmers in the business / record keeping aspects of agriculture.

4.2. Land

ACCESS TO LAND

Type of land used by farmers is primarily commonage, one Act 9 settlement, communally owned land acquired through the land reform programme, church and privately owned land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Type of land / land owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slangrivier</td>
<td>Act 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg EF</td>
<td>Commonage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saambou</td>
<td>Provincial government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duiwenhoks</td>
<td>Commercial farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwanokuthula</td>
<td>Commonage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>Trust (land reform)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale</td>
<td>Commonage and Trust (land reform)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melkhoutfontein</td>
<td>CPA and church land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermaaklikheid</td>
<td>Trust (land reform) and commercial farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albertinia EF</td>
<td>Individual ownership through land reform programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sizanani</td>
<td>Commonage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping Beauty</td>
<td>Trust (land reform)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
88% of farmers indicated that they have access to some sort of land but of these 34% only have access to small pieces of land like backyards or allotments. 12% indicated that while they do not have access to land they consider themselves farmers and are part of farmer groups with a desire to access land and pursue small-scale farming.

The majority of farmers only have access to small plots of land. A shortage of land is noted as the primary reason that black farmers in Hessequa have not been able to expand and become commercial. Although the majority of farmers in Hessequa are livestock farmers only 14% have access to land suitable for grazing with others using small pieces of privately owned land or backyards. Farmers are mobilized around holding the municipality accountable for a commonage audit.
and ensuring commonage is allocated to small-scale producers rather than established commercial farmers. In addition farmers are lobbying that the municipality should acquire additional land for commonage. The more established farmers are convinced that if they could access land through the land reform programme they would be able to grow into commercial farmers.

Only 2% of farmers have accessed farms through the state land reform programme. Where land has been redistributed to farmers much of the land is infested with alien vegetation. In order for farmers to be able to use the land productively clearing of alien vegetation must take place.

REASONS FOR NOT HAVING ACCESS TO LAND (LAND BLOCKAGE)

The majority of farmers note the lack of political will and support by the municipality in providing access to commonage and in servicing the commonage with fencing and water as the primary blockage preventing access to land. The slow pace of land redistribution and bureaucratic delays are attributed as the second largest contributing factor to land shortages. The delays in the government processes are linked to unaffordable land prices and the market led land reform process. There is a perception that private land owners are resistant to redistribution with 7% of respondents listing this as the primary blockage to land access. Only 1% of respondents perceive conversion of agricultural land as a factor in preventing land access.

LAND USE AGREEMENTS
A quarter of the farmers (26%) using commonage or privately owned land only have verbal land use agreements. This makes it difficult to secure resources, with stakeholders like DAFF only supporting farmers where a lease of at least 9 years 11 months is in place. The municipality has been reluctant to enter into land use agreements which would hold them responsible, preferring to allow farmers to use commonage for free but without support in infrastructure maintenance or land management. Farmers feel strongly that additional land with infrastructure must be made available for small-scale producers with accountable land use agreements holding land users and the municipality responsible.

48.4% of farmers have signed group / communal land use agreements with only 8.1% of farmers having signed individual land use agreements (these are farmers leasing privately owned land). The agreements vary from group to group and between individuals and there are currently no standard land use agreements or management plans for the commonage land.

Note: due to increased pressure from the farmers and the initial findings of the research the municipality has agreed to enter into land use agreements for 9 years 11 months with all farmer groups using commonage and to establish a commonage committee with land use plans.
Only 1% of farmers are paying rental according to the head of livestock on the land. Where rental is charged it is at a flat rate and not per head of livestock the farmers with larger herds of livestock benefit and those with few livestock are discriminated against. This is an issue which the commonage lease agreements must address.

The majority of farmers, 49%, do not pay for land use, these are people using land without a lease agreement. Only 2% of farmers are leasing land from commercial farmers.
There is a need for access to additional land to expand agricultural activities, in particular land suitable for grazing and crop production where water is available. The 15% who indicated that they did not want more land are the farmers who have already received land through the land reform programme. The Gracia, Melkhoutfontein and Vermaaklikheid farmers who accessed land through the state land reform programme note that their land is infested with aliens and they cannot afford to clear the land therefore rather than additional land more post settlement support is required.

The majority of farmers indicate a need for additional land for agriculture purposes, in particular for grazing. However one of the challenges is that individual farmers have small numbers of livestock.
and therefore communal grazing would be most practical but farmers are resistant to grazing communally due to interbreeding, spread of diseases and possible conflict. To maximize on the potential of grazing land communal grazing should be encouraged. A small percentage of farmers indicate a need for land and housing.

4.3. Food consumption patterns

**FOOD CONSUMPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Source</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1 - 2 Times Per Week</th>
<th>3 - 6 Times Per Week</th>
<th>Every Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHICKEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIZE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAD &amp; FLOUR</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH FRUIT &amp; VEGETABLES</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAIRY</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bread is a staple food consumed daily by 90% of households who are negatively impacted upon by the rise in bread prices. Most households only consume meat once or twice a week with only 5% reporting daily meat consumption and 9% of households never eating meat. During engagements with farmers people indicated that the high price of meat was the reason that households did not consume meat more. 49% of households consume fresh food and vegetable every day demonstrating the importance of producing household vegetables. 74% of households consume dairy every day (most people reported that the dairy product consumed was milk) which also points to the importance of small-scale agriculture in strengthening food security.

**FOOD SOURCE**
The majority of households are dependent on supermarkets as the primary source of food. Only 14% of households produce their own vegetables and fruit and 17% produce their own meat for household consumption. Although 34% make their own bread the majority reported using flour purchased from supermarkets. There is potential to expand household food production through small-scale agriculture. Very few consumers purchase from informal trades raising questions around marketing strategies of farmers.

4.4. Agricultural Production

Figures based on the last year of production during which production was negatively impacted upon by the drought

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION
The predominate agricultural activity of the farmers in Hessequa is livestock farming. With 16% of farmers producing crops (mainly vegetable) and 14% practising mixed farming. During interviews farmers noted a desire and need to diversify agricultural activities.

DECREASES IN AGRICULTURE PRODUCTION

During qualitative interviews farmers noted a decrease in agricultural production over the last 3 years.

**REASONS FOR DECREASE IN LIVESTOCK**

- 38%: No grazing land
- 22%: No water
- 23%: Died
- 17%: Generate income
38% of farmers have decreased their livestock numbers due to not being able to access suitable grazing land. 17% of farmers reduced their livestock as a result of the drought of 2010 and have not yet built up stock to previous numbers. 23% of farmers note that in order to generate enough cash for household needs they are forced to continually sell off livestock and are unable to build up sufficient stock numbers to become commercial farmers. Lack of post settlement and extension support was also noted as a challenge which prevented farmers from expanding herds.

ANNUAL CROP PRODUCTION

Due to challenges of transportation and refrigeration farmers focus their efforts on crops which are easier to store. As a result potatoes are the primary crop produced with sweet potatoes being the second most prevalent crop and onions also a popular crop. These are also staple food products and produce which grows well in the area. In Melkhoutfontein and Vermaaklikheid which are coastal villages people focus on growing sweet potatoes because “these go well with fish”.

SEED
Almost half of the crop producers, 47%, buy seedlings or seed from nurseries, agricultural co-ops or other retail outlets. Farmers who purchase seed and seedlings indicated that they do not know what type of seed they are buying. There are a growing number of producers who are trying to save their own seed with 33% already using this practise. The fact that the source of donated seed (3% from commercial farmers and 17% from the Dept of Agriculture) is unknown is of concern as state departments often distribute GMO seed.

**TYPE OF SEED**

- The majority of farmers indicated that they do not know what type of seed they use. Only 15% of farmers were confident that the seed used is open pollinated. Farmers are not well informed around
sources of seed or the implications thereof pointing to a need to raise awareness around types of seed and in particular the impact of GMOs.

### Use of crops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROP</th>
<th>CROP USE IN PERCENTAGE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION</td>
<td>MAINLY FOR SALE</td>
<td>MORE OR LESS EQUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Potatoes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrots</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beetroot</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpkin</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabbage</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onions</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cucumber</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettuce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most producers use the crops produced both for household consumption and for sale. Tomatoes are the crop most produced as a cash crop. Onions, which can be easily stored, is the crop produced most for household consumption. Only peas and cucumbers which are only grown in small numbers and not very successfully are not sold at all.

### CROP MARKETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROP</th>
<th>MARKETS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
<th>SUPERMARKETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Potatoes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrots</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beetroot</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpkin</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabbage</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onions</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettuce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary markets for agricultural crops are within the community or to local outlets like tourist facilities. The largest market within the community is for onions where farmers sell 100% of the surplus crop. Beans and pumpkin are also marketable within the community. Lettuce and spinach are not sold within the community but only to local restaurants and tourist facilities. There is space for raising awareness around the nutritional value of crops like spinach.

### CROP SALES
Potatoes are the crop which generates the most income and is also the crop most produced as farmers know there is a market. The lowest income is secured through sale of tomatoes. One of the challenges noted by farmers is that when tomatoes are in season the market is often flooded.

**LIVESTOCK NUMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF LIVESTOCK</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>YOUNG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pigs are the livestock most produced. One of the reasons given is the fact that pigs can be bred on relatively small pieces of land. There are no organized poultry farmers although farmers do produce chickens around their homes to guard against theft.

**LIVESTOCK USE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF LIVESTOCK</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION %</th>
<th>MAINLY FOR SALE %</th>
<th>MORE OR LESS EQUAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sheep are mainly produced for sale while there are few poultry farmers producing for the market in Hessequa, this may be an opportunity to expand small-scale agricultural activities as free range indigenous chickens are successfully farmed in the region and vegetables and chickens make successful agricultural companions.

**LIVESTOCK MARKETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF LIVESTOCK</th>
<th>MARKETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the exception of goats, which are primarily sold within the community and through informal traders, most livestock is sold at public auctions. During focus group interviews farmers note that they feel they are discriminated against at auction sales. The perception is that auctioneers announce that livestock is “VAT free” which is a sign that the animal is owned by a black farmer and therefore bidders keep the prices lower. Furthermore farmers indicate that access to abattoirs is a challenge with abattoirs located far from production areas and often not willing to purchase livestock from black producers.

Chicken producers did not declare their income, although they did indicate that they are selling within the community.

In qualitative interviews farmers noted that agricultural activities are not generating sufficient profit to sustain their households. This is attributed to insufficient land for expansion of agriculture and the fact that farmers are not able to build up sufficient stock being forced to continually sell off livestock in order to generate household income. Lack of post settlement and extension support is also attributed as contributing to farmers not generating income. Further farmers noted a need to diversify agricultural activities in order to generate more profits.

Although the number of goat produced is fairly low farmers are generating the most income from goats. This could be due to goats being bred as a quick cash generator whereas other livestock like cattle are also bred as a source of wealth and not only for sale. This is also an indication of the potential of expanding the informal trader markets. Although there are more pigs produced than any other livestock income generated through pig production is the lowest, this is due to lower prices secured for pork.
4.5. Skills and training

The majority of farmers (97%) indicate that they have agricultural skills mostly built up through practical experience. Few farmers indicate that they have financial, mechanical or organisational skills which are recognised as important if agricultural activities are to expand. This links to the low levels of academic training. Farmers indicated that skills upgrading and mentorship arrangements would be beneficial in improving people’s ability to use agriculture for income generation and sustainable livelihoods.
The majority of farmers have not received any formal training and have built skills through hands on practise. 31% of farmers indicated that they have benefitted though formal training mostly through short courses provided by the Dept of Agriculture.

4.6. Succession and inheritance rights

Rights to land

Farmers with ambitions to become commercial indicate a desire to own land in order to have land which children could inherit. A number of farmers who already own the land noted the difficulties and expenses of farming without post settlement support and where institutional arrangements have not been clarified.

![ENTITLEMENT ON DEATH](image)

Entitlement rights have not been formally clarified. 10% of people interviewed believe that on death the entitlement / rights to land will revert to the land owner. Other people indicated that they would like to secure succession rights but that these had not been formally secured. More than a quarter of farmers interviewed believe that only male members of the family should inherit agricultural resources. In the institutional arrangements and guiding documents of groups succession rights need to be clearly spelt out.

Assets and infrastructure
Members of farming groups were generally unclear about how assets and infrastructure would be distributed in the case of death or resignation of a member or the collapse of a group. However, people indicated preferences as to how succession rights should be defined. To avoid conflict and protect assets ownership and rights to assets must be clarified in the institutional arrangements.

4.7. Water

Access to affordable and reliable sources of water for agricultural production was noted as one of the primary challenges facing small-scale producers

**SOURCES OF WATER**
Most households interviewed (97%) have access to municipal tap water. Less than 1% of people are harvesting water either for household or agricultural use. The Hessequa municipality has not proactively made use of the opportunities to access and supply water tanks for agricultural production. In qualitative interviews with farmers and with the municipality there appeared to be some misunderstanding of how to access water tanks and whose responsibility this is.

There is an over-dependency amongst agricultural producers on municipal water which is not sustainable. More than a quarter of crop producers and 43% of livestock producers are reliant on municipal tap water only using other sources of water as secondary sources. In Slangrivier where farmers have always transported water from their homes the municipality has recently installed water points and water meters on the agricultural land. Although these farmers qualify within the indigent water policy of the municipality tariffs will be charged when consumption is above the basic free provision. It remains to be seen if the cost to pay for municipal water will be affordable.

Farmers using river water are dependent on water furrows and water turns. In times of drought the upstream farmers can deplete water sources leaving the farmers downstream without sufficient water. Farmers indicate that water pumps, which could be used to fill water tanks or dams when water is available, would be beneficial in ensuring a more reliable and constant water source.
46% of farmers reported in qualitative interviews and meetings carrying water from their homes to the agricultural sites in bakkies, buckets etc with only 54% having access to water on the site. During qualitative interviews farmers indicate that water schemes are still primarily dominated by commercial farmers with black farmers frustrated by a lack of knowledge of water management systems and legislation.

Although there are such high figures of dependency on municipal water sources some households noted that they do not pay for water and 57% pay less than R100 per month. Farmers noted that the low water bills were due to the fact that they qualify for the indigent policies of the municipality and that water consumption is still within the defined limits of the policy. In general people could not say how much household water was consumed for farming activities and how much for household consumption as it is recorded in one bill. To date the municipality has been lenient in allowing
farmers to use municipal water from communal points and on commonage land without charge. One of the reasons is the absence of written land use agreements which hold users accountable. With the election of a new council, with growing water shortages and a formalization of land use agreements farmers could well find themselves with unaffordable water bills. During stakeholder engagements with the municipality it was indicated that farmers using commonage will have to start paying for water use.

In a drought prone area like Hessequa and with the threat of water restrictions and rising costs it is a priority that better water management and water harvesting methods be implemented.

4.8. Infrastructure

Most of the farmers have managed to fence land and camps but indicate this was primarily at their own costs where there was existing fencing on the commonage this has been maintained by the farmers themselves. In the absence of commonage land use management systems and agreements the municipality is not contributing to infrastructure or maintenance. Due to the fact that there are no formal written lease agreements for commonage the Dept of Agriculture is not providing fencing on commonage. Where farmers are using land owned by commercial farmers fencing has been provided by the land owner.

The 29% of farmers who indicated that they received fencing from other sources is mainly through Child Welfare, Dept of Social Development and Dept of Rural Dev and Land Reform
Farmers are responsible for maintenance of the fencing. Clarification of roles and responsibilities will be included in the commonage agreements when these are formalized.

**OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE AND IMPLEMENTS**

Four groups of farmers, Sleeping Beauty, Heidelberg, Vetterivier and Albertinia, have received implements from the DAFF. DAFF cannot help the other groups due to the fact that there is no signed land use agreement. The farmers have to maintain the equipment themselves which is a challenge as people do not have capital.

Where equipment has been granted to farmers like at Slangrivier, there are no institutional arrangements in place. Thus the equipment in Slangrivier is locked in a shed with only 4 individuals having access. Other farmers are expected to rent this equipment at unaffordable prices. Donating equipment without establishing rules and strengthening democratic processes causes conflict and often only benefits an elite few.

**4.8. Levels of organisation**

The most active organisation in Hessequa is the church. Over 95% of people interviewed indicated that they were members of a church. The church has potential to be a powerful voice for justice and a tool for organizing members however in general the church is silent on issues of land and agrarian transformation. Some farmers in the Melkhoutfontein area are using church land for agricultural production.
It is of concern that some of the farmer groups have been in existence for more than 20 years and yet levels of organisation remain weak and agricultural activities are not well established. Many of the farmer groups did not know if they had a binding constitution or what the contents of such a document are.

The fact that the majority of farmers are fairly new members of farming groups could indicate the revival of interest in agricultural activities, this could be as a result of shrinking opportunities in formal employment. It was noted that these new members are the most active.

The municipal task team representing all 12 groups is proving a powerful voice. The task team has visited all agricultural projects of the members in order to inform joint mobilization strategies. The task team has engaged the municipality around the impounding systems and have secured an agreement that certain members of the task team will be contacted before any livestock is impounded. The task team has also secured a verbal agreement from the municipality to enter into commonage lease agreements, develop a commonage land management plan and establish a commonage committee. The task team has met with the provincial MEC for agriculture to lobby for better support to small-scale farmers and in particular agro-ecological methods of production. The task team remains committed to ongoing engagement with the municipality and other stakeholders to strengthen small-scale agriculture in Hessequa and to use the findings of the research to underpin mobilisation and lobbying.
5. **Baseline information for farm workers and dwellers in Hessequa Municipality**

5.1. **Interview sample**

- 112 interviews were conducted with 107 men and 5 women respondents living on farms. Through the research primary breadwinners were interviewed. Only 5 women on the targeted farms were the primary breadwinners of the household.
- The 112 individuals interviewed responded on behalf of 411 people living in the households – 203 females and 208 males (49% female and 51% male).
- Labour rights information is based on labour conditions of 176 farm workers (112 male and 64 female workers).
- Farmer workers and dwellers from 24 commercial farms in the Heidelberg, Vermaaklikheid and Kruisrivier areas were interviewed.

SCLC has not yet worked with the farm dwellers in this region. There are low levels of organization on the farms with no workers belonging to unions and no area farm committees in place.

5.2. **Age of farm dwellers**

The majority of people living on farms (59%) fall within the most productive income generating age group, 18 – 59 years old. Only 3% of people are over the age of 60 and therefore could be eligible for long term occupier status this might be an indication of the fact that farmers make sure people are not employed or living on the farms when they reach an age where they would qualify as long term occupiers. 38% are under the age of 18 and are mainly scholars still living with their parents.

5.3. **Household sizes**
The majority of farm dweller households (51%) have 4 – 5 people living in the home. 23% of households only consist of 2 people as children usually move off the farm when they have completed school, either voluntarily or at the demand of the land owner.

5.4. Employment

PLACES OF EMPLOYMENT

More than double the number of men are employed on the farms then women and there are many more women who are unemployed than men. Very few farm dwellers consider themselves farmers in their own rights.
Statistics for male and female temporary employees living on the farms are almost the same (3% women vs 2% men) which contradicts patterns on some commercial farms where women are predominately employed as casual or temporary workers. People noted that casual or seasonal workers are transported in from urban centres and not housed on the farms. This may be an attempt by farmers to reduce the number of people living on farms and rather source labour off farms.

Almost double the number of men are employed permanently as compared to women. This has implications for women’s tenure and housing rights which are linked to those of the permanent workers.
5.5. Household income

Categories are based on the minimum wage of R1 375.94 per month

17% of farm dweller households have a monthly income of between R1 and R16 512. These are households where one member is receiving the minimum wage of R1 651.28 or (5%) where a household is dependent on a state grant as the main source of income. Only 5% of farm dweller households have an income of more than R5 000 per month. These are people who are working off the farm in government institutions. These are also the people who do not qualify for protection within the ESTA legislation.
5.6. Food

FOOD CONSUMED IN A WEEK

Bread is the staple food source with 92% of farm dwellers consuming bread daily. Nearly a quarter of the farm dwellers interviewed never consume red meat and 18% never consume chicken within the
household. People noted that the fact that they do not eat much meat or chicken is due to unaffordability. 10% of households never eat fresh fruit or vegetables demonstrating the benefits which farm dwellers would enjoy through growing household food.

**OUTLETS WHERE FOOD IS PURCHASED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outlet</th>
<th>MEAT</th>
<th>MAIZE</th>
<th>BREAD &amp; FLOUR</th>
<th>FRESH FRUIT &amp; VEG</th>
<th>DAIRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Production</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Shops</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Traders</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakkies</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most food is purchased at supermarkets. 49% of farm dwellers purchase fresh fruit and vegetables from informal traders who travel to the farms in bakkies. This is an opportunity for small-scale farmers to market their produce as well as an opportunity for more farm dwellers to begin to produce their own fruit and vegetables. 60% of meat is produced by the farm dwellers themselves again pointing to opportunities to expand agriculture on farms.

**FOOD PURCHASED ON CREDIT**

- **YES**: 44%
- **NO**: 56%
52% of farm dwellers interviewed buy food on credit. Many of these workers use farm shops to buy on credit thus creating a dependency on the employer and a cycle of having to continue to work to pay off debt accumulated for household food.

5.7. Water

**HOUSEHOLD WATER**

![Bar chart for household water sources]

95% of respondents have tap water in the household. 4% are drinking water from streams or dams, with some respondents reporting that they share water sources with the livestock. Streams, dams and boreholes are used to supplement household water and in times of drought and water restrictions farm dwellers report that these are the primary source of household water. Only 1% of respondents are harvesting water which is in contrast with the policy of the Eden District Municipality to supply water tanks for houses on farms. Either farmers are ill informed of the policy or are not making use of the opportunity.

**WATER SOURCES FOR AGRICULTURE**
There is a high dependency on tap water for agricultural production of farm dwellers. All crop producers are using taps as a source to water crops and the majority of livestock farmers also depend on taps for water. Where farm dwellers are using other sources of water to supplement tap water it is primarily water from rivers, streams or dams.

5.8. Land

ACCESS TO LAND FOR LIVELIHOODS

57% of farm dwellers interviewed indicated that they had some access to land for crop and livestock farming although the majority indicated these were small plots around the homesteads.
Farm dwellers using the available land are mainly grazing small numbers of livestock. Farm dwellers indicated a motivation to expand crop production and food gardens.

The majority of farm dwellers have access to small pieces of land, usually around the homestead. This contrasts with the fact that people noted they do not eat fresh vegetables and could be linked to suitability of the land for crop production, water availability or time and interest.
67% of farm dwellers indicated that they would like additional land for own use. The farm dwellers who indicated no need for additional land are those who have no interest in farming.

The majority of farm dwellers who are seeking additional land for agriculture wish to expand their crop production.

5.8. Agriculture
The majority of farm dwellers save their own seed with 80% of the crop producers who are saving their own seed indicating they have only been saving seed for one year or less and 20% for 2 – 5 years. This gives an indication that there is a growing awareness of the benefits of seed saving and the agricultural skills of farm dwellers. 80% are using open pollinated varieties and 20% indicated that they do not know what type of seed they are using.
CROP USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROP</th>
<th>CROP USE IN PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>MAINLY FOR HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION</th>
<th>MAINLY FOR SALE</th>
<th>MORE OR LESS EQUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Potato</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potato</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomato</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beetroot</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumpkin</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabbage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onions</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettuce</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermelon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All crops produced are for household consumption, to supplement household food with the exception of watermelon which is also sold.

LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIVESTOCK</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>YOUNG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many farm dwellers keep chickens around the homestead for eggs and for slaughter. Chickens are kept for household consumption. Farm dwellers indicated a desire to acquire additional livestock in order to expand farming activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIVESTOCK</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION</th>
<th>MAINLY FOR SALE</th>
<th>MORE OR LESS EQUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary use of livestock (with the exception of chickens) is for sale to supplement household income.
There is potential for farm dwellers to improve household income through small-scale farming activities.

5.9. Labour rights

The research compared the rights of farm workers with the contents of the Sectoral Determination number 13, 2002 updated 2010. Although only 5 female workers were interviewed information was provided for 64 female workers and 112 male workers.

In general adherence to labour legislation was fairly high on the farms where interviews are conducted with the most vulnerable sector being temporary women workers. It must be noted that the contents of the Sectoral Determination are the minimum requirements for a life of dignity therefore any violations thereof point to human rights violation.

5.9.a. Salary Slips
The majority of farm workers are provided with pay slips. 34% of female workers do not receive pay slips as compared to 15% of male workers. Without a payslip it is difficult for workers to track deductions or to monitor payment of overtime.

5.9.b. Employment contracts

The majority of male and female works have written work contracts. More temporary workers do not have written contracts than permanent workers. Temporary workers in general and temporary women workers in particular have the highest level of non-adherence with 36% of temporary women workers not having written work contract. Workers without signed contracts are more vulnerable to exploitation.
5.9.c. Working Hours

ADHERENCE TO A 45 HOUR WORKING WEEK

![Chart showing adherence to 45-hour working week by gender and employment status.]

- Permanent Male Employees: 87% Yes, 13% No
- Temporary Male Employees: 100% Yes, 0% No
- Permanent Female Employees: 98% Yes, 2% No
- Temporary Female Employees: 82% Yes, 18% No
The majority of farm workers interviewed work within the prescribed 45 hour week. Temporary women workers have the highest number of workers who work more than the stipulated 45 hours a week. With women’s double burden of household and workplace work longer working hours places a strain on the women and on their families.

5.9.d. Adherence to minimum wage requirements

PAYMENT OF MINIMUM WAGE

The minimum wage as determined by the Sectoral Determination is R1 375,94 per month. The majority of permanent male workers (87%) receive wages in line with legal requirements for the minimum wage or above. This correlates with the fact that permanent male workers have signed work contracts. Temporary workers have the highest level of non-adherence with a quarter of temporary male worker and 27% of temporary women workers indicating that they earn below the minimum wage. There is contestation as to whether the minimum wage is a living wage therefore the fact that more than a quarter of temporary workers earn below the minimum wage contributes to levels of poverty and food insecurity on farms.

5.9.e. Reimbursement for overtime

WORKERS RECEIVING OVERTIME PAY
75% of permanent male employees and 75% of temporary male employees are paid for overtime worked as required by the Sectoral Determination for agriculture. Temporary female workers are the group with the highest number of workers receiving below the minimum wage (30%).

5.9.f. Adherence to leave requirements

**PERMANENT EMPLOYEES' LEAVE**

![Bar chart showing adherence to leave requirements for permanent employees]

- 98% of permanent male employees and 98% of permanent female employees received annual leave.
- 91% of permanent male employees and 91% of permanent female employees received sick leave.
- 84% of permanent female employees received family responsibility leave.
- 95% of permanent female employees received maternity leave.

In general the leave requirements for farm workers are adhered to. Male workers struggle most...
to secure family responsibility leave.

5.9.g. Payment for accommodation

According to the Sectoral Determination for Agriculture an employer may not deduct more than 10% of wages as rental for housing. The majority of permanent male workers do not pay more than 10% for accommodation, wood or water. 50% of women permanent and temporary workers indicated that they pay more than 10% for accommodation, wood and water. The fact that more women indicated that they pay could be linked to the fact that women are being paid less than men. 50% of temporary workers pay more than 10% for accommodation and again this could be linked to the low wages received by temporary workers.

5.9.h. Lease contracts for rental of houses on farms
79% of permanent employees have signed leased contracts for houses on farms while 81% of temporary employees have lease contracts. The tenure rights of farm dwellers without signed lease contract are more insecure and without a lease contract farmers may charge higher rental.

### 6. Conclusion

#### 6.1. Small-scale agricultural producers

**Small-scale agriculture is part of rural livelihoods.** Every rural town has at least one organized group of “emergent farmers”. Agriculture is used primarily to supplement household food and income. Farmers, who have aspirations to become commercial, are hampered by a shortage of suitable land for production, especially for grazing. Well managed commonage is essential for small-scale producers. Rural municipalities need to prioritize access to sufficient commonage and commonage management systems.

**Access to and control over water** remains the domain of established commercial farmers and industry. Reliance on municipal water for agricultural production is unsustainable. Water management systems including water harvesting and distribution must be developed to ensure a more equitable access to water and sustainable use of water.

**Agricultural markets and up-scaling of agricultural produce** should be a priority. One of the factors which hamper small-scale producers is the lack of markets and opportunities for up-scaling. To ensure more people benefit from agriculture and that existing farmers are able to expand and grow agricultural markets need to be established and opportunities for communal selling explored.
There is a need for **training and capacity enhancement** especially in sustainable methods of farming which consider the implications of climate change. The majority of farmers are using their own life experience without any formal training. Linking with commercial farmers is seen as important by the farmers however skewed power relations can derail such arrangements.

### 6.2. Farm dwellers

**Employment opportunities** on commercial agricultural farms are important. Many people work and live on farms. More men than women are permanently employed on farms, which has implications for tenure and housing rights.

Creating opportunities for farm dwellers to **practise small-scale agriculture** will strengthen food security and enhance the livelihoods of farm dwellers.

There is a growing trend for farmers to reduce the number of people living on their farms and **minimize tenure rights** through sourcing temporary / casual workers in urban centres on a daily basis and limiting the number of elderly people with long term occupier rights.

Adherence to labour legislation is **better for male workers than female workers**. Levels of organization on farms are low with no active agricultural unions in Hessequa. This makes workers more vulnerable, in particular female workers.
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