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1. Introduction and background

1.1 Introduction

ComMark has commissioned a consultant to undertake an initial baseline survey of the Alfred Nzo district municipality. The initial baseline survey was motivated by a three-year joint venture entered between WBHO Ltd and ComMark to expand the current ComMark Eastern Cape Red Meat Project to the area of Alfred Nzo district municipality, where WBHO is constructing a road between Mt Frere and Matatiele. The aim of the initial baseline survey is to provide an empirical foundation for ComMark to make strategic decisions around the allocation of project resources and the design of the project components.

The report has focused on the following issues:

- An assessment of the status quo: Current agricultural activity and infrastructure, existing livestock improvement programmes running in the area, etc. It is vital for us to have a good and detailed understanding of the current position before we begin to conceptualise and implement interventions.

- A profile of the target farmers (programme beneficiaries), including an investigation of issues such as their reasons for holding cattle, their access to markets, use of animal health products and services, etc. Once again, it is important for us to ensure that we develop programmes that reflect the aspirations and capacity of the beneficiary community.

1.2 Background

The Alfred Nzo District Municipality (ANDM) is made up of two local municipalities - Umzimvubu (Mt. Ayliff and Mt. Frere) and Matatiele (Maluti, Matatiele and Cedarville). The two local municipalities (Umzimvubu and Matatiele) are both made up of rural towns, communal and private farms. ANDM is located along the N2 national road between Durban and East London. Its area stretches from the Drakensberg Mountains and borders Lesotho in the West, Sisonke District municipality to the North and O.R. Tambo District Municipality in the east and South.

The headquarters are located in Mount Ayliff along the N2 between Mount Frere and Kokstad. ANDM has a considerably high population density, estimated at 70 people per square kilometre. However there are significant population density variations e.g. the population density of Umzimkhulu is estimated at 32 people per square kilometre and for Umzimvubu it is estimated at 154 people per square kilometre. It is reported in the ANDM website that 68% of the population in this District Municipality is found in Umzimvubu.
The Alfred Nzo District Municipality is the second poorest in the Eastern Cape after O.R. Tambo, in terms of all poverty measures such as HDI, number of people living in poverty and the poverty gap. About 44% of the population is below 15 years of age and almost 57% of the population is below 20 years. There are more females (55%) than males (45%).

Various studies conducted about the Eastern Cape Livestock market allude to the fact that, nationally, the Eastern Cape leads with respect to total livestock numbers. However, the same cannot be said with respect to production input for the livestock sector. According to a report by Mr M.C. Mbangeni, in relation to other regions Alfred Nzo holds 411 766 sheep and cattle and this is 7.6% of the Province total.

With the incorporation of Matatiele into Alfred Nzo District Municipality the livestock sector in the region is now divided into three sectors i.e. the commercial, emerging and communal. The commercial and the emerging sector is mainly made up of individual or family farms on private land and the decisions for production are easily made, as there is clear line of responsibility. In contrast, the communal sector is mainly made of farmers farming individually on farmland owned by the municipality or allocated to the entire group or community. This land is usually in the form of municipal共同ages, land redistributed for agricultural redevelopment (LRAD recipients), or settlement land for agricultural purposes (SLAG recipients).

1.3 Methodology and approach

According to the terms of reference, ComMark requires that detailed information around the following indicators is collected:

- A profile of the target beneficiaries, in terms of demographics, livestock holdings, market participation, etc.
- An assessment of existing relevant infrastructure, such as auction pens, dipping tanks, fencing, communal grazing land, etc.
- An overview and assessment of existing institutional structures, such as farmer’s organizations, tribal grazing/livestock management structures, red meat retailers, etc.
- An overview of livestock improvement projects currently in place from either local, provincial or national government.

The key source of information was interviews held with 108 local farmers. The questionnaire is attached as Appendix A.

The assessment of infrastructure was undertaken through a combined approach of on-site visits, discussions with relevant persons, and the collection of documentation. A similar approach was adopted with respect to the collection of data around existing institutional structures.
In order to address the issues around livestock improvement projects and initiatives in the target area, meetings and telephone discussions were undertaken with various key stakeholders supportive of the development agenda of the Alfred Nzo District Municipality and various source documentation collected.

Apart from the individual farmer interviews, the following people were interviewed:

### Table 1 – Meetings in Alfred Nzo District Municipality (ANDM) and with key stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact person</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 April 2008</td>
<td>Fort Hare University</td>
<td>Mr Nkosi Mzileni: Co-ordinator Fort Hare Nguni Project <a href="mailto:nmzileni@ufh.ac.za">nmzileni@ufh.ac.za</a></td>
<td>Source information about the Nguni Project and other livestock improvement projects in the Alfred Nzo Municipality</td>
<td>Mr Mzileni mentioned 3 Nguni projects that Fort Hare University is supporting in the Alfred Nzo District Municipality. He also gave reference to the Goat and Ram projects in Alfred Nzo. He was also very helpful in providing the contact numbers of the key people involved with the mentioned projects above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Agriculture at Umzimvubu local municipality (Mt Frere &amp; Mt Ayliff) under the Alfred Nzo District Municipality</td>
<td>Mr Gwele: Agricultural Development Technicians (Extention) Controller Cell:079 5001870 Office (039) 2550 100</td>
<td>Introduction re the Alfred Nzo WBHO/Commark Project. Source information about the Livestock improvement projects in the ANDM</td>
<td>Mr Gwele proposed that he will provide the required information and will also talk to the ADT’s to support the baseline study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 April 2008</td>
<td>WBHO</td>
<td>Mr MarkDavey: 0832896705</td>
<td>Introduction of the baseline study team and site visiting</td>
<td>Mr Mark Davey gave a brief overview of the WBHO Mt Frere road construction project. He also introduced Philisiwe as the contact person for WBHO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umzimvubu Local Municipality (Mt Frere &amp; Mt Ayliff)</td>
<td>Philisiwe Ntsadu: 0739172549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 April 2008</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture: Umzimvubu Local Municipality</td>
<td>Mr N. Giwu: Chairperson WBHO Project Steering Committee Cell:073 148 1381</td>
<td>Introduction of the baseline study team</td>
<td>Mr Giwu recommended that we attend the WBHO Project Steering Committee meeting scheduled for the 10th April 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Agriculture: Alfred Nzo District Municipality</td>
<td>Mr Viwe (Agricultural Intern, Veterinary section) Cell: 076 691 8938</td>
<td>Site visiting and assessment of the livestock infrastructure along the WBHO constructed road</td>
<td>Drove along the constructed road until the last village where the first phase of the road construction ends. Visited dipping tanks and grazing fields of livestock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 April 2008</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture: Alfred Nzo District Municipality</td>
<td>Mr Mbangeni: Livestock Co-ordinator 0837510169/ 0837088858</td>
<td>Telephonic conversation about Livestock Improvement Program of the ANDM</td>
<td>Gave a brief explanation about livestock improvement in Alfred Nzo and referred to Mr Gwele for further detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture: Umzimvubu Local Municipality</td>
<td>Mr Gwele (ADT controller) and Umzimvubu Local municipality Agricultural Development Technicians (ADT) 0795001870/ 0837470759</td>
<td>Mncedisi met with the ADTs and reached an agreement that 100 farmers in the following 6 villages will be sampled. (Lubhacweni; Mvuzi; Lugangeni; Njijini; Mandileni and Mabhobho). In each village 17 farmers will be interviewed and the interviews start on the 21st April 2008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April</td>
<td>Uvimba Finance</td>
<td>Mr Bongani Mdutyana: Head Customer Services: 082 850 2608 Mr Linda Nondabula: Customer Consultant: 083 413 7729</td>
<td>Introduce the Alfred Nzo Livestock Improvement Project. Source information about the type of loans they provide to livestock farmers in the Alfred Nzo District municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture: Umzimvubu Local Municipality</td>
<td>Mrs Lulama Ntanjana: Controller Veterinary Services 0832693699</td>
<td>Source information about service provided to farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>National Wool Growers Association (NWGA)</td>
<td>Mr Makaula: Co-ordinator NWGA wool improvement project Cell: 082 422 8083</td>
<td>Mr Makaula trains farmers on how to look after their sheep in order to produce good quality wool. Facilitates establishment of Wool Farmers Associations; Interlinks with animal health services provider e.g. Intervet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>WBHO Project Steering Committee</td>
<td>Mr N.Giwu : Steering Committee Chairperson 0731481381</td>
<td>Dr X. Ngetu made the presentation on behalf of Commark and WBHO and the project. Steering committee members were satisfied after some clarifications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 April</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture: Alfred Nzo District Municipality</td>
<td>Mr Mbangeni: Livestock Coordinator Cell: 083 751 0169/083 708 858</td>
<td>Presentation and Discussions about the Challenges of the Alfred Nzo Livestock Improvement Programme Took notes and Received documentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Role/Contact Person</td>
<td>Activity Details</td>
<td>Additional Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 21 April 2008 | Umzimvubu Department of Agriculture      | Mr Gwele (ADT controller) 0795001870/0837470759 | Briefing session regarding farmer interviews with the Agriculture Development Technicians (ADTs) (see list attached)  
The ADT will support the interview process through informing and organizing farmers for interviews. |                                                                                                    |
| 23 April 2008 | Umzimvubu Goat                          | Mr M.C. Qulu (Agricultural officer) 0826779781 | Source information about the Umzimvubu Goat Project  
Received information and got invitation to attend a board meeting to explain more about Commark project  
Source information about the LED programmes.  
Received Integrated Development Plans documentation and a budget for the implementation of Programs. |                                                                                                    |
| 25 April 2008 | Umzimvubu Local Municipality            | Ms Phumza Vitshima (LED Manager) 0824673696 | Source information about the objective of the association and activities or projects that they are currently engaged in. ask questions about their livestock development needs.  
Received information. See report. |                                                                                                    |
| 7 May 2008   | Umzimvubu Livestock Farmers Association  | Mrs Qhasha (Chairperson of the Association) 084 882 9609 | Telephone discussion to source information about the sheep farmers under the Wool Growers Association (WGA)  
Information received by fax on the 9th May 2008. See report. |                                                                                                    |
| 7 May 2008   | Umzimvubu Dept. of Agriculture           | Mr Kutloang (Agricultural Development Technician) (073 139 8933) | Telephone discussion regarding information about the department of agriculture’s dipping and vaccination programs and confirm the Department of Agriculture’s plans for livestock development in Mt Frere  
Received information. See report. |                                                                                                    |
| 8 May 2008   | Mt Frere Prison                          | Mr Yenge (Nutrition Manager) 039 255 0126 073 269 8270 | Telephone discussion to source information about the Prison’s supplier of meat.  
Received by fax the Sheep and Cattle annual vaccination programs; annual calendar for controlled and non-controlled animal diseases. A list of Animal Health Technicians and the areas/villages that they serve, their contact numbers and Mt Frere Livestock Census data (2007).  
A map with all the villages (including those along the Chancele Road) that are served by the Umzimvubu Department of Agriculture was also received. The mentioned documents are attached as annexures. |                                                                                                    |
| 8 May 2008   | Mt Frere Hospital                        | Mrs Zuziwe Gebashe (Kitchen Superintendent) 039 255 8200 | Telephone discussion to source information about the Hospital’s supplier of meat.  
Received information. See report. |                                                                                                    |
| 9 May 2008   | Umzimvubu Department of Agriculture      | Mr K. Nkahle 039 255 0100 073 139 8933 | Telephone discussion to source information about the Mt Frere Wool Growers Association  
Received information by fax. See report. |                                                                                                    |
2. Assessment of the current status in red meat farming

Our objective in this part of the report is to assess existing levels of agriculture, agricultural assets and infrastructure, institutional arrangements (such as grazing management and access to markets) and current and planned programmes by government in the area of livestock and red meat production in the Alfred Nzo District.

2.1 Current livestock ownership

Data on livestock ownership is available both for the entire Mt Frere area, as well as slightly less detailed data for those villages located alongside the WBHO road-building project. We have shown the main red meat livestock categories, as well as horses, donkeys and mules, since the latter group are also competing for grazing. The key data are shown in the two tables below:

Table 2 – Livestock distribution in Mt Frere area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>53,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>60,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>72,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>3,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkeys</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mules</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>3,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Umzimvubu Department of Agriculture, Animal Health Section. Mt Frere Livestock Census 2007

Ownership of red meat livestock is heavily skewed towards smaller stock – goats and sheep. When we look at ownership of cattle as a percentage of the total, it is only 29%.
Table 3 – Livestock distribution in villages along the Chancele Road constructed by WBHO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Goats</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Horses</th>
<th>Donkeys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lugangeni</td>
<td>29511</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, nthokwana, Zwelitsha</td>
<td>2299</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Njijini</td>
<td>2787</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhibha</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvuzi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandileni</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>2158</td>
<td>2875</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngwetsheni</td>
<td>3815</td>
<td>2988</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nqalweni</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39698</td>
<td>11096</td>
<td>12081</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Umzimvubu Department of Agriculture, Animal health section (2007)

The livestock ownership along the Chancele Road reflects a slightly different position – sheep are clearly heavily favoured, and cattle make up only 19% of the total of sheep, goats and cattle. (However, we should remember that the value of the cattle outweigh the value of the other livestock – one head of average-condition cattle is worth around R3,200 for slaughter whereas a similar condition sheep is worth around R750.)

However, these numbers reinforce the position that sheep and goat farmers must be included in any red meat programme in order to maximize the value to the community.

### 2.2 Assessment of existing infrastructure

An assessment was undertaken of all existing infrastructure in the area, relevant to the purposes of this project. Key infrastructure includes fencing, access to water, dipping facilities and sales facilities, such as auction pens. Access to the farming areas for transport vehicles is also an important issue. One key aim of the project will be to implement solutions for infrastructure shortcomings that have become barriers to higher-value market participation.

In the discussions held with Messrs Mbangeni, Gwele, Makaula, Matholengwe, Mzileni and Mrs Ntanjana, the key infrastructure problems were unanimously identified as **no fencing for grazing camps, no handling facilities, and limited water points**. The farmers in the area practice communal grazing in largely unfenced areas and their animals drink mainly from two rivers namely Kinirha and Tina. There are no drinking troughs and no usable dams in the area. This means that animals must travel relatively long distances for water, and also leave the community very exposed to the impact of drought (which would be ameliorated if they also had access to borehole water).
The lack of fencing is a very real problem: Apart from the issues of animals wandering onto the roads and the increased likelihood of stock theft, effective pasture management and rotational grazing is almost impossible without adequate fencing. Unfortunately, the very high cost of fencing such large areas is beyond the budget capacity of either the local community or the local authority.

There are 42 cattle dipping tanks in the area, but only 16 can be used, following a revitalization plan. The farmers use a plunge dipping system for cattle and those that participate in the programme generally dip their animals twice a month. The Department of Agriculture provides the farmers with Tritix dip. The local authority is planning to revitalize the remainder of the 42 dipping tanks. In addition, they have identified that there is a need to establish more dipping tanks as some farmers have been complaining about the travelling distance to dipping tanks. Mr Matholengwe (an animal health technician at the Umzimvubu Department of Agriculture) indicated that at present there is a need for 8 more dipping tanks, but that there was no available budget for these in the current budget. The additional dipping tanks would service the following villages: Sivumela, Mtsila, Njjini, Dangwana, Lutateni, Mphamba, Tshungwana and Mvuzi. Two of these villages (Njjini and Mvuzi) lie along the Chancele road.

None of the sheep dipping tanks in the area are in a usable condition. Presently the farmers use ecomectin to vaccinate their sheep against sheep scab and this vaccine is also subsidized by the Department of Agriculture. The vaccination is done once a year in July. (See the Livestock vaccination Program attached as annexure 4&5.) Clearly this requires attention.

Animal identification is an important issue in improving access to markets under group schemes, since buyers such as abattoirs must be able to identify individual animals for the purpose of accurate price allocation. In this area, the Umzimvubu Department of Agriculture is presently busy registering the farmers so that their animals are branded, instead of using their traditional “cutting of ears in different ways” system. About 25 farmers have already been shown how to brand their animals.

There are no sale pens in the area, and so farmers cannot access auctions. Mr Viwe and others (Giwu, Mbangeni & Matholengwe) said that the farmers sell locally for traditional activities e.g. marriage ceremonies, circumcision, funerals etc. The local authority does have plans to build sales pens (and possibly a local abattoir) but is constrained by a lack of funding.

2.3 Assessment of existing (non-government) institutional structures

The baseline study investigated the existence and health in the area of various institutional structures that affect either production or market access.
National Wool Growers Association (NWGA) Project: The NWGA was formed in 1929 and its mission is the Promotion of a Sustainable and Profitable Wool Sheep Industry in South Africa. This mission is supported by six strategic objectives:

- Establishment of a strong producer’s organization (NWGA)
- The promotion of an improved policy and legislative environment
- Creation of an effective production environment
- Constructive training and development programs to improve the knowledge and skills of all farmers and farm workers
- Accomplishment of an improved market environment
- Accomplishment of an empowered institutional environment in support of the wool industry

The NWGA has a voluntary membership of more than 10,000 farmers. These members produce more than 80% of the national clip of just below 50 million kg of wool annually. It is reported in the NWGA’s website that, close to 50% of its members are black communal and emerging farmers. The NWGA provides on-going producer driven research and marketing, inform farmers about current news and trends in wool and mutton farming and there is also a section dedicated to new farmer development.

In creating an effective production environment and also develop the communal farmers the NWGA supports a wool improvement project in the ANDM and this project is implemented through the supply of good quality Rams by the NWGA to the Alfred Nzo District Municipality sheep farmers. The NWGA has employed a local staff member located at Alfred Nzo namely Mr Makaula. He is responsible for training the sheep farmers on how to look after their sheep for good quality wool production, wool classification, sorting, bailing and marketing.

He has established 40 wool farmers association in the whole Alfred Nzo municipality. The membership of these associations is more than 250 members. The NWGA, through Mr Makaula, therefore assists the farmers to organize themselves into associations (shearing sheds) for collective wool marketing and also by supplying them with good quality rams for the production of good quality wool.

Mr Makaula also works very closely with the animal health services provider to facilitate access to adequate vet services complementary to good wool production. He also identifies the farmer’s challenges and address them together with the local Department of Agriculture.

There is also the Wool Growers Association in Mt Frere please see the table 4 below:
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Table 4 – Mount Frere Wool Growers Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of shearing shed</th>
<th>No of members</th>
<th>No of bales</th>
<th>Producer no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mabobo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>471623A7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lubacweni</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>471620A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Toleni</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>471624A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dangwana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>471628A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mphemba</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>512488A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. mahamane</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>510267A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ukwanca</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>471772A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mandileni</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>472173A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cabazi</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>471771A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Luyengweni</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>470945A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cancele</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>471774A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mampondumiseni</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>471771A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lwandiana</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>510667A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Tshungwana</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>471626A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mtshazi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>471265A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mvuzi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>510261A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ukwancen</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>471622A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Umzimvubu Department of Agriculture (2007)

The Mt Frere Wool Growers Association has 231 members and the Chairperson of the Association is Mr Jansen. The membership if the association is organized according to shearing sheds as indicated in the table above. The members sell their wool in bales to BKB either in Port Elizabeth or Durban. BKB organizes transport to collect the wool bales from the shearing sheds. At least there must be 20 bales of wool per shearing shed for BKB to provide transport. If no shearing shed meets the minimum number of 20 bales, the farmers then transport the bales at their own cost to a central place in Mt Frere at the Department of Agriculture (under the supervision of Mr Nkehle) and BKB will collect from that point.

The transport costs for the wool is deducted from the income of the farmers. The wool is bought at about R13 per kg by BKB.

Discussions held with Messrs Gwele, Makaula and Mbangeni indicated that farmers are not yet fully organised into farmer’s associations. However, the process of facilitating the formation of local farmer’s association is under way.
Once in place, these farmers’ associations can be a very effective tool for implementing community-wide production and market access improvement schemes.

There is a fairly new association (Umzimvubu Livestock Farmers Association) in the area, constituted of mainly cattle and goat farmers from Mt Frere and Mt Ayliff. It was established in December 2007. There are 9 executive members - Mrs Qhasha (Chairperson), Mr Qulu (Vice-chairperson), Mr Gxula (Treasurer), Mrs Kholisa (Secretary), Mr Njani (Deputy Secretary) and additional members Messrs Jijana, Mdoka and Mdudi and Mrs Jona. The organisation does not yet have a detailed membership database, and farmers are still joining. One of the major projects that they are involved in is in working with the local authority around the revitalization of the dipping tanks.

It is also worth noting that the National Emerging Red Producers Organisation (NERPO) has a presence in the area, as does the commercial farmers association - the Red Meat Producers Organization (RPO).

There are some forms of village level livestock and pasture management structures under the leadership of a local chief or headman. These pasture management structures are responsible for regulating livestock grazing e.g. when the fields are cultivated and planted with crops the cattle and sheep are restricted to graze near the mountain. After maize harvest for an example, the livestock is allowed back on to the field to feed on the maize stalks. However, these village level livestock and pasture management structures are ad hoc arrangements, and their enforcement is very greatly hampered by the lack of fencing. There are no explicit or written rules that everybody must adhere to. However, even these informal arrangements suggest that there is a precedent for the institution of more formal, structured arrangement.

As far as market access structures go, it is worth noting that there are middle-men (speculators) active in the area who buy from farmers in the villages and resell to the communities nearer the towns. They generally pay well below the “real” market price.

As far as red meat retailing is concerned, there are some local butcheries, a Spar and a Checkers. However, all these retailers buy their meat from an abattoir in Kokstad, which is 90 km away.

About 10 kilometers from Mt Frere there is a hospital (Madzikane ka Zulu). The hospital is supplied by their contracted supplier with 80kg beef, 100kg mutton and 100kg sausage per month. Independent suppliers tender for the supply of meat and they in turn generally source it from formal abattoirs. There is also Mt Frere prison e.g. the prison is supplied by independent suppliers 200kg of meat per month made up of Pork, Chicken & Beef and also 120kg per month of fish. The independent suppliers tender for the supply of meat and they source it from formal abattoirs.
2.4 An overview of current government livestock production support programmes

In order for this project to maximise its impact, it is important that it is aligned with support programmes and other initiatives planned and/or in implementation by the local, provincial or national government, in order to prevent duplication of efforts. Our investigation has determined that there are a considerable number of plans to support communal livestock owners and emerging farmers, but that few of them are being implemented, due largely to a shortage of funds.

The Eastern Cape Provincial Department of Agriculture has a provincial Plan for Livestock Improvement.

The provincial plan includes livestock infrastructure development e.g. fencing the camps and grazing lands, revitalization of dipping tanks, establishment of rural abattoirs etc. There is an appointed Assistant Manager who has responsibility for overseeing Livestock Improvement (Mr Skhenjana, who is based at Dhone Research Station).

In addition, given the potential of livestock production, the Alfred Nzo District Municipality has also set up a plan to support the development of the livestock industry in the area. This programme is led by Mr M.C. Mbangeni, Regional Livestock Co-ordinator of the Alfred Nzo District Municipality.

The mission of the Alfred Nzo Livestock Improvement Programme is to develop a sustainable and economically viable livestock industry with full participation of the farmers and all other stakeholders.

The objectives are:

- To establish livestock production units throughout the region
- To improve livestock production through encouragement of adoption of best practices by farmers
- To provide means for the transfer of available animal production technology to farmers for their farming ventures
- To encourage the developing farmers to join the main stream of the livestock production sector so as to contribute to food security while generating income
- Establish a functional Livestock Improvement Regional Forum
## Table 5 – Livestock improvement implementation plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Performance indicators</th>
<th>Person responsible</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Required budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Investigation on the livestock production status in the region | • Proposal  
• Survey report  
• Recommendations  
• Pilot sites identified  
• Pilot projects proposals  
• Pilot project plans  
• Implementation of plans  
• Quarterly and annual reports  
• Information sessions held  
• Information days  
• Launch of the unit | Animal Scientist & Extension Officers  
Municipalities | 5 months | R3,000- stationery  
R1,000- transport |
| 2. Establishment of livestock production units | • Pilot farms identified  
• Project proposals  
• Project implementation  
• Quarterly and annual reports  
• Information sessions held  
• Information days  
• Launch of the unit | Animal Scientist & Extension Officers  
Municipalities | 5 years | R10,000,000 infrastructure & fencing/yr  
R10,000 info & launch |
| 3. Establishment of communal breeding units | • Supply breeding material to stock farmers  
• Record of bulls and rams received  
• Database of recipient groups or farmers  
• Quarterly and annual reports  
• Annual project progress evaluation | Animal Scientist & Extension Officers  
Municipalities | Ongoing | |
| 4. Bull and ram scheme | • Demonstration trials  
• Information days  
• Lectures  
• Develop pamphlets  
• Training of Farmers  
• Farmer tours  
• Establishment of livestock production study groups | Animal Scientist & Extension Officers  
Municipalities | Ongoing | R100,000 yearly |
| 5. Facilitation of livestock production technology transfer | • Identification of farmers in need of mentorship  
• Identification of mentors  
• Signing of mentorship agreements  
• Implementation of the programme | Manager Extension  
Animal Scientist & Extension Officers  
Municipalities | 1 year for establishment and implementation  
Ongoing | R210,000/yr/farmer – mentor  
R 50 000/ Farmer- other needs |
### 7. Implementation of the livestock Identification Act
- Publicizing the Act; Animal branding and tattooing
- Develop a plan for programme roll-out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Extension Animal Scientist &amp; Extension Officers Municipalities</td>
<td>1 year and then ongoing</td>
<td>R10,000 transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Revival of livestock marketing centres
- Establish mutual relations with agents and buyers
- Identify potential areas
- Mobilize farmers
- Organise empowerment of farmers – Info days
- Keep records for the sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Extension Animal Scientist &amp; Extension Officers Municipalities</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Identification and mobilisation –6months Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R1,000,000 - sale pens/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R2,000 information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Improved land usage
- Veld assessment
- Farm /area plan
- Fencing of grazing lands
- Stock water dams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Extension Animal Scientist &amp; Extension Officers Municipalities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Identification and mobilisation –6months Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R4,000,000 a year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Report by Mr Mbangeni Alfred Nzo livestock Co-ordinator, 2007

Unfortunately, none of these projects is currently up and running, due to a lack of funds. The Alfred Nzo District has 15 Animal Health Technicians (AHT), who are responsible for providing advice and assistance on animal health issues to the farmers in these villages or areas. The AHT are dispatched as follows per area and the area (Mf) is made up of a number of villages (see table 6 below):
Table 6 – MT Frere Animal Health Technicians and areas of responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname &amp; initials</th>
<th>Contact tel. number</th>
<th>Administrative area</th>
<th>Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matolengwe M.G.</td>
<td>083 408 5776</td>
<td>Mf 4</td>
<td>Lugangeni, Mvuzi, Njijini &amp; Chancele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtangayi N.</td>
<td>083 408 5665</td>
<td>Mf 3</td>
<td>Shushu, Mvuzi &amp; First gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuzane N.T.</td>
<td>083 408 5677</td>
<td>Mf 2</td>
<td>Mtshazi, Tshungwani &amp; Mpemba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangumnta L.</td>
<td>083 408 4469</td>
<td>Mf 10</td>
<td>Ntabeni, Mgungundlovu &amp; Ntetyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jojo F.G.</td>
<td>083 408 5689</td>
<td>Mf 1</td>
<td>Esiphengeni &amp; Mpoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtsholwe M.</td>
<td>083 408 5730</td>
<td>Mf 1</td>
<td>Ncome, Xhegwini &amp; Matyamamthlophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makhubalo D.E</td>
<td>083 408 5703</td>
<td>Mf 6</td>
<td>Qwidiani &amp; Mampondomiseni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matola N.T.</td>
<td>083 408 5710</td>
<td>Mf 5</td>
<td>Nkungwini, Mafusini &amp; Nyusini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siyothula S.</td>
<td>083 408 5751</td>
<td>Mf 9</td>
<td>Mandleni, Ngwetsheni &amp; Nqalweni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabandla T.</td>
<td>071 347 5609</td>
<td>Mf 1</td>
<td>Esihlahleni, Cabazi, Mboodeni and VMB (Mt frere town)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzongwana D</td>
<td>083 2541637</td>
<td>Mf 11</td>
<td>Osborne, Lubhacweni, National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonyongo S.G.</td>
<td>073 453 2672</td>
<td>Mf 12</td>
<td>Nomkholokolo &amp; Colana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January S.A.</td>
<td>083 254 1426</td>
<td>Mf 13</td>
<td>Luyengweni &amp; Mndeni Mabaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfokeng S.P.</td>
<td>083 254 1435</td>
<td>Mf 14</td>
<td>Mabhobho, Bislane &amp; Toleni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidiya N.</td>
<td>083 254 1605</td>
<td>Mf 15</td>
<td>Mtholsheni, mziito &amp; Lutateni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Umzimvubu Department of Agriculture, Animal Health Section (2008)

There are other government programmes that are relevant for the area:

**IDC Nguni Project:** The Nguni project is funded via the IDC with R45 million for the implementation of the Nguni Cattle Project in six provinces, namely: Easter Cape, Free State, Limpopo, Mpumalanga, Northern cape and North West. This project entails the re-introduction of the Nguni Cattle Breed (Nguni) in selected rural communities of the identified provinces. The main objective of the project is to upgrade cattle in communal areas to Nguni status, through the establishment of nucleus Nguni herds. Each community receives pregnant Nguni heifers and Nguni bulls to make up a nucleus herd in each of the recipient communities. The long-term objective is to develop an international niche market for organically produced Nguni beef.

The communities are required to return 10 heifers and 2 bulls from the offspring within 5 years. Partnerships are forged with tertiary institutions and Provincial Department of Agriculture to offer extension services, training of livestock managers and project management.

In the Eastern Cape Province technical assistance to the Nguni project is offered by the University of Fort Hare under the leadership of Professor Rats and management by Mr Nkosi Mzileni. The Fort hare University provides the Breeding stock to the communities in partnership with the Provincial/ District offices of the Department of Agriculture.
For project management purposes, the model adopted is a Trust, which serves as an agent for the distribution of registered Nguni to the identified rural communities. The Trust concludes and agreement with community leaders on the understanding that within a period of five years that community will deliver back the Nguni to the Trust. The Trust appoints the project manager whose duties entail:

- Assisting and advising the communities in the management of the Nguni
- Inspection and examination of the Nguni
- Assisting in maintenance of stock book and register
- Reports regularly to trustees during meetings and
- Exercise oversight over the marking and identification of the Nguni and their progeny.

In the Alfred Nzo District Municipality there are 3 sites where the Nguni project was implemented - Saphukanduku in Mt Ayliff, Mahobe in Maluti and Mayibuyesakhane in Mt Frere and Matatiele. In all these 3 sites each community received 10 pregnant heifers and 2 bulls (making a total of 30 pregnant heifers and 6 bulls). These Nguni cattle were received in April 2005. However all the Nguni cattle that were given to Mahobe and Saphukanduku vilauges died of red water, because of poor vaccination schedules.

**Umzimvubu Goat Project:** Umzimvubu Goats is the Anchor Project of the Alfred Nzo District Municipality (ANDM), and was established at considerable expense. This project is a collaboration between ANDM, emerging goat farmer in the Alfred Nzo region, Scientific Roets (PTY) Ltd Consulting Engineers and Agricultural Project Managers and Trainers, WEZA Social Development Facilitators, the Umzimvubu Local Municipality, the International School of Tanning Technology, Craft Africa, the Co-operative Development Initiative, Department of Labour, the Animal Nutrition and Products Institute of the Agricultural Research Council, the Eastern Cape Department of Agriculture and the National Department of Agriculture. Umzimvubu Goats is situated in Mount Ayliff (90 km from Mt Frere) along the N2 highway between Kokstad and Mthatha.

More than 3000 goat farmers throughout the Alfred Nzo District Municipality have organized themselves into six registered Goat Co-operatives. These co-operatives have their own management, constitutions and business plans. The Goat Co-operatives are members of the Umzimvubu Central Goat Co-operative, which in partnership eith the Alfred Nzo District Municipality are owners and shareholders of Umzimvubu Goats (PTY) Ltd.

The plan was that goat contract growers deliver goats on a pre-determined schedule to the Umzimvubu Goat Processing Facility in Mount Ayliff. This (relatively new) facility has holding pens, an abattoir, a meat processing plant, a tannery, feed stores, a curio shop, a restaurant and a leather crafting workshop. Furthermore, eight leather crafting co-operatives have been established throughout the Alfred Nzo Region. The plan is that these co-operatives receive raw products from the Goat Processing Facility.
Despite the cost and scale of the project, it has had limited impact. There are major supply challenges faced by the goat farmers in Alfred Nzo Municipality. The discussions held with Messrs Gwele and Matholengwe indicate that the buying price per goat is not attractive to farmers and they therefore prefer selling live goats to local village people and other buyers. The goat processing facility could be used for sheep, but this would have to be discussed with Umzimvubu Goats.
3. Profile of beneficiaries

3.1. Research process

The research process involved on-field administered questionnaires with target beneficiaries.

3.2. The questionnaire

A draft questionnaire was distributed and discussed during a workshop on the 21st April 2008 with the Department of Agriculture Technicians (ADTs) in Mt Frere before being finalised. A copy of the questionnaire is attached as Appendix A.

3.3. The sample

Only people who actually owned livestock were interviewed. A sample of 108 farmers were randomly selected from the following villages on either side of the Chancele road namely Lungangeni; Green; Njijini; Bhibha; Mvuzi; VMB; Mandileni; Ngwetsheni and Nqalweni. Selected farmers were given two weeks’ notice of the interview process.

3.4. Fieldwork

The interviews were conducted by a team of ADTs, under supervision of the appointed consultant. The inclusion of the Department of Agriculture Development Technicians helped a lot in identification and location of respondents, since these people are very familiar with the area and the individual farmers.

In general the process went smoothly, although some problems were experienced e.g. farmers questioning the sincerity of the research and also citing research fatigue. In one other area (Mabhobho) the interviews were delayed for 5 hours due to a municipality meeting that took place before the interviews.
3.5. Key findings

3.5.1. Farmer demographics

Table 7 – Farmer profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the age profile of the farmers increases, so there is a greater representation of women. However, it was interesting to note the relatively high representation of women farmers.

3.5.2. Livestock ownership demographics

The table below indicates the spread of cattle, sheep and goat ownership among the framers, as well as the herd size.

Table 8 – Livestock ownership: number of animals per farmer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-5 animals</th>
<th>6-10 animals</th>
<th>11-15 animals</th>
<th>16-20 animals</th>
<th>More than 20</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates that the farmers in Mt Frere are largely cattle and sheep owners, rather than goat owners. In addition, the majority of farmers (more than 80%) own both cattle and sheep. The relatively high levels of multiple animal ownership are a good sign for the introduction of initiatives such as the custom feeding programme.

It is noticed that 30.5% of the 108 farmers interviewed own less than 5 cattle and 27% own more than 6 cattle but less than 10. Those that own up to 15 head of cattle are 8% of the total and those that own up to 20 herd of cattle make up 11%. Only 2.7% own more than 21 heard of cattle.

The table below indicates how the ownership of livestock is allocated by age category, and by gender.
This table indicates that:

- On balance, women tend to own fewer head of livestock than men. In general, younger females own more livestock than older females. This may be attributed to females having married older man and therefore inherited the livestock, or possibly lobola, which can be gained by the sister of the bride.

- Proportionately (i.e. as a percentage of their total livestock holdings), women own more goats than men, and men hold more sheep. However, their cattle ownership is the same.

- There is a considerable difference between women and men in terms of livestock ownership by age: Most animals are owned by younger women and older men. Given that farmer age is a key indicator of how conservative his/her attitude is likely to be towards new ideas and therefore informs how interventions should be structured, this may be a problem.

Table 10 – Source of livestock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bought</th>
<th>Received as gift</th>
<th>Received as lobola</th>
<th>Inheritance</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>More than one reason (not specific)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the farmers (76.8%) mentioned that they bought the livestock they own from the local commercial farms and only 11% received the stock they own as a form of payment for lobola.
3.5.3 Reasons for holding livestock

The reasons for holding livestock are often complex, and just as often not sufficiently well understood by programme designers. Without an accurate understanding of why communal farmers are holding livestock, it is easy to make incorrect assumptions about the real barriers to market access.

The table below indicates the primary reason among survey respondents for holding livestock. It must be remembered that in many cases this is not the only reason for holding livestock. Where the respondents could not select a primary reason for owning livestock, they have been included in the second last column.

**Table 11 – Primary reason for owning livestock**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Profit</th>
<th>Emergency</th>
<th>Lobola</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>More than one reason (not specific)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above indicates that direct (i.e. to sell for a profit) and secondary (i.e. to sell or exchange as required) commercial reasons are the most important ones for keeping cattle. The main reasons for keeping livestock for both sheep and cattle farmers are the same: They all keep livestock as a form of a reliable source of money for payment of school fees, bartering for other goods, and as a “savings account”. The most striking issue in this category is that mostly farmers keep livestock as a form of payment for Lobola and also local sales. Most of the farmers in the “other” category indicated that they keep livestock for their own slaughter and household needs.

The two most important conclusions that can be drawn from these findings are:

- Improving the health and weight of livestock is an outcome that almost all farmers would be interested in, subject to the marginal cost versus benefit.
- A significant number of framers would benefit from improved access to markets that would pay them a better price.

### 3.5.4. Breeding

This part of the questionnaire concerned issues around breeding of livestock: Quantity, in terms of how often cows and ewes conceive, and quality, in terms of how bulls and rams are selected/sourced.

The following table indicates the average conception rate of cattle and sheep, by livestock owner.
The two important findings here are:

- The relatively high number of farmers who do not know how often their animals are conceiving; and
- The fairly high intervals between conception. This is much more likely to be the result of keeping calves/lambs with their mothers for an extended period of time (as opposed to selling them), which greatly affects the condition of the mother.

A plan of selling calves and lambs at a younger age not only provides a more regular source of income for farmers, but also allows them to increase turnover, since the cows/ewes can conceive more often.

The table below indicates how calves/lambs are being conceived. What is clear is that there is not really any considered breeding taking place. Even those that indicated that they have their own bull in practice it is the same bull that is servicing the other farmer’s livestock. Given the resource constraints of these communal farmers and the difficulties of implementing any kind of breeding programme in an unfenced area, these findings should be expected.

### Table 13 – Method of conception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artificial insemination</th>
<th>Your own bull/ram</th>
<th>Local bull/ram</th>
<th>2 or more local bulls/rams</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Farmers will only be more keen to invest in a better breeding scheme when they have seen that it results in calves that are worth more money.

### 3.5.5. Record keeping

The table below indicates the prevalence of record keeping among the farmers, and it is higher than might be expected.
Table 14 – Record keeping

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority (69%) of the farmers do keep records of their livestock, recording information such as how many they have at a given point, and they use a stock card system. The stock card system is also used by the local department of Agriculture officials during dipping and vaccination of livestock.

3.5.6. Animal husbandry and health

The table below indicates how often farmers are dipping their livestock.

Table 15 – Frequency of dipping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Stopped</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Once in 2 weeks</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>When a need arises</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that there are no usable sheep dipping tanks, and so only cattle are being dipped. The majority of the farmers indicate that they get food regular support from local officials as they dip their cattle at least once in 2 weeks or every month in winter and once a week in summer.

The table below indicates the methods that farmers use to treat their animals. The cost of veterinary services would be a barrier to greater use of these services.

Table 16 – Medical treatment of livestock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use veterinary services</th>
<th>Traditional herbs</th>
<th>Both (Veterinary and traditional)</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53
Most farmers use both traditional and veterinary medicine. Farmers indicated that the local Department of agriculture does vaccinations on their behalf. Sheep get vaccinated annually for blue tongue in August/September and for pulpy kidney from December to March each year. Cattle get vaccinated with Valbazen & Tramisol in December/January; Ranide, Pro red, Pro blue, Ramol in February/March; Valbazen and Multispec in April/May; Ranide, Pro red and blue in June/July; Valbazen and Tramisol (August/September) and Valbazen and Multispec in October/November.

All the farmers interviewed grazed their animals on communal (tribal) land. The table below indicates farmers’ level of happiness with the existing communal pasture management systems.

### Table 17 – Satisfaction with communal grazing scheme

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the farmers believe that the present pasture management system is not supportive of an effective production system, because there are no fenced camps, and hence less control over animals and no opportunities for rotational grazing.

### 3.5.7. Participation in and access to markets

How often and why do farmers participate in formal livestock markets, and how do they access those markets? This is vital information for the purposes of designing a market-based intervention. For the purposes of this report, the “formal” market is one where livestock change hands for cash, as opposed to as gifts or in barter exchange for other goods.

Our findings indicated that a significant number of farmers (29 out of the sample of 108) have never sold any cattle, although they have often voluntarily lost possession of animals, largely for the purposes of lobola or gift giving, or customary matters.

The collection of the data in this part of the questionnaire was a little problematic, since not all of the farmers differentiate between selling a cow for cash, and exchanging it for other goods.

The table below summarises how often the interviewed farmers had in fact sold livestock in the past year, and their main reasons for doing so:
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Table 18 – Frequency of and reasons for selling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of selling</th>
<th>Number of farmers</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Funeral expenses</th>
<th>School fees</th>
<th>General h/hold expenses</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the farmers sell only once a year, this maybe because of their small size of livestock as indicated before that most farmers interviewed own less than 5 cattle or sheep. The informal discussions held with the agricultural extension personnel indicated that there is no culture of keeping livestock for commercial purposes and therefore even the frequency of selling is very much driven by demand at a particular point in time e.g. big holidays like Christmas and Easter; and ritual celebrations i.e. circumcisions; weddings, funerals.

The table indicates that farmers view their cattle largely as a source of cash when it is required, rather than as a source of cash to be realized when the animals are at optimum market value. Changing this perception is key to improving the income generated by livestock ownership.

In terms of the farmers’ ability to access markets when they do want to sell livestock, the information from the farmers and the agricultural technicians in the area indicates that there is no formal marketing/sales channel available to the communal farmers. When they do want to sell animals, they will do so informally, either to local/travelling speculators, or to their neighbours.

The table below indicates what method farmers have used when they have sold animals:

Table 19 – Actual selling method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct to a buyer</th>
<th>Auction sale</th>
<th>Other means</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below indicates what method of selling the farmers would like to use, given the option. Most farmers would like to stick with what they know, but there are a considerable number who would be interested in exploring other options.
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Table 20 – Preferred method of selling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auction</th>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Direct to a buyer</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Speculators</th>
<th>Abattoir</th>
<th>Auction &amp; abattoir</th>
<th>Auction &amp; direct to buyer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the reasons quoted for the preference of selling directly to a buyer are: immediate access to cash and unavailability of other marketing channels. It is our experience that, as farmers see the benefit of selling through alternative mechanisms such as auctions, they become much more enthusiastic about these channels.

The table below indicates the reasons that interviewees cited for preferring certain methods of selling.

Table 21 – Reasons for preferring one method of selling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auction</th>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Direct to a buyer</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Speculators</th>
<th>Abattoir</th>
<th>Auction &amp; Abattoir</th>
<th>Auction &amp; direct to buyer</th>
<th>Payment guaranteed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market price guaranteed</td>
<td>Guaranteed market and price</td>
<td>Immediate access to cash. Unavailability of other marketing channels</td>
<td>Lack of market information</td>
<td>Better income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table does highlight that many farmers believe that the only way to be guaranteed one’s payment is to sell directly to a buyer, although this is not quite the reality.