



DEPARTMENT OF  
WATER AFFAIRS  
AND FORESTRY

# Feasibility Study for the Raising of Clanwilliam Dam

## Financial Viability of Irrigation Farming



Final  
February 2009

I:\hydro\400415Clanwilliam Dam\Graphics - Covers & CD covers - Study reports - Feb 2009.cdr



NINHAM SHAND  
CONSULTING SERVICES



JAKOET &  
ASSOCIATES





DEPARTMENT OF WATER AFFAIRS AND FORESTRY  
DIRECTORATE OPTIONS ANALYSIS

## FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE RAISING OF THE CLANWILLIAM DAM

### FINANCIAL VIABILITY OF IRRIGATION FARMING

**Final**

**February 2009**

*Prepared by:*

Prof. Johann Laubscher  
Dagbreek Str 11  
Onder-Papegaaiberg  
Stellenbosch  
7600  
South Africa

Tel: 021-887 0584  
Fax: (088) 021-887 0584  
e-mail: [jl45@telkomsa.net](mailto:jl45@telkomsa.net)

*Prepared for:*

Director: Options Analysis  
Department of Water Affairs and Forestry  
Private Bag X313  
Pretoria  
South Africa

Tel: 012 – 336 8321  
Fax: 012 – 338 8295  
e-mail: [icb@dwaf.gov.za](mailto:icb@dwaf.gov.za)

This report is to be referred to in bibliographies as:

Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa. 2009. *Financial Viability of irrigation Farming*. Prepared by Prof J Laubscher, as part of the Feasibility Study for the Raising of Clanwilliam Dam. DWAF Report No. P WMA 17/E10/00/1609.

Department of Water Affairs and Forestry  
Directorate Options Analysis

**FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE RAISING OF THE CLANWILLIAM DAM**

**APPROVAL**

**Title** : Financial Viability of Irrigation Farming

**DWAF Report No.** : P WMA 17/E10/00/1609

**NS Report No.** : 4427/400414

**Author** : Prof. Johann Laubscher

**Status of Report** : Final

**Date** : February 2009

---

**STUDY TEAM** : **Approved for the Clanwilliam Dam Raising Association by:**

.....  
*E VAN DER BERG*  
*Study Leader*

.....  
*M J SHAND*  
*Study Director*

---

**DEPARTMENT OF WATER AFFAIRS AND FORESTRY**

Directorate Options Analysis

**Approved for Department of Water Affairs and Forestry by:**

.....  
*A D BROWN*  
*Study Manager*

.....  
*L S MABUDA*  
*Director: OA*

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

This report deals with the evaluation of the financial viability of existing irrigation farming as well as the envisaged expansion of irrigation farming in relevant regions of the Olifants River system in the Western Cape Province, that may utilise additional irrigation water, following the potential raising of the Clanwilliam Dam. The envisioned expansion of irrigation farming addresses the option of the expansion of existing irrigation farms as well as the developing of new irrigation farms. The production possibilities and the accompanying irrigation water requirements that were used in the financial viability analysis are based on the findings of soil and crop-experts regarding appropriate enterprises (refer to the relevant report by Lambrechts, Schloms and Ellis). Appropriate information about the costs of the additional irrigation water originating from the envisaged enlargement of the Clanwilliam Dam, were supplied by the engineering component of the study team (refer to the relevant report by Ninham Shand, Consulting Engineers). The financial analyses were done at constant 2005/06 price levels. Typical farming situations were modelled for each of the regions of the study area, with the assistance of leading farmers and other industry experts. It is assumed that the financial results that are associated with the typical farming models of each region will also apply to the total irrigated area of that region. It is further assumed that the managerial inputs on each of the typical farms in the different regions of the study area will be optimal.

The financial viability of irrigation farming is evaluated with the aid of a computer model and by applying the following decision-making criteria, namely:

- profitability
  - \* internal rate of return (IRR) on capital employed in real terms
  
- affordability
  - \* expected cash-flow and break-even year at different own-to-loaned capital ratio's
  
- relative "efficiency" of the utilisation of irrigation water
  - \* annuity of the net financial benefits per m<sup>3</sup> irrigation water applied
  - \* number of jobs created per 1000 m<sup>3</sup> of irrigation water applied

The results of the financial viability analysis about existing irrigation farming and the envisaged irrigation developments in the different regions of the study area are presented in **Tables ES1, ES2 and ES3**.

**Table ES1 Financial viability of existing irrigation farming in the study area**

Scenario/Region	Water Need (m <sup>3</sup> /ha)	Evaluation Criteria						Jobs/1000 m <sup>3</sup> Water (number)
		IRR *	NPV/ha **	Annuity/m <sup>3</sup> Water ***	Break Even Year****			
					Equity at: 80%	Equity at: 60%	Equity at: 40%	
Citrusdal Citrus farm	11,380	4.55%	(19,684)	0.05	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.05
Clanwilliam Citrus farm	9,177	7.54%	20,575	0.33	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.06
Melkboom/Trawal Mixed farm	9,495	1.99%	(54,416)	(0.20)	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.03
Melkboom/Trawal table grape farm	13,580	34.44%	607,371	3.31	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.10
Klawer/Vredendal Mixed farm	9,197	10.34%	46,490	0.51	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.03
Klawer/Vredendal table grape farm	13,580	9.57%	107,643	0.86	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.10

\* Internal rate of return (in real terms) on capital investment.

\*\* Net present value at a real discounting rate of 4% per year, (i.e. 10% nominal interest per year at a yearly inflation rate of, say, 6%).

\*\*\* Annuity of the net benefits per m<sup>3</sup> irrigation water applied at a real discounting rate of 4% per year.

\*\*\*\* At a real loan interest rate of 4% per year, i.e. 10% nominal interest per year.

**Table ES2 Financial viability of the proposed expansion of existing irrigation farms in the study area**

Scenario/Region	Water Need (m <sup>3</sup> /ha)	Evaluation Criteria						Jobs/1000 m <sup>3</sup> Water (number)
		IRR *	NPV/ha **	Annuity/m <sup>3</sup> Water ***	Break Even Year****			
					Equity at: 80%	Equity at: 60%	Equity at: 40%	
Citrusdal citrus farm expansion	11,380	3.19%	(65,846)	(0.11)	06/07	06/07	> 40 Years	0.05
Clanwilliam citrus farm expansion	8,870	6.38%	6,118	0.28	13/14	15/16	17/18	0.06
Melkboom/Trawal mixed farm expansion	9,378	5.42%	(8,594)	0.15	12/13	19/20	22/23	0.04
Melkboom/Trawal table grape expansion	13,580	28.76%	685,269	3.79	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.09
Klawer/Vredendal mixed farm expansion	9,106	10.26%	48,479	0.53	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.03
Klawer/Vredendal table grape expansion	13,037	11.24%	189,645	1.38	11/12	12/13	12/13	0.10

\* Internal rate of return (in real terms) on capital investment.

\*\* Net present value at a real discounting rate of 4% per year, i.e. 10% nominal interest per year at a yearly inflation rate of, say, 6%.

\*\*\* Annuity of the net benefits per m<sup>3</sup> irrigation water applied at a real discounting rate of 4% per year.

\*\*\*\* At a real loan interest rate of 4% per year, i.e. 10% nominal interest per year.

**Table ES3 Financial viability of the envisaged new irrigation farms in the study area**

Scenario/Region	Water Need (m <sup>3</sup> /ha)	Evaluation Criteria						Jobs/1000 m <sup>3</sup> Water (number)
		IRR *	NPV/ha **	Annuity/m <sup>3</sup> Water ***	Break Even Year****			
					Equity at: 80%	Equity at: 60%	Equity at: 40%	
Citrusdal new Citrus farm	11,380	1.42%	(240,432)	(0.80)	> 40 Years	> 40 Years	> 40 Years	0.05
Clanwilliam new Citrus farm	8,870	4.19%	(58,010)	0.05	32/33	36/37	39/40	0.05
Melkboom/Trawal new mixed farm	9,378	Negative	(113,563)	(0.53)	> 40 Years	> 40 Years	> 40 Years	0.04
Melkboom/Trawal new table grape farm	13,580	11.05%	338,574	2.38	15/16	15/16	16/17	0.09
Klawer/Vredendal new mixed farm	9,106	4.93%	(22,452)	0.15	>40 years	>40 years	>40 years	0.03
Klawer/Vredendal new table grape farm	13,580	5.24%	(44,479)	0.37	19/20	21/22	23/24	0.09

\* Internal rate of return (in real terms) on capital investment.

\*\* Net present value at a real discounting rate of 4% per year, (i.e. 10% nominal interest per year at a yearly inflation rate of, say, 6%).

\*\*\* Annuity of the net benefits per m<sup>3</sup> irrigation water applied at a real discounting rate of 4% per year.

\*\*\*\* At a real loan interest rate of 4% per year, i.e. 10% nominal interest per year.



As far as the profitability criterion is concerned, an IRR of at least 4% per year in real terms (*i.e.* an IRR of 10% per year in nominal terms at an inflation rate of, say, 6% per year) can be seen as a benchmark. At a benchmark IRR of 10% per year in nominal terms (*i.e.* an IRR of 4% per year in real terms at an inflation rate of, say, 6% per year) the following irrigation farming situations that were analysed, seem to be financially viable:

### Existing irrigation farming

Klawer/Vredendal region:

Mixed farming, *i.e.* wine grapes and tomatoes (real IRR of 10.34 % per year)

Table grape farming (real IRR of 9.57% per year)

Melkboom/Trawal region:

Table grape farming (real IRR of 34.44% per year)

Clanwilliam region:

Citrus farming with potatoes (real IRR of 7.54 % per year)

Citrusdal region:

Citrus farming (real IRR of 4.55 % per year)

### Expansion of existing irrigation farming

Klawer/Vredendal region:

Mixed farming, *i.e.* wine grapes and tomatoes (real IRR of 10.26 % per year)

Table grape farming (real IRR of 11.24% per year).

Melkboom/Trawal region:

Mixed farming, *i.e.* wine grapes and tomatoes (real IRR of 5.42% per year)

Table grape farming (real IRR of 28.76% per year)

Clanwilliam region:

Citrus farming with potatoes (real IRR of 6.38% per year)

### New irrigation farms

Melkboom/Trawal region:

Table grape farming (real IRR of 11.05% per year)

Clanwilliam region:

Citrus farming with potatoes (real IRR of 4.19% per year)

Klawer/Vredendal region:

New mixed farm, *i.e.* wine grapes and tomatoes (real IRR of 4.93% per year)

New table grape farm (real IRR of 5.24% per year)

It is clear from the financial analysis that, given the assumptions made, existing irrigation farming is quite profitable in the relevant regions of the study area. The main contributing factors in this regard are, *inter alia*:

- ❖ well developed and well managed farms
- ❖ sound supporting marketing structures for produce
- ❖ sound profitability levels for the major farming branches due to efficient farming practices and favourable price levels for produce
- ❖ the availability of affordable irrigation water (at R1 925 per listed hectare under irrigation)

Farming practices in the relevant regions of the study area are relatively capital intensive. It seems that it will be more viable to expand existing farms than to develop new irrigation farms. The typical mixed farming situation in the Melkboom/Trawal region is at present under financial stress (*i.e.* a real IRR of 1.99 % per year). Possible contributing factors to this finding are, *inter alia*:

- ❖ relatively small farms (i.e. 35 ha relative to 60 ha in Klawer/Vredendal) and thus the negative impact of higher unit overhead costs
- ❖ a decline in prices as far as the main enterprise, i.e. wine grapes is concerned.

The analysis shows further that an expansion of the mixed farming situation in Melkboom/Trawal to 50 ha should lead to increased profitability (i.e. a real IRR of 5.42 % per year).

The expansion of table grape farming in the Melkboom/Trawal region seems to be the most viable option from a financial point of view. It also seems to be a viable option to expand existing citrus farms in the Clanwilliam region in combination with potato production. Year cropping (i.e. potato production in this case) can have a considerable positive effect on the cash flow of farms. Farmers in the Clanwilliam area have sound experience and thus know how as far as the production and marketing strategies of the potato branch is concerned.

The expansion of citrus farming upstream of the Clanwilliam Dam (i.e. irrigation development on individual farms in Citrusdal) is not envisaged to be profitable, mainly due to the expected relatively high cost of irrigation infrastructure.

Several possibilities exist as far as the raising of the Clanwilliam Dam wall is concerned, each of which having a unique cost and yield level. This leads to different water unit cost levels. The sensitivity of farm profitability for different water unit cost levels were thus also analysed (refer to **Table ES4**).

**Table ES4: Real internal rate of return (IRR) on capital investment in typical farming operations at different unit water costs levels (i.e. dam raising alternatives)**

Raising Level (m)	Discounting Rate (%/a)	Water cost (c/m <sup>3</sup> )	IRR of typical new farming developments per region (%)				
			CLANWILLIAM	MELKBOOM/TRAWAL		KLAWER/VREDENDAL	
			New mixed farm	New table grape farm	New mixed farm	New table grape farm	New mixed farm
5	4	37	4,43	11,25	0,47	5,45	5,32
	6	49	3,94	10,85	neg	5,04	4,54
	8	64	3,33	10,36	neg	4,52	3,59
10	4	43	4,19	11,05	neg	5,24	4,93
	6	58	3,57	10,56	neg	4,73	3,97
	8	75	2,88	10,01	neg	4,15	2,91
15	4	47	4,02	10,92	neg	5,11	4,67
	6	62	3,41	10,43	neg	4,59	3,72
	8	81	2,64	9,82	neg	3,95	2,53

The increment between the expected highest unit water cost (i.e. R0.81/m<sup>3</sup>) and the lowest (i.e. R0.37/m<sup>3</sup>) is relatively small. The sensitivity analysis thus showed that given the small variation in the unit cost of irrigation water that is associated with alternative dam raising possibilities, the water cost per se will only have a minor impact on the profitability level of individual farms. When stated in another way it means that the expected cost of the additional irrigation water is a relatively small component of the total cost structure of the mainly capital intensive farming developments that are envisaged.

---

Irrigation farming activities in the investigation area are relatively capital intensive and risky. Top-grade managerial and labour skills are preconditions for financial success and any degradation in this regard will have a negative impact on the financial results from farming.

The trend that the market value of land (refer to **Section 6.2.1**) exceeds the production value thereof implies that a farmer should be able to supply a considerable portion of the farm's capital need from own financial sources. New entrants from previously disadvantaged groups will therefore be faced with the mentioned realities and in order for them to be successful, special measures should be considered, *inter alia*:

- ❖ training facilities to further managerial skills
- ❖ appropriate financial support systems via government schemes
- ❖ appropriate farming ownership models and financial support systems to accommodate and further "partnerships" between existing commercial farmers and new entrants to farming

The finding that the expansion of existing farms should be more profitable than the development of new farms lead to an investigation of the financial viability of a "partnership" between the farmer and his labourers as far as the expansion of farming activities is concerned. Several possibilities exist as far as partnership agreements are concerned. A business trust, with the farmer and his labourers as beneficiaries, served as an example of a "joint venture" to counter the mentioned barriers to entry to farming. The financial analysis in this regard indicated that, given the assumptions made, the proposed "joint venture" should be viable, in general, in the different regions of the investigation area.

Particulars in this regard should, however, be investigated comprehensively for each individual case.

---

## CONTENTS

---

Section	Description	Page
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background .....	1
1.2	Aim of the study .....	1
1.3	Research method .....	1
1.4	Arrangement of chapters .....	2
<b>2</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Study area .....	3
2.2	Research approach .....	4
<b>3</b>	<b>TYPICAL FARMING SITUATIONS IN THE RELEVANT REGIONS OF THE STUDY AREA.....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Introduction .....	8
3.2	Typical farming models.....	8
<b>4</b>	<b>INCOME AND COST BUDGETS FOR SELECTED CROPS .....</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1	Introduction .....	29
4.2	Marketing prospects for produce .....	29
4.3	Perennial crops: costs of establishment.....	30
4.4	Annual variable costs of selected crops .....	32
4.5	Expected income from selected crops per region .....	32
<b>5</b>	<b>EXPECTED COSTS OF IRRIGATION WATER .....</b>	<b>36</b>
5.1	Existing irrigation farming .....	36
5.2	Envisaged irrigation development .....	36
<b>6</b>	<b>FINANCIAL VIABILITY OF IRRIGATION FARMING.....</b>	<b>38</b>
6.1	Introduction .....	38
6.2	Analytical framework (also refer to Section 2.2).....	38
6.3	Financial viability of existing irrigation farming .....	39
6.4	Financial viability of envisaged irrigation developments.....	41
6.5	Realities that may be obstructive to new entrants to farming in the study area .....	45
<b>7</b>	<b>ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT OF PREVIOUSLY DISADVANTAGED GROUPS .....</b>	<b>47</b>
7.1	Clanwilliam: expansion of an existing mixed farm (citrus and potatoes) from 55 ha to 100 ha .....	48
7.2	Melkboom/Trawal .....	50
7.3	Klawer/Vredendal .....	53
7.4	Citrusdal: expansion of a typical citrus farm from 50 ha to 70 ha.....	55
<b>8</b>	<b>CONCLUDING REMARKS .....</b>	<b>58</b>

## List of Tables

Table 3.1	Assumed present and model table grape farming situation in the Melkboom/ Trawal region.....	9
Table 3.2	Assumed present and model mixed farming situations (with wine grapes as main enterprise) in the Melkboom/Trawal region.....	9
Table 3.3	Assumed present and model mixed farming situations (with wine grapes as main enterprise) in the Klaver/Vredendal region.....	10
Table 3.4	Assumed present and model citrus farming units in the Citrusdal region.....	10
Table 3.5	Assumed present and model mixed farming situations in the Clanwilliam region.....	11
Table 3.6	Expected capital investment on a typical existing table grape farm.....	12
Table 3.7	Expected capital investment on a typical existing mixed farm.....	13
Table 3.8	Expected capital investment on a typical model mixed farm.....	14
Table 3.9	Expected capital investment on a typical existing mixed farm.....	15
Table 3.10	Expected capital investment on a typical model mixed farm.....	16
Table 3.11	Expected capital investment on a typical existing citrus farm.....	17
Table 3.12	Expected capital investment on a typical model citrus farm.....	18
Table 3.13	Expected capital investment on a typical existing mixed farm.....	19
Table 3.14	Expected capital investment on a typical model mixed farm.....	20
Table 3.15	Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical citrus farm of 70 ha, Citrusdal, 2005/06.....	21
Table 3.16	Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical citrus farm from 50 ha to 70 ha, Citrusdal, 2005/06.....	21
Table 3.17	Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical citrus farm of 100 ha, Clanwilliam, 2005/06.....	22
Table 3.18	Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical irrigation farm from 55 ha to 100 ha, Clanwilliam, 2005/06.....	22
Table 3.19	Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical table grape farm of 25 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06.....	23
Table 3.20	Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical table grape farm from 20 ha to 25 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06.....	23
Table 3.21	Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical mixed farm of 50 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06.....	24
Table 3.22	Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical mixed farm from 35 ha to 50 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06.....	24
Table 3.23	Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical table grape farm of 25 ha, Klaver/Vredendal, 2005/06.....	24
Table 3.24	Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical table grape farm from 20 ha to 25 ha, Klaver/Vredendal, 2005/06.....	25
Table 3.25	Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical farm of 75 ha, Klaver/Vredendal, 2005/06.....	25
Table 3.26	Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical irrigation farm from 60 ha to 75 ha, Klaver/Vredendal, 2005/06.....	25
Table 3.27	Assumed managerial and labour requirements and their remuneration for typical model farms in the different regions of the study area.....	27
Table 3.28	Water requirements of crops (m <sup>3</sup> /ha/a).....	28
Table 4.1	Expected costs per hectare of establishing table grapes, wine grapes and citrus fruit in selected regions of the study area.....	31
Table 4.2	Expected annual variable costs per hectare (Rand) of selected crops in the study area.....	33
Table 4.3	Expected output, payments and lifetime of selected table grape cultivars in the Melkboom/Trawal and Klaver/Vredendal regions of the study area under optimal production conditions, 2005/06.....	33
Table 4.4	Expected output and producers' prices of wine grapes and other selected crops in the Melkboom/Trawal region of the study area under optimal production conditions, 2005/06.....	34
Table 4.5	Expected output and producers' prices of wine grapes and other selected crops in the Klaver/Vredendal region of the study area under optimal production conditions, 2005/06.....	34
Table 4.6	Expected output and producers' prices of citrus fruit in the Citrusdal region of the study area under optimal production conditions, 2005/06.....	34

Table 4.7	Expected output and producers' prices of citrus fruit and other selected crops in the Clanwilliam region of the study area under optimal production conditions, 2005/06 .....	35
Table 5.1	Expected cost of irrigation water at different raising levels of the Clanwilliam Dam, 2005/06 .....	37
Table 6.1	Financial viability of existing irrigation farming in the study area .....	40
Table 6.2	Financial viability of the proposed expansion of existing irrigation farms in the study area .....	42
Table 6.3	Financial viability of the envisaged new irrigation farms in the study area .....	44
Table 6.4	Internal rate of return (IRR) on capital investment in typical farming operations at different unit water cost levels (i.e. dam raising alternatives).....	45
Table 7.1	Possible capital and financing structure of the envisaged farm expansion and the relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners, Clanwilliam, 2005/06 .....	49
Table 7.2	Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical citrus farm from 55 to 100 ha, Clanwilliam, 2005/06 .....	49
Table 7.3	Possible capital and financial structure of the envisaged mixed wine grape farm expansion and the relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06 .....	50
Table 7.4	Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical "mixed" wine grape farm from 35 to 50 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06 .....	51
Table 7.5	Possible capital and financing structure and relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners when expanding a typical table grape farm, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06.....	52
Table 7.6	Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical table grape farm from 20 to 25 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06 .....	52
Table 7.7	Possible capital and financing structure of the envisaged wine grape farm expansion and the relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners, Klawer/Vredendal, 2005/06 .....	53
Table 7.8	Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical "mixed" wine grape farm from 60 to 75 ha, Klawer/Vredendal, 2005/06 .....	54
Table 7.9	Possible capital and financing structure and relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners when expanding a table grape farm, Klawer/Vredendal, 2005/06.....	54
Table 7.10	Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical table grape farm from 20 to 25 ha, Klawer/Vredendal, 2005/06 .....	55
Table 7.11	Possible capital and financing structure of the envisaged farm expansion and the relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners, Citrusdal, 2005/06 .....	56
Table 7.12	Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical citrus farm from 50 to 70 ha, Citrusdal, 2005/06 .....	57

## List of Figures

Figure 2.1	The relevant irrigation regions of the study area.....	3
------------	--------------------------------------------------------	---

## APPENDICES

Appendix A :	Exhibits 6.1 to 6.6
Appendix B :	Exhibits 6.7 to 6.12
Appendix C :	Exhibits 6.13 to 6.18

---

# 1 INTRODUCTION

---

## 1.1 Background

---

This report deals with the financial viability of the raising of the Clanwilliam Dam as an additional source of irrigation water for farming downstream towards Klaver/Vredendal. The financial viability of irrigation farming upstream (i.e. the Citrusdal area) direct from the Olifants River is also investigated. This is an expansion of the Olifants-/Doring River Basin Study (Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, 1998) and the Western Cape Olifants-/Doring River Irrigation Study (WODRIS), 2004. Relevant irrigation farming areas in the Citrusdal, Clanwilliam, Melkboom/Trawal and Klaver/Vredendal regions are investigated as far as the viability of irrigation farming is concerned. These areas were identified by soil and crop specialists to be suitable for the production of citrus fruit, grapes (wine-, dried- and table grapes) and vegetables (refer to the *Soils, Water Requirements and Crops Report* by Lambrechts, Schloms and Ellis, 2006, DWAF Report No. P WMA 17/E10/00/1106). It is thus necessary to rate the alternative areas in terms of their potential to utilise the irrigation water profitably. All financial information applies to the 2005/06 financial year.

---

## 1.2 Aim of the study

---

The aim of this part of the multi-faceted study is to evaluate the financial viability of the raising of the storage capacity of the Clanwilliam Dam as far as irrigation farming in relevant areas of the basin is concerned: Specific objectives are the following:

- ❖ an evaluation of the financial viability of existing irrigation farming in the relevant farming regions,
  - ❖ an evaluation of the financial viability to expand irrigation farming (i.e. the expansion of existing farms and/or the creation of new farms) in the relevant farming areas, and
  - ❖ an identification of factors that may be obstructive for new entrants from previously disadvantaged communities to enter the farming industry and to evaluate the viability of certain “joint ventures” between farmers and their labourers as far as the expansion of irrigation farming is concerned.
- 

## 1.3 Research method

---

It is accepted that irrigation farming plays an important role in the study area from a socio-economic point of view. An evaluation of the potential of the study area for irrigation farming will thus be of value to the policy maker. The emphasis of this part of the study thus falls on a financial evaluation of the irrigation potential of the relevant regions of the study area. The costly nature of the envisaged development of the storage capacity of the Clanwilliam Dam from an agricultural perspective will probably lead to the necessity to practice relatively profitable farming activities. It is thus assumed that a commercial farming culture will be maintained. Effective and efficient farming practices will thus be a prerequisite for success in the deregulated marketing

---

environment that face the farmers. Typical farming situations in the relevant regions of the study area will form the basis for the research. The characteristics of relevant regions of the study area, from a farming point of view, were identified by the soil, climate and crop experts that were involved in the study. The typical farms in each region were simulated with the aid of industry experts and leading farmers from the different regions. It is assumed that the results of the financial evaluation of the typical farming situations will serve as a plausible source of information for the evaluation of the viability of irrigation farming in the relevant regions of the study area. It is further assumed that the managerial inputs on the typical farms will be optimal. The financial evaluation is computer based and involves, *inter alia*, the following:

- \* the development of a computer based calculation program for every typical farming situation to enable a sensitivity analysis regarding the financial criteria that were employed. Both the expected profitability and liquidity of the envisaged farming operations are evaluated.
- \* the identification of viable farming enterprises, with the aid of enterprise budgets, that were generated with the help of industry experts and leading farmers.
- \* the calculation of the cost of additional irrigation water that is associated with the envisaged increase in the storage capacity of the Clanwilliam Dam.

Potential irrigation developments in the study area will be influenced by, *inter alia*, suitable soils and climatic conditions and by the expected costs of the irrigation developments. Potential areas in the relevant regions that may be suitable for irrigation farming were identified by the soil- and climate experts (*Soils, Water Requirements and Crops Report* by Lambrechts, Schloms and Ellis, 2006, DWAF Report No. P WMA 17/E10/00/1106) in collaboration with the engineering team from Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers. The financial viability of both the expansion of existing irrigation farms and the development of new irrigation farms were investigated.

---

## 1.4 Arrangement of chapters

---

**Section 2** involves a discussion of the methodology that was followed in the study. Typical farming models (refer to **Section 3**), income and costs budgets for selected crops (refer to **Section 4**) and the expected costs of the envisaged irrigation developments and thus by implication irrigation water (refer to **Section 5**) generates the necessary information for the analyses of the financial viability of irrigation farming in the relevant regions of the study area (refer to **Section 6**). The conclusions and limitations of this section of the study are listed in **Section 8**.

The viability of certain "joint ventures" between farmers and their labourers, as far as new irrigation developments is concerned, is discussed in **Section 7**.



## 2 METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Study area



Figure 2.1 The relevant irrigation regions of the study area

The study focuses on the financial viability of:

- ❖ the raising of the storage capacity of the Clanwilliam Dam to enable the further development of irrigation farming in relevant downstream regions, *inter alia*, the Clanwilliam, Melkboom/Trawal and Klawer/Vredendal farming areas.
- ❖ the development of irrigation farming systems by individual farmers that are operating upstream of the Clanwilliam Dam (i.e. the Citrusdal area) and that are supplied with pumped irrigation water direct from the Olifants River flow.

The mentioned farming areas are relatively homogeneous from the viewpoint of soil and climatic characteristics, and thus, by implication, production possibilities.

---

## 2.2 Research approach

---

The emphasis of the study falls on the potential of the relevant regions as far as the expansion of irrigation farming is concerned. The focus is on the potential of the relevant regions regarding the expansion of irrigation farming in a financial viable way. An explorative approach was followed to gather the appropriate information. Workshops with leading farmers and other industry experts were employed to cover the multi-faceted issues that impact on the potential of the regions for irrigation farming. Determining factors in this regard are, *inter alia*, the availability of soils of an acceptable quality, climatic considerations and thus by implication crop production possibilities as well as the expected costs of the expansion of the storage capacity of the Clanwilliam Dam (refer to the *Soils, Water Requirements and Crops Report* by Lambrechts, Schloms and Ellis, 2006, DWAF Report No. P WMA 17/E10/00/1106) and the expected costs of irrigation scheme development. Typical farming situations in the relevant regions of the study area serve as a basis for the financial viability analyses.

### 2.2.1 Typical farming situations

It is accepted that farming practices are based on sound physical-biological and economic-financial considerations. Typical farming activities in the study area are characterised mainly by capital and labour intensive perennial cropping systems.

The focus of this study is on the potential of the study area for the expansion of irrigation farming. Information regarding the present farming situation thus only serve as a point of departure in that regard. Other important aspects to be dealt with include, *inter alia*, the model farming situations regarding the combination of enterprises and the technology to be employed in the production process. In order to evaluate the implications of the mentioned aspects on the financial viability of farming in the study area it was decided to employ typical farms as an analytical tool, as far as the analysis of both the existing- and the envisaged farming situations are concerned. Typical farms for each of the relevant regions of the study area were thus deduced with the aid of leading farmers and other industry experts during workshop sessions on 16/08/2005 at Vredendal and 17/08/2005 at Citrusdal. It is assumed that this procedure will generate plausible information as far as the existing and model farming operations are concerned.

The following industry experts and their accompanying field of interest were employed:

<b>Expert</b>	<b>Field of interest</b>
J Lambrechts	Soils, crops, irrigation
B Schloms	Soils, climate, irrigation
F Ellis	Soils, climate, irrigation
J Joubert	Crops
R Erasmus	Irrigation
P Louw	Crops
R Hugo	Irrigation
E van der Berg	Water Resources Engineering
K Hundley	Agricultural Engineering
A Roux	Engineering
M January	Environmental
V Zenani	Environmental
F van Heerden	Engineering/Irrigation
M du Randt	Crops

The following leading farmers from the different regions were involved to develop typical farming models during the workshops held on 16/8/2005 and 17/8/2005, respectively.

Clanwilliam	Dirkie Mouton Joop Basson
Melkboom/Trawal	Tinus van Staden Arend Adriaanse Jakkie Visser
Klawer/Vredendal	Francois Pienaar Gideon van Zyl Ryan Engelbrecht Kallie Stephan Nico Laubscher Izak Coetzee Dirk Brand Jannie Mosterd W.G. van der Merwe S.P. Mannel
Citrusdal	Kobus de Witt Bernie van den Heever Gert Kotze Christo Smit Johan Mouton Pieter Hofmeyr

A typical present farming situation was deduced in order to evaluate the financial viability of the present state of irrigation farming in the different regions with the emphasis on the ability of the present situation to adapt to a model situation for the same typical farm, should more irrigation water become available.

The model farming situations were also deduced with the aid of the farmers and other industry experts. The model farming situations were used to evaluate the financial viability of the envisaged expansion of the storage capacity of the Clanwilliam Dam. Aspects regarding the typical farms that were covered during the workshops are the following:

- ❖ size and enterprise composition
- ❖ capital structure
- ❖ labour and managerial requirements
- ❖ expected output and prices of products
- ❖ irrigation infrastructure
- ❖ water requirements and irrigation scheduling

The expected structure of the costs of the different farming enterprises were obtained from selected industry experts and institutions. The expected prices for products are based on relevant information that was supplied by farmers, other industry experts and marketing institutions. The relevant information regarding the typical farming situations of each region was modelled with the aid of a computer-based spreadsheet in order to enable an evaluation of the financial viability of the execution thereof. The farming models were verified continuously with the aid of farmers and industry experts who attended the workshops.

## 2.2.2 Typical farming models

Due to the long-term nature of farming activities in the study area, a multi-period calculation model was developed for each farming situation. The calculation model can handle planning periods of up to 40 years. It is assumed that a 40-year period will be sufficient in order to illustrate the effect, in financial terms, of possible envisaged changes in farming strategy. The calculations were done at constant 2005/06 price levels. Discounting of future expected income and costs was done at a real interest rate of 4 % per year (i.e. the difference between a nominal interest rate of 10 % per year and a yearly inflation rate of, say, 6 %). Due to the changing nature of interest rates, the sensitivity of the financial results will also be tested for a range of real discounting rates.

### Evaluation criteria

The success of farming should be evaluated in terms of both the profitability and the financial viability thereof. The expected profitability of the envisaged future farming situations in the study area was evaluated by means of the internal rate of return on capital invested (IRR). The financial viability of the envisaged irrigation farming activities was evaluated with the aid of cash-flow analyses regarding the typical farming situations at different own-to-loaned capital ratios. The expected break-even year, as far as the cumulative cash flow is concerned, serves as an indicator for the financial viability of farming operations.

The relative "efficiency" of the different regions of the study area regarding the utilisation of scarce water and the creation of jobs is, however, also important for the policy maker. The relative ability of the different regions to generate jobs with the aid of irrigation farming activities is illustrated by calculating the ratio of jobs created per 1000 m<sup>3</sup> of irrigation water applied. The relative "efficiency" of the different regions, as far as the utilisation of irrigation water is concerned, is calculated by means of the ratio of the net financial benefit from irrigation farming per m<sup>3</sup> of water applied. The net financial benefit per hectare of each typical farming situation is deduced by calculating the net present value (NPV) per hectare of the envisaged farming situations. A real discounting rate of 4 % per year was used in this regard. The computerized calculation model has various characteristics as far as its abilities are concerned.

**Facilities of the calculation model**

The calculation models provide answers regarding the expected profitability and financial viability of the envisaged farming situations in the different regions of the study area. Other facilities of the model are the following:

- ❖ it can handle 30 different blocks/areas of land
- ❖ a transformation/development period of 3 to 5 years is assumed
- ❖ the effect of different financing strategies can be analysed
- ❖ the sensitivity of the “answers” for important parameters like the value of output and the discounting rate can be analysed
- ❖ it can evaluate the financial viability of **existing** irrigation farming, the expansion of existing irrigation farming and the development of **new** envisaged irrigation farms

The typical farming situations of the relevant regions of the study area are the theme of the following section.

---

### 3 TYPICAL FARMING SITUATIONS IN THE RELEVANT REGIONS OF THE STUDY AREA

---

#### 3.1 Introduction

---

The relevant regions of the study area on which this study has a bearing were shown in **Section 2.1** (refer also to **Figure 2.1**). The typical farming situations in the relevant regions are next discussed with the emphasis on the present and model composition of enterprises as well as the accompanying farming infrastructure, labour and managerial requirements and the irrigation water requirements for the selected crops\*. This information, together with the income and costs budgets for the selected crops (refer to **Section 4**) and the estimated costs of the additional irrigation water from the Clanwilliam Dam (refer to **Section 5**), serve as a basis for the analysis of the financial viability of the expansion of irrigation farming in the study area (refer to **Section 6**).

---

#### 3.2 Typical farming models

---

The typical farming situations (present and prototype) of the relevant regions of the study area are illustrated in the following **Sections 3.2.1 to 3.2.4**. As was stated in **Section 1.3**, it is assumed that the financial evaluation of the envisaged typical farming situations will serve as a plausible source of information for the evaluation of the viability of irrigation farming in the different regions of the study area.

##### 3.2.1 Land-use of the present and prototype farming situations

The present and model land-use situations on typical farms in the relevant regions of the study area are presented in **Tables 3.1 to 3.5**. Land-use possibilities range from vines (wine, table and dried grapes), citrus fruit to vegetables. The selection of crops for a specific region is determined by soil and climatic considerations as well as by the market prospects for products. The production process of the mentioned enterprises is both capital- and labour intensive. In order to cope with this reality it is usually found that a crop mix is selected to limit the realization of extreme peak periods as far as the pressure on the capital infrastructure and the permanent labour force of farms are concerned. The crop mix of typical farms in the different regions was selected during workshop sessions with leading farmers and other industry experts on 16/08/2005 and 17/08/2005 at Vredendal and Citrusdal, respectively.

##### **Melkboom/Trawal region**

The expansion of typical table grape and mixed farming situations are envisaged should more irrigation water become available for this region (refer to **Tables 3.1 and 3.2**). The development of new table grape farming units of, say, 25 ha per unit is also envisaged in this region. As far as the mixed farming situation is concerned, it is assumed that the model situation (refer to **Table 3.2**) should serve as a plausible farming composition in this regard.

---

\*Information in this regard was obtained with the aid of workshop sessions with leading farmers and other industry experts as were discussed in Section 2.2.1 (refer to page 2-2).

**Table 3.1 Assumed present and model table grape farming situation in the Melkboom/Trawal region**

Present situation	Area (ha)	Model situation	Area (ha)
Table grape cultivar mix:		Table grape cultivar mix:	
Prime seedless	3	Prime seedless	4
Flame seedless	2	Flame seedless	4
Victoria	2	Crimson seedless	6
Majestic	1.5	Sugarone	5
Sunred seedless	0.5	Red globe	6
Thomson seedless	6.5		
Waltham cross	2.0		
Crimson seedless	1.0		
Red Globe	1.5		
Total irrigation	20		
Irrigable land	5		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>

**Table 3.2 Assumed present and model mixed farming situations (with wine grapes as main enterprise) in the Melkboom/Trawal region**

Present situation	Area (ha)	Model situation	Area (ha)
Wine grapes:		Wine grapes:	
Chenin blanc	10	Chardonnay	5
Colombar	9	Chenin blanc	13
Hanepoot/Muskadel	3	Colombar	9
Shiraz	3	Hanepoot/Muskadel	3
Pinotage	3	Shiraz	3
Chardonnay	2	Pinotage	5
Grapes (Dried)	2	Grapes (Dried)	5
Vegetables	3	Vegetables	7
	2		
Total irrigation	35		
Irrigable land	15		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>50</b>

**Klawer/Vredendal region**

Both the expansion of typical table grape and mixed farming situations as well as the development of new farms is envisaged should more irrigation water become available for this region. It was concluded during the workshop sessions that the typical table grape farming situation that is envisaged for the Melkboom/Trawal region (refer to **Table 3.1**) will be relevant to evaluate the financial viability of both the expansion of existing farms and the development of new table grape farms of 25 ha in this region. The mixed farming situation in this region is envisaged to increase from 60 ha under irrigation to 75 ha (refer to **Table 3.3**). Should new mixed farms be developed in this region, it is expected to comprise of 75 ha of irrigated crops (refer to the model situation in **Table 3.3**).

**Table 3.3 Assumed present and model mixed farming situations (with wine grapes as main enterprise) in the Klaver/Vredendal region**

Present situation	Area (ha)	Model situation	Area (ha)
Wine grapes:		Wine grapes:	
White cultivars	30	White cultivars	25
Red cultivars	10	Red cultivars	15
Grapes (dried)	10	Grapes (dried)	20
Vegetables	10	Vegetables	15
Total irrigation	60		
Irrigable land	15		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>75</b>

**Citrusdal region**

The Citrusdal region is upstream of the Clanwilliam Dam and thus leads to a different strategy as far as the development of irrigation water sources is concerned. Existing farms are mainly irrigated directly from the Olifants River, while a portion of the irrigation water needs for the peak irrigation period is stored in private dams. The envisaged expansion of existing citrus farms as well as the development of new citrus farms in this region (refer to **Table 3.4**) is thus assumed to be possible only via "private" irrigation water development systems directly from the Olifants River.

**Table 3.4 Assumed present and model citrus farming units in the Citrusdal region**

Present situation	Area (ha)	Model situation	Area (ha)
Navels	31	Navels	41
Valencias	15	Valencias	15
Lemons	2	Lemons	-
Soft citrus	2	Soft citrus	14
Total irrigation	50		
Irrigable land	20		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>70</b>

**Clanwilliam region**

The expansion of typical mixed farming situations (mainly citrus fruit and potato production) as well as the development of new mixed irrigation farms (refer to model situation in **Table 3.5**) is envisaged should more irrigation water become available for this region.



**Table 3.5 Assumed present and model mixed farming situations in the Clanwilliam region**

Present situation	Area (ha)	Model situation	Area (ha)
Navels	20	Navels	35
Valencias	10	Valencias	15
Potatoes	25	Potatoes	50
Total irrigation	55		
Irrigable land	45		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>

### 3.2.2 Expected capital structure of typical farms

The expected capital structure (in detail) of typical farming situations in the different regions of the study area is presented in **Tables 3.6 to 3.14**.

Irrigation land was valued at the bare land value thereof with the aid of leading farmers from the different regions and other industry experts, *inter alia*, from leading commercial banks. The bare land value of irrigated land in the different regions was valued at R30 000/ha. Irrigable land that is expected to be developed for irrigation purposes, should more irrigation water become available, was valued at R15 000/ha.

The mentioned values are based on the present production possibilities, mainly dryland cropping or extensive livestock production. It is assumed that the accessibility thereof for irrigation purposes will impact positively on the value of the bare land that has potential for irrigation farming.

The improvements on the land like orchards, buildings, dams, boreholes and other irrigation infrastructure were valued at the replacement value thereof. As far as existing farms are concerned, it was assumed that fixed improvements like buildings should be valued at 50% of the calculated replacement value thereof, while the irrigation infrastructure were valued at 60% of the replacement value thereof. Orchards were valued at the replacement value thereof, but depreciated for the age of each specific block. Envisaged improvements that are connected to the expansion and/or replacement of items, *inter alia*, orchards and irrigation infrastructure like dams, main lines, pumps, filters and inland irrigation equipment were valued at the replacement value thereof. The appropriate improvements on "new" farms that are associated with the envisaged new irrigation developments in certain regions of the study area were valued at the replacement value thereof.

The relevant equipment (i.e. tractors, vehicles, spray pumps, cultivation equipment, etc.) of typical farms were valued at existing prices as new or at a reasonable market price depending on the availability of second hand items of an acceptable quality. Inputs from leading farmers were useful in this regard.

**Table 3.6 Expected capital investment on a typical existing table grape farm**  
**Region : Melkboom/Trawal and Klawer/Vredendal**  
**Area: 20 ha**

Item	Units	Number of Units	Value	
			(R/Unit)	(R)
<b><u>Fixed Capital</u></b>				
<u>Land:</u>				
Irrigated	Ha	20	30,000	600,000
Irrigable	Ha			
Dryland	Ha			
Orchards/Vines	Ha	20	50,828	1,016,565
Total				1,616,565
<u>Buildings:</u>				
<u>Housing:</u>				
Labour		12.00	75,000	900,000
Manager		1.00	225,000	225,000
Manager Assistant		1.00	100,000	100,000
Pack/Cooling Shed		1.00	1,410,000	1,410,000
Total				2,635,000
Irrigation (Exist)				338,500
Irrigation (New)				0
Total Fixed Capital				4,590,065
<b><u>Moveable Capital</u></b>				
<u>Livestock</u>				
<u>Equipment:</u>				
Tractors		2.00	125,000	250,000
Trailer sets		3.00	15,000	45,000
Spray pumps		2.00	70,000	140,000
Sulphur spray		1.00	12,000	12,000
"Stokkiekapper"		1.00	20,000	20,000
LDV		1.00	100,000	100,000
Truck		1.00	200,000	200,000
Loose tools		1.00	25,000	25,000
Other		1.00	20,000	20,000
Total Moveable Capital				817,000
<b>Total Capital Investment</b>				<b>5,407,065</b>

**Table 3.7 Expected capital investment on a typical existing mixed farm**  
**Region : Melkboom/Trawal**  
**Area: 35 ha**

Item	Units	Number of Units	Value	
			(R/Unit)	(R)
<b><u>Fixed Capital</u></b>				
<u>Land:</u>				
Irrigated	Ha	35	30,000	1,050,000
Irrigable	Ha			
Dryland	Ha			
Orchards/Vines	Ha	33	30,115	993,805
Total				2,043,805
<u>Buildings:</u>				
Housing:				
Labour		7.00	75,000	525,000
Manager		1.00	225,000	225,000
Shed		1.00	250,000	250,000
Total				1,000,000
Irrigation (Exist)				548,100
Irrigation (New)				
Total Fixed Capital				3,591,905
<b><u>Moveable Capital</u></b>				
Livestock				
<u>Equipment:</u>				
Tractors		2.00	100,000	200,000
Spray pumps		1.00	40,000	40,000
Weed spray		1.00	25,000	25,000
Tip trailer		1.00	5,000	5,000
Harvesting bins		1.00	15,000	15,000
LDV		1.00	125,000	125,000
"Bossiekapper"		1.00	5,000	5,000
Disc		1.00	8,000	8,000
Disc harrow		1.00	5,000	5,000
Scraper		1.00	10,000	10,000
Harvesting trailer		1.00	10,000	10,000
Drying equipment		1.00	60,000	60,000
Other		1.00	10,000	20,000
Total Moveable Capital				528,000
<b>Total Capital Investment</b>				<b>4,119,905</b>

**Table 3.8 Expected capital investment on a typical model mixed farm**  
**Region : Melkboom/Trawal**  
**Area: 50 ha**

Item	Units	Number of Units	Value	
			(R/Unit)	(R)
<b><u>Fixed Capital</u></b>				
<u>Land:</u>				
Irrigated	Ha	35	30,000	1,050,000
Irrigable	Ha	15	15,000	225,000
Dryland	Ha			
Orchards/Vines	Ha	33	30,115	993,805
Total				2,268,805
<u>Buildings:</u>				
Housing:				
Labour		7.00	75,000	525,000
Labour		3.00	75,000	225,000
Manager		1.00	225,000	225,000
Manager Assistant		1.00	100,000	100,000
Shed		1.00	250,000	250,000
Total				1,325,000
Irrigation (Exist)				548,100
Irrigation (New)				285,375
Total Fixed Capital				4,427,280
<b><u>Moveable Capital</u></b>				
Livestock				
<u>Equipment:</u>				
Tractors		2.00	100,000	200,000
Tractors		1.00	120,000	120,000
Spray pumps		1.00	40,000	40,000
Spray pumps		1.00	45,000	45,000
Weed spray		1.00	25,000	25,000
Tip trailer		1.00	5,000	5,000
Harvesting bins		2.00	15,000	30,000
Truck		1.00	250,000	250,000
LDV		1.00	125,000	125,000
"Bossieslaner"		1.00	5,000	5,000
Disc		1.00	8,000	8,000
Disc harrow		1.00	5,000	5,000
Scraper		1.00	10,000	10,000
Harvesting trailer		2.00	10,000	20,000
Shade cloth		1.50	60,000	90,000
Other		1.00	20,000	20,000
Total Moveable Capital				998,000
<b>Total Capital Investment</b>				<b>5,425,280</b>

**Table 3.9 Expected capital investment on a typical existing mixed farm**  
**Region : Klawer/Vredendal**  
**Area: 60 ha**

Item	Units	Number of Units	Value	
			(R/Unit)	(R)
<b><u>Fixed Capital</u></b>				
<u>Land:</u>				
Irrigated	Ha	60	30,000	1,800,000
Irrigable	Ha			
Dryland	Ha			
Orchards/Vines	Ha	50	32,803	1,640,142
Total				3,440,142
<u>Buildings:</u>				
<u>Housing:</u>				
Labour		10.00	75,000	750,000
Manager		1.00	225,000	225,000
Manager Assistant		1.00	100,000	100,000
Single quarters		1.00	200,000	200,000
Shed		1.00	250,000	250,000
Total				1,525,000
Irrigation (Exist)				1,202,640
Irrigation (New)				0
Total Fixed Capital				6,167,782
<b><u>Moveable Capital</u></b>				
<u>Livestock</u>				
<u>Equipment:</u>				
Tractors		2.00	120,000	240,000
Tractors		2.00	80,000	160,000
Spray pumps		2.00	40,000	80,000
Weed spray		1.00	30,000	30,000
Trailer		1.00	20,000	20,000
Harvesting bins		2.00	8,000	16,000
Bin Trailers		2.00	12,000	24,000
LDV		2.00	100,000	200,000
"Bossieslaner"		1.00	8,000	8,000
Drying Equipment		1.00	210,000	210,000
Bins		100.00	140	14,000
Other		1.00	30,000	30,000
Total Moveable Capital				1,032,000
<b>Total Capital Investment</b>				<b>7,199,782</b>

**Table 3.10 Expected capital investment on a typical model mixed farm**  
**Region : Klawer/Vredendal**  
**Area: 75 ha**

Item	Units	Number of Units	Value	
			(R/Unit)	(R)
<b><u>Fixed Capital</u></b>				
<u>Land:</u>				
Irrigated	Ha	60	30,000	1,800,000
Irrigable	Ha	15	15,000	225,000
Dryland	Ha			
Orchards/Vines	Ha	50	32,803	1,640,142
Total				3,665,142
<u>Buildings:</u>				
<u>Housing:</u>				
Labour		12.00	75,000	900,000
Manager		1.00	225,000	225,000
Manager Assistant		2.00	100,000	200,000
Single quarters		1.00	200,000	200,000
Shed		1.00	250,000	250,000
Total				1,775,000
Irrigation (Exist)				1,202,640
Irrigation (New)				325,935
Total Fixed Capital				6,968,717
<b><u>Moveable Capital</u></b>				
<u>Livestock</u>				
<u>Equipment:</u>				
Tractors		2.00	120,000	240,000
Tractors		2.00	80,000	160,000
Tractors		1.00	160,000	160,000
Spray pumps		3.00	40,000	120,000
Spray pumps		1.00	45,000	45,000
Weed spray		1.00	30,000	30,000
Trailer		1.00	20,000	20,000
Trailer		1.00	25,000	25,000
Harvesting bins		3.00	8,000	24,000
Bin trailers		3.00	12,000	36,000
LDV		2.00	100,000	200,000
"Bossieslaner"		1.00	8,000	8,000
Drying Equipment		2.00	210,000	420,000
Bins		120.00	100	12,000
Other		1.00	30,000	30,000
Total Moveable Capital				1,530,000
<b>Total Capital Investment</b>				<b>8,498,717</b>

**Table 3.11 Expected capital investment on a typical existing citrus farm**  
**Region : Citrusdal**  
**Area: 50 ha**

Item	Units	Number of Units	Value	
			(R/Unit)	(R)
<b><u>Fixed Capital</u></b>				
<u>Land:</u>				
Irrigated	Ha	50	30,000	1,500,000
Irrigable	Ha			
Dryland	Ha			
Orchards/Vines	Ha	50	30,823	1,541,126
Total				3,041,126
<u>Buildings:</u>				
<u>Housing:</u>				
Labour		9.00	75,000	675,000
Manager		1.00	225,000	225,000
Manager Assistant		1.00	100,000	100,000
Single quarters		1.00	130,000	130,000
Shed		1.00	250,000	250,000
Total				1,380,000
Irrigation (Exist)				2,778,976
Irrigation (New)				0
Total Fixed Capital				7,200,102
<b><u>Moveable Capital</u></b>				
<u>Livestock</u>				
<u>Equipment:</u>				
Tractors		4.00	106,250	425,000
Fertilizer caster		1.00	60,000	60,000
Spray pumps		2.00	46,000	92,000
Weed Spray		1.00	12,000	12,000
Trailer		1.00	10,000	10,000
Bin trailer set		4.00	10,000	40,000
LDV		1.00	70,000	70,000
Forklift		1.00	40,000	40,000
Truck		1.00	100,000	100,000
Weed cultivator		1.00	6,000	6,000
Motor bike		1.00	20,000	20,000
Other and ladders		1.00	62,000	62,000
Total Moveable Capital				937,000
<b>Total Capital Investment</b>				<b>8,137,102</b>

**Table 3.12 Expected capital investment on a typical model citrus farm**  
**Region : Citrusdal**  
**Area: 70 ha**

Item	Units	Number of Units	Value	
			(R/Unit)	(R)
<b><u>Fixed Capital</u></b>				
<u>Land:</u>				
Irrigated	Ha	50	30,000	1,500,000
Irrigable	Ha	2	15,000	30,000
Dryland	Ha			
Orchards/Vines	Ha	50	30,823	1,541,126
Total				3,341,126
<u>Buildings:</u>				
Housing:				
Labour		12.00	75,000	900,000
Manager		1.00	225,000	225,000
Manager assistant		2.00	100,000	200,000
Single quarters		1.00	130,000	130,000
Shed		1.00	250,000	250,000
Total				1,705,000
Irrigation (Exist)				2,778,976
Irrigation (New)				1,823,584
Total Fixed Capital				7,825,102
<b><u>Moveable Capital</u></b>				
Livestock				
<u>Equipment:</u>				
Tractors		6.00	125,833	755,000
Fertilizer caster		1.00	60,000	60,000
Spray pumps		3.00	60,667	182,000
Fork lift		1.00	40,000	40,000
Weed Spray		2.00	23,500	47,000
Trailer		1.00	10,000	10,000
Bin trailer set		6.00	13,333	80,000
LDV		1.00	70,000	70,000
Truck		1.00	100,000	100,000
Disc		1.00	6,000	6,000
Motor bike		1.00	20,000	20,000
Topper		1.00	30,000	30,000
Other and ladders		1.00	62,000	62,000
Total Moveable Capital				1,462,000
<b>Total Capital Investment</b>				<b>9,287,102</b>



**Table 3.13 Expected capital investment on a typical existing mixed farm**  
**Region : Clanwilliam**  
**Area: 55 ha**

Item	Units	Number of Units	Value	
			(R/Unit)	(R)
<b><u>Fixed Capital</u></b>				
<u>Land:</u>				
Irrigated	Ha	55	30,000	1,650,000
Irrigable	Ha			
Dryland	Ha			
Orchards/Vines	Ha	30	47,081	1,412,438
Total				3,062,438
<u>Buildings:</u>				
<u>Housing:</u>				
Labour		10.00	75,000	750,000
Manager		1.00	225,000	225,000
Manager assistant		2.00	100,000	200,000
Single quarters		1.00	250,000	250,000
Shed		1.00	250,000	250,000
Total				1,675,000
Irrigation (Exist)				901,273
Irrigation (New)				0
Total Fixed Capital				5,638,711
<b><u>Moveable Capital</u></b>				
<u>Livestock</u>				
<u>Equipment:</u>				
Tractors		2.00	100,000	200,000
Tractors		2.00	185,000	370,000
Fertilizer caster		1.00	60,000	60,000
Trailer		3.00	20,000	60,000
Bin trailer set		12.00	6,000	72,000
Spray Pumps		1.00	100,000	100,000
Weed Spray		1.00	12,000	12,000
Fork lift		1.00	160,000	160,000
Truck		1.00	1,000,000	1,000,000
LDV		1.00	100,000	100,000
Potato equipment		1.00	805,000	805,000
Centre pivot		1.00	152,750	152,750
Weed cultivator		1.00	6,000	6,000
Motorbike		2.00	20,000	40,000
Other and ladders		1.00	58,000	58,000
Total Moveable Capital				3,195,750
<b>Total Capital Investment</b>				<b>8,136,114</b>

**Table 3.14 Expected capital investment on a typical model mixed farm**  
**Region : Clanwilliam**  
**Area: 100 ha**

Item	Units	Number of Units	Value	
			(R/Unit)	(R)
<b><u>Fixed Capital</u></b>				
<b><u>Land:</u></b>				
Irrigated	Ha	55	30,000	1,650,000
Irrigable	Ha	45	15,000	675,000
Dryland	Ha			
Orchards/Vines	Ha	30	47,081	1,412,438
Total				3,737,438
<b><u>Buildings:</u></b>				
Housing:				
Labour		25.00	75,000	1,875,000
Manager		1.00	225,000	225,000
Manager Assistant		5.00	110,000	550,000
Single quarters		2.00	175,000	350,000
Shed		1.00	250,000	250,000
Total				3,250,000
Irrigation (Exist)				901,273
Irrigation (New)				953,302
Total Fixed Capital				7,888,711
<b><u>Moveable Capital</u></b>				
Livestock				
<b><u>Equipment:</u></b>				
Tractors 60 kW		1.00	250,000	250,000
Tractors 55 kW		2.00	175,000	350,000
Tractors 35 kW		3.00	116,667	350,000
Fertilizer caster		1.00	60,000	60,000
Spray Pumps		2.00	110,000	220,000
Weed Spray		1.00	12,000	12,000
Trailer		3.00	20,000	60,000
Bin Trailer set		15.00	6,000	90,000
Forklift		1.00	160,000	160,000
Truck		1.00	1,000,000	1,000,000
LDV		1.00	100,000	100,000
Motor bike		2.00	20,000	40,000
Weed cultivator		1.00	6,000	6,000
Potato equipment		1.00	805,000	805,000
Centre pivot		2.00	229,125	458,250
Other and Ladders		1.00	58,000	58,000
Total Moveable Capital				4,019,250
<b>Total Capital Investment</b>				<b>11,907,961</b>

### 3.2.3 Visualised investment in farm irrigation infrastructure

The expected investment in farm irrigation infrastructure in the different regions of the study area is presented in **Tables 3.15 to 3.26**. Information in this regard was provided by the engineering section of the research team (refer to the internal study memo on farm irrigation infrastructure by Ninham Shand, Consulting Engineers, 2007, and to the *Irrigation Development Options Report* by Hundley, 2007, DWAF Report No. P WMA 17/E10/00/1407).

**Table 3.15** Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical citrus farm of 70 ha, Citrusdal, 2005/06  
Irrigated area : 70 ha

Capital cost (R)	Rand
Pump station	388 679
Pipe line	71 698
River pumps	
Pump station	173 585
Pipe line	107 547
Dam	6 339 623
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>R7 081 132</b>
Per hectare	R 101 159
<b>Operating costs (R/a)</b>	
Equipment	38 849
Electricity	29 245
<b>TOTAL (R/a)</b>	<b>R 68 094</b>
Per hectare	R 973

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

**Table 3.16** Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical citrus farm from 50 ha to 70 ha, Citrusdal, 2005/06  
Expanded irrigation area : 20 ha

Capital cost (R)	Rand
Pump station	116 981
Pipe line	40 566
River pumps	
Pump station	61 320
Pipe line	55 660
Dam	1 449 057
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>R1 723 584</b>
Per hectare	R 86 179
<b>Operating costs (R/a)</b>	
Equipment	11 268
Electricity	10 377
<b>TOTAL (R/a)</b>	<b>R 21 645</b>
Per hectare	R 1 082

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

**Table 3.17 Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical citrus farm of 100 ha, Clanwilliam, 2005/06**  
**Irrigated area: 50 ha Citrus**  
**50 ha Potatoes**  
**100 ha**

<b>Capital cost (R)</b>	<b>Citrus (R)</b>	<b>Potatoes (R)</b>
Pump station	449 057	474 528
Pipe line	107 547	107547
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>R556 604</b>	<b>R582 075</b>
Per hectare	R 11 132	R 11 642
<b>Operating costs (R/a)</b>	<b>Citrus (R)</b>	<b>Potatoes (R)</b>
Equipment	10 377	10 755
Electricity	16 038	9 434
<b>TOTAL (R/a)</b>	<b>R26 415</b>	<b>R20 189</b>
Per hectare	R 528	R 404

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

**Table 3.18 Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical irrigation farm from 55 ha to 100 ha, Clanwilliam, 2005/06**  
**Expanded irrigated area: 20 ha Citrus**  
**25 ha Potatoes**

<b>Capital cost (R)</b>	<b>Citrus (R)</b>	<b>Potatoes (R)</b>
Pump station	174 528	234 906
Pipe line	159 434	159 434
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>R333 962</b>	<b>R394 340</b>
Per hectare	R 16 698	R 15 774
<b>Operating costs (R/a)</b>	<b>Citrus (R)</b>	<b>Potatoes (R)</b>
Equipment	5 755	6 698
Electricity	6 603	5 660
<b>TOTAL (R/a)</b>	<b>R12 358</b>	<b>R12 358</b>
Per hectare	R 618	R 494

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

**Table 3.19** Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical table grape farm of 25 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06  
Irrigated area: 25 ha

Capital cost (R)	Rand
Pump station	216 981
Pipe line	81 132
TOTAL	R298 113
Per hectare	R 11 925
Operating costs (R/a)	
Equipment	6 320
Electricity	7 547
TOTAL (R/a)	R 13 867
Per hectare	R 555

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

**Table 3.20** Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical table grape farm from 20 ha to 25 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06  
Expanded Irrigated area: 5 ha

Capital cost (R)	Rand
Pump station	46 226
Pipe line	50 000
TOTAL	R96 226
Per hectare	R19 245
Operating costs (R/a)	
Equipment	2 264
Electricity	1 887
TOTAL (R/a)	R 4 151
Per hectare	R 830

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

**Table 3.21 Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical mixed farm of 50 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06**  
**Irrigated area: 45 ha wine grapes**  
**5 ha tomatoes**

Capital cost (R)	Rand
Pump station	363 208
Pipe line	169 811
TOTAL	R533 019
Per hectare	R 10 660
Operating costs (R/a)	
Equipment	9 623
Electricity	12 264
TOTAL (R/a)	R 21 887
Per hectare	R 438

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

**Table 3.22 Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical mixed farm from 35 ha to 50 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06**  
**Expanded irrigated area: 15 ha**

Capital cost (R)	Rand
Pump station	113 208
Pipe line	97 170
TOTAL	R210 378
Per hectare	R 14 025
Operating costs (R/a)	
Equipment	3 491
Electricity	3 774
TOTAL (R/a)	R 7 265
Per hectare	R 484

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

**Table 3.23 Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical table grape farm of 25 ha, Klawer/Vredendal, 2005/06**  
**Irrigated area : 25 ha**

Capital cost (R)	Rand
Pump station	293 396
Pipe line	107 547
TOTAL	R400 943
Per hectare	R 16 038
Operating costs (R/a)	
Equipment	7 453
Electricity	10 377
TOTAL (R/a)	R 17 830
Per hectare	R 713

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

**Table 3.24** Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical table grape farm from 20 ha to 25 ha, Klawer/Vredendal, 2005/06  
Expanded irrigated area : 5 ha

Capital cost (R)	Rand
Pump station	74 528
Pipe line	55 660
TOTAL	R130 188
Per hectare	R 26 038
Operating costs (R/a)	
Equipment	2 264
Electricity	1 887
TOTAL (R/a)	R 4 151
Per hectare	R 830

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

**Table 3.25** Expected irrigation infrastructure for a typical farm of 75 ha, Klawer/Vredendal, 2005/06  
Irrigated area : 60 ha wine grapes  
15 ha tomatoes

Capital cost (R)	Rand
Pump station	944 340
Pipe line	183 962
TOTAL	R1 128 302
Per hectare	R 15 044
Operating costs (R/a)	
Equipment	23 302
Electricity	23 585
TOTAL (R/a)	R 46 887
Per hectare	R 625

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

**Table 3.26** Expected irrigation infrastructure for the expansion of a typical irrigation farm from 60 ha to 75 ha, Klawer/Vredendal, 2005/06  
Expanded irrigated area : 10 ha wine grapes  
5 ha tomatoes

Capital cost (R)	Rand
Pump station	169 811
Pipe line	81 132
TOTAL	R250 943
Per hectare	R 16 729
Operating costs (R/a)	
Equipment	4 434
Electricity	4 717
TOTAL (R/a)	R 9 151
Per hectare	R 610

Source: Irrigation cost estimates, Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers, 2007.

### 3.2.4 Expected labour and managerial requirements

The expected labour and managerial requirements of typical farms in the different regions of the study area are presented in **Table 3.27**. Information in this regard was generated during workshop sessions with leading farmers from the different regions of the study area and other industry experts.

Production processes in general are characterised by, *inter alia*, a relatively labour intensive nature. Irrigation farming in the study area thus plays an important role as far as employment opportunities are concerned, on the farm level as well as for the relevant supporting industries (i.e. input suppliers and processing industries).



**Table 3.27 Assumed managerial and labour requirements and their remuneration for typical model farms in the different regions of the study area**

Region	Farm area (ha)	Owner/managers		Managerial assistants		Labour			
		Number	Rem.* (R)	Number	Rem.* (R)	Permanent		Seasonal	
						Number	Rem.* (R)	Number	Rem.** (R)
MELKBOOM/TRAWAL									
• Table grapes	25	1	170,000	1	85,000	16	15,200	60	50
• Mixed farm***	60	1	128,000	1	36,000	10	12,500	30	45
KLAWER/VREDENDAL									
• Table grapes	25	1	170,000	1	85,000	16	15,200	60	50
• Mixed farm***	75	1	130,000	2	18,300	12	12,500	40	45
CITRUSDAL									
• Citrus farm	70	1	108,000	2	36,000	12	13,950	70	50
CLANWILLIAM									
• Mixed farm****	100	1	108,000	5	39,000	27	12,500	65	50

\* Cash remuneration per unit per year

\*\* Cash remuneration per unit per day

\*\*\* With wine grapes as main enterprise

\*\*\*\* With citrus fruit and potatoes as main enterprises

### 3.2.5 Expected irrigation water requirements for selected crops

The expected gross annual irrigation water requirements for selected crops in the different areas of the study area are presented in **Table 3.28**. Relevant information in this regard was supplied by the soil and crop experts (refer to the *Soils, Water Requirements and Crops Report* by Lambrechts, Schloms and Ellis, 2006, DWAF Report No. P WMA 17/E10/00/1106).

**Table 3.28** Water requirements of crops (m<sup>3</sup>/ha/a)

Crop	Irrigation water requirement per production area per annum (m <sup>3</sup> /ha/a)		
	Citrusdal	Clanwilliam	Trawal/Klawer***
Citrus fruit	11,380	12,250	14,660
Table grapes	-	-	13,580
Wine grapes	8,130	8,650	9,650
Potatoes*	5,990	5,490	6,820
Tomatoes**	6,430	6,660	6,930

\* Centre pivot system (water requirement per production cycle)

\*\* Drip irrigation system (water requirement per production cycle)

\*\*\* This is a combination of the Melkboom/Trawal en Klawer/Vredendal areas

---

## 4 INCOME AND COST BUDGETS FOR SELECTED CROPS

---

### 4.1 Introduction

---

The profitability of irrigation farming is mainly influenced by the costs of irrigation developments relative to the profitability of farming practices. Irrigation farming practices in the study area are determined by soil and climatic considerations, as well as by market prospects for products.

Crop production possibilities range from vines (table and wine grapes), citrus fruit to vegetables (mainly tomatoes and potatoes). This section aims to present the expected income and cost structures of the selected irrigation farming practices in the different regions of the study area. Relevant information in this regard will be utilized during the analysis of the financial viability of irrigation farming (present and proposed) in the different regions of the study area (refer to **Section 6**). The 2005/06 production year serves as a base year for the financial analysis. This implies that all the financial data is presented in 2005/06 Rand values. Producer income is, however, mainly determined by marketing prospects for produce. Relevant trends in this regard will thus serve as a base for the assumptions as far as producer price expectations is concerned.

---

### 4.2 Marketing prospects for produce

---

The main crops of the investigation area, i.e. wine and table grapes and citrus fruit, are relatively capital- and labour intensive as far as production is concerned. Producer's risk is further enhanced via the impact of the globalisation of world trade and more specific the tough competition from Asian, African and Latin American low wage producers on traditional South African export markets. The strong Rand thus further pressures returns from the mentioned export orientated crops. Given the relatively small role of the mentioned industries of approximately 1 to 3% in a world production context, it is of paramount importance to optimize effectivity and efficiency as far as the production and marketing of produce of quality is concerned.

Given the mentioned increased pressure that is realized on export markets, it is important to investigate alternative opportunities. Local market opportunities are enhanced by a growing South African economy in which a strong trend of a more equitable distribution of wealth and income generates buying power. It may thus be worthwhile to investigate opportunities in this growing segment of the market.

#### 4.2.1 Grapes

The marketing prospects, as far as grapes (wine and table grapes) and vegetables are concerned were discussed comprehensively in the similar WODRIS report in 2004 (Department of Agriculture, Western Cape Government, Report 259/2004/13, September 2004).

The strong trend of a weakening Rand from 1990 to 2000 served as an incentive for producers to become more export orientated. Continuous reform, as far as the cultivar mix is concerned, in order to meet global market requirements took place in the wine and table grape industries. Tougher world competition is putting greater pressure on the need for product excellence (i.e.

noble varieties). The South African wine and table grape industries took advantage of the mentioned export opportunities and wine exports quadrupled while table grape exports nearly trebled over the decade 1992 - 2002. The average export prices of table grapes trebled over the mentioned period. As far as the production of table grapes is concerned, the investigation area (i.e. Melkboom/Trawal) has the advantage of a relatively early marketing season and thus relatively higher prices on export markets regarding this perishable product (i.e. short shelf life). This advantage will serve to alleviate the income decrease of producers, should the Rand appreciate in the exchange value thereof. It is thus obvious that a strong Rand will have a negative effect on producers' earnings.

The strengthening Rand over the past 3 to 4 years, combined with the plateau in the wine market will thus lead to lower producer prices. The six-year cycle in the world wine market should further be kept in mind when evaluating the recent downward pressure as far as prices is concerned. It is thus advisable to avoid the large-scale uprooting of cultivars that are experiencing, possibly temporary, low price levels.

#### 4.2.2 Citrus fruit

Citrusdal and Clanwilliam are two of the leading citrus producing areas of South Africa. Approximately 60% of the production volume is exported, mainly to the United Kingdom, USA, Europe and the Middle East. As in the case of export grapes, a weakening rand in the decade 1992 to 2002 served as an incentive for export marketing. Producer income increased mainly due to the continuing trend of a weakening Rand over the mentioned period. Since 2002 the export realization of producers became under pressure due to a stronger Rand. A positive development, as far as citrus marketing from the investigation area is concerned, is the granted access to the USA market. Citrusdal and Clanwilliam are the only production areas in South Africa that qualified as far as the strict phito sanitary regulations regarding fresh produce imports to the USA is concerned. This positive milestone has lead to an increase of citrus exports to the USA. Relative favourable prices in the USA, when seen together with the trend of a weakening Rand since 2006, lead to an increase in the export income of producers of approximately 24 % when compared with the situation in the 2005/06 production season. The income of producers, as was deduced during the workshop sessions in 2005 can thus be seen as relatively conservative.

---

### 4.3 Perennial crops: costs of establishment

---

The expected costs of the establishment of the selected perennial crops for the different regions of the study area are presented in **Table 4.1**. Information in this regard was obtained from industry institutions, the soil experts of the research team and also from leading farmers. It should be noted that the capital investment for inland irrigation facilities have been excluded from this costing, but forms a part of the investment in farm irrigation infrastructure (refer to **Section 3.2.3** and **Tables 3.15** to **3.26**).

**Table 4.1 Expected costs per hectare of establishing table grapes, wine grapes and citrus fruit in selected regions of the study area**

Items Costed	Table Grapes (R/ha)		Wine Grapes (R/ha)		Citrus fruit (R/ha)	
	Melkboom/ Trawal	Klawer/ Vredendal	Melkboom/ Trawal	Klawer/ Vredendal	Citrusdal	Clanwilliam
1.1 Trellising:	39,425	39,425	11,000	11,000	0	0
1.2 Fertilizer	703	703	639	639	3,500	3,500
1.3 Plant Material	16,500	16,500	18,662	18,662	16,000	16,000
1.4 Drainage	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	8,000	8,000
1.5 Contract Work	6,750	6,750	6,750	6,750	8,775	8,775
1.6 Tractor and Implement Costs	4,500	4,500	1,760	1,760	3,750	3,750
1.7 Labour	7,500	7,500	1,410	1,410	5,500	5,500
1.8 Permanent Irrigation Equipment	19,500	19,500	14,000	14,000	16,000	16,000
1.9 Soil Tests and other	25	25	25	25	1,250	1,250
<b>Total Establishment Costs:</b>	<b>101,403</b>	<b>101,403</b>	<b>60,746</b>	<b>60,746</b>	<b>62,775</b>	<b>62,775</b>

Source: Table grape study-group results, VINPRO (SA), Agriculture Western Cape and leading farmers from the study area, 2005/06.

---

#### 4.4 Annual variable costs of selected crops

---

The expected annual variable costs per hectare for the selected cropping systems in the study area are presented in **Table 4.2**. Detailed information regarding the costs of production of crops per region is not available. The costs of production of specific crops in defined regions were obtained from study groups and industry institutions. Information in this regard was thus inspected carefully in order to consider the appropriateness thereof regarding the other regions of the study area. It was concluded that only minor differences regarding the variable costs of production (i.e. the costs of fertilizer, pest control, fuel and maintenance, etc.) might exist between the different regions. It was thus decided that the generalization of information regarding the variable costs of production per crop per region would be acceptable for the purpose of this study. It should be noted that as far as the overhead costs of production (i.e. the costs of capital, labour, management and irrigation water) is concerned, each region was dealt with separately with the aid of the region-specific typical farming models.

---

#### 4.5 Expected income from selected crops per region

---

The visualized crop production pattern varies per region in the study area, mainly due to climatic differences. The expected output, prices and life span of perennial crops in the different regions of the study area are presented in **Tables 4.3 to 4.7**. Information about the expected output and lifespan of crops as well as the price expectations for products was obtained during workshop sessions with leading farmers from each region and other industry experts (refer to **Section 2.2.1**).

**Table 4.2 Expected annual variable costs per hectare (Rand) of selected crops in the study area**

Cost Items		Tomatoes	Potatoes	Table Grapes	Wine Grapes	Citrus fruit
Direct Costs:	Seed	6,450	10,991			
	Fertilizer	6,450	11,485	3,460	984	2,846
	Pesticides & Herbicides	9,400	5,591	6,428	1,078	3,630
	Trellising	15,265				
		4,100	2,677	10,037	2,579	1,837
Mechanisation:	Transport	4,850	4,110	1,203		6,842
	Fuel and	1,175			479	307
General:	Repairs			1,500	931	1,200
	Other			3,137	636	585
	Electricity	1,500	1,761	264	248	442
	Admin Other					
<b>Total</b>		<b>R49,190</b>	<b>R36,615</b>	<b>R26,029</b>	<b>R6,935</b>	<b>R17,689</b>

Source: Table grape study-group results, VINPRO (SA), Agriculture Western Cape and leading farmers from the study area, 2005/06.

**Table 4.3 Expected output, payments\* and lifetime of selected table grape cultivars in the Melkboom/Trawal and Klaver/Vredendal regions of the study area under optimal production conditions, 2005/06**

Fruit Variety/Cultivar	Output per ha			Payment per 4.5 kg Carton (R)		Expected lifetime (years)	Years to full – bearing
	Ton	Grading (%)		Export*	Local**		
		Export	Local				
Prime Seedless	22,50	75	10	58,30	23,50	20	5
Flame Seedless	21,15	75	10	50,30	23,50	20	5
Victoria	19,13	75	10	33,30	23,50	20	5
Majestic	22,50	75	10	23,30	23,50	20	5
Sunred Seedless	22,50	75	10	28,30	23,50	20	5
Thompson Seedless	17,55	75	10	28,30	23,50	20	5
Waltham Cross	18,00	75	10	18,30	23,50	20	5
Crimson Seedless	15,75	75	10	43,30	23,50	20	5
Red Globe	27,00	75	10	33,30	23,50	20	5
Sugarone	18,00	75	10	48,30	23,50	20	5

\* Estimated delivery in port (DIP) payment minus the costs of packing, transport and levies for the Melkboom region. It is assumed that the payments to producers in the Klaver/Vredendal region will be 20 % lower due to a relatively later harvesting season.

\*\* When sold as fresh fruit on the local market minus the costs of packing and transport.

**Table 4.4** Expected output and producers' prices of wine grapes and other selected crops in the Melkboom/Trawal region of the study area under optimal production conditions, 2005/06

Fruit Variety/Cultivar	Output per ha (ton)	Price per ton (R)	Expected lifetime (years)	Years to full-bearing
<b>WINE GRAPES</b>				
Chenin Blanc	25	1000	25	5
Colombar	25	1000	25	5
Hanepoot	20	1300	25	5
Shiraz	15	2000	25	5
Pinotage	15	2000	25	5
Merlot	15	2000	25	5
Cabernet S	15	2500	25	5
Other red	15	2000	25	5
<b>DRIED GRAPES</b>				
Sultanas	30	1250	25	5
<b>TOMATOES</b>				
	75	2000	-	-

**Table 4.5** Expected output and producers' prices of wine grapes and other selected crops in the Klawer/Vredendal region of the study area under optimal production conditions, 2005/06

Fruit Variety/Cultivar	Output per ha (ton)	Price per ton (R)	Expected lifetime (years)	Years to full-bearing
<b>WINE GRAPES</b>				
White cultivars	25	1000	25	5
Red cultivars	12	2000	25	5
<b>DRIED GRAPES</b>				
	30	1250	25	5
<b>TOMATOES</b>				
	75	2000	-	-

**Table 4.6** Expected output and producers' prices of citrus fruit in the Citrusdal region of the study area under optimal production conditions, 2005/06

Cultivar	Output per ha (ton)	Price per ton* (R)	Expected lifetime (years)	Years to full-bearing
Navels	45	1223	40	9
Valencias	45	865	40	9
Midnight	45	1475	40	9
Soft Citrus	50	810	40	9
Lemons	50	550	40	9

\* Average payment to producers after the costs of packing and export levies for the 2003, 2004 and 2005 production seasons has been taken into account.

Source: Goedeheop Citrus Company Pty (Ltd), 2005.



**Table 4.7 Expected output and producers' prices of citrus fruit and other selected crops in the Clanwilliam region of the study area under optimal production conditions, 2005/06**

Cultivar	Output per ha (ton)	Price per ton* (R)	Expected lifetime (years)	Years to full-bearing
Navels	40	1223	40	9
Valencias	43	865	40	9
Midknight	45	1475	40	9

\* Average payment to producers after the costs of packing and export levies for the 2003, 2004 and 2005 production seasons has been taken into account.

Source: Goedehoop Citrus Company Pty (Ltd), 2005.

---

## 5 EXPECTED COSTS OF IRRIGATION WATER

---

Information about the costs of irrigation water forms an integral part of the database that is required to undertake the financial viability analysis of irrigation farming in the investigation area (refer to **Section 6**). Both the existing irrigation farming situations and the envisaged future irrigation farming developments thus form a part of this assignment.

---

### 5.1 Existing irrigation farming

---

As far as existing irrigation farming is concerned, the present water tariff of R1 925 per listed hectare serves as a cost-input in the financial viability analysis. The cost of water upstream of the Clanwilliam Dam (i.e. Citrusdal region) is taken as R80 per listed hectare at 12 200 m<sup>3</sup>/ha. Information in this regard was obtained from the regional office of the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry at Clanwilliam.

---

### 5.2 Envisaged irrigation development

---

Irrigation development addresses both the expansion of existing irrigation farming and the development of new irrigation farms in the research area (refer to **Sections 2.1** and **3.2**). The envisaged irrigation development upstream of the Clanwilliam Dam will comprise mainly of the development of "private" (i.e. per individual farm) irrigation schemes where water will be pumped directly from the river. The expected cost of the infrastructure of this envisaged irrigation development was presented in **Tables 3.15** and **3.16**. The cost of the water is assumed to be at the same rate as for the existing irrigation practices of this kind, i.e. R80 per listed hectare at 12 200 m<sup>3</sup>/ha. The expected cost of the additional irrigation water (from the Clanwilliam Dam) for downstream utilisation at different dam raising levels is presented in **Table 5.1**. The expected costs of farm irrigation infrastructure developments that are associated with the downstream expansion of irrigation farms were presented in **Tables 3.17** to **3.26**.

**Table 5.1 Expected cost of irrigation water at different raising levels of the Clanwilliam Dam, 2005/06**

Yield and Costs	Raising levels (m)			Discounting rate (%)
	5	10	15	
Expected yield (Mm <sup>3</sup> /a)	38	55	70	
Expected 2005/06 costs (R mil)				
Capital costs	210,352	356,792	489,647	
Maintenance	8,987	15,245	20,920	
Total	219,339	372,037	510,567	
Capital redemption (R mil/a)*	14,04	23,81	32,68	4%
Expected water cost (R/m <sup>3</sup> )	0,37	0,43	0,47	
Capital redemption (R mil/a)*	18,64	31,62	43,39	6%
Expected water cost(R/m <sup>3</sup> )	0,49	0,58	0,62	
Capital redemption (R mil/a)*	24,32	41,25	56,61	8%
Expected water cost (R/m <sup>3</sup> )	0,64	0,75	0,81	

\* Expected costs based on 2006 price levels, accounting for a period, up to yield availability, of 5 years, and at a loan redemption period of 25 years.

Shortened periods, up to the availability of water, other than the five years used for the calculations, would marginally lower the expected cost of the water.

Refined, slightly altered yields have become available towards the end of the study, which are the following:

Raising levels (m)	5	10	15
Expected yield (Mm <sup>3</sup> /a)	32	59	73

For the 5m raising this would imply that the expected water cost would increase by about 20% for a 5m raising, while the water costs for the 10m and 15m raising would reduce by about 7% and 4%, respectively. As water is only one of the input costs, the overall effect of this change will be small, and would only marginally influence the findings of this report.

---

## 6 FINANCIAL VIABILITY OF IRRIGATION FARMING

---

### 6.1 Introduction

---

The financial viability of both the existing and the envisaged expansion of irrigation farming in the study area were investigated. Typical regional farming models (refer to **Section 3**), the expected income and costs structures of the selected crops in the different regions (refer to **Section 4**) and the costs of irrigation water (refer to **Section 5**) serve as inputs to the financial viability analysis. The research approach that was described in **Section 2** is applied for the analysis. The results of the financial viability analysis are followed by a short discussion of the realities that may be obstructive to new entrants to farming in the study area.

---

### 6.2 Analytical framework (also refer to Section 2.2)

---

The multi-period financial analysis was executed at constant 2005/06 price levels. The discounting of the expected future financial results was done at a real interest rate of 4% per year (i.e. a nominal interest rate of approximately 10% per year at a yearly inflation rate of, say, 6%). Due to the difficulty to estimate an appropriate discounting rate, the sensitivity of the financial results will be tested by employing a range of real discounting rates.

#### 6.2.1 Evaluation Criteria

The financial viability analysis focuses on the expected profitability and affordability of irrigation farming in the study area. It also aims to illustrate the relative "efficiency" of the consumption of irrigation water in the different regions of the study area.

##### a. Profitability

The expected profitability of the typical farming operations in the different regions of the study area is measured by means of the internal rate of return on the capital employed (IRR) and the net present value (NPV) of the expected flow of funds over the calculation period of 40 years. The NPV is calculated at a variety of real discounting rates.

##### b. Affordability

Farming operations in the study area is relatively capital intensive and risky due to, *inter alia*, uncertain farming output and product prices. Another reality that faces the farmer is the trend that the market value of land exceeds the productive value thereof. This implies that a farmer should be able to supply an appropriate portion of the capital needs from his own financial sources. When stated in another way, this means that, in general, farm output-value will not be able to remunerate all the farming inputs when the total capital need for the farm is financed via loaned capital. The impact of different own-to-loaned capital ratios on the break-even year of the expected cash flow from farming will illustrate this aspect.

##### c. "Efficiency" of irrigation water consumption

Two criteria are employed to illustrate the relative "efficiency" of the consumption of irrigation water in the different regions of the study area. The first criterion is financially-based. It measures the annual net financial benefit that is realised from irrigation farming per m<sup>3</sup> of water

---

used per year. The second criterion focuses on job creation by irrigation farming. The ratio of job creation per 1 000 m<sup>3</sup> of irrigation water consumed serves as a criterion of the relative “efficiency” of the different regions of the study area.

---

### 6.3 Financial viability of existing irrigation farming

---

The financial viability of existing irrigation farming in the different regions of the study area, when estimated with the aid of the mentioned criteria (refer to **Section 6.2**), is presented in **Exhibits 6.1 to 6.6** (see **Appendix A**), with a summary thereof in **Table 6.1**.

Given the assumptions regarding the income and costs structures of farms and the cost of irrigation water from the existing irrigation scheme that were stated in **Sections 3 to 5**, irrigation farming (i.e. mainly table grape, wine grape and citrus farming) is financially viable in all but one of the regions that were investigated, (i.e. an IRR of more than 4% per year). The typical mixed farming situation in the Melkboom/Trawal region is at present under financial stress, mainly due to the relatively low prices for the main enterprise, i.e. wine grapes.

The financial analysis indicates favourable returns on capital employed, especially for table grape farming in Melkboom/Trawal, but also as far as table grape and mixed farming in Klaver/Vredendal and citrus farming in the Clanwilliam region is concerned. Contributing factors in this regard are, *inter alia*, the following:

- ❖ Well-established farming communities that are supported by the necessary supporting infra-structure as far as marketing services and input-supplying industries are concerned
- ❖ sound managerial skills at the farm level
- ❖ relatively affordable tariffs for irrigation water from existing water sources.

**Table 6.1 Financial viability of existing irrigation farming in the study area**

Scenario/Region	Water Need (m <sup>3</sup> /ha)	Evaluation Criteria						Jobs/1000 m <sup>3</sup> Water (number)
		IRR *	NPV/ha **	Annuity/m <sup>3</sup> Water ***	Break-even Year****			
					Equity at: 80%	Equity at: 60%	Equity at: 40%	
Citrusdal citrus farm	11,380	4.55%	(19,684)	0.05	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.05
Clanwilliam citrus farm	9,177	7.54%	20,575	0.33	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.06
Melkboom/Trawal mixed farm	9,495	1.99%	(54,416)	(0.20)	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.03
Melkboom/Trawal table grape farm	13,580	34.44%	607,371	3.31	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.10
Klawer/Vredendal mixed farm	9,197	10.34%	46,490	0.51	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.03
Klawer/Vredendal table grape farm	13,580	9.57%	107,643	0.86	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.10

\* Internal rate of return (in real terms) on capital investment.

\*\* Net present value at a real discounting rate of 4% per year, (i.e. 10% nominal interest per year at a yearly inflation rate of, say, 6%.

\*\*\* Annuity of the net benefits per m<sup>3</sup> irrigation water applied at a real discounting rate of 4% per year.

\*\*\*\* At a real loan interest rate of 4% per year, i.e. 10% nominal interest per year.

---

## 6.4 Financial viability of envisaged irrigation developments

---

Irrigation development addresses the development of new water sources for both the expansion of existing irrigation farms and the development of virgin farms.

### 6.4.1 Expansion of existing irrigation farming

The financial viability of the expansion of existing irrigation farming, on typical farms in the different regions, of the study area is presented in **Exhibits 6.7 to 6.12** (see **Appendix B**), with a summary thereof in **Table 6.2**.

Given the assumptions about the income and cost structures of farms and the costs of the additional irrigation water from the proposed raising of the Clanwilliam Dam, the expansion of existing irrigation farms seem viable in all the regions downstream of the Clanwilliam Dam. The main contributing factors in this regard are, *inter alia*:

- ❖ the relatively cheaper additional irrigation water associated with the raising of the dam (i.e. R0,43/m<sup>3</sup> for a 10 metre raising, at a real discounting rate of 4% per annum)
- ❖ the possibility to realize "economy-of-scale effects" as far as the utilisation of existing infrastructure on farms is concerned.

**Table 6.2 Financial viability of the proposed expansion of existing irrigation farms in the study area**

Scenario/Region	Water Need (m <sup>3</sup> /ha)	Evaluation Criteria						Jobs/1000 m <sup>3</sup> Water (number)
		IRR *	NPV/ha **	Annuity/m <sup>3</sup> Water ***	Break-Even Year****			
					Equity at: 80%	Equity at: 60%	Equity at: 40%	
Citrusdal Citrus farm expansion	11,380	3.19%	(65,846)	(0.11)	06/07	06/07	> 40 Years	0.05
Clanwilliam Citrus farm expansion	8,870	6.38%	6,118	0.28	13/14	15/16	17/18	0.06
Melkboom/Trawal mixed farm expansion	9,378	5.42%	(8,594)	0.15	12/13	19/20	22/23	0.04
Melkboom/Trawal table grape expansion	13,580	28.76%	685,269	3.79	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.09
Klawer/Vredendal mixed farm expansion	9,106	10.26%	48,479	0.53	05/06	05/06	05/06	0.03
Klawer/Vredendal table grape expansion	13,037	11.24%	189,645	1.38	11/12	12/13	12/13	0.10

\* Internal rate of return (in real terms) on capital investment.

\*\* Net present value at a real discounting rate of 4% per year, i.e. 10% nominal interest per year at a yearly inflation rate of, say, 6%.

\*\*\* Annuity of the net benefits per m<sup>3</sup> irrigation water applied at a real discounting rate of 4% per year.

\*\*\*\* At a real loan interest rate of 4% per year, i.e. 10% nominal interest per year.



### 6.4.2 New irrigation farms

The expected financial viability of the development of typical irrigation farms on virgin land in the relevant regions of the study area, are presented in **Exhibits 6.13 to 6.18** (see **Appendix C**), with a summary thereof in **Table 6.3**.

In general, the development of new irrigation farms seems to be problematic from a financial viability viewpoint. Given the reality of relatively profitable existing farming operations in the various regions of the study area, the major contributing factor to lower profit margins seems to be the expected relatively high capital cost of the development of new farms.

An exception in this regard is the seemingly profitable option of the development of new table grape farms in the Melkboom/Trawal region, where a real IRR of 11.05% per year can be expected (refer to **Exhibit 6.16** in **Appendix C**). A major contributing factor in this regard is the expected higher prices for produce due to a relatively favourable early harvesting season.

It is thus important to note that the expansion of existing irrigation farms (refer to **Table 6.2**) will in general be financially more viable than the development of new irrigation farms (refer to **Table 6.3**), should more irrigation water become available from the Clanwilliam Dam. The main reason for this finding is the cost effectiveness of the improved utilisation of infrastructure on existing farms relative to the costly nature of the development of new farms. This finding should be kept in mind when strategies are developed for the economic empowerment of previously disadvantaged groups (refer to **Section 7**).

**Table 6.3 Financial viability of the envisaged new irrigation farms in the study area**

Scenario/Region	Water Need (m <sup>3</sup> /ha)	Evaluation Criteria						Jobs/1000 m <sup>3</sup> Water (number)
		IRR *	NPV/ha **	Annuity/m <sup>3</sup> Water ***	Break-even Year			
					Equity at: 80%	Equity at: 60%	Water (number)	
Citrusdal new Citrus farm	11,380	1.42%	(240,432)	(0.80)	> 40 Years	> 40 Years	> 40 Years	0.05
Clanwilliam new Citrus farm	8,870	4.19%	(58,010)	0.05	32/33	36/37	39/40	0.05
Melkboom/Trawal new mixed farm	9,378	Negative	(113,563)	(0.53)	> 40 Years	> 40 Years	> 40 Years	0.04
Melkboom/Trawal new table grape farm	13,580	11.05%	338,574	2.38	15/16	15/16	16/17	0.09
Klawer/Vredendal new mixed farm	9,106	4.93%	(22,452)	0.15	>40 years	>40 years	>40 years	0.03
Klawer/Vredendal new table grape farm	13,580	5.24%	(44,479)	0.37	19/20	21/22	23/24	0.09

\* Internal rate of return (in real terms) on capital investment.

\*\* Net present value at a real discounting rate of 4% per year, (i.e. 10% nominal interest per year at a yearly inflation rate of, say, 6%.

\*\*\* Annuity of the net benefits per m<sup>3</sup> irrigation water applied at a real discounting rate of 4% per year.

\*\*\*\* At a real loan interest rate of 4% per year, i.e. 10% nominal interest per year.

The sensitivity of the financial viability of new farming developments for the cost of additional irrigation water is presented in **Table 6.4**. Three dam raising levels (i.e. 5 metre, 10 metre and 15 metre) are considered, each with a unique expected cost structure and yield per annum (refer to **Table 5.1**). The expected cost structure of the dam developments is also influenced by the capital discounting rate as far as future capital expenditure and dam operating costs are concerned. The financial viability analysis (refer to **Tables 6.1 to 6.3** and **Exhibits 6.1 to 6.18**) of irrigation farming was done at a cost level of R0,43/m<sup>3</sup> as far as the additional irrigation water is concerned (i.e. a 10 metre raising and the bench mark real capital discounting rate of 4% per annum).

It is clear from **Table 6.4** that the different envisaged cost levels (i.e. water cost/m<sup>3</sup> at different dam raisings) only have a minor impact on the expected financial viability of irrigation farming. The main reason for this finding is the reality of relatively small incremental differences between the water unit costs at the different dam raising levels.

Given the expected yields and costs of the alternative dam raisings and the income and cost structure associated with typical farming operations in the investigation area, it can be concluded that, from a pure farm-financial perspective, the financial viability of irrigation farming is not sensitive to the potential level of dam raising.

**Table 6.4 Internal rate of return (IRR) on capital investment in typical farming operations at different unit water cost levels (i.e. dam raising alternatives)**

Raising Level (m)	Discounting Rate (%/a)	Water cost (c/m <sup>3</sup> )	IRR of typical new farming developments per region				
			Clanwilliam	Melkboom//Traval		Klawer/Vredendal	
			New mixed farm	New table grape farm	New mixed farm	New table grape farm	New mixed farm
5	4	37	4,43	11,25	0,47	5,45	5,32
	6	49	3,94	10,85	negative	5,04	4,54
	8	64	3,33	10,36	negative	4,52	3,59
10	4	43	4,19	11,05	negative	5,24	4,93
	6	58	3,57	10,56	negative	4,73	3,97
	8	75	2,88	10,01	negative	4,15	2,91
15	4	47	4,02	10,92	negative	5,11	4,67
	6	62	3,41	10,43	negative	4,59	3,72
	8	81	2,64	9,82	negative	3,95	2,53

## 6.5 Realities that may be obstructive to new entrants to farming in the study area

The following realities should be kept in mind when one considers becoming involved in irrigation farming in the study area:

- (i) Irrigation farming is in general relatively capital intensive and expensive, due to, *inter alia*, the following:
  - ❖ High-potential irrigation land is relatively scarce in the RSA and is thus expensive

- 
- ❖ the upgrading of medium-low and medium potential irrigation land is a relatively expensive activity
  - ❖ the development of irrigation schemes is capital-intensive and thus costly, and
  - ❖ water reticulation systems on farms are costly
- (ii) High-income crops, with the accompanying high level of technological and managerial inputs, are thus produced, attempting to recover the mentioned relatively high costs.
- (iii) Acceptable quality and price levels for produce are furthered by sound managerial practices at the farm level as well as by productive marketing practices.
- (iv) The trend that the market value of land (refer to **Section 6.2**) exceeds the productive value thereof, implies that a farmer should be able to supply a considerable portion of the farm's capital need from own financial sources.

New entrants from previously disadvantaged groups will therefore be faced with the mentioned realities when considering becoming farmers. The development of appropriate farming ownership models and suitable financial support systems to accommodate and further "partnerships" between existing commercial farmers and the new entrants are further discussed in **Section 7**.

---

## 7 ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT OF PREVIOUSLY DISADVANTAGED GROUPS

---

The economic empowerment of previously disadvantaged communities is an important objective of the political dispensation in South Africa.

As far as the agricultural sector is concerned this objective at first manifested itself mainly towards measures to further the redistribution of land (i.e. the belief existed that land ownership should lead to the mentioned groups to become successful farmers).

The following realities regarding farming in the South African milieu, however, served as barriers to the realization of success as far as this belief is concerned:

- ❖ Agriculture functions in a highly competitive environment as far as markets are concerned and thus experience variable prices. The level of price variability is enhanced via the variable exchange rate of the Rand.
- ❖ Agricultural production is of biological nature and is influenced by the nature. Economic uncertainty in agriculture is further enhanced via variable outputs due to the impact of variable weather conditions on agricultural production.
- ❖ Most agricultural industries in the investigation area are relatively capital-intensive as far as production processes is concerned.
- ❖ The gap between the production and market value of land implies that about 60% of the capital requirement should be financed by own capital sources. It is thus difficult to enter the farming industry should one experience a shortage of "own capital".
- ❖ The risky nature of agricultural production implies the necessity of skilful managerial inputs.

Strategies to enhance economic empowerment should thus take the mentioned realities into consideration, especially as far as the lack of managerial skills and limited capital resources of envisaged new entrants to farming is concerned. Even when capital limitations were countered by government subsidisation, various examples exist where lack of managerial skills lead to failure of land reform projects.

The emphasis, as far as economic empowerment is concerned, thus shifted from the objective of land redistribution per se to the attainment of a "share" in existing successful businesses as an initial step towards economic empowerment. The generation of own capital in this way may thus lead to the attainment of the objective of land ownership at a later stage.

It is thus assumed that the yield of the Clanwilliam Dam project (i.e. additional irrigation water for farming) will only become a reality when farming schemes are developed that involve the previously disadvantaged people (for example the farm labourers) in a viable way. Possible farming schemes were discussed in full in the Olifants-/Doring River Irrigation Study reports (Department of Agriculture, Provincial Government Western Cape, Contract 259/2000/2001, Report JA0385A, September 2004, *Agricultural Development Plan and Economic Analysis – Volume 1*, p. 13-1).

As far as the investigation area is concerned, the following example can serve as an illustration of a possible partnership between a commercial farmer and his labourers. The proposed structure was applied to the main typical farming models of the investigation area, i.e. citrus, table grape and wine grape farms. It was clear from the analysis of Sections 6.4.1 and 6.4.2 (refer to p.6-10) that it should be more viable to expand existing farms than to start new farms. The proposed structure of farming partnerships will thus focus on an investigation of the viability to expand existing commercial farms in partnership with the farm labourers.

### **Basic structure**

A business Trust, with the farmer and his existing permanent labourers as beneficiaries, serve as an example of a business entity.

Trustees are selected from the mentioned groups.

The effectivity of the Board of Trustees may be enhanced via the appointment of relevant experts as additional trustees from "outside", for example a person(s) with legal and financial/accounting skills.

### ***Farmer contribution:***

- ❖ the land for the envisaged development
- ❖ managerial inputs
- ❖ a portion of the additional capital needs (refer to the examples that follow for an outline of the "relative interest" of the farmer and his labourer partners in the envisaged farming developments).

### ***Labour contribution:***

- ❖ labour inputs
- ❖ managerial inputs (as part of the Board of Trustees)
- ❖ R20 000 per participating labourer (i.e. the "grant" from government)

The remaining capital needs for the envisaged development is to be financed with loaned capital (i.e. a 50-50 share of the loan by the farmer and the participating labourer partners, respectively). An analysis of the viability of this envisaged farming development strategy, as far as the expansion of existing typical farms in the study area is concerned, follows below.

---

## **7.1 Clanwilliam: expansion of an existing mixed farm (citrus and potatoes) from 55 ha to 100 ha**

---

The calculations (refer to **Tables 7.1** and **7.2**) have a bearing only on the expanded portion of the existing farm (i.e. 45 ha). It is assumed that the 10 permanent labourers who are currently employed will be the farmer's partners in the joint venture. Given the assumptions made, the proposed joint venture seems a viable proposition.

**Table 7.1 Possible capital and financing structure of the envisaged farm expansion and the relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners, Clanwilliam, 2005/06**

Expected capital investment*: ~~~~~			Financing strategy ~~~~~	R/ha
<b>FIXED CAPITAL:</b>		<b>R/ha</b>	<b>OWN CAPITAL</b>	
Bare Land		15,000	Farmer contribution: Land	15000
Buildings		35,000	Equipment	
Irrigation (main lines,pumps,filters & dams		21,184	Buildings	35000
Establishment		27,900		
<b>MOVABLE CAPITAL:</b>			Labour contribution** (10 @ R20000/45 ha)	4444
Equipment		18,300	Total	54444
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>117,384</b>	<b>BORROWED CAPITAL</b>	<b>62940</b>
* for 45 ha (i.e. 20 ha of citrus fruit and 25 ha of potatoes)			Re-capitalized for 3 years	70838
			Repayment from year 4 to year 13	-8,742
Relative interest : Farmer/ Labourers ~~~~~				
		<b>RAND/ha</b>		
Labour:	Own capital** (10 @ R20000/45 ha)	4,444		
	Dev loan (50% of loan)	31,470		
	Total	35,914		
	Interest of labour	31%		
Farmer interest		69% (i.e. R 81470 )		
~~~~~				
** Labour 'grant':	R 20,000	per labourer		

**Table 7.2 Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical citrus farm from 55 to 100 ha, Clanwilliam, 2005/06\***

Year	Margin before debt payment (R/ha)	Debt Payment (R/ha)	Margin after debt payment	Comulative margin	Profit share of labourers per ha per year	Profit share of farmer per ha per year	Profit share per labourer per ha per yr	Profit share per labourer per year (45 ha)
0	-6,099		-6,099	-6,099				
1	6,581		6,581	482				
2	6,581		6,581	7,063				
3	6,581		6,581	13,643				
4	8,399	8,742	-343	13,300	4,069	9,231	407	18,312
5	10,217	8,742	1,475	14,775	451	1,024	45	2,030
6	13,853	8,742	5,111	19,886	1,564	3,547	156	7,036
7	17,488	8,742	8,747	28,632	2,676	6,070	268	12,042
8	21,124	8,742	12,382	41,015	3,788	8,594	379	17,048
9	24,760	8,742	16,018	57,033	4,901	11,117	490	22,054
10	24,760	8,742	16,018	73,051	4,901	11,117	490	22,054
11	24,760	8,742	16,018	89,070	4,901	11,117	490	22,054
12	24,760	8,742	16,018	105,088	4,901	11,117	490	22,054
13	24,760	8,742	16,018	121,106	4,901	11,117	490	22,054
14	24,760		24,760	145,867	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
15	24,760		24,760	170,627	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
16	24,760		24,760	195,387	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
17	24,760		24,760	220,147	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
18	24,760		24,760	244,907	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
19	24,760		24,760	269,668	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
20	24,760		24,760	294,428	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
21	24,760		24,760	319,188	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
22	24,760		24,760	343,948	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
23	24,760		24,760	368,708	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
24	24,760		24,760	393,469	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
25	24,760		24,760	418,229	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
26	24,760		24,760	442,989	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
27	24,760		24,760	467,749	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
28	24,760		24,760	492,509	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
29	24,760		24,760	517,270	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
30	24,760		24,760	542,030	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
31	24,760		24,760	566,790	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
32	24,760		24,760	591,550	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
33	24,760		24,760	616,310	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
34	24,760		24,760	641,071	7,576	17,185	758	34,090
35	24,760		24,760	665,831	7,576	17,185	758	34,090

\* Expansion of 20 ha citrus fruit and 25 ha potatoes

**7.2 Melkboom/Trawal**

**7.2.1 Expansion of a typical wine grape farm from 50 ha to 65 ha**

Given the assumptions made, the proposed joint venture seems a viable proposition for both the farmer and his 7 permanent labour partners (refer to **Tables 7.3** and **7.4**)

**Table 7.3 Possible capital and financial structure of the envisaged mixed wine grape farm expansion and the relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06**

Expected capital investment*:				Financing strategy		R/ha
<b>FIXED CAPITAL:</b>				<b>OWN CAPITAL</b>		
Bare Land			15,000	Farmer contribution: Land		15,000
Buildings			21,667	Equipment		37,667
Irrigation (main lines,pumps,filters)			19,025			
Establishment			40,497			
<b>MOVABLE CAPITAL:</b>				Labour contribution** 7 @ R20 000/15 ha		9,333
Equipment			37,667	Total		62,000
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>BORROWED CAPITAL</b>		71,856
* For 15 ha (i.e.10ha of wine grapes and 5ha of tomatoes)				Re-capitalized for 7 years		94,678
				Repayment from year 7 to year 16		R -11,684
Relative interest : Farmer/ Labourers						
				<b>RAND/ha</b>		
Labour:	Own cap**	7 @ R20 000/15 ha	9,333			
	Dev loan	(50% of loan)	35,928			
	Total		45,261			
Interest of labour			34%			
Farmer interest			66% (i.e. R 88595 )			
** Labour 'grant' : R 20,000 per labourer						



**Table 7.4 Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical "mixed" wine grape farm from 35 to 50 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06\***

Year	Margin before debt payment (R/ha)	Debt Payment (R/ha)	Margin after debt payment	Cumulative margin	Profit share of labourers per ha per year	Profit share of farmer per ha per year	Profit share per labourer per ha per year	Profit share per labourer per year (15 ha)
0	-7,580		-7,580	-7,580				
1	-5,545		-5,545	-13,653				
2	-5,545		-5,545	-19,969				
3	1,744		1,744	-18,958				
4	5,388		5,388	-13,570				
5	12,677		12,677	-893				
6	12,677		12,677	11,784	3,985	7,800	569	8,538
7	12,677	11,684	993	12,777	336	657	48	720
8	12,677	11,684	993	13,771	336	657	48	720
9	12,677	11,684	993	14,764	336	657	48	720
10	12,677	11,684	993	15,757	336	657	48	720
11	12,677	11,684	993	16,750	336	657	48	720
12	12,677	11,684	993	17,743	336	657	48	720
13	12,677	11,684	993	18,736	336	657	48	720
14	12,677	11,684	993	19,730	336	657	48	720
15	12,677	11,684	993	20,723	336	657	48	720
16	12,677	11,684	993	21,716	336	657	48	720
17	12,677		12,677	34,393	4,287	8,391	612	9,185
18	12,677		12,677	47,070	4,287	8,391	612	9,185
19	12,677		12,677	59,747	4,287	8,391	612	9,185
20	12,677		12,677	72,424	4,287	8,391	612	9,185
21	12,677		12,677	85,101	4,287	8,391	612	9,185
22	12,677		12,677	97,778	4,287	8,391	612	9,185
23	9,033		9,033	106,811	3,054	5,978	436	6,545
24	5,388		5,388	112,199	1,822	3,566	260	3,904
25	2,633		2,633	114,832	890	1,742	127	1,908

\* Expansion by 15 ha (i.e. 10 ha of wine grapes and 5 ha of tomatoes)

## 7.2.2 Expansion of a typical table grape farm from 20 ha to 25 ha

Table grape production in the Melkboom/Trawal region seems to be the most profitable farming branch in the investigation area (refer to **Tables 6.1** and **6.2**).

Given the assumptions made (refer to **Table 7.5** and **7.6**), the proposed joint venture thus also seems to be a viable proposition for both the farmer and his labour partners (i.e. the 12 permanent labourers that are currently employed).

**Table 7.5 Possible capital and financing structure and relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners when expanding a typical table grape farm, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06**

Expected capital investment*:			Financing strategy	R/ha
FIXED CAPITAL:		R/ha	OWN CAPITAL	
Bare Land	15000		Farmer contribution: Land	15000
Pumps and main lines	19245		Equipment	32680
Irrigation (main and branch lines inland)	5000			
Establishment	101653		Labour contribution	12 @ R20000/5 ha
Buildings(new)	60000		Total	48000
				95680
MOVABLE CAPITAL:			BORROWED CAPITAL	
Equipment	32680			137898
TOTAL	233578		Re-capitalized for 5 years	167927
* for 5ha of table grapes			Repayment from year 5 to year 14	-20,723
Relative interest : Farmer/ Labourers				
		RAND/ha		
Labour:	Own capital** 12 @ R20000/5 ha	48000		
	Development lc (50% of loan)	68949		
	Total	116949		
	Interest of labour	50%		
Farmer interest		50% ( i.e. R 116629 )		
** Labour 'grant': R 20,000 per labourer				

**Table 7.6 Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical table grape farm from 20 to 25 ha, Melkboom/Trawal, 2005/06\***

Year	Margin before debt payment (R/ha)	Debt Payment (R/ha)	Margin after debt payment	Cumulative margin	Profit share of labourers per ha per year	Profit share of farmer per ha per year	Profit share per labourer per ha per yr	Profit share per labourer per year (5 ha)
0	-33,870		-33,870	-33,870				
1	-66,768		-66,768	-104,683				
2	-66,768		-66,768	-178,342				
3	25,639		25,639	-158,840				
4	71,842		71,842	-90,494				
5	164,250	20,723	143,526	55,164	27,620	27,544	2,302	11,508
6	164,250	20,723	143,526	198,690	71,861	71,665	5,988	29,942
7	164,250	20,723	143,526	342,216	71,861	71,665	5,988	29,942
8	164,250	20,723	143,526	485,742	71,861	71,665	5,988	29,942
9	164,250	20,723	143,526	629,269	71,861	71,665	5,988	29,942
10	164,250	20,723	143,526	772,795	71,861	71,665	5,988	29,942
11	164,250	20,723	143,526	916,321	71,861	71,665	5,988	29,942
12	164,250	20,723	143,526	1,059,847	71,861	71,665	5,988	29,942
13	164,250	20,723	143,526	1,203,374	71,861	71,665	5,988	29,942
14	164,250	20,723	143,526	1,346,900	71,861	71,665	5,988	29,942
15	164,250		164,250	1,511,150	82,237	82,012	6,853	34,266
16	164,250		164,250	1,675,399	82,237	82,012	6,853	34,266
17	164,250		164,250	1,839,649	82,237	82,012	6,853	34,266
18	164,250		164,250	2,003,898	82,237	82,012	6,853	34,266
19	118,046		118,046	2,121,944	59,104	58,942	4,925	24,627
20	71,842		71,842	2,193,787	35,970	35,872	2,998	14,988

\* Expanded area 5 ha

### 7.3 Klawer/Vredendal

#### 7.3.1 Expansion of a typical wine grape farm from 60 ha to 75 ha

Given the assumptions made, the proposed joint venture (refer to **Tables 7.7** and **7.8**) seems a viable proposition for both the farmer and his labour partners (i.e. the 10 permanent labourers that are currently employed).

**Table 7.7 Possible capital and financing structure of the envisaged wine grape farm expansion and the relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners, Klawer/Vredendal, 2005/06**

Expected capital investment*			Financing strategy		R/ha
~~~~~			~~~~~		
<b>FIXED CAPITAL:</b>			<b>OWN CAPITAL</b>		
Bare Land		R/ha 15000	Farmer contribution:	Land	15000
Buildings		21667		Equipment	15533
Irrigation (main lines,pumps,filters)		21729			
Establishment		40497			
<b>MOVABLE CAPITAL:</b>			Labour contribution**	10 @ R20000/15 ha	13333
Equipment		15533	Total		43867
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>BORROWED CAPITAL</b>		<b>70560</b>
* for 15ha (i.e 10ha of wine grapes and 5ha of tomatoes)			Re-capitalized for 5 years		85925
			Repayment from year 5 to year 14		R -10,604
Relative interest : Farmer/ Labourers					
~~~~~					
			<b>RAND/ha</b>		
Labour:	Own cap**	10 @ R20000/15 ha	13333		
	Dev loan	(50% of loan)	35280		
	Total		48613		
	Interest of labour		42%		
Farmer interest			58% (i.e. R 65813 )		
~~~~~					
** Labour 'grant' :	R 20,000 per labourer				

**Table 7.8 Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical "mixed" wine grape farm from 60 to 75 ha, Klaver/Vredendal, 2005/06\***

Year	Margin before debt payment (R/ha)	Debt Payment (R/ha)	Margin after debt payment	Cumulative margin	Profit share of labourers per ha per year	Profit share of farmer per ha per year	Profit share per labourer per ha per yr	Profit share per labourer per year (15 ha)
0	-4,327		-4,327	-4,327				
1	-2,418		-2,418	-7,016				
2	-2,418		-2,418	-9,813				
3	5,138		5,138	-4,863				
4	8,916		8,916	4,053	1,722	2,331	172	2,583
5	16,471	10,604	5,867	9,920	2,493	3,375	249	3,739
6	16,471	10,604	5,867	15,788	2,493	3,375	249	3,739
7	16,471	10,604	5,867	21,655	2,493	3,375	249	3,739
8	16,471	10,604	5,867	27,522	2,493	3,375	249	3,739
9	16,471	10,604	5,867	33,390	2,493	3,375	249	3,739
10	16,471	10,604	5,867	39,257	2,493	3,375	249	3,739
11	16,471	10,604	5,867	45,124	2,493	3,375	249	3,739
12	16,471	10,604	5,867	50,992	2,493	3,375	249	3,739
13	16,471	10,604	5,867	56,859	2,493	3,375	249	3,739
14	16,471	10,604	5,867	62,726	2,493	3,375	249	3,739
15	16,471		16,471	79,197	6,998	9,473	700	10,496
16	16,471		16,471	95,668	6,998	9,473	700	10,496
17	16,471		16,471	112,139	6,998	9,473	700	10,496
18	16,471		16,471	128,610	6,998	9,473	700	10,496
19	16,471		16,471	145,082	6,998	9,473	700	10,496
20	16,471		16,471	161,553	6,998	9,473	700	10,496
21	16,471		16,471	178,024	6,998	9,473	700	10,496
22	16,471		16,471	194,495	6,998	9,473	700	10,496
23	12,693		12,693	207,188	5,393	7,301	539	8,089
24	8,916		8,916	216,103	3,768	5,128	379	5,682
25	6,093		6,093	222,197	2,589	3,505	259	3,883

\* Expansion by 15 ha (i.e. 10 ha of wine grapes and 5 ha of tomatoes)

### 7.3.2 Expansion of a typical table grape farm from 20 ha to 25 ha

Given the assumptions made (refer to **Tables 7.9** and **7.10**), the proposed joint venture seems a viable proposition for both the farmer and his labour partners (i.e. the 12 permanent labourers that are currently employed).

**Table 7.9 Possible capital and financing structure and relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners when expanding a table grape farm, Klaver/Vredendal, 2005/06**

Expected capital investment*:				Financing strategy	R/ha
~~~~~				~~~~~	
<b>FIXED CAPITAL:</b>			R/ha	<b>OWN CAPITAL</b>	
Bare Land		15000		Farmer contribution: Land	15000
Pumps and main lines		26038		Equipment	32680
Irrigation (main and branch lines inland)		5000			
Establishment		101653			
Buildings(new)		60000		Labour contribution 12@ R20000/5ha	48000
				Total	95680
<b>MOVABLE CAPITAL:</b>				<b>BORROWED CAPITAL</b>	144691
Equipment		32680			
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>240371</b>		Re-capitalized for 6 years	183280
* for 5ha of table grapes				Repayment from year 6 to year 15	-22,618
Relative interest : Farmer/ Labourers					
~~~~~			<b>RAND/ha</b>		
Labour:	Own capital** 12 @ R20000/5 ha	48000			
	Development lc (50% of loan)	72346			
	Total	120346			
	Interest of labour	50%			
Farmer interest		50% (i.e. R 120026 )			
~~~~~					
** Labour 'grant': R20000	per labourer				

**Table 7.10 Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical table grape farm from 20 to 25 ha, Klawer/Vredendal, 2005/06\***

Year	Margin before debt payment (R/ha)	Debt Payment (R/ha)	Margin after debt payment	Cumulative margin	Profit share of labourers per ha per year	Profit share of farmer per ha per year	Profit share per labourer per ha per yr	Profit share per labourer per year (5 ha)
0	-33,870		-33,870	-33,870				
1	-66,768		-66,768	-104,683				
2	-66,768		-66,768	-178,342				
3	7,157		7,157	-178,064				
4	44,120		44,120	-139,327				
5	118,046		118,046	-22,136				
6	118,046	22,618	95,428	73,292	36,695	36,597	3,058	15,289
7	118,046	22,618	95,428	168,720	47,777	47,650	3,981	19,907
8	118,046	22,618	95,428	264,147	47,777	47,650	3,981	19,907
9	118,046	22,618	95,428	359,575	47,777	47,650	3,981	19,907
10	118,046	22,618	95,428	455,003	47,777	47,650	3,981	19,907
11	118,046	22,618	95,428	550,431	47,777	47,650	3,981	19,907
12	118,046	22,618	95,428	645,859	47,777	47,650	3,981	19,907
13	118,046	22,618	95,428	741,287	47,777	47,650	3,981	19,907
14	118,046	22,618	95,428	836,715	47,777	47,650	3,981	19,907
15	118,046	22,618	95,428	932,143	47,777	47,650	3,981	19,907
16	118,046		118,046	1,050,189	59,102	58,944	4,925	24,626
17	118,046		118,046	1,168,235	59,102	58,944	4,925	24,626
18	118,046		118,046	1,286,281	59,102	58,944	4,925	24,626
19	81,083		81,083	1,367,364	40,596	40,488	3,383	16,915
20	44,120		44,120	1,411,484	22,089	22,031	1,841	9,204

\* Expanded area 5 ha

## 7.4 Citrusdal: expansion of a typical citrus farm from 50 ha to 70 ha

At the time of the investigation (i.e. 2005/06) the citrus industry in the study area experienced a period of financial stress, mainly due to lower export prices as well as the negative effect of a relatively strong Rand (refer to **Table 6.1** and **Section 4.2**). This situation improved considerably since 2005, mainly due to successful marketing actions in the U.S.A. The analysis (refer to **Tables 7.11** and **7.12**) thus reflects a relatively conservative picture as far as the financial success of the proposed joint venture between the farmer and his labour partners is concerned. Other factors that may contribute to the finding that the proposed joint venture is not a profitable proposition are, *inter alia*:

- ❖ the relative expensive nature of the development of water sources upstream of the Clanwilliam Dam by individual farmers
- ❖ the fact that the assumed typical farm in the Citrusdal area is a specialized Citrus farm (i.e. no supporting vegetable branch as in the case of, for example, potatoes at Clanwilliam).

**Table 7.11 Possible capital and financing structure of the envisaged farm expansion and the relative interest of the farmer and his labour partners, Citrusdal, 2005/06**

Expected capital investment*:				Financing strategy	R/ha
<b>FIXED CAPITAL:</b>			R/ha	<b>OWN CAPITAL</b>	
Bare Land		15,000		Farmer contribution: Land	15,000
Buildings		27,500		Equipment	27,250
Irrigation (main lines,pumps,filters & dams		86,179		Buildings	27,500
Establishment		62,775			
<b>MOVABLE CAPITAL:</b>				Labour contribution** (9 @ R20000/20 ha)	9,000
Equipment		27,250		Total	78,750
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>218,704</b>	<b>BORROWED CAPITAL</b>	<b>139,954</b>
* for 20 ha of citrus fruit				Re-capitalized for 9 years	199,524
				Repayment from year 9 to year 18	-24,623
Relative interest : Farmer/ Labourers					
			<b>RAND/ha</b>		
Labour:	Own cap** (9 @ R20000/20 ha)	9,000			
	Dev loan (50% of loan)	69,977			
	Total	78,977			
	Interest of labour	36%			
Farmer interest:		64% ( i.e. R 139727 )			
** Labour 'grant': R 20,000 per labourer					

**Table 7.12 Possible profit sharing agreement when expanding a typical citrus farm from 50 to 70 ha, Citrusdal, 2005/06\***

Year	Margin before debt payment (R/ha)	Debt Payment (R/ha)	Margin after debt payment	Cumulative margin	Profit share of labourers per ha per year	Profit share of farmer per ha per year	Profit share per labourer per ha per year	Profit share per labourer per year (20 ha)
0	-11,391		-11,391	-11,391				
1	-30,642		-30,642	-42,033				
2	-30,642		-30,642	-72,675				
3	-30,642		-30,642	-103,317				
4	-26,552		-26,552	-129,869				
5	-22,461		-22,461	-152,330				
6	-14,281		-14,281	-166,610				
7	-6,100		-6,100	-172,710				
8	2,081		2,081	-170,629	-109,770	-60,859	-12,197	-243,934
9	10,262	24,623	-14,361	-184,990	-5,186	-9,175	-576	-11,524
10	10,262	24,623	-14,361	-199,351	-5,186	-9,175	-576	-11,524
11	10,262	24,623	-14,361	-213,712	-5,186	-9,175	-576	-11,524
12	10,262	24,623	-14,361	-228,073	-5,186	-9,175	-576	-11,524
13	10,262	24,623	-14,361	-242,434	-5,186	-9,175	-576	-11,524
14	10,262	24,623	-14,361	-256,795	-5,186	-9,175	-576	-11,524
15	10,262	24,623	-14,361	-271,156	-5,186	-9,175	-576	-11,524
16	10,262	24,623	-14,361	-285,517	-5,186	-9,175	-576	-11,524
17	10,262	24,623	-14,361	-299,878	-5,186	-9,175	-576	-11,524
18	10,262	24,623	-14,361	-314,239	-5,186	-9,175	-576	-11,524
19	10,262		10,262	-303,977	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
20	10,262		10,262	-293,715	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
21	10,262		10,262	-283,454	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
22	10,262		10,262	-273,192	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
23	10,262		10,262	-262,930	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
24	10,262		10,262	-252,668	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
25	10,262		10,262	-242,407	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
26	10,262		10,262	-232,145	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
27	10,262		10,262	-232,145	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
28	10,262		10,262	-232,145	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
29	10,262		10,262	-232,145	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
30	10,262		10,262	-232,145	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
31	10,262		10,262	-232,145	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
32	10,262		10,262	-232,145	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
33	10,262		10,262	-232,145	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
34	10,262		10,262	-232,145	3,706	6,556	412	8,235
35	10,262		10,262	-232,145	3,706	6,556	412	8,235

\* Expanded area 20 ha

It thus seems that a joint venture between a farmer and his labour partners, as described in the accompanying case studies, can generally be a viable proposition as far as the expansion of existing farming activities is concerned. Particulars in this regard should, however, be investigated in full for each individual case.

## 8 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The financial viability of existing irrigation farming as well as the envisioned irrigation developments in the relevant regions of the study area had been investigated. Regional typical farming models (refer to **Section 3**), the expected income and costs structures of the selected crops in the different regions (refer to **Section 4**) and the expected costs of irrigation water (refer to **Section 5**) serve as inputs for the financial viability analysis (refer to **Section 6**). The multi-period financial analysis was executed at constant 2005/06 price levels (refer to **Section 2.2**). The financial viability analysis focused on the expected profitability and affordability of irrigation farming in the study area. It also aims to illustrate the relative "efficiency" of the consumption of irrigation water in the different regions of the investigation area. The following decision-making criteria were applied:

- profitability
  - \* internal rate of return (IRR) on capital employed in real terms
- affordability
  - \* expected cash-flow and break-even year at different own-to-loaned capital ratios
- relative "efficiency" of the utilisation of irrigation water
  - \* annuity of the net financial benefits per 1000 m<sup>3</sup> irrigation water applied
  - \* number of jobs created per m<sup>3</sup> of irrigation water applied

As far as the profitability criterion is concerned, an IRR of at least 4% per year in real terms (i.e. an IRR of 10% per year in nominal terms at an inflation rate of, say, 6% per year) can be seen as a benchmark. At the benchmark IRR of 10% per year in nominal terms (i.e. an IRR of 4% per year in real terms at an inflation rate of, say, 6% per year) the following of the irrigation farming activities that were investigated seem to be financially viable (refer to **Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3**):

### Existing irrigation farming

Klawer/Vredendal region:

- Mixed farming, i.e. wine grapes and tomatoes (real IRR of 10.34% per year)
- Table grape farming (real IRR of 9.57% per year)

Melkboom/Trawal region:

- Table grape farming (real IRR of 34.44% per year)

Clanwilliam region:

- Citrus farming with potatoes (real IRR of 7.54% per year)

Citrus region:

- Citrus farming (real IRR of 4.55% per year)

### Expansion of existing irrigation farming

Klawer/Vredendal region:

- Mixed farming, i.e. wine grapes and tomatoes (real IRR of 10.26% per year)
- Table grape farming (real IRR of 11.24% per year).

Melkboom/Trawal region:

- Mixed farming, i.e. wine grapes and tomatoes (real IRR of 5.42% per year)
- Table grape farming (real IRR of 28.76% per year)



Clanwilliam region:

- Citrus farming with potatoes (real IRR of 6.38% per year)

### **New irrigation farms**

Melkboom/Trawal region:

- Table grape farming (real IRR of 11.05% per year)

Clanwilliam region:

- Citrus farm with potatoes (real IRR of 4.19% per year)

Klawer/Vredendal region:

- New mixed farm, i.e. wine grapes and tomatoes (real IRR of 4.93% per year)
- New table grape farm (real IRR of 5.24% per year)

It is clear from the financial analysis that, given the assumptions made, existing irrigation farming is quite profitable in the relevant regions of the study area. The main contributing factors in this regard are, *inter alia*:

- ❖ well-developed and well-managed farms
- ❖ sound supporting marketing structures for produce
- ❖ sound profitability levels for the major farming branches due to efficient farming practices and favourable price levels for produce
- ❖ the availability of affordable irrigation water (at R1 925 per listed hectare under irrigation)

Farming practices in the relevant regions of the study area are relatively capital intensive. It seems that it will be more viable to expand existing farms than to develop new irrigation farms.

Varying water costs are associated with the alternative possibilities as far as the raising of the Clanwilliam Dam is concerned. The increment between the expected highest unit water cost (i.e. R0.81/m<sup>3</sup>) and the lowest (i.e. R0.37/m<sup>3</sup>) is relatively small. The cost of irrigation water from the Clanwilliam Dam is a relatively small component of the total cost structure of the mainly capital intensive farming developments that are envisaged. The sensitivity analysis (i.e. farm profits versus unit water cost) thus showed that water cost *per se* (i.e. at the envisaged cost levels that are associated with the alternative dam raisings) will only have a minor impact on the profitability of farms.

Irrigation farming activities in the investigation area are relatively capital intensive and risky. Top-grade managerial and labour skills are preconditions for financial success and any deviance in this regard will have a negative impact on the financial results from farming.

The trend that the market value of land (refer to **Section 6.2**) exceeds the production value thereof implies that a farmer should be able to supply a considerable portion of the farm's capital need from own financial sources. New entrants from previously disadvantaged groups will therefore be faced with the mentioned realities and in order for them to be successful, special measures should be considered, *inter alia*:

- ❖ training facilities to further managerial skills
- ❖ appropriate financial support systems via government schemes/subsidies
- ❖ appropriate farming ownership models and financial support systems to accommodate and further "partnerships" between existing commercial farmers and new entrants to farming.

---

Several possibilities exist as far as partnership agreements are concerned. It was concluded that it should be more profitable to expand existing farms than to develop new farms (refer to **Tables 6.1** to **6.3**). The focus of an analysis in this regard is thus on a business agreement between a farmer and the new entrants (i.e. his permanent labourers) only as far as the envisaged new irrigation developments are concerned (i.e. the expanded portion of the existing farm). A business trust, with the farmer and his labourers as beneficiaries, serves as an example of a "joint venture" to counter the mentioned barriers to entry to farming. The financial analysis in this regard indicated that, given the assumptions made, the proposed "joint venture" should be viable, in general, in the different regions of the investigation area.

The perspective that was generated by this study about the financial viability of irrigation farming in the investigation area could be broadened should more typical farming situations be modelled. Budget considerations, however, limited the realization of a more extended investigation.

---

---

**APPENDIX A**

**Exhibits 6.1 to 6.6**

---

---

Exhibit 6.1: Expected flow of funds and return on investment of a typical existing irrigation farm

Table with 20 columns (years 05/06 to 24/25) and multiple rows. Key sections include: Income after Packing Costs (Crops, Livestock, Other), Total Income, Production Costs (Crops, Livestock, Other), Fixed Asset Repairs, Margins, Management, Labour, Water, Distribution, Capital Costs, and Margins with Income at various percentages.

Return on Investment:

Table for Return on Investment showing Internal Rate of Return at % of Income. Columns: 100%, 130%, 120%, 90%, 80%. Rows: (%), (%), (4.55%, 21.68%, 15.41%, 0.65%, -2.57%).

NPV at:

Table for NPV at showing Cap. Rate and Net Present Value. Columns: Cap. Rate (%), Net Present Value (R), (R/Ha), Annuity \* Period (Yrs), 40 (R/M^3). Rows: 2.00%, 4.00%, 6.00%, 8.00%, 10.00%, 12.00%.

\* Annuity of Net Benefits over 40 years.

Job Creation per 1000 Cubic metre Water:

Table for Job Creation per 1000 Cubic metre Water showing Regular, Seasonal, Management jobs per 1,000 M^3 Water.













---

**APPENDIX B**

**Exhibits 6.7 to 6.12**

---















---

**APPENDIX C**

**Exhibits 6.13 to 6.18**

---













# FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE RAISING OF CLANWILLIAM DAM

## Study Reports

No	Report name	8.1.1 DWAF Report numbers	8.1.2 NS Report numbers
1	Inception	No report number	4414
2	Screening of Options	P WMA 17/E10/00/0405	4415
3	Water Quality	P WMA 17/E10/00/0506	4416
4	System Analysis	P WMA 17/E10/00/0607	4417
5	Groundwater Resources	P WMA 17/E10/00/0707	4418
6	Environmental Scoping	P WMA 17/E10/00/0805	4419
7	Environmental Impact	P WMA 17/E10/00/0907	4420
8	Soils, Water Requirements and Crops	P WMA 17/E10/00/1106	4422
9	Water Management Plan for the Olifants-Doorn Catchment Management Area	P WMA 17/E10/00/1207	4423
10	Opportunities for the Supply of Water to Resource-poor Farmers	P WMA 17/E10/00/1307	4424
11	Irrigation Development and Water Distribution Options	P WMA 17/E10/00/1407	4425
12	Impacts on Roads and other Infrastructure	P WMA 17/E10/00/1507	4426
13	Financial Viability of Irrigation Farming	P WMA 17/E10/00/1607	4427
14	Socio-economic Impact Assessment	P WMA 17/E10/00/1707	4428
15	Financial Evaluation	P WMA 17/E10/00/1807	4455
16	Main	P WMA 17/E10/00/1907	4429

8.1.3 No	8.1.4 Reports by DWAF	DWAF Report numbers	NS Report numbers
17	Feasibility Design of Raising (Engineering Design) and Design Report Addendum	-	4430
18	First Engineering Geological Materials Report (Course Aggregate) For Proposed Raising (Council for Geoscience)	-	4431
19	Farm Dams (Options Analysis): include under Report 4 as Appendix	-	4432