



REPORT OF THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE

ON NATURAL RESOURCES

VISIT TO GREEN SCHEMES IN ZAMBEZI, KAVANGO EAST, AND KAVANGO WEST

29 SEPTEMBER 2022 TO 3 OCTOBER 2022



Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.....	4
2.	OBJECTIVES OF THE VISITS.....	4
3.	METHODOLOGY.....	5
4.	COMPOSITION OF THE DELEGATION.....	5
5.	PURPOSE OF THE REPORT.....	5
6.	VISITS TO GREEN SCHEMES AND OBSERVATIONS.....	5
6.1	ZAMBEZI REGION – 29 August 2022.....	5
6.1.1	Meeting with the Chief Regional Officer, Constituency Councillors, and Officials – Zambezi Regional Council.....	5
6.1.2	Briefing and Visit to Silos operated by Agro-Marketing Trade Agency (AMTA).....	5
6.1.3	Courtesy Call on Ngambela Albius Kamwi and Indunas – Masubia Traditional Authority.....	6
6.1.4	Briefing Meeting and Site Visit – Kalimbeza Rice Project.....	7
6.1.5	Meeting with Representatives of Namibia Agronomic Board.....	8
7.	MEETINGS IN KAVANGO EAST REGION – 30 August 2022.....	9
7.1	Courtesy Call on Fumu Erwin Mbambo and Traditional Councillors.....	9
7.2	Meeting with Chief Regional Officer, Constituency Councillors, and Government Officials – 31 August 2022.....	11
7.3	Briefing Meeting and Site Visit – Shadikongoro Green Scheme.....	11
7.4	Courtesy Call on the Senior Traditional Councillor VadGciriku Traditional Authority – Mr. Festus Shikerete.....	12
7.5	Briefing and Site Visit - Shitemo Green Scheme Project.....	14
7.6	Briefing and Site Visit – Ndonga Linena Green Scheme Project.....	15
7.7	Courtesy Call on the Senior Traditional Councillor, Sambyu Traditional Authority- Mr. Sebastiaan Kantema – 1 September 2022.....	16
7.8	Briefing Meeting and Site Visit – Mashare Green Scheme Project.....	17
7.8.1	Mashare Agricultural College (Under the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform management).....	17
7.8.5	Mashare Irrigation and Mashare Berries (Under private sector management).....	18
7.9	Briefing and Site Visit - Uvhungu-Uvhungu Green Scheme Project (Under the Government management).....	19
8.	MEETINGS IN KAVANGO WEST REGION – 2 SEPTEMBER 2022.....	20
8.1	Courtesy Call on the Governor, Constituency Councillors, and Officials.....	20
8.2	Courtesy Call on the Homba Eugen Siwombe and Traditional Councillors.....	20
8.3	Briefing Meeting and Site Visit – Musese Green Scheme Project (Leased to private person by the Traditional Authority).....	21
8.4	Courtesy Call on Homba Alfons Kaundu and Traditional Councillors.....	23
8.5	Briefing and Site Visit – Sikondo Green Scheme Project.....	24
9	FINDINGS.....	25

9.1	Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Land Reform	25
9.2	Agro-Marketing Trade Agency (AMTA)	26
9.3	Agricultural Business Development (Agribusdev).....	26
9.3.1	Kalimbeza Rice Project	26
10	CONCLUSION	28
11	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	28
11.1	The Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Land Reform to:.....	28
12	MEMBERS SIGNATURES	29

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 As part of its mandate, the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Natural Resources resolved to visit Green Schemes (GSs) Projects in Zambezi, Kavango East, and Kavango West. The visits took place from 29 August 2022 to 2 September 2022.
- 1.2 The Green Scheme Policy of 2008 was designed to maximize irrigation opportunities along the maize triangle (Grootfontein, Tsumeb, and Otavi) as well as in the North Central and North Eastern regions using the Kunene, Kavango, and Zambezi rivers as well as the promotion of agro projects in the South using Orange River and dams such as Naute and Hardap. The Ministry further enacted the policy to harness the governments and other stakeholder's resources to increase agriculture productivity and social development as envisaged in the national development plans and Vision 2030 strategy.
- 1.3 The target group and beneficiaries according to the policy are: Investors and irrigation expertise - to assist GRN in achieving its objectives of increased food production and skills transfer to emerging farmers in rural communities – employment and job creation preference to be given to communities residing near the projects, assist existing farm landowners with access to irrigation water to enhance food security and diversification of agricultural production.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE VISITS

- 1) The objectives were to assess the operational viability of the projects in the wake of reports of them being non-productive and most being dormant.
- 2) To establish factors or reasons why the GSs were not performing as envisaged and what the challenges were that attributed to the failure of the schemes.
- 3) To hear the views of the community and regional leadership, including the Traditional Authorities, on the operations of the GSs.
- 4) Benefits include employment creation, production levels, food security, and other social aspects.
- 5) To understand the marketing challenges Small Scale Irrigation Farmers (SSIFs) face in accessing the market and how to encourage more production.
- 6) Most importantly, based on the views shared to determine if there was a need for government to outsource or allow foreign investors to bid for the running of the GSs.

3. METHODOLOGY

- 3.1 In fulfilling its objectives, the Committee had meetings with representatives of the following offices: The Governor's office, traditional authorities, regional council, Agro-Marketing Trade Agency, Namibia Agronomic Board, management of GSs, and SSIFS.

4. COMPOSITION OF THE DELEGATION

- 4.1 The Delegation comprised Hon. Tjekero Tweya, Hon. Agnes Mpingana Kafula, Hon. Kletus Karondo, Hon. Herlinde Lucia Tjiveze, Hon. Paula Kooper, Hon. Johanna Kandjimi, Hon. Mike Venaani, Hon. Annakleta Sikerete, Hon. Dr. Tangeni Cornelius K. Iijambo, Hon. Vincent Joseph Mareka, Hon. Maria Kamutali, and Hon. Nghidipo Hamata, Ms. Annalisa Meroro, and Ms. Namasiku Lizazi as support staff.

5. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 5.1 The report's purpose is to inform the National Assembly about the findings of the Committee on its visit to Green Schemes to Zambezi. Kavango East and Kavango West Regions.

6. VISITS TO GREEN SCHEMES AND OBSERVATIONS

6.1 ZAMBEZI REGION – 29 August 2022

6.1.1 Meeting with the Chief Regional Officer, Constituency Councillors, and Officials – Zambezi Regional Council

- 6.1.1.1 The Delegation met with the regional leadership at the Regional Council. The Chief Regional Officer, Ms. Regina Ndopu-Lubinda, who represented the Office of the Governor, welcomed the Delegation to Region. Ms. Ndopu-Lubinda shared the same views and concerns on the operation of the GSs. She also suggested that the Committee visit the Liselo plot given to the government for another GS of over 1800ha. According to her, phase one was completed by the Ministry at N\$40 million, constructing an electrified fence and de-bushing. However, due to delays on the side of the Ministry, a significant portion of the fence was vandalized by community members in need of grazing for their livestock. After the meeting, the Delegation visited the plot and observed how community members damaged the fence and many bushes had grown back.

6.1.2 Briefing and Visit to Silos operated by Agro-Marketing Trade Agency (AMTA)

- 6.1.2.1 The Acting Manager, Mr. Thomas Constantin, informed the Delegation that he was temporarily assigned to the Katima Mulilo AMTA Office after suspending the former manager who faced corruption charges. AMTA had six (6) silos, of which only one was at total capacity; two were empty, one had 600t instead of 700t, and the other two were at half the capacity and a quarter.

He explained the modus operandi of AMTA, which raised more questions from the Members. The Delegation learned that AMTA buys grains from farmers and pays for them before they sell them to millers.

The silos were used as storage for the business component and as a national strategic reserve for drought relief food. The silos were also used by private millers such as Bokomo and Namib Mills, who pay handling fees for the service. AMTA was operating on a cost-recovery basis. The Delegation toured AMTA premises and noted that some of the silos had grains stored for over two years, and grain bugs were visible outside the silos.

6.1.3 Courtesy Call on Ngambela Albius Kamwi and Indunas – Masubia Traditional Authority

- 6.1.3.1 Ngambela Albius Kamwi informed the Members that the GSs used to produce food in the past, but now they were dead. He wanted to know whose responsibility it was to assess the problem and why the schemes were not working. According to him, the land for GSs was obtained from Traditional Authorities (TAs), and in doing so, people were relocated to pave the way for GSs. The land government was given for production was not fully utilized, and he wanted to know why it was the case. In the future, the Ngambela emphasized that the TA will hesitate to avail land to the government, citing the Kalimbeza as an undesirable example. It could have been beneficial if the GS had been put under intensive agricultural production, but that was different.
- 6.1.3.2 Another concern was the non-payment of seasonal workers who work on an eight monthly contract without being paid. There was a high expectation from the Kalimbeza GS, but unfortunately, the government let people down. Those assigned only focused on filling their stomachs. Nothing was happening at the GS, which was not comforting. He wanted to know if there was any consideration for a college where people could be trained on how to plant rice. Since the government intended to invite investors from outside to take over, how would locals know how to do the same he wanted to know why the government was not considering bringing back retired extension officers and using their expertise to run Kalimbeza Rice Project.
- 6.1.3.3 Ngambela Kamwi further informed the Members that the Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Land Reform needed to consult TAs, and he believed there was a need to do so. The Kalimbeza Project originally started with sugar cane production, but that was halted without explanation, and it was then replaced with rice production. He called on the government to train people so that they could produce food for themselves. Transferring skills is very important for people can take over after ten years which was the initial plan. Kalimbeza was a success and had the potential to be rolled out to other areas too. Accordingly, when feasibility studies were done, they

were told that a considerable portion of the farm was unsuitable for rice production. Even so, he believed that it could have been used to produce other produce throughout the year, or return to the Traditional Authority for community usage. Ngambela Kamwi was not impressed by the government's intention to look for private investors since there have been too many consultations with little happening on the ground.

6.1.4 Briefing Meeting and Site Visit – Kalimbeza Rice Project

1.	Total Size (hectares) ha	229ha
2.	ha Under Production	150ha
3.	ha Unused	79ha
4.	Rent Paid per ha	N\$50 per hectare under production= N\$7500.00

6.1.4.1 The Farm Manager, Mr. Kompeli, informed the Delegation that the size of the Project was 229ha, of which 150ha was used for rice production. In 1999, the Project was revived to plant rice with assistance from the University of Namibia. In 2014, it was commercialized to produce two types of rice, the long grain and super rice, of which they managed to make 1,8MT (Metric Tonnes) per hectare. There are 11 permanent employees and seasonal workers appointed to assist with the weeding and transplanting of the rice during the planting season between January and August. Harvesting is done in September to avoid flood damage, as the area was prone to seasonal floods between April and May. The field needed to be leveled, which was another contributing factor to low production as it prevented the equal distribution of water, the pipes bought were smaller, and that also affected the water flow.

6.1.4.2 Regarding the implements and tractors of the six tractors, only two are in working condition, and the other four need to be fixed. The rice combines harvester and rice processing machine both needed to be fixed, and the colour sorter machine was giving problems too.

6.1.4.3 Production Capacity 2014 -2022

Period	Hectares planted	Harvest
2014	41ha	90MT
2015	76ha	147MT
2016	118ha	156MT (that was when financial problems started)

2017-2018	108ha	10MT (lost due to floods and malfunctioning combined harvester)
2019	-	(No production due to power cut because of debt)
2020	Planted animal fodder	728 bales valued at over N\$600 000.00
2021	59ha	76MT
2021/22	79ha	3,5MT

6.1.4.4 During 2021/22, they had rice in the field, but unfortunately, they could not secure the appointment of casual workers on time to scare birds as they needed approval from Windhoek, which took longer than anticipated. As a result, they suffered severe losses because of birds.

In 2019, the Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Land Reform availed N\$10 million to pay the electricity bill and level off the field. Agribusdev appointed a company to level the area, but the contractor needed the right equipment and thus could not do the job and was suspended the same day he started working. The contract of the second contractor was also terminated. An amount of N\$1 5 million was paid to the contractor whose agreement was terminated.

6.1.4.5 Challenges faced include, among others, the procurement of a new milling machine and package system and the uneven land surface that need leveling. In addition, the unequal distribution of water causes low yield; the area has a lot of weeds and not easy to control by hand. The Project suffers excessive damage from birds, and it is challenging to scare them effectively without casual workers. Key among the challenges is granting approval for any improvement on the Project, which takes longer. Before they submit a request for procurement, they need permission to get approval to request quotations, which takes longer due to the bureaucratic system in place. They are not even able to purchase a tyre approval must first be granted from Windhoek.

6.1.5 Meeting with Representatives of Namibia Agronomic Board

6.1.5.1 On the complaints raised about the high prices of maize, the Delegation was briefed by Mr. Patrick Lubanda from the Namibian Agronomic Board (NAB). According to him, NAB was mandated to promote the agronomic and Horticulture industry and to facilitate the production, processing, storage, and marketing of controlled products in Namibia, and their vision was to encourage the agronomic and horticulture industry through market regulations and facilitation. The price for fresh produces was negotiated between the producer and the buyer. NAB shares the Average Farm Gate Prices for specific product lines, Import Parity Prices (from Cape Town

Fresh Produce Market), and Retail Prices from Windhoek shops with all Traders and Producers. This assists producers in benchmarking when establishing their commodity prices for selling to Traders. Regarding market access, the Agronomic Industry Act (Act 20- of 1992) and The Namibian Horticulture Market Share Promotion (MSP) Scheme, Rules and Regulations on Close borders, Open on pro-rata, and Open Borders for imports were implemented to control special products. Therefore, to ensure the closing of the borders when there was an oversupply of certain products locally.

6.1.5.2 The maize price formula is determined by the agronomy industry, which includes all stakeholders such as Farmers' Unions, Green schemes, and Grain processors. The Formula is determined by calculating the SAFEX, which is a weighted average, 8% GMO-free premium is added plus the Import levy of 3.6% as well as the transport differential from Otavi to Ex-Sannieshof (RSA), NAB monitors the price for Fortnights (two weeks) period and informs the industry accordingly as the price was not fixed for the entire marketing season. In the case of the Zambezi Region, the Grain Pool Floor Price Mechanism has been adopted as it is the responsibility of the farmer to deliver maize to the miller to get the price referred to as the mill door price.

6.1.5.3 On why Namibia Maize Price is based on the South African Price, He explained that it was because Namibia was importing more than 80% of the White Maize (WM) from South Africa, so the price was based on that, but adding GMO plus other additions. About who regulates the price of Maize Meal, as Farmers sell a 50kg bag of maize at 250 Namibian dollars and buy the same bag of Maize meal at N\$500, he explained that the agronomic industry regulates only the price of the unprocessed White Maize, Wheat, and Pearl Millet, while Millers set their prices after processing the raw product. Therefore, the millers' price was not controlled.

7. MEETINGS IN KAVANGO EAST REGION – 30 August 2022

7.1 Courtesy Call on Fumu Erwin Mbambo and Traditional Councillors

7.1.1 The Fumu welcomed the Delegation and expressed his appreciation for the Committee's visit to Green Schemes in the Region. He told the Members that he was disturbed by the current condition of GSs. The Shadikongoro GS was progressing well in the past, and the harvest was very good. The GS, from the onset, was supposed to produce maize, but he learned that the milling of maize was done elsewhere, on which he sought an explanation since the GS was equipped with milling facilities and employed locals. He also wanted more clarity on the government's intention to invite investors from outside to run the GSs, since the locals can run GS. The Fumu stated that Traditional Authority availed plots for GSs to the GRN with the

understanding that GSs would benefit local people. However, most GSs were abandoned, and nothing was going on. Given the status quo, he called on GRN to return the plots to the rightful owners, as they also can run GSs. The Fumu urged the Committee to visit Omega, where GRN built houses and boreholes that are now abandoned, and people are suffering due to unemployment and, as such, resort to poaching of wild animals.

- 7.1.2 The Fumu further informed the Committee that all GSs were not given permanently to GRN, the idea of GRN was to acquire land to produce food for the people and secondly to create employment. The Committee was also informed that the Traditional Authority (TA), during a consultative meeting with the Minister of Agriculture, Water, and Land Reform, learned of the Ministry's intention to either sell or lease some GS, to which the TA is opposed. The Fumu further informed the Committee that both Kavango East and West Regions felt that the GSs in the regions would not be handed over to foreign investors but would be managed by locals.

The Committee was also informed that the collapse of the GSs was the result of the operation of Agribusdev, such as the delays in the supply of seeds that were only delivered after the rainy season.

- 7.1.3 On the way forward, the Fumu said that the Region had youth trained to run GSs. The Region has water and land, and those with money can make a proposal to GRN to assist them in running the GSs. Currently, GSs are run so that the locals are becoming poor. The other alternative was for the TA to approach investors outside the country. Specific reference was made to the recent benchmark visit to the Homba Investment Association in South Africa, where they witnessed the food production. Homba Investment Association experience could be beneficial to GSs locally. Plea to the Minister that the Regional Council and Traditional Authority can run GSs and must be allowed to do so.

- 7.1.4 The TA did not support bids for GSs since it always goes to those with money, leaving the locals more destitute and saying that they were tired of suffering and appealing to GRN to ensure full utilization of land given for food production and to plant sufficient food. As it was, only a tiny part of the land was used to plant, and whatever they produced was taken elsewhere for processing. There was a need to reconsider the planting method and ensure sufficient food production.

- 7.1.5 A concern was raised about the status of Omega. Upon returning from exile, it was given to returnees to make a living from Omahangu. Later it was given to the public, but nothing happened. Most tractors and implements are abandoned, which belonged to the government. In

conclusion, Fumu said that the biggest challenges were the office-bound GRN officers who never went out in the Region to familiarise themselves with the situation.

7.2 Meeting with Chief Regional Officer, Constituency Councillors, and Government Officials – 31 August 2022

7.2.1 The Committee met with the regional leadership of Kavango East, who expressed serious concern about managing the GSs in both Kavango Regions. They shared the same sentiments with Fumu Erwin Mbambo that both Kavango East and West Regional Councils with the TAs could run GSs and did not support the Ministry's proposal to invite foreign investors to run GSs.

7.3 Briefing Meeting and Site Visit – Shadikongoro Green Scheme

1.	Total Size (hectares) ha	590ha
2.	ha Under Production	390gha
3.	ha Unused	200ha
4.	Fees Paid per ha to the TA	N\$50 per ha under production = N\$19 500.00

7.3.1 The Members were informed that the GS honors its commitment and social responsibility, and the GS pays on annual basis royalties to the TA calculated at N\$50 per hectare under production. In terms of employment, preference was always given to locals.

Provision for the donation of movable property, hiring tractors and implements to locals at costs recovery rate done when needed. Challenges: marketing fresh produce is challenging due to distance from the market and AMTA doing little to assist farmers but only being reactive to orders they receive. Tenders to purchase fresh produce for schools and hospitals are always given to private tenderers who, in turn, buy from GSs. Why can't the GRN buy directly from GSs? Thus the recommendation for GRN to approach GSs for that, same with drought relief items to be sourced from GSs and not outside the country. High electrical costs were paid to Nored, and the water bill was over half a million, and not possible for the GSs to pay that.

7.3.2 The small-scale farmers owed Agribank N\$1 5 million during the period 2020/2021, taken as a production loan, and half of that was owed to the GS for services rendered. The services rendered were on things such as land preparation, spraying, and fertilizers. Recommendation: for Agribank to assist farmers with another production loan based on the amount repaid on existing loans. On the money from the production loan, the farmers were given both inputs for summer and winter. With outputs from summer, they managed to repay half of the loan, but

unfortunately, they were instructed not to plant for winter; thus, the debt was incurred, and they could not repay Agribank.

7.3.3 The expenses for Small Scale farmers also went high due to extra costs, such as purchasing draglines that used to be supplied at no cost by the Ministry. Additionally, they were required to pay casual workers and buy their own seeds and fertilizers. Some of the factors attributed to the failure of the GS were bureaucratic process in procurement procedures – the input process was too long as approval had to be done in Windhoek, resulting in excessive delays by Agribusdev; the registration of a tractor was declined for the reasons that there was nothing going on at Shadikongoro GS. However, the tractor can be used to assist farmers in kind or paid for by farmers for services;

7.3.4 The farmers are expected to transport their produce, which is expensively questioning the role of AMTA as they are not fulfilling the agreement to come to take the fresh produce to the market; The combined harvester is broken and needs good services; The GS received expired fertilizers from Agribusdev that they were unable to use; Agribusdev turning a blind eye to farmer's pleas, example the type of seeds to supply and the planting season; one Silo had 30 000 ton, the other is empty.

The problem started after Agribusdev took over; workers were still on low salaries without any increment for many years, on a pension not sure if correct amounts were being deducted, uncertain in employment on contract without any hope for permanent jobs, and Failure of GS was contributed to the funding model being used by Agribusdev.

7.4 Courtesy Call on the Senior Traditional Councillor VadGciriku Traditional Authority – Mr. Festus Shikerete

7.4.1 The Senior Traditional Councillor, Mr. Festus Shikerete, in his welcoming remarks, encouraged discussions on the land as it concerns all. The Gciiriku Traditional Authority is having two GSs namely Shitemo and Ndonga Linena. He further stated that in 1976, the Traditional Authority availed land to government to start projects in Shitemo with the promise that they would produce their own food and to generate their own income. The sad part, he said, was that people had to be relocated and were never compensated because the parents accepted to be relocated on condition that their future generation will benefit and their children were also to be employed there. Those told to relocate were told to move and reside at the river bank where there was no space to cultivate.

- 7.4.2 Mr. Shikerete said as they were entering a new era and promises made were not fulfilled, and even current GSs, the produce is taken elsewhere, leaving no benefit to the community. Surprisingly, those coming from elsewhere are the ones fighting for land leaving owners as onlookers and without grazing areas for their livestock, while GSs need to be more productive.
- 7.4.3 In terms of Ndonga Linena, the Delegation was informed of an agreement that was in place between the TA and the government under the Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Land Reform, for joint venture stating the percentage of partnership. The first company appointed through the partnership had a steering committee to run the operations of the GS and a board to manage its affairs. The company performed satisfactorily until the passing of its manager. With the appointment of the second manager, production started to go down.
- 7.4.4 The management of the GS worsen with the introduction of the Agribusdev business model. According to the Senior Traditional Councillor, Agribusdev dismantled everything, production went down, and they never bothered to consult the TA. It was further stated that authority and power should not be separated. Currently, the TA was the authority, yet strength was needed. He further proposed that locals with relevant experience and expertise should be considered to manage GSs or the whole land should be given back to the TAs for them to look for prospective investors, and with that, he emphasized real investors and not those they experienced who came as investors and then ended up taking loans from Agribank like the poor.
- 7.4.5 Mr. Shikerete applauded the Committee for the initiative taken to visit the GSs and urged it to be done annually as the land in Kavango was in deep trouble from Shitemo along the Kavango river bed. In 1992, the GS had a farm manager who utilized the farm productively, where locals benefited from the surplus. Recently, they have witnessed farm managers coming, and when they do something wrong, they turn to the court. According to him, many cases were pending at the court of people fighting for land in Kavango for their businesses without regard for locals and how they will survive. He observed that trouble starts when farm managers are assigned and felt that powers to run GSs should be vested in the people themselves. He raised concern that only people from other places came and managed the GSs, and when locals complained, they were being accused of doing politics.
- 7.4.6 At Ndonga Linena, farmland was not fully utilized because the pivot irrigation system was not reaching all areas. In another part, there were many bushes, and it suggested that that area be cleared and given to locals residing there to cultivate. The Delegation was informed that during 2009-2011, the farm used to produce sweat potatoes, but now it will be a shock to see it. The

farm was very productive during the time of a certain Mr. Opperman, but when other farm managers took over, they removed irrigation pipes, and production went down. When farm managers are assigned, they come and cheat the system establishing themselves while leaving people hungry. Mr. Shikerete stated that he was still recalling the benefits the locals were ripping benefits from GSs. After harvesting, the locals used to be given leftover produce, but now all leftovers were burnt.

7.4.7 The Senior Traditional Councillor strongly discouraged lawyers from discussing land issues as the TA could deal with them. Mr. Shikerete narrated that from 1991-2010, he used to work at Shitemo GS, and it was operated successfully. There were 50 permanent employees and over 700 casual workers, and by then, the managers knew their work. He stated that the downfall of GSs was due to the recruitment of university graduates from outside the region who lacked practical understanding of GSs and ended up working as administrators only. It was further stated that the machine to make groundnuts and the milling plant were removed and that no production was taking place at Shitemo GS. He called on the government to recall expertise to manage GSs, and experts in the Region to assemble irrigation pipes.

7.4.8 He expressed dissatisfaction with the current farm manager at Shitemo GS from Agro Pro Company who used a different method to acquire the leasehold. He stated that the company had no single tractor, yet they called themselves a company expected to produce. It was noted that the farm manager was using the leasehold to get investors to pump money into the Project. There was no production at the farm, and he urged the government to only grant investors leaseholds if they had money.

7.4.9 In the past, Mashare Agricultural College was a college where people used to be trained to acquire knowledge in agriculture, but it was now dormant. Another raised was the employment of non-locals at the GSs, and it suggested that employees of SCIFs at GSs be from those areas. He further told the leasehold to include a condition to terminate the contract within three years if the GS was unproductive.

7.5 Briefing and Site Visit - Shitemo Green Scheme Project

1.	Total Size (hectares) ha	430ha
2.	ha Under Production	166ha
3.	ha Unused	264ha
4.	Fees Paid per ha to the TA	N\$50 per ha under production = N\$8300.00

7.5.1 At Shitemo GS, the Delegation learned that Mr. Frans Mushimba, although he was not present at the meeting, was the leaseholder on a 25-year agreement. In his absence, Mr. Deon van Blerk informed the meeting that he entered into a business partnership agreement with Mr. Frans Mushimba to produce wheat. The size of the farm is 430 hectares, of which the pivot system only covers 230 hectares. In contrast, only 166 hectares were under production. The Delegation wanted to know the criteria for awarding the leasehold agreement and the underutilization of farmland.

7.6 Briefing and Site Visit – Ndonga Linena Green Scheme Project

1.	Total Size (hectares) ha	1000ha
2.	ha Under Production	678ha
3.	ha Unused	322ha
4.	Fees Paid per ha to the TA	N\$50 per ha under production = N\$33 900.00

7.6.1 The Farm Manager, Mr. Janno Rentel informed the Members that Ndonga Linena GS was one of the GSs under the direct management of the Agricultural Business Development Agency (Agribusdev) but was now in the process to be transferred back to the Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Land Reform. **For four years it was just idle, no production and employees were receiving their monthly salaries while doing nothing.** The farm produces maize and wheat as the main crops for winter and summer, along with various vegetables.

7.6.2 Production capacity

Production Components	Farm size (1000ha)	Area under production
Commercial	424ha	200ha
Medium Scale Irrigation	80ha	-
Small Scale Irrigation	174ha	-

7.6.3 There was no production happening at the farm due to limited funds, a malfunctioning pump station, and tractors and implements in bad condition. Even so, they managed to plant 200ha from the 400ha they planned initially because of the pump station's inability to supply water to the whole area under production. During the 2019/20 Financial Year, the Ministry availed funds to buy inputs such as seeds and fertilizers and no funds to use for repairs. Of the six pumps at the farm, only one was working though not effectively. The pivots were last serviced in 2010 and

are thus wholly worn out. The implements like the planter, sprayer, tractors, and silos were also not working.

- 7.6.4 Furthermore, there was no formal directive from the Ministry on Agribusdev and the way forward with the defunct Agribusdev. Currently, 32 employees on the government payroll are getting paid monthly without doing anything.
- 7.6.5 There was limited security appointed to guard the farm, thus exposed to vandalism by community members; No clear direction on where to make payments requests for monthly suppliers, invoices for Nored, Telecom, and others, and no provision made to pay monthly invoices and they fear that it might be disconnected if they piled up and **High electricity charges from Nored whereby they are expected to pay demand charges of N\$40 000.00 monthly whether they are in production or not.**
- 7.6.6 The SSIFs represented by Mr. Booysen Mutelo stated that the farm management was better before Agribusdev took over, where employees needed to be treated better. According to him, the Oshikunino Company was a private company but took good care of implements and equipment compared to Agribusdev, which was closer to the government. He stated that Agribusdev was endorsed in Parliament, but for the last four years, nothing was cultivated at the farm, and he urged the government to devise solid measures to rescue the situation. He thought that the management crisis had a direct impact on them. They could not go into total production because of defective implements and equipment, and because of that, they could not get approval for another production loan from Agribank.
- 7.6.7 Further to that, they owed much money to the Project and Agribank, which they were unable to repay due to unpaid debts of over N\$1 million by Omhlanga Mills for maize sold to them during the 2017/18 period, and no updated was provided on the case; the other issue was the disappearance of N\$294.488.35, stolen by the previous farm manager, which they requested the Ministry to intervene; no official communication on the way forward with the now defunct Agribusdev and who would be held accountable for their reckless administration and bureaucratic system and non-availability of parts in Namibia to repair pump station and constant unfulfilled promises on the side of the Ministry.

7.7 Courtesy Call on the Senior Traditional Councillor, Sambyu Traditional Authority- Mr. Sebastiaan Kantema – 1 September 2022

- 7.7.1 The Committee paid a courtesy call to the Sambyu Traditional Authority, where Mr. Sebastiaan Kantema welcomed the Delegation on behalf of the Traditional Councillor, Mr. Edward Sikerete.

According to him, in 1971, when the Mashare Project started, it was flourishing. There was always milk from the dairy, but production went down when the defunct Agribusdev took over. The TA regrets why they gave land for the GS project as they were not getting anything from it. The aim was to help people get food from it; if not, it was better to return the land. In the past, people were trained on how to run the GS, but that is not the case anymore. He said Mashare GS was not functioning anymore and did not know what was happening there, and the same applies to Uvhungu-Uvhungu GS, who had yet to learn where the cattle were taken. Mr. Kantema said that the Hompas were convinced that their subjects will be better off, which is not the case. He expressed deep dissatisfaction with the current situation and wanted land to be returned to cultivate themselves.

7.7.2 He further wanted to know why produce from local GSs was taken elsewhere and not processed locally to add value locally. He said the expectation was not to receive handouts but to get locally produced products cheaper for the communities. He further wanted to know what happened to the Ministry's oversight role over GSs, as they were waiting to get feedback from them on the status of GSs. According to him, the community members were not part of the GSs, but they were not involved in decision-making, and the lack of coordination could have improved the performance of GSs and the underutilization of farmland. Following that, he said the demand from the government is still there. However, there needed to be more motivation to avail land as the existing GSs were well managed, and there was no visible benefit to their people.

7.8 Briefing Meeting and Site Visit – Mashare Green Scheme Project

7.8.1 Mashare Agricultural College (Under the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform management)

1.	Total Size (hectares) ha	795ha
2.	ha Under Production	795ha
3.	ha Unused	-
4.	Fees Paid per ha to TA	No payment to TA

7.8.2 Mr. Lukas Mandema gave a brief background and current condition of Mashare Agricultural College. According to him since its inception in 1962, Mashare Agricultural College was used as a breeding station for cattle, chickens, and Omahangu. In addition, the college also offered short skills training for farmers, research, and new technologies. In 2019, the funding of its budget was stopped, which was mainly utilized for repairs and to fund the work plan. They are now primarily

dependent on minimal financing from commercial farmers. As a result of budget cuts, there was nothing happening, no production or research due to lack of funds; inability to repair defective equipment and implements; the chickens died because of starvation as they had no budget for fodder or medicine. Despite the request sent to the Ministry to avail funds to the college, they have yet to receive a response, and the little money they get from selling their produce goes back to Treasury. All 18 farms report directly to managers based in Windhoek, and there is a need to decentralize that for effective management. Mashare produces all seeds up to 55 tons for Omahangu yet the processing and packaging are done in Omahenene. Through the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the Project acquired a small machine to process and package its seeds but was informed to wait to package at Mashare in 2020.

7.8.3 Furthermore, the Agricultural Mechanism and Seed Improvement Project (NAMSIP) bought a tractor, but it is not road worthy as they cannot register it with Natis because of an outstanding payment by the Ministry to Natis. Because of that, it is a challenge to transport seeds for processing to Omahenene for processing and supply time to farmers. He stressed that the current bureaucratic system needs to be revised. GSs approached the Ministry with the suggestion for AMTA to assist with transport feedback that has yet to be received. The Project came up with a 5-year strategic plan which included a resource mobilization component but needed to be approved, which he believed was the main reason most Development Partners pulled out. He further stated that Mashare could only be a centre of excellence with a budget.

7.8.4 The other concern about the cattle was the carrying capacity of the farm which was 480 hectares. While the 280 hectares used for grazing was too little as they were unable to provide supplementary feeding for the cattle like in the past. Due to the bureaucratic system in place, they are also not able to sell some cattle or transport them to other camps for better grazing options.

7.8.5 Mashare Irrigation and Mashare Berries (Under private sector management)

1.	Total Size (hectares) ha	860ha
2.	ha Under Production	60 ha - blue berries and 361 crop production = 421ha
3.	ha Unused	439ha (open spaces too small to put pivots, rocky and uneven land and or unsuitable soil for production)
4.	Fees Paid per ha to the TA	N\$50 per hectare under production= N\$21 050.00

7.8.6 The Farm Manager, Mr. Lourens Le Grange gave a presentation on the history and management of Mashare, which is attached as an annexure. The Project is one of the few GSs in total production. Apart from the production of maize, wheat, cover crops such as groundnuts, and soya of sugar beans, the owner also acquired the tender to produce blueberries for local and international markets. The blue berries project is doing extremely well.

7.9 Briefing and Site Visit - Uvhungu-Uvhungu Green Scheme Project (Under the Government management).

1.	Total Size (hectares) ha	825ha
2.	ha Under Production	361ha
3.	ha Unused	464ha
4.	Fees Paid per ha to the TA	N\$50 per ha under production = N\$18 050.00

7.9.1 Mr. Floris Smit, the Farmer Manager gave an overview of the operational status of Uvhungu-Uvhungu specifically on the situation he found and how he was planning to transform the farm. According to him, the project size is 825ha. The commercial component had a total area of 333ha under center pivot irrigation and 28ha under dragline irrigation. Another 0.8ha and 1.2ha were under the greenhouse and shade net, respectively but were not under production since the wind destroyed both greenhouses' roofs. The SCIFs production area was 60ha, and under a dragline irrigation system, which was divided among 9 SCIFs since 2010, each operating on a 6ha, one of the plots was vacant and without sprinklers.

7.9.2 The Project sources its labor forces within Uvhungu-Uvhungu, Kayengona, and Kaisosi villages. Currently, the GS has 24 permanent employees, of which six (6) were originally from the irrigation, and the rest were part of the old dairy side. When the dairy part closed, all employees were transferred to the irrigation part of the farm, even though the irrigation do not need so many employees.

7.9.3 Mr. Smit informed the Delegation that for the first time in 35 years, the GS never planted or harvested anything because they had no pivots operational to plant during winter, no seeds, fertilizers, chemicals, or even a wheat planter. Last year, they managed to plant 50ha of SSF and 110ha for the commercial side, which is minimal compared to the 825ha of farmland. The GS is not having a tractor or combined harvester and is dependent on other GSs in the area and because of that, they were still harvesting. The further setback is the lack of storage facilities such as silos and weighbridges, to weigh produce from SSFs. As such, they have to harvest

directly from the truck and transport it to the point of sale. Mr. Smit needed to foresee the improvement in that regard. Thus, they will not be able to plant during the winter season. The other challenge was the transportation of maize to Tsandi for processing, and with associated high transport costs, they had to pay for private transport. Despite that, the GS so far harvested 240MT and was expecting a total income of ± N\$3 million. Additionally, the GS had reserve funds from the previous wheat season, and that should be sufficient to cater for breakdowns and spares through the coming season.

7.9.4 For the maize season 2022/23, the GS was in full swing to get everything ready to plant maize for the SSFs as well as the commercial side of the farm. In total, they were anticipating planting 183ha, inclusive of 54ha at the SSF side. Mr. Smit informed the Delegation that they acquired almost inputs except for chemicals which he estimated to be below N\$1 million. Mr. Smit was very optimistic and told the Delegation that they were repairing both John Deere tractors to be in good running condition for the coming planting season. Mr. Smit provided the Delegation with a list of serviceable and unserviceable implements, which is attached as an Annexure.

7.9.5 The Committee also visited the new site where the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform relocated the Dairy project. The Committee learned that the Ministry spent over N\$150 million. Despite that, the project was far from completion. It was estimated the Ministry would need over N\$200 million to finalize the project. At the time of the visit, the project was on standstill due to unavailability of funds and the Committee expressed its dismay and disappointment. The Traditional Authorities and members of the community threaten to take back land or to fence it for household usage. Since it was abandoned for almost 10 years while the government seems not to be interested or know what to do with it.

8. MEETINGS IN KAVANGO WEST REGION – 2 SEPTEMBER 2022

8.1 Courtesy Call on the Governor, Constituency Councillors, and Officials

The Delegation paid a courtesy call to Hon. Sirkka Uusiku, the Governor of Kavango West Region, who welcomed and commended them for visiting the GSs in the Region. After a short briefing on the objective of the visit, the Governor expressed concern about the current condition of most GSs and also stated that there was another GS called Sigone that still needed to be developed.

8.2 Courtesy Call on the Homba Eugen Siwombe and Traditional Councillors

8.2.1 The Homba stated that, in the past, GSs used to feed people, but now it was not the case and people started to complain. According to him, it was a one-man show with no inclusion of the TAs in the operation of GSs, except after harvesting when they were called to take the surplus.

He was of the opinion that there was no way a new GS would be allowed, GSs are supposed to be productive and to produce food which was not the case, most food products are imported from other countries. He further stated that people were moved to pave the way for the GSs, but now they are walking barefoot. The other concern was that training was not offered to the people to run GSs, and there needed to be a proper monitoring mechanism in place to oversee the operation of GSs to determine if they were productive or not.

8.2.2 He called on the processing of produce to be done locally to create employment for the people. Mr. Siwombe had no objection to who was to run the GSs, as long as it was appropriately run with shared responsibilities. On the other hand, he wanted to know was there are no Namibians who can run GSs? Or if it was the lack of money or policy issue. He further said there was a need to review the structure of the GSs in terms of the produce and where the market was. He noted that Musese individuals were given opportunities to plant, but the locals were left out. He stated that the TA had no problem availing land for GSs but only if their subjects could be considered and the GSs were productive. He wanted to know why GSs only utilize smaller areas for planting and not the whole farmland. He was of the opinion that GSs must be operated to benefit people in those areas they are located. Lastly, he said, we could only receive complete independence if we could produce our own food.

8.3 Briefing Meeting and Site Visit – Musese Green Scheme Project (Leased to private person by the Traditional Authority)

1.	Total Size (hectares) ha	650ha
2.	ha Under Production	530ha
3.	ha Unused	12ha
4.	Fees Paid per ha to the TA	N\$50 per ha under production =N\$26 500.00

8.3.1 Mr. Metzger provided a detailed presentation on Musese GS, which was another successful GS under full production. The farm size is 650ha, of which 530ha was under production. The production information is attached as Annexure.

8.3.2 Electricity “Demand” charges – high demand charges are badly affecting the operation of GS. The demand charges are charged by Nored on each GS whether they are in production or not. Even if water pumps are open unintentionally and closed immediately, the demand charges payable can be over N\$200 000.00. For over 10 years, several requests to exempt GSs from paying demand charges were forwarded. Urgent action is needed to provide relief to

struggling GSs. Solar power was urgently needed with a minimum 500Kw with an estimated cost of 3 million at each GS. At Musese GS the farm manager purchased a solar plant for N\$2 million dollars and was waiting for instructions from the Hompa to install it.

- 8.3.3 Mr. Metzger believed that all GSs under Agribusdev were a failure and proposed the commercialization of half of the GSs with a 99-year leasehold, like in Angola, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Botswana. On communities' benefits from GSs production, he said all GSs must contribute equally to communities. Whereby an amount of N\$500 000.00 should be paid annually to the regional council for regional infrastructure development, subject to review and adjustment after 5 years, and a student rotational loan scheme or investment into "Governor's Fund" exclusively for refundable agriculture student loans.
- 8.3.4 **Modus operandi**, the farm manager believed that irrespective of the type of operation; each GS must have an advisory board consisting of 2 village headmen, two traditional authority representatives, two representatives from the Regional Council (chairperson and chief regional officer), two managers from other GSs, two business personalities, or community members appointed by the GS manager and one small scale farmer. He further suggested that the farm manager chair the meeting open to the public and for the board to meet quarterly. He also said that a payment of N\$500.00 to board members per hour to cover traveling expenses. Further, he proposed an annual meeting at the cost of all GS managers, including SCFs at GSs, on a rotational basis. To contribute to traditional local authorities, Mr. Metzger proposed a monthly payment of N\$15 000.00 as royalties to assist with traveling expenses and sitting fees of the standard prices. He said that it must be audited and checked regularly by the GS managers. All costs proposed should be subjected to annual adjustment according to the consumer price index (CPI). As an accountability measure, he proposed that all GSs must be audited and inspected by RCs and other GS managers under a confidentiality/non-disclosure agreement.
- 8.3.5 **Small Scale Farmers** – trainees to work under the direct supervision of the farm manager, to avoid delays in operation, mechanical services should be booked 3 months prior to execution by commercial GS. Procurement should be done with the commercial partner, and Agribank should provide production loans to farmers. He also proposed a performance management strategy for establishing SCFs and the operationalization of Mashare Agricultural College.
- 8.3.6 Mr. Metzger stated that Namibia Agronomic Board (NAB) was functioning well, and the main summer and winter crop marketing was well organized. The newer GSs had sufficient storage silos, and there were no problems. However, in the case of AMTA, the silos were run

unprofessionally, and the current situation of unserviceable silos was proof of the inability of the state to operate silos. On that, he proposed to auction Kavango mills to the highest bidders and start milling locally. He said that would save SCFs from huge transport costs of N\$72 000.00 per farmer to transport crops to Tsandi.

8.3.7 As a best practice, Mr. Metzger suggested that no irrigation fields may be burned or bailed, all GSs follow good agricultural practices (GAP). Crop rotation with cover crops must be mandatory as it will assist the soil in regenerating and becoming more productive. All GSs should develop their monitoring wells for contamination and be able to monitor groundwater against contamination according to the requirement set out by the Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM). As value-addition GSs should buy cattle from local farmers at market-related prices and develop feedlots – cattle herds to graze and fertilize cover crops. The SCF's main crops must be absorbed by commercial GSs and fresh produce by AMTA to cut transport costs.

8.3.8 In conclusion, Mr. Metzger believed there was no need for government to invite foreign investors before local investors were consulted. He referred to the management structure at Musese as a perfect example of a GS under a local private investor farmer manager whose farms were managed well. He said that was because of the fact that he has decision-making powers and open communication with the headman.

8.3.9 He further stated that commercial operation at Musese GS produced 4000t white maize for the past two seasons. Unfortunately, winter crops could only be planted after delays in making decisions by the Ministry. The commercial and SCFs components at Musese GS proved to have the potential capacity to produce 6000t white maize and 4000t wheat. To further supplement their incomes, he said, there was a need for additional storage silos, a mill, and a blending plant to add value and also to create employment opportunities.

8.4 Courtesy Call on Hompa Alfons Kaundu and Traditional Councillors

8.4.1 Hompa Kaundu informed the Delegation that Sikondo was currently unproductive because of unresolved disputes and a lack of directive on the way forward from the Ministry. The underutilization of farmland was raised as another concern. He also stated that people were talking of inclusivity, but at the GS, the locals were excluded, and their livelihoods took. He also wanted to know why the farm produce was born somewhere else for processing rather than locally to create employment for the people living in the surrounding areas. He stressed that if the Ministry could not run the GSs successfully, it must return it to the TAs to get its investors.

8.5 Briefing and Site Visit – Sikondo Green Scheme Project

1.	Total Size (hectares) ha	850ha
2.	ha Under Production	665
3.	ha Unused	185ha
4.	Fees Paid per ha to the TA	N\$50 per hectare under production =N\$33250.00

- 8.5.1 The Farm Manager at Sikondo GS, Mr. Nghidinwa, informed the Delegation that the size of the GS was 850ha, of which 350ha was for the commercial component and 270ha for the medium-scale farmers under production. According to him, 70ha was not usable, and they needed 50ha extra to be serviced to maximize output. All hectares were being utilized effectively. The challenges started in 2014 when Agribusdev took over, and their operational model killed the GS, especially the transfer of funds between GSs. Every GS should be rated on its own merit, not based on funds transferred from other GSs. The biggest challenge was the high electricity charges due to the high demand for Rundu, the farm is regarded as part of Rundu, and the request to reduce their charges was not met. However, as a relief, they got feedback from the Ministry to set up a solar plant from allocated funds.
- 8.5.2 The farm manager raised a concern about the condition of most implements and equipment. According to him, the tractor was bought in 2011, and the current value due to depreciation was 10%, and despite that, they had no right to recommend it to be auctioned or to buy a new one and no access to overdraft or loans, thus demanding for them to access funds. He recommended that GRN consider PPPs to maintain implements through lease agreements while GSs focus on production. Furthermore, consider agro-tourism as another viable option to generate income for GSs. Mr. Nghidinwa stated that Sikondo, in 2015, was voted as the most successful product on the farm to supply AMTA and the market. It has the potential to become the centre of excellence.
- 8.5.3 As a matter of concern, the Delegation was informed that the river's water level was decreasing at an alarming rate, raising the issue of the long-term sustainability of GSs along the rivers. Due to constant delays, Mr. Nghidinwa said that the current procurement system was preventing GS's efficiency from reaching its full potential. The planting seasons were known, yet they always fell into the same trap. Hence the need to relax some of the requirements during the planting season for it to run smoothly. There was a need to review the procurement process. Before Agribusdev, there was a steering committee headed by a deputy director within the regional council who had

signatory powers, and there was no need for approval to be granted from Windhoek. Managers had the authority to purchase up to N\$50 000.00, but now they could only purchase up to N\$5000.00. Farm managers spent more time filling out bidding forms and less on production.

- 8.5.4 In 2018, the late former managing director appointed his advisor. At the same time, he happened to be an employee of the company supplying Agribusdev with fertilizers. That was the beginning of corruption allegations that consequently led to the suspension of the managing director. The Ministry has never reviewed GS policy since its inception in 2008. Thus the need to be adjusted to accommodate new technologies and changes afterward. On why the GS was not providing a financial contribution to the TA, Mr. Nghidinwa said they were up to date with the payment to the TA and provided proof of payments done, attached as an Annexure.
- 8.5.5 For the benefit of the community– the GS had a database of the most vulnerable households, and six groups got N\$1500 monthly payments directly to their banks. In terms of employment, the GS has 32 permanent employees, 300 casual workers, and 50 contract workers, all from surrounding areas. Sikondo made a significant impact on the community.

9 FINDINGS

As stated above, the Committee's key objectives were to determine the operational viability of the GSs, the validity of the complaints on the management of GSs, and the justification for the Ministry's intention to invite foreign investors:

9.1 Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Land Reform

- 1) The Ministry spent ±N\$40 million on phase one of a plot at Liselo earmarked for GS, no developments happened, and community members vandalized it in search of grazing area for their livestock
- 2) Payment of demand charges to Nored – GSs are expected to pay around N\$40 000,00 demand charges whether in production or not, even those with solar plants
- 3) Lack of consultation with regional leadership on the management of GSs
- 4) Inconsistent funding of GSs
- 5) Lack of accountability and maintenance plan for expensive implements and equipment by the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform, inconsistency in keeping records of GRN assets.
- 6) Losses incurred to GSs and SSIFs due to lack of effective business strategy and accountability

9.2 Agro-Marketing Trade Agency (AMTA)

- 1) 1) Ineffective and inefficient management of Silos AMTA in Katima Mulilo,
- 2) 2) no set fumigation schedule for silos, no control on a time limit on the storage of produce.
- 3) 3) Inconsistency in the supply of fresh produce.
- 4) 4) Lack of support to farmers in terms of marketing and transporting their produce.

After the visit, the Committee engaged the management of AMTA in Windhoek on its findings. The Committee took note of the predicament faced by AMTA in terms of operation and lack of regulation.

9.3 Agricultural Business Development (Agribusdev)

According to the majority of stakeholders consulted, the failure of GSs was a result of the business model introduced by Agribusdev and is outlined as follows:

9.3.1 Kalimbeza Rice Project

Wasteful expenditure of N\$2,164 236.14 from the N\$10 million, the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform availed to fund critical services such as levelling off the field, repairs and payment of electricity at the Kalimbeza Rice Project. The money was paid to contractors who were unable to carry out the task despite being the successful bidders.

9.3.2 Shadikongoro GS

The SSIFs incurred over 1 5 million in debts to Agribank and the GS due to a directive not to plant. While they already took a production loan and bought inputs for the summer planting season, farmers received expired fertilizers. The Shadikongoro GS was equipped with a milling machine yet their produce was taken to Tsandi for processing, resulting in extra costs for the farmers. The GSs were not considered in awarding tenders to supply fresh produce to schools, hospitals, or the drought relief program. The manager was instructed to 1) stop ploughing sunflower – no oil production despite having functional machines. 2) stop milling the wheat while machines were operational and no reason given.

9.3.3 Ndonga Linena GS

The GS was not under production for four consecutive years because of limited funds, malfunctioning implements, and repair of the pump station, while staff were on full pay over the four years' period.

9.3.4 Mashare GS

The operation at Mashare Agricultural College came to a complete standstill, with no training, production, or seed processing taking place despite the GS having a seed processing machine. Chickens died due to starvation, pigs and few cattle remaining, face starvation, buildings are in deplorable condition.

9.3.5 Uvhungu-Uvhungu GS

The dairy part was relocated to another area of the GS, and the Ministry spent millions of dollars on the Project. The Project was far from completion, and the GRN was to pump over N\$200 million or more.

9.3.6 Shitemo GS

The leaseholder, Mr. Frans Mushimba, entered into a business partnership agreement with Mr. Deon van Blerk to do business with the products they intended to plant for export purposes.

9.3.7 Sikondo GS

The internal transfer of funds between GS impacted the sustainability and productivity of GSs. Concern about the decreasing water levels of the rivers in both Kavango Regions.

9.3.8 General Findings

- 1) Defective implements and equipment; no maintenance plan in place.
- 2) The delays by the Ministry in the payment of salaries of seasonal workers
- 3) The Ministry makes unilateral decisions without consulting the farm manager.
- 4) There was inconsistency in allocating funds to GSs and delays in paying services rendered to GSs, such as water and electricity bills.
- 5) Lack of communication and coordination between stakeholders on the operation of GSs.
- 6) Reason for high demand charges for electricity paid to **NORED** by GSs whether in production or not.
- 7) High transport fees for SSIFs to transport produce for processing or to the market
- 8) Stripping of agriculture implements by the officials with no consequences or accountability and making GSs scrapyard of the very expensive and sophisticated equipment.
- 9) Lack or non-supervision by the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform – either deliberate or pure negligence (don't care attitude), and incompetence – four years of no productivity but continue budgeting for it and feed Parliament with untruths in their Annual Accountability Reports during Budget and no visits to the sites. Tantamount to: corruption, fraud, waste land and theft of public resources – A drastic action should be taken from the Head to operations managers for this failure and misleading Parliament and whole Nation.
- 10) Government to renegotiate with Traditional Authorities the new terms and conditions of the GSs and not unilateral decision by the government for its own failure without delay. To be decentralised and competent and committed people should be tasked with running the agriculture sector.

- 11) Perception – Business module centralised in Windhoek to loot and enrich management from the assets of the residents of the residents of the Kavango East and Kavango West Regions. Hence, they were deliberately excluded from management and exclusion of Traditional Authorities.
- 12) Outsourcing – Can and may be viable option only if correct and fair procedures are followed, by involving Traditional Authorities who are the custodians of the land and recognition by government to consult them in good faith.
- 13) Renting of GSs land – Total size of 1500ha, GS irrigate 300ha, ministry only pay rent for 300ha, and the 1200ha unused, the Ministry refuse to pay which are very strange arrangements. No rational and the Ministry refuse to return the unused 1200ha to Traditional Authorities to previous owners to be used and produce food.
- 14) Dissatisfaction of TAs – Due to the unanimous objection of any lease of GSs to any third party by Government, there is a need to renegotiate all agreements between government via Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform and the Traditional Authorities instead of one party to this agreement, unilaterally decide to pass it on to any other party. It must be first discussed with TAs for an amicable solution and all existing MOU/MOA be amended or repealed accordingly.
- 15) Lack of adequate regulation for effective management of GSs.

10 CONCLUSION

After extensive consultation with all relevant stakeholders, it became clear that the Ministry needed to level the playing field for GSs run by GRN and those privately run. While the privately run GSs could operate freely and take the initiative and experience to increase their production capacity. The government run GSs were subjected to a non-functioning bureaucratic system introduced through Agribusdev wrong business module without due consideration of the consequences of their actions or non-action. The Committee learned that GSs can, not be run from Windhoek, taking into account the risk involved in farming and decisions that need to be taken without delays to save produce.

11 RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 The Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Land Reform to:

- 1) Provide a status update of the Liselo 1800 ha plot earmarked for Green Scheme in the Zambezi Region of which N\$ 40 million has been spent to date no activity has taken place, the plot remains idle and the fence vandalised.
- 2) To work on new strategies in dealing the high demand charges payments to Nored by Green Schemes by investing in renewable energy technologies.
- 3) To develop a strategy to address the lack of management and coordination experienced by Green Schemes.

- 4) To address the inconsistent funding experienced by Green Schemes GSs and delays in payment of bills as these severely affects the operations.
- 5) To put in place measures to ensure that assets at all Green Schemes are accounted by instituting annual stock taking and maintenance of farming equipment's to be done on time.
- 6) To address the losses incurred due to the ineffective Agribusdev business model at all GSs in relation to outstanding debts to Small Scale farmers.
- 7) To effect payment to seasonal workers at Green Schemes timeously.
- 8) To provide status of the abandoned dairy project, costs so far incurred and needed for completion of entire project.
- 9) Formalisation of a stakeholder engagement strategy and review of the current GSs policy to accommodate current needs and demands.

11.2 AMTA

To adopt new business model of decentralising operations of Green Schemes and secure markets for their produce and to subsidise the high transport costs to AMTA hubs.

12 MEMBERS SIGNATURES

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 1) Hon. Tjekero Tweya | : Chairperson |  |
| 2) Hon. Agnes Mpingana Kafula | : Deputy Chairperson |  |
| 3) Hon. Kletus Karondo | : Member |  |
| 4) Hon. Herlinde Lucia Tjiveze | : Member |  |
| 5) Hon. Paula Kooper | : Member |  |
| 5) Hon. Mike Venaani | : Member |  |
| 6) Hon. Nghidipo Lukas Hamata | : Member |  |
| 7) Hon. Maria Kamutali | : Member |  |
| 8) Hon. Annakletha Sikerete | : Member |  |
| 9) Hon. Johanna Kandjimi | : Member |  |

10) Hon. Dr. Tangeni C.K. : Member

11) Hon. Vincent Joseph Mareka : Member

12) Hon. Ephraim Nekongo : Member



