



FIXSA!

SPAZA SHOP SUPPORT FUND · PUBLIC-SOURCE FIELDWORK

Tracing Spaza Fund businesses.

Public sources reveal operating businesses, sector differences and conflicting locations. The missing link is the evidence tying each business to its award.

Published	14 August 2026
Updated	24 August 2026
Evidence base	Approval snapshots, parliamentary briefings and oversight, open government records, company websites, reporting and public directories
Publication rule	No private portal records or personal information

READ THE LIVE ARTICLE

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

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.

02

Later reporting • 24 August 2026 The company comparisons below use the original 162-row schedule and the separate 109-row September annexure. Findings 04 reports on the fuller 1,386-row schedule and wider cross-checks. A ‘no match’ result here applies only to the lists checked in this article. [Read Findings 04 ->](#)

What we found

Some listed names lead to credible operating businesses. Others lead to different sectors, uncertain locations or no reliable public match.

Why it matters

A business’s existence, its trading activity and its link to an approved award are three different questions. An absent web footprint is not evidence of failure.

The open question

Can SEDFA connect each award to a verified applicant, inspected shop and recorded eligibility decision?

01 / How we tested a name

Identity, operation and award are three different questions.

The SEDFA schedule frequently gives only a shop or entity name. We treated that name as a lead, not a conclusion. A useful match needed more than spelling: it needed corroborating geography, relevant activity and a dated source.

Even a strong public match cannot show what SEDFA saw during an inspection. The permit, ownership record, assessed premises and decision score remain inside the withheld application file.

Where B2BHint publishes an exact enterprise profile, the atlas now shows a source-attributed public company file: summary fields, business-contact availability, officer roles, beneficial-ownership availability, a tax-registration signal and related-company traces. FixSA withholds exact tax identifiers, private portal-only fields, residential or unverified street addresses and contact details that are not independently presented as business-facing.

At this stage, five profiles had received the expanded public-source review. Nine related-company names were checked against the 162-row schedule and the 109-row September annexure; no second exact listing was identified. That is a bounded dataset result, not proof that another application or payment never existed.

Is the name distinctive and consistently linked across reliable sources?

Is there dated evidence of real trading activity in the relevant area?

Can that operation be tied to the premises and criteria used for support?

Eight public traces worth following

These records have accessible evidence supporting an operation, relevant activity or local business lead. The strength is not equal, and none completes SEDFA's eligibility test.

File 035 Strong operating trace

Bellarosa WIP Productions

A company website and independent foundation profile describe a Mthatha poultry enterprise selling eggs and chicken to households, retailers and spaza shops. The open question is whether the funded activity was its own retail point or its supply operation.

[Open the evidence file](#)

File 086 Strong operating trace

Makhetha Market Store

Independent reporting describes a closely matching Soweto family grocery store that began as a spaza shop and later converted into a Pick n Pay outlet. The award record still needs to be tied to the reported premises.

[Open the evidence file](#)

File 021 Relevant activity

Sebenza Trading Solutions

City-backed economic-development coverage places the exact name in a Cape Town food-and-beverage growth programme. That supports relevant activity and geography, but not the particular shop inspection.

[Open the evidence file](#)

File 029 Relevant activity

Dashishi

A public-radio business profile describes a Northern Cape catering and supply company. It is meaningful operating evidence, although the specific Tsantsabane retail site remains unverified.

[Open the evidence file](#)

File 011 Operating trace

Prelim Logistix

A small-business programme profile describes a community internet café that later became part of a supermarket. Public location descriptions do not settle whether this was the Bushbuckridge premises assessed for support.

[Open the evidence file](#)

File 032 Directory lead

Paraffin Cafe Events Management and Tourism

An exact-name public directory entry places the business in specialty food retail in Worcester. The activity and broad location align, while the legal identity, permit and assessed premises remain open.

[Open the evidence file](#)

File 044 Directory lead

Mapogo Zacharia Mamorobela Tradings

An exact-name directory result places a business in retail trade at Gakgapane, consistent with Greater Letaba. A directory entry cannot establish the award recipient or its eligibility on its own.

[Open the evidence file](#)

File 046 Directory lead

Napoli General Trading

A commercial directory places the name in wholesale trade in Kuruman, within Ga-Segonyana. This supports a local business lead, but does not document a customer-facing spaza shop.

[Open the evidence file](#)

A visible business-just not the expected one

02 / Pattern two

Six sector differences that need an award-level explanation.

Ntombilele Legacy

The visible footprint concerns accommodation at Tugela Mouth, while an official bidder list records the name in a clothing-supply tender. Neither source documents the spaza premises assessed by SEDFA.

Tanamie Consortium

Marine-industry directories describe an exact-name supplier. The record does not establish the Maphumulo grocery or spaza operation shown in the funding schedule.

Gaffy Trading

An official sector-registration list associates the exact name with private-security activity. A separate retail operation is possible, but is not established by the released records.

Bjele Dreambuilders

National Arts Council records show the exact name as a paid beneficiary for a musical project. That is context-not evidence of wrongdoing-and it does not document a Newcastle shop.

Cool Off Farm

Official bid registers show participation in public procurement, including food supply. Appearance in a bid register is not proof of winning a contract and does not establish the Makhado retail premises.

VLAVD Capital Solutions

An official energy record concerns a KwaZulu-Natal wholesale petroleum licence. No reliable reviewed source documents the Ndwedwe spaza operation.

Different does not mean disqualified. A business may operate multiple sites or divisions. These records justify a question to SEDFA: which shop, premises and retail activity did the application establish?

03 / Pattern three

Sometimes the contradiction is already inside the government schedule.

Nomasontho Spazashop is recorded under Limpopo and Greater Sekhukhune, but the same row names AbaQulusi municipality in KwaZulu-Natal. K2024730888 is recorded under Overberg District while naming Breede Valley municipality, which falls under Cape Winelands.

These may be capture errors rather than assessment failures. But without the inspected address and municipality, readers cannot tell which location SEDFA actually verified.

A public register should be internally consistent before citizens are asked to trust its conclusions.

04 / The silence problem

No search result is not a verdict.

Many township and rural businesses trade without a website, a formal map listing or searchable media coverage. Some operate under the proprietor's name, while a storefront uses a local trading name. Spelling and punctuation also vary.

For that reason, FixSA labels a profile “not publicly verified” rather than “fake”. The burden remains on the funding agencies to keep the identity and inspection evidence-not on a small shop to build an internet footprint.

Search can discover evidence. It cannot manufacture certainty where the underlying government record is incomplete.

What would settle these profiles

Release outcomes, not private raw files.

SEDFA can protect identity numbers, home addresses, bank details and genuinely confidential business material while still showing how each public-money decision was made.

¹ **01 Verified identity** The legal entity or proprietor identity used for the award, with protected personal fields removed.

- 2 02 **Inspected operation** The trading municipality, site-visit date and whether the shop was operating.
- 3 03 **Criteria outcomes** Pass, fail or verified results for permits, ownership and the programme's published requirements.
- 4 04 **Decision reason** A redacted score, approval reason and any conditions attached to support.

Supporting records: the 109-row annexure and programme timeline

Newly public evidence · PMG Annexure B

One approval list adds 109 application references.

The two-page document is titled SSSF List · Approvals - 26 Sept 2025 . Its amount column is explicitly labelled "Amount Applied for", so the figures should not be described as money paid or disbursed without further records.

109 approval-list rows

R4,183,653 document total · amount applied for

31 names matched to the original 162-record FixSA schedule

A new public row to follow

Kitchen 4 All and Tuckshop

Province	Gauteng
Amount applied for	R40,000
List date	26 September 2025

The exact disclosed name appears on an SSSF approval list with a public application reference, province and amount applied for.

No legal entity number, municipality, trading premises, operating evidence, permit outcome or payment status appears in this row. A web search did not produce a reliable independent source tying the name to an operating Gauteng shop.

[Open the full public annexure](#)

A disclosure timeline-not one complete list

The programme grew faster than the public beneficiary record.

Each source uses a different date and money field. "Amount applied for", "approved value" and "package value" must remain separate. None, on its own, proves payment.

The public annexure. Thirty-one names match FixSA's 162-row schedule exactly.

A parliamentary briefing recorded 2,726 submitted applications and continuing verification work.

The joint government update recorded 1,316 SEDFA approvals and 1,053 NEF approvals.

SEDFA separately recorded 5,327 applications, R57 million disbursed and 930 shops supported. This is a SEDFA-only snapshot, not a new combined national total.

What this changes: the 109-row annexure and the 162-row SEDFA schedule are partial, dated views. They cannot be treated as the full programme population.

Snapshot reviewed · 24 August 2026

The July snapshot separates approvals from disbursements.

As at 31 July, SEDFA reported 5,327 applications received, 1,386 approvals and R83.9 million in approved support-70 approvals and R4.3 million above its part of the 29 May snapshot.

The same graphic separately records R57 million disbursed to 930 shops. “Approved support” and “disbursed” are different stages and should not be merged.

The May snapshot covers SEDFA and the NEF together; the July snapshot covers SEDFA only. Approved support and disbursements describe different stages. For the fuller 1,386-row schedule and row-level reconciliation, read Findings 04.

[Open SEDFA's official snapshot](#)

Supporting context: parliamentary oversight and delivery claims

New evidence · Parliamentary oversight

The application file is not the only missing link. Monitoring was, too.

A Portfolio Committee report on its Eastern Cape visit, dated 25 March 2026, documents weaknesses in licensing, location verification and post-investment monitoring. These are system findings; they do not establish wrongdoing by any named beneficiary.

Licensing bottleneck

The report says only 18,722 of 81,039 registered shops were fully licensed, using the Committee's figures and wording.

Permit verification risk

Officials raised concerns about forged municipal permits and licences while describing slow verification.

Missing location proof

The Committee noted a lack of confirmed project locations and recommended GPS coordinates for every application.

Weak monitoring

The report says municipalities were often unaware of funded projects and records serious concerns about post-investment monitoring.

[Another document attached to the PMG meeting](#)

CoGTA recorded 14,060 geo-mapped businesses.

Its 12 November 2025 presentation also recorded 82,924 registration or licensing applications from July to September and 15,528 approvals during that window. These are regulatory-system figures-not SSSF funding approvals. CoGTA described manual municipal processing and staff shortages.

[Open the presentation](#)

One visited shop confirms support-but under the older programme.

The Committee visited Oyisa Amanyamadoda, confirmed an operating shop and recorded R10,500 received under the Covid-era Spaza Shop Support Programme. The report describes her as a candidate for the current SSSF, not as proof of a current SSSF award.

Protea Glen Extension 29, Gauteng

A delivery trace outside the 162-row schedule.

SEDFA publicly identified founder Thomas Chauke as an SSSF beneficiary and said he received business training and stock support. The name does not appear in FixSA's 162-row schedule. No application reference, amount or payment record was included, so the case should remain a separate programme trace rather than being inserted into that register.

[Open SEDFA's public profile](#)

Location not disclosed

A second delivery claim outside the disclosed lists.

SEDFA says Decate Mkhonto reported that SSSF assistance helped the business move from stock shortages and declining customers toward greater stability. No exact match for the person or trading name appears in FixSA's 162-row schedule or the 109-row September annexure. The post supplies no amount, approval date, application reference, legal-entity number, location or payment record. FixSA therefore records it as an official delivery claim-not a verified disbursement or beneficiary-register match.

[Open the official SEDFA post](#)

[How support was designed to move](#)

Public programme documents describe a controlled stock-delivery chain.

The DSBD programme guide describes a stock grant for initial purchases through a delivery-channel partner.

Assets and infrastructure were described as blended grant-and-loan support, alongside up to R10,000 in non-financial support.

The NEF's public RFP proposed delivery-channel partners, centralised procurement, distribution coordination and traceable payment systems.

These documents explain the intended design. They do not establish that every approved shop received stock, that every transaction followed the model, or that post-investment checks occurred.

[Read the evidence](#)

Public sources used in this finding

Every link below was accessible without using FixSA's restricted research archive. Additional sources remain attached to the individual atlas profiles.

View all 37 public sources

[SEDFA beneficiary schedule · image 1](#)
[SEDFA beneficiary schedule · image 2](#)
[PMG · SSSF approvals to 26 September 2025 \(Annexure B\)](#)
[PMG · Portfolio Committee meeting record, 12 November 2025](#)
[PMG · dtic / SSSF presentation](#)
[PMG · CoGTA registration and geo-mapping presentation](#)
[Parliament · Eastern Cape oversight report, dated 25 March 2026](#)
[Parliament · Eastern Cape oversight visit media alert](#)
[DSBD · 2026 programme guide](#)
[NEF · RFP 03/2025/26 bulk inventory and delivery-channel model](#)
[Government · joint SSSF update, 29 May 2026](#)
[SEDFA · programme-impact snapshot as at 31 July 2026](#)
[Parliament · 930 SEDFA disbursements and control assurances](#)
[SEDFA · Decate Mkhonto delivery claim, 22 August 2026](#)
[SEDFA · official public updates](#)
[Government · June SSSF outreach update](#)
[SAnews · current SSSF application guide, 23 July 2026](#)
[B2BHint · South African registry sources and coverage](#)
[B2BHint · attribution and reuse terms](#)
[Mahlasela Fruit and Veg Market · from B2BHint](#)
[Esona Spaza Shop · from B2BHint](#)
[Sebenza Trading Solutions · from B2BHint](#)
[Bellarosa WIP Productions · from B2BHint](#)
[Pikwane Corp · from B2BHint](#)
[Bellarosa company profile](#)
[Bellarosa independent entrepreneur profile](#)
[Makhetha's Market · Business Day](#)
[Sebenza · Invest Cape Town](#)
[Dashishi · SAfm profile](#)

[Prelim Logistix · Fetola alumni profile](#)

[Ntomb'lele Legacy Group](#)

[Ntombilele Legacy · Treasury bidder list](#)

[Tanamie Consortium · marine supplier catalogue](#)

[Gaffy Trading · security-sector register](#)

[Bjele Dreambuilders · NAC paid beneficiaries](#)

[Cool Off Farm · perishable-provisions bid register](#)

[VLAVD Capital Solutions · petroleum licence record](#)

Finding 02 · Conclusion

Follow the evidence. Leave room for the answer.

The public record contains credible businesses, unresolved links and real inconsistencies. The fair response is neither automatic trust nor automatic suspicion. It is a demand for the redacted assessment evidence behind each award.

[Inspect the profiles](#)

[Read Findings 01 ->](#)