



# FIXSA!

SPAZA SHOP SUPPORT FUND · INTERIM EVIDENCE BRIEF

## The first 162 Spaza Fund records: R9.78 million, missing checks.

The original disclosure lists support packages and geographic inconsistencies, but not the assessments behind each approval.

|               |                                                          |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Published     | 13 August 2026                                           |
| Corrected     | 14 August 2026 · Esona and Pikwane registry comparisons  |
| Updated       | 24 August 2026 · later SEDFA programme snapshot          |
| Evidence base | PAIA response, official records and public-source checks |
| Status        | Interim-open to correction as stronger evidence appears  |

**READ THE LIVE ARTICLE**

<https://fixsa.co.za/findings/spaza-shop-fund>

Visit FixSA!: <https://fixsa.co.za>

Explore the Spaza Shop Fund Atlas: <https://sedfa.fixsa.co.za>

National symbols are included for civic context and do not imply government endorsement.

# 01

**Later reporting • 24 August 2026** This brief covers the original 162-row disclosure. Findings 04 examines a fuller 1,386-row schedule and reconciles its opening 162 rows with that disclosure. The figures and case-review counts below describe the earlier evidence set, not the whole programme. [Read Findings 04 ->](#)

## What we found

The first 162 approval records list R9,784,000 in support packages. Ninety-seven records are in KwaZulu-Natal.

## Why it matters

Names, locations and package values make the register inspectable. They do not show how each applicant was assessed.

## The open question

Which identities, premises, permits and eligibility outcomes did SEDFA verify before approving support?

01 / A partial window

## The visible R9.78 million is not the whole programme.

Government describes the fund as a R500 million initiative led jointly by the Department of Small Business Development and the Department of Trade, Industry and Competition, and implemented through SEDFA and the National Empowerment Fund. SEDFA's response to SACR says its responsibility was limited to a R150 million contribution.

The 162 packages represent about 6.5% of that R150 million contribution. This measures the disclosure we have; it is not a finding of underspending. A 29 May 2026 government update reported 2,369 approvals worth about R179.6 million across both agencies: 1,316 SEDFA approvals valued at R79.6 million and 1,053 NEF approvals valued at R99.9 million.

SEDFA's later snapshot, stated as at 31 July 2026, reports 5,327 applications received, 1,386 approvals and R83.9 million in approved support. It separately records R57 million disbursed to 930 shops. The snapshot itself supplies no recipient list. Findings 04 examines a fuller 1,386-row approval schedule and its reconciliation with these opening records.

**6.5% of SEDFA's stated contribution represented by the supplied schedule**

**02 / Geographic pattern**

# Almost six in ten visible beneficiaries are in KwaZulu-Natal.

KwaZulu-Natal accounts for 97 of the 162 records and R5.82 million of visible package value. Every province appears, but the schedule does not explain whether the concentration reflects application volumes, verification success, rollout timing or an incomplete extract.

The packages fall into three repeated values-R56,000, R60,000 and R65,000-which align consistently with province in this schedule. The released pages do not explain the basis for those differences.

**KwaZulu-Natal 97 R5,820,000**

**Northern Cape 12 R672,000**

**Western Cape 11 R715,000**

**Gauteng 11 R715,000**

**Limpopo 9 R585,000**

**Eastern Cape 9 R540,000**

**Mpumalanga 7 R392,000**

**Free State 5 R280,000**

**North West 1 R65,000**

**03 / The company checks**

# Public evidence supports some identities, but it does not complete the eligibility test.

Twenty-one files have been enriched with public-source evidence. Nine contain evidence supporting an identity, location or relevant operation. Twelve need answers because a key link remains unresolved or the visible activity, status or location needs explanation. The other 141 records remain first-pass files.

This is not a “real or fake” test. A legitimate company may operate a second site that is not visible online, while an eligible informal shop may have no web footprint. The test is whether the identity, inspected premises and published eligibility criteria can be tied to the award.

**9 evidence found**

**12 need answers**

**141 awaiting enriched review**

**The evidence so far**

# Twenty-one public-source case notes

These notes summarise the initial public-source checks. Open the evidence hub for individual profiles, source links and later checks.

## File 001 • Needs answers Nomasontho Spazashop

The disclosed geography is internally inconsistent. AbaQulusi is in Zululand District, KwaZulu-Natal-not Greater Sekhukhune, Limpopo.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 002 • Needs answers K2021003006 (SOUTH AFRICA)

The schedule publishes an enterprise number as the company name. Public searches did not reveal a reliable trading name or business activity.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 003 • Needs answers K2024730888 (SOUTH AFRICA)

The legal name remains unresolved and the disclosed district does not match the municipality: Breede Valley forms part of Cape Winelands, not Overberg.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 004 • Evidence found MAHLASELA FRUIT AND VEG MARKET

An exact-name company record shows an in-business private company registered in December 2024 at Nthorwane, Mpumalanga. The name, province and retail activity align with the award record.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 005 • Needs answers NTOMBILELE LEGACY

A substantial public footprint shows an active hospitality business at Tugela Mouth. An official bidder list separately records the legal name in a clothing-supply tender. No reviewed source connects the entity to a spaza shop.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 010 • Needs answers TANAMIE CONSORTIUM

Marine-industry directories list an exact-name Durban supplier. The uncommon name supports an identity lead, but the public activity and city do not establish a Maphumulo spaza operation.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 011 • Needs answers PRELIM LOGISTIX

Programme and directory records describe a trading business that became an internet café and supermarket. Public location descriptions differ from the Bushbuckridge location in the award schedule.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 012 • Needs answers ESONA SPAZA SHOP

CIPC and B2BHint now resolve the exact entity as K2021492111 and agree on its Lusikisiki locality and deregistration for annual-return non-compliance. The schedule's May 2026 approval requires an explanation of the status assessed at the time.

[Open the evidence file](#)

### **File 016 • Needs answers GAFFY TRADING**

An official sector-registration list contains the exact name and associates it with private security. The record supports an identity lead, but not a Hantam spaza operation.

[Open the evidence file](#)

### **File 021 • Evidence found SEBENZA TRADING SOLUTIONS**

An exact-name CIPC-derived record identifies an in-business Cape Town company. City-backed coverage independently places it in a food-and-beverage growth programme.

[Open the evidence file](#)

### **File 022 • Evidence found BONGANI OKUHLE TUCK SHOP**

An exact-name business listing places the shop in Jabavu, Soweto. It supports the disclosed activity and municipality, but not the legal identity or funding checks.

[Open the evidence file](#)

### **File 029 • Evidence found DASHISHI**

A public-radio profile describes a Northern Cape catering and supply company. This supports an operating food-business lead, while the exact Tsantsabane shop and legal registration remain unverified.

[Open the evidence file](#)

### **File 032 • Evidence found PARAFFIN CAFE EVENTS MANAGEMENT AND TOURISM**

An exact-name directory listing places the company in specialty food retail in Worcester, aligning with Breede Valley and a food-retail use of the fund.

[Open the evidence file](#)

### **File 035 • Evidence found BELLAROSA WIP PRODUCTIONS**

Multiple independent and first-party sources support an operating Mthatha poultry enterprise selling eggs and chicken to households, small retailers and spaza shops.

[Open the evidence file](#)

### **File 044 • Evidence found MAPOGO ZACHARIA MAMROBELA TRADINGS**

An exact-name directory result places the close corporation in retail trade at Gakgapane, consistent with Greater Letaba in Limpopo.

[Open the evidence file](#)

### **File 046 • Evidence found NAPOLI GENERAL TRADING**

An exact-name commercial directory entry places the company in wholesale trade in Kuruman, within Ga-Segonyana. It does not establish a customer-facing spaza shop.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 050 • Needs answers BJELE DREAMBUILDERS

Official National Arts Council records confirm the exact-name entity as a paid beneficiary for a musical project. They do not document a Newcastle spaza shop.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 086 • Evidence found MAKHETHA MARKET STORE

Independent reporting profiles a closely matching Soweto family store that began as a spaza shop and later converted to a Pick n Pay outlet. The legal entity is not disclosed.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 101 • Needs answers PIKWANE CORP

CIPC checked in August 2026 gives Kimberley, Northern Cape, while B2BHint's older public page gives Sandton, Gauteng. The schedule's Sol Plaatjie location aligns with the newer CIPC locality; the dated address change and funded shop remain unresolved.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 105 • Needs answers COOL OFF FARM

Official procurement registers confirm the exact incorporated name and food-supply bidding activity, but do not establish the Makhado spaza operation in the award schedule.

[Open the evidence file](#)

## File 160 • Needs answers VLAVD CAPITAL SOLUTIONS

An official energy-department record shows an exact-name entity received a KwaZulu-Natal wholesale petroleum licence. No reliable reviewed source documents a Ndwedwe spaza operation.

[Open the evidence file](#)

04 / Records requiring explanation

# Several entries cannot be reconciled from the published information alone.

The clearest source-level inconsistencies are geographic: Nomasontho Spazashop is placed in Limpopo and Greater Sekhukhune but lists AbaQulusi municipality in KwaZulu-Natal; K2024730888 is placed in Overberg but lists Breede Valley, part of Cape Winelands. Other checks found visible business activities or locations that differ from the award description.

These are reasons to request underlying records, not proof that an award was improper. A company can have more than one activity or site, and the schedule may contain administrative errors.

“Needs answers” means the public record is incomplete or inconsistent. It is not a finding of fraud, ineligibility or wrongdoing.

## SEDFA released the register but withheld the files that would settle the central questions.

The response was granted in part and refused in part. SEDFA withheld individual scorecards, due-diligence and risk reports, credit assessments, business plans, financial statements and supporting application documents, citing sections 34, 36 and 37 of PAIA.

The schedule states that personal-capacity applicants were redacted with “xxx” for PAIA compliance. The supplied material contains only pages 1 and 2 of a nine-page response, plus two images of beneficiary tables.

- 1 A machine-readable, complete beneficiary register.
- 2 The legal identity behind each trading name.
- 3 The inspected premises and municipality.
- 4 Permit, ownership and operating-verification outcomes.
- 5 The reasons for province-linked package values.
- 6 Corrections for inconsistent geography.

What PAIA still allows

06 / Challenging the refusal

## The exemptions protect particular information-not necessarily whole files.

Sections 34, 36 and 37 cannot simply be cancelled. The decision can, however, be challenged if SEDFA applied them too broadly, did not establish the required harm, or withheld portions that could have been released after redaction.

### Read the PAIA access guide: exemptions, remedies and timing

#### Separate and disclose

PAIA requires every reasonably severable, non-protected part of a record to be disclosed. Identity numbers, home addresses, bank details and genuinely confidential business material can be removed while eligibility outcomes, scores, reasons and verification results are released.

#### Prove the exemption

Section 34 concerns unreasonable disclosure of personal information about natural people. Section 36 requires likely commercial harm or competitive disadvantage. SEDFA cited section 37(1)(b), a discretionary ground that also requires likely prejudice to the future supply of information and a public interest in preserving that supply.

## Apply the public-interest override

Protected information must still be disclosed where it would reveal evidence of a substantial failure to comply with the law and the public interest clearly outweighs the protected harm. The geographic contradictions and government's own verification figures provide specific issues to investigate, but general suspicion alone is not enough.

### The route capable of compelling access

- 1 **01 Ask SEDFA to reconsider.** Demand record-by-record reasons, proof of the claimed harm, confirmation of any third-party notices, and redacted disclosure under sections 25(3), 28, 36(2), 37(1)(b), 46 and 47-49.
- 2 **02 Complain to the Information Regulator.** Use PAIA Form 5 and attach the original request, the complete response, correspondence, the beneficiary schedule and the documented inconsistencies. The Regulator can set aside the decision or require SEDFA to act through an enforcement notice.
- 3 **03 Apply to court under section 78.** After the applicable Regulator process is exhausted, a court can inspect the withheld records, set the refusal aside and order disclosure. Under section 81(3), the party defending the refusal carries the burden of showing that it complies with PAIA.

A narrower request is stronger Ask for verification outcomes, not private raw data. Redacted assessment scorecards and reasonsPass, fail or verified result for each eligibility criterionMunicipal permit status and verification dateSite-visit date, outcome and operating municipalityLegal entity name and CIPC number where applicableApproval decision, conditions and due-diligence conclusionAn index identifying each withheld record and exact subsection used

SEDFA appears to be an “other public body”, rather than a national or provincial department or municipality, so an internal PAIA appeal appears not to apply. The remedies page of the complete nine-page response should still be checked. A complaint normally must reach the Information Regulator within 180 days of receipt of the decision. If it was received on 7 August 2026, the calculated deadline is **3 February 2027**; the actual receipt date controls.

The most useful comparison is *Joseph v Head, Department of Social Development Gauteng*, where broad reliance on commercial sensitivity did not justify withholding public-grant records. The Supreme Court of Appeal has also stressed that exemption claims and section 46 arguments must be tied to evidence about the particular records, not general allegations. [Read Eskom v AfriForum](#)

### Read the record

## Primary and official sources

The individual evidence files in the atlas link the additional company-level sources used for each case note.

[SEDFA response · page 1 of 9](#)

[SEDFA decision · page 2 of 9](#)

[Beneficiary schedule · image 1](#)

[Beneficiary schedule · image 2](#)

[Joint government update · 29 May 2026](#)

[SEDFA programme-impact snapshot · as at 31 July 2026](#)

[Parliamentary reply 2400](#)

[Official SSSF eligibility presentation](#)

[Promotion of Access to Information Act 2 of 2000](#)

[Information Regulator · PAIA Form 5](#)

[Information Regulator · guide to using PAIA](#)

[Joseph v Head, Department of Social Development Gauteng](#)

[Eskom v AfriForum · Supreme Court of Appeal](#)

[CIPC BizProfile company search](#)

[Esona Spaza Shop · from B2BHint](#)

[Pikwane Corp · from B2BHint](#)

**Interim conclusion**

## The disclosure creates leads, not verdicts.

The evidence shows a real national programme, a partial 162-record schedule, a strong geographic concentration and a mixture of convincing operating footprints, unresolved identities and apparent record inconsistencies. It does not yet show whether every beneficiary passed the full assessment.

[Inspect the atlas](#)

[Read Findings 02 ->](#)