



**MINISTER  
FORESTRY, FISHERIES AND THE ENVIRONMENT  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

**GENERAL PUBLISHED REASONS FOR DECISIONS ON APPEAL  
FOR THE VERIFICATION OF SMALL-SCALE FISHERS IN THE WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE**

**Introduction**

1. These are the General Published Reasons for the decisions by the Minister of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (the Minister) on the appeals submitted against the decision(s) of the Delegated Authority in relation to the verification of small-scale fishers in the Western Cape Province. This document is titled the "*General Published Reasons for Decisions on Appeal for the Verification of Small-Scale Fishers in the Western Cape Province*" (the Appeals GPR).
2. The Appeals GPR is structured as follows:
  - 2.1 Introduction;
  - 2.2 Assessment approach
  - 2.3 Systematic/Cross cutting Grounds of Appeals;

- 2.4 Outcome of the Appeals;
- 2.5 Conclusion; and
- 2.6 The final list of verified small-scale fishers in the Western Cape set out in **Annexure A** to the Appeals GPR.

3. The Marine Living Resources Act 18 of 1998 (MLRA), which came into effect on 1 September 1998 aims to, among other, ensure the long-term sustainable utilisation of marine living resources, achieve the orderly access to, exploitation of, utilisation, and protection of the country's marine living resources.

4. Section 18(1) of the MLRA provides that “[n]o person shall undertake commercial fishing or small-scale fishing, engage in mariculture or operate a fish processing establishment unless a right to undertake or engage in such an activity or to operate such an establishment has been granted to such a person by the Minister.”

5. Prior to 2014, the MLRA recognised and provided for rights only in the recreational, commercial and subsistence sectors, to the exclusion of small-scale fishers.

6. In 2014, section 19 of the MLRA was amended to include small-scale fishers and to provide for community-based and small-scale fishing. The MLRA, as amended in 2014, provides the following definitions:

6.1. A small-scale fisher means—

“a member of a small-scale fishing community engaged in fishing to meet food and basic livelihood needs, or directly involved in processing or marketing of fish, who—

- (a) traditionally operate in near-shore fishing grounds;
- (b) predominantly employ traditional low technology or passive fishing gear;
- (c) undertake single day fishing trips; and
- (d) is engaged in consumption, barter or sale of fish or otherwise involved in commercial activity, all within the small-scale fisheries sector.”

6.2. A small-scale fishing community means—

“a group of persons who—

- (i) are, or historically have been, small-scale fishers;
- (ii) have shared aspirations and historical interests or rights in small-scale fishing;
- (iii) have a history of shared small-scale fishing and who are, but for the impact of forced removals, tied to particular waters or geographic area, and were or still are operating where

- they previously enjoyed access to fish, or continue to exercise their rights in a communal manner in terms of an agreement, custom or law; and
- (iv) regard themselves as a small-scale fishing community.”

7. Section 19 of the MLRA, as amended, provides as follows:

*“(1) The Minister, in order to achieve the objectives contemplated in section 9 (2) and 39 (3) of the Constitution, by notice in the Gazette—*

*(a) must, subject to any law relating to marine protected areas, establish areas or zones where small scale fishers may fish;*

*(b) may, within a prescribed period, recognise a community to be a small-scale fishing community, if the community meets requirements contained in the definition of a small-scale fishing community;*

*(c) may declare any other fishing or related activity or the exercise of any right of access in an area or zone contemplated in subsection (1) (a) to be prohibited;*

*(d) must prescribe—*

*(i) the process and procedures relating to the allocation and recognition or rights of access to small scale fishers based within small-scale fishing communities;*

*(iii) the management of the rights of access;*

*(iv) the criteria and timetable for recognition of small-scale fishers and small-scale fishing communities; and*

*(e) may prescribe any ancillary or incidental administrative or procedural matter that it is necessary to prescribe for the proper exercise and performance of the powers and duties referred to in the preceding paragraphs.*

*(2) No small-scale fishing right or permit shall be transferable except with the approval of and subject to the conditions determined by the Minister.*

*(3) The Minister and any organ of state shall have regard to the need to incorporate a community-based approach in the allocation of rights of access within the small-scale fisheries sector.”*

8. In 2016, the then Minister responsible for the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (the Department)<sup>1</sup> promulgated, in terms of section 19(1)(d) of the MLRA, the Regulations relating to Small-Scale Fishing in GN 229 in Government Gazette 39790 of 8 March 2016 (the Small-Scale Regulations), which sets out the process relating to the application and granting of small-scale fishing rights.

9. The process, in summary, comprises of the following six steps:

---

<sup>1</sup> References to ‘the Department’ must be read as a reference to either the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment, as this department is currently named, or to its predecessor at the relevant time.

- Step One:** Communities register an expression of interest with the Department.
- Step Two:** The Department conducts a verification process of each person claiming to be a small-scale fisher in each of the communities that have registered an expression of interest.
- Step Three:** The Department assists the community with registering the community as a co-operative and identifying suitable species and fishing areas to be used for commercial purposes and for own consumption.
- Step Four:** The Department assists the verified fishing communities to apply for a fishing right.
- Step Five:** The Department assesses whether rights should be granted to the fishing community.
- Step Six:** The fishing communities may, if they so wish, appeal an adverse decision with respect to their application.

10. During the period between 2016 to 2019, the Department initiated steps one and two of the process, nationwide. The procedure relating to **step two** of the process is set out in the Small-Scale Regulations as follows:

*“(2) The Department must conduct a verification procedure, in accordance with the time period specified in regulation 3, of each person considering themselves to be a small-scale fisher in each of the communities that have registered an expression of interest contemplated in sub-regulation (1).”*

*(3) The verification procedure must be conducted in order to determine whether each person of the intended small-scale fishing community, meets the criteria of a small-scale fisher as set out in regulation 4(1).*

*(4) Communities may be required to assist the Department in verifying the small-scale fishers in their respective communities.*

*(5) The Department must publish, in relevant popular newspapers, a list of persons recognised as small-scale fishers per small-scale fishing community.”*

11. Step two of the process is referred to as the *verification process*, which is intended to ensure that persons claiming to be small-scale fishers are in fact small-scale fishers per the definitions in the MLRA. This is as

opposed to those who undertake fishing or engage in fishing-related activities as part of a commercial venture.

12. The Department received a total of 8646 applications for small-scale fishing verification in the Western Cape alone.
13. In terms of section 79 of the MLRA, the Deputy Director-General: Fisheries Management was appointed as the Delegated Authority (DA) responsible for the verification process.
14. Based on their consideration of these applications, the Delegated Authority issued a provisional list of small-scale fishers in the Western Cape (initial verification process).
15. Appeals against any decision taken in terms of the MLRA are governed by section 80 of the MLRA, read with Regulation 5(3) of the Regulations to the MLRA, published under Government Notice R1111 in Government Gazette 19205, dated 2 September 1998 (the MLRA Regulations).
16. Aggrieved small-scale applicants who were dissatisfied with the decisions of the Delegated Authority in the initial verification process submitted appeals to the Minister in terms of section 80 of the MRLA read with Regulation 5 of the MLRA Regulations.
17. In or during February 2019, the Minister issued her decisions on these appeals and the Department consequently issued the final list of small-scale fishers in the Western Cape Province, per the initial verification process and Minister's appeal decision.
18. However, following from complaints submitted by several fishing communities to the Department that the initial verification process and its outcomes in the Western Cape were unfair and arbitrary, he Minister called for an audit inquiry into the findings of the initial verification process. The audit revealed that the verification process was fundamentally flawed due to a lack of clarity in the application process, deficient data capturing and errors of law amongst other matters of concern.
19. Consequently, the Minister instituted an application out of the Western Cape to review and set aside the small-scale verification process in this province, which application was granted together with an order remitting verification process to the Department for reconsideration. The court directed that the remitted verification process was limited to those applications where the applicant could demonstrate to the Department that they had either (a) applied in the initial verification process; or (b) did not apply in the initial verification process, due to no fault of their own.

20. The Department received in excess of 4 000 applications during the reconsideration process.
21. In or during March 2023, the DA finalised her reconsideration of the verification applications, and more than 84% of applicants were declared successful and are thus recognised as small-scale fishers in the Western Cape, in line with the MLRA.
22. Aggrieved applicants were again entitled to submit appeals to the Minister in terms of section 80 of the MRLA read with Regulation 5 of the MLRA Regulations. The Department received 461 appeals against the reconsidered decision(s) of the Delegated Authority.
23. Regulation 5 of the MLRA Regulations prescribes that appeals are to be submitted within 30 days from the date of notification of the decision taken. The date for submission of appeals against the decision of the Delegated Authority in relation to the re-verification process lapsed on 05 May 2023. This date was set after the Department identified the need to establish collection points in or nearby to fishing communities where appeals would be collected on specified dates. The collection points, together with the corresponding collection date, were advertised by the Department and appeals were collected from the designated collection points in accordance with this timeline.
24. The Directorate: Appeals and Legal Review (Cape Town) (the Appeals Directorate) was responsible for the administration and processing of these appeals. The Directorate with the assistance of the Minister's Appeals Advisory Team (AAT) were responsible for making recommendations to the Minister on the decisions to be taken on these appeals.
25. On or about 7 June 2023, the Delegated Authority provided his response to the grounds of appeal in terms of Regulation 5 of the Regulations to the MLRA.

#### **THE APPROACH ADOPTED BY THE APPEAL AUTHORITY ON THE ASSESSMENT OF THE APPEALS**

26. Cognisant of the unique nature of the small scale fishery sector, the Appeal Authority adopted the DA's approach per General Published Reasons (the DA's GPR) as follows:
  - 26.1. "In the Assessment and Verification process of verification forms, it was important to note that the Small-Scale Fishing Rights Allocation Process is a non-competitive process, and it seeks to include as many Small-Scale Fishers as possible. A principle that was used by Assessment Teams was that "All applicants were successful", unless they were unable to provide proof that they met all the required criteria as described in the Regulations, which could also be described as the "Negative Marking" principle."

- 26.2 “Acknowledging that there are generally varying levels of literacy in fishing communities and that the completion of application forms may have been a challenge for certain individuals, albeit having access to assistance from fellow fishers, other individuals, CBOs and the Department, the Assessment teams assessed all the forms from the perspective of a fisher. This means that as much as there were set administrative requirements, a number of applicants may have not followed the prescribed requirements in completing the verification forms. It is with this reason that the main objective of the assessment teams was to gather information submitted by an applicant, regardless of how the information was presented in the forms.”
- 26.3 The DA’s GPR listed several allowances made in the original assessment process, which were incorporated into the assessment of the appeals, thus applying a lenient approach.
27. In all instances, the information presented by the appellants in the application for verification form (application form) and in the appeal form were considered in the light of applicants’ declaration in section 8 of the application form, that the information is “*true and correct, to the best of their knowledge and belief.*” The information was thus accepted as true and correct unless indicated to the contrary by any other information contained in the verification form or the appeal.
28. This Appeals GPR addresses the issues raised in the appellants’ grounds of appeal, and it sets out how I, in my capacity as the Appeal Authority in terms of section 80 of the MLRA, dealt with these issues to determine and decide the appeals in general.
29. I note at the outset that in making my decisions on these appeals, I considered and balanced a wide range of factors. These include, but are not limited to, the following:
- 29.1. The principles and objectives derived from the Constitution that are relevant to the small-scale verification process;
- 29.2. The principles and objectives of the MLRA as stated in section 2 thereof;
- 29.3. The purpose and objectives of the recognition of small-scale fishers as provided for in section 19 of the MLRA read together with the 2012 Policy for the Small-Scale Fisheries Sector in South Africa and the 2016 Small-Scale Fishing Regulations;
- 29.4. The fact that the small-scale verification process was non-competitive and sought to verify as many small-scale fishers as possible in terms of the legislative and policy framework;

- 29.5. The need for transformation of the fishing industry to achieve equity and to address historical imbalances.
30. In determining each of the appeals, I considered all relevant factors and the information before me, including but not limited to:
- 30.1. The Marine Living Resources Act, 1998 (Act No 18 of 1998);
  - 30.2. The Small-Scale Regulations in terms of the Marine Living Resources Act;
  - 30.3. The Policy for the Small-Scale Fisheries Sector in South Africa;
  - 30.4. The Guidance and Explanation Notes for the Small-Scale Fisher;
  - 30.5. The verification applications;
  - 30.6. The Delegated Authority's GPR dated 06 March 2023;
  - 30.7. The Delegated Authority's decision letters;
  - 30.8. The Appeal forms;
  - 30.9. The Regulation 5 (3) report; and
  - 30.10. Relevant case law.
31. Where necessary and appropriate, the Appeals GPR refers to individual appeals. However, the Appeals GPR does not respond to each appeal and to every allegation by individual appellants. Specific grounds of appeals which are not addressed in the Appeals GPR, are dealt with in the individual appeal decisions that will be sent to appellants.
32. Each appellant will receive the individual Appeal Decision and the reasons for such decision; and the Appeals GPR will be published on the Department's website.
33. The Appeals GPR is final. However, the allocation of fishing rights is subject to the correctness of the assertions made and information submitted by the applicants / appellants. If any information in the online application or online appeal process is found not to be true or complete, or if false information is provided, or material information is not disclosed, this may lead to the revocation, suspension, cancellation, alteration or reduction, in terms of section 28 of the MLRA, of any right, license or permit granted on the strength of the verification application or appeal.

#### **SYSTEMATIC/CROSS CUTTING GROUNDS FOR REJECTION AND GROUNDS OF APPEAL**

##### **Wide appeals: Provision of new information on appeal**



34. Appeals submitted in terms of section 80 of the MLRA are regarded as wide appeals, which entails a reconsideration of the application *afresh* and may include the consideration of additional information provided on appeal.
35. Therefore, where appellants had omitted information in their verification forms, or the information presented on appeal was unrelated to the information originally presented but nonetheless relevant for a determination of the appeal, I accepted and considered the information.

**Applicant failed to establish citizenship or minimum age**

36. Applicants were required to establish citizenship in the Republic and that they attained the minimum age requirement of 18 years as at date of the application for verification, by producing their identity documents with the application form.
37. The Delegated Authority therefore disqualified or dismissed those applications where an applicant had failed to attach a copy of his/her South African identity document to the verification form, on the basis that the applicant had failed to establish their citizenship and/ or minimum age requirement of 18 years as at date of the application for verification.
38. I upheld the appeals for those appellants who had been disqualified or dismissed on this basis but who provided their identity documents as evidence of their citizenship and/or compliance with the minimum age requirement.

**Accumulated 10 years' experience in traditional fishing operations**

39. The following definitions, as they appeared in the glossary definitions in the verification form, were applied to an assessment of appeals related to this requirement:
  - 39.1. Traditional Fishing Operations- the use of low-tech fishing methods and passive gear on nearshore fishing grounds, normally carried out on single day trips;
  - 39.2. Processing- the use of low technology and gear to clean and gut fish bought/caught directly from traditional fishing operations;
  - 39.3. Marketing- buying fish directly from fishers that use traditional fishing operations and selling it elsewhere ("Langanas") (This excludes individuals/applicants who buy their fish from retailers); and

39.4. Accumulated- this means that experience/years required does not have to be consecutive or following each other.

i. Supporting affidavits lacked detail of traditional fishing activity

40. The Delegated Authority dismissed applicants' applications for verification where applicants had submitted affidavits as evidence that they had 10 years of traditional fishing experience but where the affidavits did not "clearly describe the traditional fishing operations the applicant has been involved in as required."

41. In my assessment of this issue, the following approach was adopted:

41.1 If the affidavit provided by the appellant on appeal confirmed the information in the verification form, without specific reference to or repetition of the initial information, the affidavit was treated as comparable to a confirmatory affidavit in legal proceedings and the affidavit was thus accepted as confirmation under oath of what was stated by the appellant in the application form.

41.2 Where an appellant failed to present any additional evidence on appeal to what was already stated in their application form, or where an appellant filed further affidavits on appeal in a similar form to those filed that had been initially filed with their application forms, the information submitted on appeal was considered and the appeal against the Delegated Authority's finding as set out above was upheld;

41.3 Most appellants had properly understood that their failure to provide a detailed affidavit could be cured by providing an affidavit on appeal that specifies the traditional fishing operations in which they were involved and the details of their period of involvement. In such instances, the additional information was accepted and served as supplementary to the information initially provided;

41.4. In all instances where the information provided by the appellant, either in the verification form or the appeal form, indicated a cumulative period of 10 years' experience in traditional information was confirmed by an affidavit, it was accepted and the appeal was upheld.

ii. Insufficient evidence to establish 10 years' experience

42. Where applications were dismissed because: "the applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to substantiate 10 years' experience in traditional fishing operations as required" the following approach was adopted:

- 42.1. Where the information provided by the appellant was confirmed only by one or more affidavits from fellow fishermen / members of their community / people from who they bought or to whom they sold fish, it was accepted as sufficient evidence and appeal was upheld on the basis that Applicants for verification were provided with guidance and explanation notes which indicated that affidavit evidence from fellow fishermen / people to whom you sold or from whom you purchased fish / boat crew members would be accepted as supporting documents. While it is indicated that such affidavit evidence would be the lowest form of supporting document, it does not indicate that an application will be refused if no further supporting documents are provided. In other words, affidavit evidence is acceptable as a single source of verification provided it verifies the relevant information. If this were not the case, applicants ought to have been told that their applications would not be accepted if the only verifying document they relied upon was an affidavit by themselves and/or a fellow fishermen;
- 42.2. Where additional evidence was presented, that being in the form of permits, receipts, photographs, etc, this evidence was considered in conjunction with the information provided by the appellant. Where the additional evidence was relevant to and corroborated what was stated by the appellant, the evidence was accepted and the appeal was upheld;
- 42.3. Where the information presented by the appellant indicated that the appellant was in their tenth year, but that the tenth year had not yet completed, this was accepted where appellants indicated a family/childhood history (parents or grandparents) of involvement in and dependence upon traditional fishing operations to sustain the family and the appeal was upheld.
- iii. Experience in commercial ventures
43. The Delegated Authority refused those applications where “the information provided on the application form and affidavits states that the applicant worked for a factory, which does not prove 10 years’ experience of traditional fishing operations.”
44. On this aspect, the following approach was adopted:
- 44.1. The verification form was assessed for indications that the appellant had remained involved in traditional fishing operations over-and above / in addition to their formal employment. Where the application form indicated, for example, that an appellant, although employed, remained reliant on buying fish from local fishermen to clean (process) and sell (market) in order to supplement their income or the collection of coastal resources (mussel / bait / periwinkle) to cook for and feed the family prior to, during and, in the case of periods of unemployment or factory closures, after their

formal employment, this was accepted as demonstrating years of experience / involvement in traditional fishing operations;

- 44.2. Most appellants understood that they were required to demonstrate experience in traditional fishing operations over-and-above their work in a factory on appeal. Where appellants indicated on appeal that they supplemented their work in factories by, for example: (a) working on traditional vessels over weekends; (b) buying, cleaning, filleting and selling fish at the local harbour over weekends or whenever they were unemployed / their contracts had ended / factories had closed; (c) teaching their family members and members of their community traditional fishing and processing methods; (d) collecting resources from the coast to cook in order to feed the family- this was accepted as a sufficient demonstration that appellants remained involved in traditional fishing activities. Provided that the periods indicated by the appellants amounted to or exceeded 10 years, the appeals were upheld;
- 44.3. The same approach was adopted for any other form of formal employment that, although related to fishing and traditional fishing operations, were commercial ventures. For example, appellants who cleaned fish in the traditional manner on commercial fishing vessels or appellants who were employed by municipalities for fish monitoring and counting were assessed according to the same method set out above. Where these appellants could demonstrate cumulative involvement in traditional fishing operations over and above their formal employment, the appeal was upheld;
- 44.4. Where an appellant was unable to demonstrate any involvement in traditional fishing operations outside of their indicated formal employment, the appeal was dismissed. This included appeals where appellants indicated that they engaged in traditional methods of fish processing, for example low-technology methods of cleaning, gutting and filleting, as part of their employment. If an appellant was unable to demonstrate that they used these methods for any personal venture other than their employment, and did not indicate any other form of involvement in or reliance on traditional fishing operations, it was not accepted as experience / involvement in traditional fishing operations and the appeal was dismissed.

#### **Dependency on traditional fishing operations**

45. Applicants were required to demonstrate:

- 45.1. That they derive the major part of their livelihood from traditional fishing operations;
- 45.2. Historical dependence on fish, either directly or in a household context, to meet food and basic livelihood needs.

46. These requirements were assessed in terms of the definitions and explanations provided in the explanatory notes as contained in the 'Guidance and Explanation Notes for the Small-Scale Fishers'. In accordance with the explanatory notes, the following is of relevance to this criterion:

46.1. "Major part" refers to 50 + 1%;

46.2. Part-time work (even work unrelated to fishing activities) does not necessarily mean that the applicant is not dependent on or does not derive the major part of his/her livelihood from traditional fishing operations;

46.3. "Historical dependence" refers to past direct historical involvement of the individual in traditional fishing operations, meaning the individual is directly involved in or was dependent on traditional fishing operations to sustain their household;

46.4. "Basic livelihood needs" encompasses a huge array of needs that differ from person-to-person or fishing community, e.g. Fishing for income, fishing as a tradition or custom and/or fishing for consumption.

i. Supporting affidavits lacked detail demonstrating dependency on traditional fishing operations

47. The Delegated Authority dismissed applications where the applicants' affidavits that were submitted to establish dependency on traditional fishing operations did not "clearly describe the traditional fishing operations from which the applicant derives his livelihood."

48. On this aspect, the following approach was adopted:

48.1. If an affidavit provided by an appellant on appeal confirmed the information in the verification form, without specific reference to or repetition of such information, the affidavit was treated as comparable to a confirmatory affidavit in legal proceedings and was accepted as confirmation under oath of what was stated by the appellant in the verification form. Where an appellant failed to present any additional evidence on appeal than what was already stated in their application, or filed further affidavits on appeal in a similar form to those filed initially, the appeal against a finding as set out above was upheld;

48.2. Most appellants had properly understood that their failure to provide a detailed affidavit could be cured by providing an affidavit that specifies the traditional fishing operations upon which they are, and have historically been, dependent. In such instances, the additional information was accepted and served as supplementary to the information initially provided;

48.3. In all instances where the information provided by the appellant, either in the verification form or the appeal form, indicating dependence on traditional fishing operations information was confirmed by an affidavit, it was accepted and the appeal was upheld.

ii. Insufficient evidence to establish dependency

49. The Delegated Authority dismissed applications where “the applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to substantiate that they derive the majority of their livelihood from / are dependent on traditional fishing operations” the following approach was adopted:

49.1. Where the appellant provided information indicating dependency that was confirmed only by one or more affidavits from fellow fishermen / a member(s) of their community / people from whom they bought or to whom they sold fish, it was accepted as sufficient evidence. The ground of appeal was thus upheld on the basis that applicants were provided with guidance and explanatory notes that affidavits on these issues would be accepted as supporting documents to their applications.

49.2. While it was indicated that such affidavits would be the lowest form of supporting document, it does not indicate that an application will be refused if no further supporting documents are provided.

49.3. In other words, an affidavit is acceptable evidence, as a single source of verification, provided that it verifies the relevant information. If this were not the case, applicants ought to have been told that their applications would not be accepted if the only verifying document they relied upon was an affidavit by themselves and/or a fellow fishermen.

49.4. Where additional information and/or evidence was presented on appeal, in the form of permits, receipts, photographs, etc, this evidence was considered in conjunction with other information provided by the appellant. Where the additional evidence was relevant to and corroborated by the statements of appellant, the evidence was accepted and the appeal was upheld;

iii. Dependance on commercial ventures

50. The Delegated Authority refused applications where “the information provided on the application form and affidavits states that the applicant worked for a factory, which does not demonstrate dependency on traditional fishing operations.”
  
51. On this aspect, the following approach was adopted:
  - 51.1. The Verification form was assessed for indications that the appellant had remained involved in traditional fishing operations over-and above / in addition to their formal employment in order to supplement their income / feed their family due to insufficient income / maintain their family history and culture of fishing.
  
  - 51.2. Where the application form indicated, for example, that an appellant, although employed, remained reliant on buying fish from local fishermen to clean (process) and sell (market) in order to supplement their income or the collection of coastal resources (mussel / bait / periwinkle) to cook for and feed the family prior to, during and, in the case of periods of unemployment or factory closures, after their formal employment, this was accepted as a cumulative indication that appellants remained dependent upon traditional fishing operations for the majority of their livelihoods- such majority being demonstrated in multiple forms and not only financially.
  
  - 51.3. Most appellants understood that they were required to demonstrate a dependency on traditional fishing operations over-and-above their work in a factory on appeal. Where appellants indicated that they supplemented their work in factories by, for example: (a) working on traditional vessels over weekends; (b) buying, cleaning, filleting and selling fish at the local harbour over weekends or whenever they were unemployed / their contracts had ended / factories had closed; (c) teaching their family members and members of their community traditional fishing and processing methods; (d) collecting resources from the coast to cook in order to feed the family- this was accepted as a sufficient demonstration of dependency. Provided that the periods indicated by the appellants demonstrated historical and current continued dependency, the appeals were upheld.
  
  - 51.4. The same approach was adopted for any other form of formal employment that amounted to a commercial venture. For example, appellants who were employed on commercial fishing vessels or appellants who were employed by municipalities for fish monitoring and counting or who worked in commercial fisheries were assessed according to the same method set out above. Where these appellants could demonstrate continued involvement in traditional fishing operations over and above their formal employment for the purpose of supplementing income and/or sustaining the family / household and/or maintaining family traditions and cultures, it was accepted that appellants demonstrated dependency in the wider sense on traditional fishing operations. In assessing

whether it amounted to the major part of their livelihood, this was not constrained to a financial exercise, but rather, viewed holistically, whether multiple facets of an appellant's life was clearly demonstrated to be dependent upon traditional fishing operations.

- 51.5. Where an appellant was unable to demonstrate any current involvement in and dependency on traditional fishing operations, be it at all or outside of their indicated formal employment, the appeal was dismissed. This included appeals where appellants indicated that: they: (a) were retired and not earning any income from traditional fishing; (b) expressly indicated "no" to the question whether they were dependent on traditional fishing for their livelihoods and then presented information consistent with the "no"; and (c) did not or could not indicate that they remain engaged in traditional methods of fish processing, for example low-technology methods of cleaning, gutting and filleting, and selling to supplement grant income, or that they collected or were reliant on coastal resources or fish to put food on the table and feed the family / household, the appeal was dismissed for failure to demonstrate dependency.

## OUTCOMES OF THE APPEALS

52. There was a total of 461 small-scale verification appeals for the Western Cape. Below is an overview of the outcome:

### Upheld appeals

- 46.1 431 appeals were upheld

### Dismissed appeals

- 46.2 29 appeals were dismissed.

- 46.3 1 appeal was submit by an applicant who was successful per the Delegated Authority's decision. This appeal is rendered moot.

53. The final list of verified small-scale fishers in the Western Cape is attached as **annexure A**.


## CONCLUSION

54. Section 80 of the MLRA deems me to be the Appeal Authority over decisions of the Delegated Authority and I have wide appeal powers in terms thereof. I have the power on appeal to award fishing rights, and to



overturn the decisions of the Delegated Authority to allocate rights, where such decision-making is rational, fair and in line with the provisions and purpose of the MLRA and specific policies.

55. Should any appellant be dissatisfied with any aspect of my decision(s), it may apply to a competent court to have this decision judicially reviewed. Judicial review proceedings must be instituted within 180 days of notification hereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act, 2000 (Act No. 3 of 2000) (PAJA).



**MS B D CREECY, MP**

**MINISTER OF FORESTRY, FISHERIES AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

DATE: 13/11/2023

Annexure A

No	Application Number	Applicant Name	Outcome of Appeal
1.	VF0108	(Afrika) Daniels Oriana Joy	uphold
2.	VF6490	Abbas Mogamat Mansour	uphold
3.	VF6226	Abrahams Andre	uphold
4.	VF6901	Abrahams Asia	uphold
5.	VF7187	Abrahams Johanna	uphold
6.	VF0495	Adams Mogamat Nazeem	moot
7.	VF4662	Adams Lee-Ann	uphold
8.	VF6073	Adams Andrew Martin	uphold
9.	VF6971	Adams Dina Paulina	uphold
10.	VF7186	Adams Maliekah	uphold
11.	VF7751	Adams John Syster Derrick	uphold
12.	VF9616	Adams Deverson	uphold
13.	VF6252	Africa Sharon Marlene	uphold
14.	VF9353	Afrika Madelein Jeniffer	uphold
15.	VF9519	Afrika Delene	uphold
16.	VF10083	Afrikaner Sonia Winifred	dismiss
17.	VF8653	Afrikaner Lodewyk Johannes	uphold
18.	VF6338	Ahrends Kurt Joseph	uphold
19.	VF7062	Alexander Greshen Samantha	uphold
20.	VF8801	Alfred Nicholaas	uphold
21.	VF6169	Allard Abraham Joseph	uphold
22.	VF1096	Allen Roseline	uphold

23.	VF0584	Amon Wendy Constance	uphold
24.	VF1573	Andrew Gursvon	uphold
25.	VF7465	Andrew Johanna	uphold
26.	VF7959	Andrew Esme	uphold
27.	VF8378	Andrew Gertruida	uphold
28.	VF1717	Andrews Sandy	dismiss
29.	VF9798	Anna Don	uphold
30.	VF0162	Anthony Angela	uphold
31.	VF0210	Anthony Muhamad Seraj	uphold
32.	VF1746	Anthony Farieda	uphold
33.	VF0783	Antonie Daniel Davids	uphold
34.	VF7363	Aploon Sophia	dismiss
35.	VF7832	April Eminly Anneline	uphold
36.	VF9438	April Jonathan Jacobus	uphold
37.	VF0003	Arendse Micheal	uphold
38.	VF0055	Arendse Charles Robert	uphold
39.	VF1208	Arendse Melisha Theresa	uphold
40.	VF7189	August Stefanus Jacobus	uphold
41.	VF9405	Baadjies Irene Winifred	uphold
42.	VF7366	Baartman Donita Renee	uphold
43.	VF7321	Baartman Moss Johannes Jacobus	uphold
44.	VF7589	Baker Edward Charles	uphold
45.	VF7804	Baker Virgil David	uphold
46.	VF7825	Baker Hendrinne Valencia	dismiss
47.	VF2554	Bangani Vuyokazi Bhalile	uphold
48.	VF6992	Bantam Victor Peter	uphold

49.	VF8491	Bantam Stephanus	uphold
50.	VF7633	Barnardo Yushry	dismiss
51.	VF2567	Barnes Nomuselelo	uphold
52.	VF0874	Baron Rolabd Arthur	uphold
53.	VF9402	Benjamin Johanna	uphold
54.	VF10033	Bergh Pamela Angeline	uphold
55.	VF7507	Bester Andrian Elric	uphold
56.	VF7552	Beukes Janetta	uphold
57.	VF0623	Biko Thembeke Princess	uphold
58.	VF6682	Bitterbos Willem	uphold
59.	VF8431	Blankenberg Gert	dismiss
60.	VF9360	Boer Colin Josef	uphold
61.	VF8413	Boois Carolina	uphold
62.	VF9502	Boois John Johannes Deon	uphold
63.	VF1225	Boonzaaier Julian Christo	uphold
64.	VF7359	Booyesen Kerlina	uphold
65.	VF7482	Booyesen Pieter	uphold
66.	VF7500	Booyesen Patrick	uphold
67.	VF1487	Bopheka Abie Thembile	dismiss
68.	VF7260	Bosch Magdelene Dorothy	uphold
69.	VF8135	Bosch Josephine Jacqueline	uphold
70.	VF7185	Bosse Deborah Yvonne	uphold
71.	VF6251	Botes Suzette Marianne	uphold
72.	VF9461	Bouwers Jethro Johannes	uphold
73.	VF0862	Bovana Ntomboxolo Angel	uphold
74.	VF0028	Brummer Michael Msizeni	uphold

75.	VF2447	Brutus Troy Allan	uphold
76.	VF6972	Buckton Reeve Verna	uphold
77.	VF0213	Caccia Bruno Hans	uphold
78.	VF6340	Carlse Teresita Anthea	uphold
79.	VF0972	Carolus Mason Austin	uphold
80.	VF10034	Carolus Dina	uphold
81.	VF6755	Carolus Johan Charlton	uphold
82.	VF8148	Carolus Marthinus	uphold
83.	VF2349	Cefu Nomalingisa	dismiss
84.	VF7141	Claassen Edith Ann	uphold
85.	VF0119	Clarke Gloriana	dismiss
86.	VF6130	Clarke Dayline	uphold
87.	VF0595	Classen Martha	dismiss
88.	VF8869	Cleophas Stalin Bernice Carido	uphold
89.	VF8424	Cloeta Gert	uphold
90.	VF1213	Cloete Angus Graham	uphold
91.	VF6250	Cloete Maxwill Godfrey	uphold
92.	VF7466	Cloete Joune	uphold
93.	VF7470	Cloete Luanda Valencia	uphold
94.	VF7953	Cloete Paulus	uphold
95.	VF7954	Cloete Jenefer Angeline	uphold
96.	VF7957	Cloete Adro Jerome	uphold
97.	VF7958	Cloete Niklaas	uphold
98.	VF7960	Cloete Andries	uphold
99.	VF7962	Cloete Jowin Innaes	uphold
100.	VF7963	Cloete Vernon	uphold

101.	VF7965	Cloete Marta Maria	uphold
102.	VF8157	Cloete Katrina Esmerelda	uphold
103.	VF8405	Cloete Wilbur Winfred Granville	uphold
104.	VF8860	Cloete Gert	uphold
105.	VF9435	Cloete Patricia Angelina	uphold
106.	VF2627	Coetzee Andries	uphold
107.	VF8113	Coetzee Johanna Martalena	Uphold
108.	VF2425	Coli Bongani	uphold
109.	VF3626	Coraizin Patricia	uphold
110.	VF3629	Coraizin Peter John	uphold
111.	VF6813	Cornelius Bereldine	uphold
112.	VF7411	Coroize Samantha Precilla	uphold
113.	VF6778	Da Silva Sandra	uphold
114.	VF10280	Daliqingha Sindiswa	uphold
115.	VF8131	Dampies Jonathan	uphold
116.	VF0212	Davids Abdullah	uphold
117.	VF1394	Davids Nazeem	dismiss
118.	VF6278	Davids Pauline	uphold
119.	VF6467	Davids Angeline Louisa	uphold
120.	VF6822	Davids Cynthia Patricia	uphold
121.	VF7829	Davids Jacques William	upload
122.	VF8096	Davids Jacqueline	uphold
123.	VF8159	De Klerk Deon Ernest	uphold
124.	VF9423	De Klerk Joseph Thomas	uphold
125.	VF1775	De Louw Mogammat Alie	dismiss
126.	VF7130	Dickson Bertram	uphold

127.	VF8498	Diergaardt Elizabeth Katrina	uphold
128.	VF10732	Diko Lwandile	uphold
129.	VF4465	Dlamini Wegman Zembule	uphold
130.	VF8800	Don Tobias Hendrik	uphold
131.	VF8657	Don Betty	uphold
132.	VF9939	Don Gert	uphold
133.	VF9030	Dredericks Reiner	uphold
134.	VF6969	Dreyer Theresa	uphold
135.	VF7207	Dreyer Rudo Waan	uphold
136.	VF7768	Du Toit Christoffel	uphold
137.	VF8101	Du Toit William Sidney	uphold
138.	VF3251	Duna Zwelandile	uphold
139.	VF3274	Duna Babalwa Nancy	uphold
140.	VF10710	Dyonase Lwando	uphold
141.	VF3265	Dyonase Thandiwe	uphold
142.	VF3920	Engel Ashely	uphold
143.	VF7833	Engel Valencia Suretha	uphold
144.	VF7716	Engelbrecht Nicolas	uphold
145.	VF8777	Engelbrecht Hendrick Jihannes	uphold
146.	VF6518	Europa Esmeralda	uphold
147.	VF6876	Europa Lena	uphold
148.	VF8031	Europa Ilene Martha	uphold
149.	VF7843	Farao Annelie Sandra	uphold
150.	VF10041	Farmer Janion Christopher	uphold
151.	VF6877	Ficher Eva Sophia	uphold
152.	VF7044	Fick Elen Hendrika	uphold

153.	VF7176	Fisher Lena Marina	uphold
154.	VF6100	Fortuin Christian	uphold
155.	VF6883	Fortuin Lizzie	uphold
156.	VF0243	Fortune Mogamat Zain	uphold
157.	VF6940	Fransman Anthony Joniel	uphold
158.	VF8866	Fredericks Emiel Johnathan	dismiss
159.	VF0839	Fuzani Thandile	uphold
160.	VF6372	Gabriels Aliston Gerald	uphold
161.	VF6231	Galant Jerome	uphold
162.	VF2417	Gatya Constance Sindiswa	uphold
163.	VF7147	Germishuys Pieter Johannes Gerhardus	uphold
164.	VF7955	Goliath Aletta	dismiss
165.	VF2342	Gontsana Vusumzi Roy	uphold
166.	VF7773	Gordon Japie	uphold
167.	VF9572	Gordon Francois Andries	uphold
168.	VF6139	Gouws Jeannette	uphold
169.	VF2250	Gronewald Micaela Amore	uphold
170.	VF3998	Gubuzelisa Phikiswa	uphold
171.	VF3263	Gumpana Sindiswa	uphold
172.	VF0583	Gunn Shamseeeya	uphold
173.	VF7758	Gwaza Frank Dickson	uphold
174.	VF3404	Hako Nomawande	uphold
175.	VF0346	Hammaersley Stanley	uphold
176.	VF6720	Hendricks Elmary Ann	uphold
177.	VF7048	Hendricks Caroline	uphold
178.	VF7172	Hendricks Mornay Francis	uphold



179.	VF6845	Hess Belinda Magenita	uphold
180.	VF1621	Hlatshwayo Mshoniseni Reggie	uphold
181.	VF0804	Hlaziya Luyanda	uphold
182.	VF2343	Hlaziya Pamela	uphold
183.	VF0620	Hlazo Nomalanga Cynthia	uphold
184.	VF0403	Hlongwane Senzo	uphold
185.	VF4661	Hlongwane Michael Msizeni	uphold
186.	VF0762	Jeremy Mark Isaacs	uphold
187.	VF110	Isaacs Shariefa	uphold
188.	VF7301	Jacobs Mary	uphold
189.	VF6998	James Ben	uphold
190.	VF6984	Jansen Niklaas	uphold
191.	VF7580	Jansen Jacob	upload
192.	VF8857	January Elizabeth Gertruida	uphold
193.	VF8126	Jeffries Patricia	uphold
194.	VF7790	Johannes Gerard David	uphold
195.	VF7015	Johnson Dario John	uphold
196.	VF0791	Joloza Fikelwa Felicia	dismiss
197.	VF0222	Jonase Sibongile Primrose	Uphold
198.	VF1375	Jones Nolene Emerencia	dismiss
199.	VF6077	Jones Ernest	uphold
200.	VF6781	Jones Magdalena Geraldine	uphold
201.	VF3646	Joorst Frank Abrahams	uphold
202.	VF6770	Jordaan Bianca Lynn	uphold
203.	VF7924	Jordaan Anna	uphold
204.	VF1193	Joseph Angelo	uphold

205.	VF6545	Julies Preston Paul	uphold
206.	VF7478	Julies Caroles	uphold
207.	VF0159	Julius Fabian Anthony	uphold
208.	VF9562	Kanow Raymond Johnston	uphold
209.	VF7464	Kasper Willem	uphold
210.	VF9354	Katrina Johanna Maria	uphold
211.	VF9354	Katrina Johanna Maria	uphold
212.	VF10031	Kearns Colin Patrick	uphold
213.	VF0051	Kehl Ruben Henry Clifford	uphold
214.	VF9029	Kersouw Andries	uphold
215.	VF2371	Khethula Nozuko	uphold
216.	VF2973	Kiel Paul Ernest	uphold
217.	VF2956	Klaas Sekiwe	uphold
218.	VF6317	Kleinsmidt Frieda Julia	uphold
219.	VF6665	Knowles John Franklin	uphold
220.	VF1422	Konco Vuyokazi	uphold
221.	VF7650	Konstant Jacques	uphold
222.	VF0599	Koopman Cathleen	uphold
223.	VF7312	Koopman Eva	uphold
224.	VF7626	Koopman John Caniels	uphold
225.	VF4783	Kroukamp Yinn	uphold
226.	VF3954	Laduduma Thozina	uphold
227.	VF7495	Lamoore Karel Afrika	uphold
228.	VF8236	Latola Victor Steven	uphold
229.	VF8370	Le Fleur Jonich Selwin	uphold
230.	VF0237	Leibrandt Albertus Jacobus Daniel	uphold

231.	VF0330	Leibrandt Llewellyn Kelvin	uphold
232.	VF6247	Lewis William Donald	uphold
233.	VF7789	Lewis Tyron	uphold
234.	VF8610	Lewis Romalia Denzilo	uphold
235.	VF6817	Linden Eleanor	uphold
236.	VF9413	Lintvelt Maria Marika	uphold
237.	VF7788	Losper Shane Eligon	uphold
238.	VF9482	Losper Lynette Catrina	uphold
239.	VF9643	Losper Net Julienne Losper	uphold
240.	VF8404	Louis Leah Meintjie	uphold
241.	VF8143	Louw Louisa	uphold
242.	VF6029	Love Duncan	uphold
243.	VF8465	Love Natania Rochelle	uphold
244.	VF8495	Love Grizelda Lorida	uphold
245.	VF9785	Love Andre Lionel	uphold
246.	VF1492	Lucas Patrick Pakamisa	dismiss
247.	VF10593	Luvuno Malibongwe	uphold
248.	VF3320	Luyters Gerald Raymond	uphold
249.	VF6123	MacDonald Christopher Leslie	uphold
250.	VF3721	Madlunge Nandipha Gloria	uphold
251.	VF1618	Mahanjana Banzi Lennox	uphold
252.	VF3765	Makinana Lulama Mavis	uphold
253.	VF2864	Makwelo Nolundi Irene	uphold
254.	VF1041	Maliwa Siyabulela Lennox	uphold
255.	VF2900	Mana Akhona	uphold
256.	VF1848	Manceta Nkululeko	uphold

257.	VF3259	Mangeala Babalwa	uphold
258.	VF0393	Manzini Elizabeth Nomatamsanqa	uphold
259.	VF2897	Maoeng Tsiliso Ezekiel	uphold
260.	VF6539	Marais Nicolene	uphold
261.	VF0120	Marquard Isaac	uphold
262.	VF7486	Marthinus Nicolas Johannes	dismiss
263.	VF7865	Marthinus Annie Maria	uphold
264.	VF8023	Marthinus Jo-Anne Margeret	uphold
265.	VF7316	Martin Marianna	dismiss
266.	VF0261	Masobe Lekeledi Ivy	uphold
267.	VF0530	Mateta Eunice Nomfundo	uphold
268.	VF2219	Matiwane Gcinikhaya Daysman	uphold
269.	VF0797	Mavatha Fundiswa Theoreen	uphold
270.	VF6291	May Aaron Noval	uphold
271.	VF7302	May Elsie	uphold
272.	VF2120	Mbali Sonwabo Wiseman	uphold
273.	VF0425	Mbambisa Siviwe	uphold
274.	VF10394	Mbane Raymond Thembelani	uphold
275.	VF0692	Mbetane Nkosinathi Clive Grey	uphold
276.	VF2218	Mdokwe Mpumzeni	uphold
277.	VF3967	Mehlo Sebelomzi Ephraim	uphold
278.	VF7590	Meyer Edward Gavin	uphold
279.	VF3972	Mfencu Nokubonga Mageret	dismiss
280.	VF3756	Mgema Christinah Kholiswa	uphold
281.	VF2153	Mguga Nokanene Nomzamo	uphold
282.	VF10612	Mhlola Nophesheya Vivian	dismiss

283.	VF8348	Miggels Adam Abraham	uphold
284.	VF7851	Mitchell Harry Charles	uphold
285.	VF7442	Mjaja Sibongiseni Vincent	uphold
286.	VF2895	Mjuza Yolanda Khunjulwa	uphold
287.	VF3313	Mlambisa Mzwandile	dismiss
288.	VF2351	Mlimisi Nokwanda	uphold
289.	VF3969	Mlimisi Mfuneko	uphold
290.	VF0784	Montague Dylan Maxwell	uphold
291.	VF6469	Montague Mark Anthony	uphold
292.	VF7886	Montague Maria Magdalena	uphold
293.	VF6469	Montaque Mark Anthony	uphold
294.	VF0426	Moolman Lydia	uphold
295.	VF3650	Moolman Natalie	uphold
296.	VF9940	Moolman Lydia	uphold
297.	VF7799	Moos Karel	uphold
298.	VF1430	Mostert Jacobus	uphold
299.	VF0414	Mothusi Sylvia Raesija	uphold
300.	VF8372	Mtamo Lena	uphold
301.	VF1973	Mthembu Mxhawuleni	uphold
302.	VF3431	Mvakwendlu Feziswa	uphold
303.	VF3311	Mzukwa Fundiswa	uphold
304.	VF3807	Nabani Nomthetho	uphold
305.	VF3405	Nadyokwe Xolelwa Olga	uphold
306.	VF6074	Natal Ursula Andrene	uphold
307.	VF0395	Ndaba Felokwakhe Ellias	uphold
308.	VF1972	Ndaba Mathandi Aaron	uphold

309.	VF10748	Ndabisa Khalipha	uphold
310.	VF4402	Ndabula Siphon Theodore	uphold
311.	VF8363	Ndike Charmaine	uphold
312.	VF10684	Ndleleni Eugie	uphold
313.	VF0160	Ndlovu Skuyuyu Thomas	uphold
314.	VF0223	Ndlovu Khuselwa Sylvia	uphold
315.	VF2201	Boniwe Ndongeni	uphold
316.	VF0175	Neaver Arnold	uphold
317.	VF2683	Nero Angeline Sawet	uphold
318.	VF7192	Newman Shariefa	uphold
319.	VF7727	Newman Rupert Morne	uphold
320.	VF7828	Newman Frans	uphold
321.	VF7861	Newman Elizabeth	uphold
322.	VF7863	Newman Caroline Paulina	uphold
323.	VF8010	Newman George Harris	uphold
324.	VF8015	Newman Daniel Jacobus	uphold
325.	VF8033	Newman Paulina Elizabeth	uphold
326.	VF8138	Newman Caroline	uphold
327.	VF8359	Newman Maria Esmerelda	uphold
328.	VF0290	Ngcetani Malibongwe Theophilus	uphold
329.	VF10298	Ngubemhlophe Nkosenkulu Nick	uphold
330.	VF10248	Ngwane Nontsindiso	uphold
331.	VF10708	Ngwane Mncedisi	uphold
332.	VF3271	Nkubu Mandlosapho	uphold
333.	VF2414	Nondala Neziswa	uphold
334.	VF2955	Nonjojo Lindokuhle	uphold

335.	VF3417	Ntlabetye Ntomboxolo	dismiss
336.	VF0409	Ntswabu Phathuxolo Alfred	uphold
337.	VF5544	Ntwana Ethel Faniswa	uphold
338.	VF0138	Nyakatyha Madoda	dismiss
339.	VF8853	Oliphant Phillip	uphold
340.	VF0003	Oppelt Brigdgette Joan	uphold
341.	VF2154	Panziso Lungiswa	uphold
342.	VF4424	Peter Vivian	uphold
343.	VF9440	Peters Hanna	uphold
344.	VF6810	Petersen Hendrina	uphold
345.	VF4666	Petywa Siviwe	uphold
346.	VF3764	Philandel Roda Petronella	uphold
347.	VF2172	Philipps Sarah	uphold
348.	VF0563	Phillips Susan	uphold
349.	VF7562	Pickering Renita Yolanda	uphold
350.	VF9495	Pieters Devonia	uphold
351.	VF6292	Pieters Etna Johanna	uphold
352.	VF10040	Pietersen Eva	uphold
353.	VF6358	Pietersen Micheal Andreas Pietersen	uphold
354.	VF7126	Pietersen Maxwille Wayne	uphold
355.	VF3275	Piyose Fuzeka Charlote	uphold
356.	VF9912	Poggenpoel Kaity Johanna	uphold
357.	VF4674	Poli Phelokazi	uphold
358.	VF0619	Ponaona Neho Godfrey	uphold
359.	VF7944	Possel Willem	uphold
360.	VF8013	Prins Warren Nilton	uphold

361.	VF0300	Qotoyi Mziwandile	uphold
362.	VF7456	Raates Dunisha	dismiss
363.	VF2373	Rigala Licia	uphold
364.	VF0601	Rodgers Joan Charlet	uphold
365.	VF7631	Roman Sophia Magdalena	dismiss
366.	VF1026	Rosi Ntsomi Zoliswa Tamara	dismiss
367.	VF8154	Ruiter Selurita Elfreda Louisa	uphold
368.	VF6879	Ruiterson Anna	uphold
369.	VF0454	Ryklief Gaironeesa	uphold
370.	VF0455	Ryklief Mogamat Fuad	uphold
371.	VF0642	Ryklief Rafeeq	uphold
372.	VF8078	Sampson Analine Roslin	uphold
373.	VF1085	Samuels Zubeida	uphold
374.	VF7492	Samuels Elmien Margot	dismiss
375.	VF7494	Samuels Niclaas	uphold
376.	VF6601	Sauls Yolandie Emmely	uphold
377.	VF8433	Sauls Danwill	uphold
378.	VF7177	Saunders Cynthia	uphold
379.	VF7118	Scheepers Clinton	uphold
380.	N/A	September Simon Petrus	dismiss
381.	VF3973	Sibhuqashe Thandiswa Olivia	uphold
382.	VF10821	Sibuqashe Nosiphiwo	uphold
383.	VF2213	Sigwela Nomvuselelo Olivia	uphold
384.	VF3751	Simanga Mbulelo	uphold
385.	VF1408	Sitole Abednigo	uphold
386.	VF4795	Situnzi Masotshwandile	uphold



387.	VF2418	Skwati Nolufefe Carrie	uphold
388.	VF6360	Slingers Micheal	uphold
389.	VF7214	Slingers Dewald	uphold
390.	VF6403	Smal Leonard James	uphold
391.	VF1485	Smith Christina	uphold
392.	VF8200	Smith Eveline Joseph	uphold
393.	VF8667	Smith Eva	uphold
394.	VF9790	Smith Anna Johanna	uphold
395.	VF2108	Smous Joseph Solomon	uphold
396.	VF7760	Snyers John William Jacob	uphold
397.	VF6624	Snyers Polina	uphold
398.	VF6955	Solomons Marlene Josephine	uphold
399.	VF0875	Solomos Leon	uphold
400.	VF0173	Sotyantya Thelma Nomtshato	uphold
401.	VF6641	Spandiel Christo-Bell	uphold
402.	VF7582	Speelman Marthinus	uphold
403.	VF11003	Stevens Olivia Salome	uphold
404.	VF7383	Stevens Hendrick	uphold
405.	VF8183	Stevens Marilan Juhulda	uphold
406.	VF9571	Stofberg Gregory	uphold
407.	VF2415	Stoffberg Anthony William	uphold
408.	VF6022	Stoffberg Mario Peter	uphold
409.	VF9235	Swarts John Steven	uphold
410.	VF7146	Swartz Kelly Lydia	uphold
411.	VF8178	Swartz Ellen	uphold
412.	VF8486	Swartz Mariana	uphold

413.	VF0333	Talakumeni Kholeka Patience	uphold
414.	VF8386	Taylor Jan Johannes	uphold
415.	VF7771	Thomas John	uphold
416.	VF10430	Tofile Pelma Nomacebo	uphold
417.	VF7786	Toonjies Paul	uphold
418.	VF6973	Van Blerk Christina Mary	uphold
419.	VF7370	Van Der Heyde Ireen	uphold
420.	VF8422	Van Der Poll Daniel Jacobs	uphold
421.	VF8666	Van Der Poll Francis	uphold
422.	VF9799	Van Der Poll Maria	uphold
423.	VF1125	Van Der Ross Mathilda Ingrid	uphold
424.	VF6773	Van Hooi Eugene Christopher	uphold
425.	VF9625	Van Hooi Edward Matthwes	uphold
426.	VF2600	Van Nelson Renee	uphold
427.	VF7951	Van Niekerk Elizabeth Leah	uphold
428.	VF8855	Van Niekerk Cratton	uphold
429.	VF6045	Van Reenen Renate Helena	uphold
430.	VF1399	Van Rooyen Carmen	uphold
431.	VF11113	Van Wyk Christopher Jeremy Heinrich	uphold
432.	VF7952	Van Wyk Ronalda	uphold
433.	VF9414	VanWyk Jordan Jacoba Maria Elizabeth	uphold
434.	VF2866	Velaphi Fundiswa	uphold
435.	VF3403	Vellem Xoliswa	uphold
436.	VF7721	Visser Amelia	uphold
437.	VF6154	Vister Jasper Franklin	uphold
438.	VF9137	Volka James	uphold

439.	VF1293	Vraagom Christie Davids	uphold
440.	VF8206	Vyfer Katrina Gerdelina	uphold
441.	VF8225	Vyver Katrina Certalina	uphold
442.	VF9613	Walters Jacomein Vergenia	uphold
443.	VF10651	Wayiti Sithembiso Elliot	uphold
444.	VF2869	Wichman Elaine	dismiss
445.	VF10032	Willemse Alereece Lee-Ann	uphold
446.	VF0481	Williams Afrika	uphold
447.	VF10038	Williams Furlen Eddie	uphold
448.	VF2631	Williams Xolisile Petros	uphold
449.	VF6365	Williams Donovan Craig	uphold
450.	VF6743	Williams Chrizelda Cindy	uphold
451.	VF6767	Williams Morne	uphold
452.	VF7251	Williams Ray Aiken	uphold
453.	VF8112	Wilson Una Valley	uphold
454.	VF2859	Xaba Richard	uphold
455.	VF1836	Xokozela Thabile	uphold
456.	VF3963	Yawa Phumla Margaret	uphold
457.	VF3261	Yekiwe Nosibusiso	uphold
458.	VF6922	Yon Lilian	uphold
459.	VF3720	Zazini Tololo	uphold
460.	VF2423	Zitho Mzukisi Luntu	uphold
461.	VF2574	Zitho Shiella Nolonwabo	uphold