



FIXSA!

SINGLE-COMPANY EVIDENCE FILE · SPAZA SHOP SUPPORT FUND

Esona's R60,000 approval: the missing checks.

SEDFA's schedule records an approval on 26 May 2026. The public sources do not establish the applicant's status on that date or whether support was delivered.

Schedule file	012
Approval field	26 May 2026
Package field	R60,000
B2BHint match	K2021492111
Published	21 August 2026
Reviewed	24 August 2026

READ THE LIVE ARTICLE

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

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.

03



This finding compares SEDFA’s released schedule with B2BHint, a third-party public company directory. The status displayed on B2BHint does not establish Esona’s status on 26 May 2026, and the schedule’s R60,000 is a combined support-package value-not proof of cash payment or delivery. FixSA makes no allegation of wrongdoing.

Later reporting • 24 August 2026 Findings 04 examines the fuller 1,386-row schedule. This case note retains its original two-record comparison; the related-company check below covered the 162-row schedule and 109-row annexure. The wider schedule does not establish Esona’s approval-day status or delivery outcome. [Read Findings 04 ->](#)

What we found

The schedule records a R60,000 package under Esona’s exact name. B2BHint displays deregistration but supplies no effective date.

Why it matters

The directory cannot establish approval-day status. Registration may also be optional at this package level, so that display alone cannot settle eligibility.

The open question

What applicant identity and eligibility evidence did SEDFA accept on 26 May 2026, and what support was delivered?

Two public records

What SEDFA records. What B2BHint displays.

GOVERNMENT SCHEDULE 01

SEDFA’s disclosed row

Name	ESONA SPAZA SHOP
Approval date	26 May 2026
Province	Eastern Cape
District	O.R. Tambo
Municipality	Ngquza Hill
Total package	R60,000

The schedule defines the total as stock, a trading system, training and business-development support. It gives no enterprise number, application reference, verification result, delivery date or payment field.

Inspect the schedule

OPEN COMPANY DIRECTORY 02

B2BHint's public display

Name	ESONA SPAZA SHOP
Enterprise no.	K2021492111
Legal form	Private company
Incorporated	March 2021
Broad locality	Lusikisiki, Eastern Cape
Displayed status	Inactive; deregistered due to annual-return non-compliance

The page says “last updated 2 years ago” but gives no exact effective date for the displayed status. B2BHint describes CIPC as its source and separately warns that source data or its presentation may contain errors.

Inspect the public company page

IDENTITY Exact name match GEOGRAPHY Broad alignment B2BHint shows Lusikisiki; SEDFA's schedule shows “Ngquza Hill”. **APPROVAL-DATE STATUS Not disclosed**

A necessary distinction

The displayed deregistration status alone does not prove the application was ineligible on 26 May 2026.

The Fund's public criteria say CIPC registration is optional depending on the enterprise's funding requirement and required within six months for funding above R80,000. Esona's schedule row shows a R60,000 package.

That does not make the displayed status irrelevant. It changes the question: if CIPC registration was optional at this package level, which applicant identity, owner-management evidence, municipal registration, operating premises and permit did SEDFA accept?

FixSA finding

The approval-date evidence is missing.

B2BHint supplies no effective deregistration date. Its relative update label cannot establish Esona's status on 26 May 2026. The missing record is the dated applicant-identity and eligibility assessment used for that approval.

What dated company-status evidence did SEDFA use on the approval date?

Why the answer is missing

SEDFA withheld categories of records that could answer the central questions.

WITHHELD Individual scorecard

WITHHELD Due-diligence report

WITHHELD Risk assessment

WITHHELD Supporting application records

SEDFA's 7 August PAIA decision says access to individual evaluation files-including scorecards, assessment and due-diligence reports, financial and credit assessments, business plans, financial statements, risk assessments and applicant supporting documents-was refused under sections 34, 36 and 37. A privacy-safe outcome table could disclose criteria checked, dates, results, reason codes and delivery status without publishing the private files.

PACKAGE FIELD R60,000

Approval is not delivery

The released records do not show whether Esona received stock, a trading system, training or business support.

The disclosed row is an approval record with a combined package value. It contains no invoice, supplier record, delivery note, training attendance, disbursement line or current award status.

Five records. One answer.

SEDFA can make this approval auditable.

Publish the dated outcomes, not the private application file. Until then, File 012 remains an unresolved public-funding approval.

- 1 01 **The dated company-status record** What official status did SEDFA verify for the applicant on 26 May 2026, and what was the effective date of that status?
- 2 02 **The identity used in the application** Which legal identity and application reference were assessed under the name ESONA SPAZA SHOP?
- 3 03 **The shop, permit and site visit** Which Ngquza Hill trading site was inspected, when was the visit completed, and what municipal-registration or permit outcome was accepted?
- 4 04 **The approval decision** Which eligibility checks passed, under what delegated authority was the package approved, and was the decision later amended, suspended or cancelled?
- 5 05 **The delivery record** What stock, trading system, training and business-development support was actually delivered, on which dates, and at what final value?

Supporting check: the related-company search and its limits

Related-company check

One public officer link. No second exact fund-list match found.

B2BHint's public Esona page lists Cynthia Ntombencinci Mabovula as a director and links the same officer to Mabovula Holdings, enterprise number K2018367360. The directory displays current and historic same-name officer entries; FixSA treats them as one person-level lead, not two different people.

FixSA checked Mabovula Holdings against the 162-row SEDFA schedule and the 109-row September approval annexure. No second exact company-name or enterprise-number listing was identified. This does not establish that the related company never applied for or received support through another undisclosed list or trading name.

Inspect the related-company page

Inspect the evidence

Public sources used.

Every factual field in this finding is tied to an open page. FixSA excludes exact tax identifiers, private portal-only data, residential or unverified street addresses and contact details not independently presented as business-facing.

SEDFA beneficiary schedule · Esona appears in the first supplied image

SEDFA PAIA response · page 1 of the supplied copy

SEDFA PAIA decision · page 2 of the supplied copy

Esona Spaza Shop · open B2BHint company page

Mabovula Holdings · open B2BHint company page

B2BHint · South African data-source description

B2BHint · public disclaimer

Spaza Shop Support Fund · public eligibility criteria

Spaza Shop Support Fund · programme description

Government · national verification update, 29 May 2026

Ingquza Hill Local Municipality · municipal profile

Right of reply and corrections

FixSA invites Esona and SEDFA to provide the missing dates and records.

Documented responses and corrections can be sent to fixsaza@gmail.com. Verified material will be attributed and added to the evidence trail.

The released record does not make this R60,000 approval publicly auditable.

The exact-name match is strong. The broad location is consistent. B2BHint's displayed status raises a legitimate verification question. But only SEDFA can show what it verified on 26 May 2026 and what support, if any, was delivered. Until a dated, privacy-safe outcome record is released, the accountability gap remains with the agency.

[Open File 012 ->](#)