

**NATIONAL ASSEMBLY  
WRITTEN REPLY**

**QUESTION 640  
FRIDAY, 15 MARCH 2024**

**640. Mr N S Matiase (EFF) to ask the Minister of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development: [★205] [Question submitted for oral reply now placed for written reply because it is more than quota (Rule 137(8))].**

Whether her department conducted any study to determine full details of tangible changes in the levels of (a) household income and (b) employment as a result of land restitution comparing pre and post transfer period; if not, why not; if so; what are the relevant details of the findings?**NW769E**

**THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE, LAND REFORM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT:**

- (a) (b) No, The Land Restitution Evaluation Study (LRES) did not address this question. The primary objective of the study was to measure the impact of restitution awards on the beneficiaries' well-being. The conference that the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights (CRLR), is organising in April 2024 will discuss this question.

**BACKGROUND**

1. In 2013/14 it was agreed that an Impact Evaluation study be conducted to measure the impact of the Land Restitution Programme.
2. The Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit (SALDRU) of the University of Cape Town (UCT) was eventually appointed by 3ie and DRDLR to undertake the study referred to the LRES. The LRES is the first effort to quantify the impacts of the forms of restitution.
3. A grant agreement between SALDRU and 3ie was signed on 6 December 2016 and a service level agreement (SLA) between SALDRU (UCT) and the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD) was signed on 2 March 2017.
4. The primary aim of the study was to evaluate the efficacy of the compensation scheme as a mechanism to sustainably improve the economic position of beneficiaries. A further knowledge gap the study sought to address was the impact of and on the aspirational/ psychological outcomes, noting the restorative justice outcome of Land Restitution.
5. Notably, improved aspirational/psychological outcomes might operate as catalysts for positive economic decision making, suggesting that a rationale based on restorative justice cannot easily be separated from economic fundamentals

6. The overarching question was to ascertain whether once off transfers – cash or land transfers may be a cost-effective way of initiating a virtuous cycle of accumulation and growth in living standards.
7. The data was collected and analysed, and the impacts estimated for their economic, psychological and cognitive well-being.

## **DISCUSSION**

8. The impact study took about 6 years to complete cognisant of the COVID-19 pandemic which resulted in the reconfiguration of the study in keeping with research processes. The study sample included 3735 individuals, across 2646 households and 505 claims. A hybrid methodology was employed – a qualitative and quantitative study.
9. The delay of the study was also due to some technical and operational challenges which were addressed by a steering committee comprising of all role-players - CRLR, DPME, DALRRD and the International Initiative for Impact Evaluations (3ie) an organisation specialising in impact evaluations. The overall cost of the study was 25 million and the main findings are:
  10. Large awards have large impacts: whether in cash or the value of the land rights conferred, large restitution awards cause sustained improvements to beneficiary well-being.
  11. Economic well-being: mean per-capita consumption is estimated to be 25-26% higher for household that receive restitution awards or value in land above R200 000, compared to households that receive R25 000.
  12. Psychological well-being: The risk for depression decreases by 10% for individuals that receive restitution awards) or value in land rights) of R250 000, compared to households that receive R25 000.
13. The study points to the notion that large magnitude transfers, whether in cash or land rights causes sustained improvements to beneficiary well-being i.e., both economic well-being and psychological well-being.
14. Further, the findings for large awards amounts afford stakeholders a platform to formalise an operational definition of “equitable redress”, noting that there are sizable impacts of settlements awards that are more or less the same as the standard settlement offer.

**END**