

KZN COGTA : COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING AND EVALUATION TOOL

BACK TO BASICS TEMPLATE WITH INDICATORS

2018 - 2019 MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL YEAR

BACK TO BASICS INFORMATION SHEET		MUNICIPAL PROFILE			
PERIOD FOR THIS REPORT (i.e. period on which you are reporting, State Quarter)	Q1	1. No. & Name of Municipality	MASTER DOC		
DATE (i.e. date on which this report was written)	Oct 18	2. Category of Municipality			
TEAM LEADER - (COGTA Official)	N. Mncwabe	3. Population size per municipality	VERSION : B2B - October 2018		
NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING REPORT (Person Capturing)	N.G. Gumede	4. Number of wards per municipality			
CONTACT DETAILS OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS REPORT	ngumede@ulundi.gov.za	5. Number of Councillors per municipality	Phone (landline)	035 874 5100	
	0837087465	6. Number of households in municipality	Phone (cell)	083 708 7465	
	035 874 5100	7. Number of Traditional Councillors participating in municipal council	Email	ngumede@ulundi.gov.za	

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

	Good
	Satisfactory
	Critical

PROVINCIAL SCORING

Municipality to state which indicators are not applicable in line with the Powers and Function performed

Score the municipality from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest) in terms of :		WEIGHTING	POINTS Q1	SCORE Q1	POINTS Q2	SCORE Q2
A	Putting People first	8	8	100%		
B	Delivering basic services	19	17	89%		
C	Good Governance	13	11	85%		
D	Sound Financial Management	19	9	47%		
E	Building Capable Local Government Institutions	8	4	50%		
TOTALS		67	49	73%		

Notes for completing the template :

1	Do not make any amendments to the template i.e. change weightings or indicators
2	Assistance in respect of the financial indicators would be provided by the COGTA : Municipal Finance Business Unit
3	Any Municipality that is currently under any COGTA intervention will be categorised as "Requiring Intervention" regardless of the scoring of this template.
4	LM = Local Municipality , DM = District Municipality & SC = Secondary Cities : Complete the indicators applicable to your municipality

A	PUTTING PEOPLE FIRST	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING (Do not Amend)	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
							Target	Actual				
1	Number of Ward Committee meetings held per month in the past quarter (per ward)	LM/SC	2	For all meetings held 100% to 67% = 2 / 66% to 34% = 1 / 33% to 0% = 0	Functionality as determined by 6 key criteria at least 3 meetings per quarter per ward (DCOGTA)	Ward committee meeting Minutes, attendance registers	72	72	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Percentage attendance at ward committee meetings:							98%					
What are the main reasons for non-functional Ward Committees? E.g. meetings no held, reports not submitted, Quorums not reached, or Other reasons												
Comments:							Sitting was 100%					
2	Number of ward reports on planned activities per ward per quarter?	LM/SC	2	For one report submitted per ward per quarter 100% to 67% = 2 / 66% to 34% = 1 / 33% to 0% = 0	Functionality as determined by 6 key criteria at least 1 report per quarter per ward(DCOGTA)	Reports on planned activities	24	38	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
What are the main reasons for non-submission of reports?												
Comments:												
3	Number of sectoral reports submitted per ward committee per month	LM/SC	2	Sector reports submitted 100% to 67% = 2 / 66% to 34% = 1 / 33% to 0% = 0	Functionality as determined by 6 key criteria depending on the number of ward committee members in a ward(DCOGTA)	Ward committee reports	720	655	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					

What are the main reasons for non-submission of reports?												
Does the municipality have a:												
Batho Pele Policy and Procedure Manual?							Yes					
Service Delivery Charter and Standards?							Yes					
Service Delivery Improvement Plan (SDIP)?							Yes					
Does the SDIP for the municipality identify at least 3 services to be improved							Yes					
Comments:							none					
4	Number of wards where community meetings were held	LM/SC	2	Ward reports submitted 100% to 67% = 2 / 66% to 34% = 1 / 33% to 0% = 0	Functionality as determined by 6 key criteria at least 1 meeting per quarter per ward(DCOGTA)	Minutes and attendance registers of community meetings	24	24	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
What are the main reasons for non-submission of reports?												
Comments:												
TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR			8				840	789	8			
B	SERVICE DELIVERY	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING (Do not Amend)	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
							Target	Actual				
5	Percentage of households with access to potable water	DM/SC	0	< 60 % = 0 60 % → 80 % = 1 81 % → 90 % = 2 > 90 % = 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculation : number of households with at least a basic level of water service divided by total number of households in the municipal area X 100 (%) Norm 100 % however NDP target is 92 % Standard : basic LoS - access within 200 meters (RDP standard) with a flow rate of 10 litres per minute. Water quality to comply with National Water Act and SANS 241 	Billing system and service delivery data / report	District Indicator					
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Number of Households							N/A					
What are blockages challenge it terms of backlog alleviation? E.g. Funding, PMU Capacity, or SCM Delays etc.							N/A					
Number of unplanned interruptions							N/A					
Average time taken to repair unplanned interruptions							N/A					
% of water losses incurred during the quarter							N/A					
List Campaigns to reduce water losses							N/A					
Comments							N/A					
6	Percentage of households served with a sanitation facility	DM/SC	0	< 70 % = 0 70 % → 90 % = 1 > 90 % = 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculation : number of households with at least a basic level of sanitation service divided by total number of households in the municipal area X 100 (%) Norm 100 % Standard : basic LoS (level of service) is a Ventilated Improved Pit latrine (VIP) 	Billing system and service delivery data / report	District Indicator					
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Number of Households							N/A					
What are blockages challenge it terms of backlog alleviation? E.g. Funding, PMU Capacity, or SCM Delays etc.							N/A					
Number of sewer spillages per quarter							N/A					
Average time taken to fix spillages							N/A					
Comments							N/A					

7	Percentage of households served with electricity.	LM/SC	2	<p>< 60 % = 0 60 % → 85 % = 1 > 85 % = 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculation : number of households with an electricity connection divided by total number of households in the municipal area X 100 (%) • Norm 100 % however NDP target is 92 % • Standard - basic LoS (level of service) is 20 Amp supply and 50 kWh / month <p>[Include households with electricity connection provided by municipality AND households connected by Eskom]</p>	Billing system and service delivery data / report	11 160	11 165	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Number of Households							11165					
What are blockages challenge it terms of backlog alleviation? E.g. Funding, PMU Capacity, or SCM Delays etc.							N/A					
Number of unplanned interruptions							52					
List Campaigns to reduce electricity losses							Mashona - Ward 08 Electrical Awereness Campaign					
Comments							None					

8	Percentage of planned new housing units constructed	LM/SC	2	100 % = 2 80 % → 99 % = 1 < 80 % = 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculation : Number of new housing units constructed divided by planned number of new housing units (from IDP or SDBIP targets) X 100 (%) Norm 100% 	Project completion reports, quarterly reports, mid-year and annual reports	60%	89%	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
What is the housing backlog ? - number of houses							10 000					
What are blockages challenge it terms of backlog alleviation? E.g. Funding, PMU Capacity, or SCM Delays etc.							Slow approval of houses by the department of human settlement					
Do you have an approved Housing Sector Plan?							Yes					
Comments							None					
9	Percentage of households which have access to refuse removal	LM/SC	2	0 → 30 % = 0 31 % → 67 % = 1 > 67 % = 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculation : number of households provided with a refuse collection service divided by total number of households in the municipal area X 100 (%) [Include households where street collection service provided in loco PLUS households for which communal facilities are provided e.g. skips ; include municipal service or contracted services] Norm 100% 	Billing system AND roster	100%	100%	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Households							15 972					
Frequency of refuse removal? (Daily / weekly ?)							CBD Households - Weekly					
How many households receive other forms of refuse removal, define (rural areas)							None					
What are blockages and challenges in terms refuse removal?							None					
Number of land-fill sites.							1					
Number of land-fill sites registered?							1					
Comments							None					
10. A	Does the municipality have an approved roads maintenance plan for the year ?	All	2	Approved roads maintenance plan = 2 No plan = 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculation : Confirm yes or no Norm : yes 	Approved roads maintenance plan / SDBIP	Yes	Yes	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Comments							None					
10. B	Percentage of targetted municipal roads maintained in terms of the Municipality's approved maintenance plan	All	2	100 % = 2 80 % → 99 % = 1 < 80 % = 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculation : Number of kilometres of roads maintained divided by planned number of kilometres of roads to be maintained (from IDP or SDBIP targets) X 100 (%) Norm 100% 	Project completion reports, quarterly reports, mid-year and annual reports	600m2	1390.82m2	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Reasons for non-achievement the target							N/A					
Comments							none					
11	Indigent Register	All	2	Yes & Updated Register = 2, Yes but not updated = 1, No = 0	Municipality to have Indigent Register based on an approved Indigent Policy		Yes	Yes	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Number of registered indigent households:							5843					
How regular does the municipality update the indigent register?							As an when there is a new applicant, approved by Council					
Comments							none					
12	Percentage of registered indigent households receiving Free Basic Water	DM/SC	0	0 → 59% = 0 60%→100% = 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculation : number of indigent households receiving free basic water (from the approved and updated indigent register) divided by total number of registered indigent households X 100 (%) Norm 100% 	Indigent register and billing system	District Indicator					
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Reasons for non-achievement of the target							N/A					
Comments							None					

13	Percentage of registered indigent households receiving Free Basic Electricity	LM/SC	1	0 → 59% = 0 60% → 100% = 1	• Calculation : number of indigent households receiving free basic electricity (from the approved and updated indigent register) divided by total number of registered indigent households X 100 (%) • Norm 100%	Indigent register and billing system	100%	100%	1			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Reasons for non-achievement of the target							N/A					
Comments							None					
14	Percentage of registered indigent households receiving Free Basic Refuse Removal	LM/SC	1	0 → 59% = 0 60% → 100% = 1	• Calculation : number of indigent households receiving free basic refuse removal (from the approved and updated indigent register) divided by total number of registered indigent households X 100 (%) • Norm 100%	Indigent register and billing system	100%	100%	1			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Reasons for non-achievement of the target							N/A					
Comments							None					
15	Percentage of jobs maintained in the CWP programme	LM/SC	2	0 - 40% = 0 41% - 60% = 1 >60% = 2			550	543	2			
16	Percentage of Municipal budget set aside for SMME's / Coops supported in implementing projects towards job	ALL	2	0% = 0 1% = 1 =>2% = 2	Minimum 2% of the total budget, excluding LED Economic Infrastructure budget		0,33%	0%	0			
Comments							Due to financial constrains there was no expenditure for the first quarter					
17	Age analysis (updating) of the LED Strategy	ALL	1	>5 years = 0 <5 years = 1	Not more than 5 years		N/A	4 years	1			
Comments							To be reviewed in the next financial year					
TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR			19						17			
C	GOOD GOVERNANCE	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
							Target	Actual				
18	Number of Council meetings held over	ALL	2	1 meeting = 2 / 0 meeting = 0	1 meeting per quarter		1	2	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
What are the main reasons for Council not meeting?							None					
Quorums not reached:							Nil					
Reports not submitted:							N/A					
Comments							None					
19	Number of EXCO meetings held	All	2	3 meeting = 2 / 2 meeting = 1 / 0 - 1 meeting = 0	1 meeting per month		3	3	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Reasons for EXCO meeting not being held:							None					
Comments							None					
20	Percentage of functional Portfolio Committees	ALL	2	Functionality of Portfolio Committees: 100% to 67% = 2 / 66% to 34% = 1 / 33% to 0% = 0	1 meeting per quarter for each portfolio committee		100%	67%	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Number of Portfolio Committees							6					
Number of functional Portfolio Committees							4					
Number of meetings held per committee per quarter							3					
Reasons for Portfolio Committee meeting not being held:							None					
Quorums not reached							None					
Reports not submitted:							n/a					
Other							None					
Comments							LED and Tourism Portfolio Committees meetings are not convened monthly					
21	Number of council meetings with the participation of traditional leaders	ALL	1	Traditional leaders representation/attendance at Council meetings: 0 = 0 >0 = 1	1 Council meeting per quarter		1	2	1			

							QUARTER 1					
22	Number of Audit Committee meetings	ALL	2	1 meeting = 2 / 0 meeting = 0	1 meeting per quarter		1	1	2			
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1					
	Reasons for Audit Committee meeting not being held:						None					
	Comments						None					
23	Number of Audit Committee reports	ALL	2	1 report = 2 / 0 report = 0	1 report per quarter		1	0	0			
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1					
	Reasons for non-submission of reports to Council:						The Audit committee chair still awaiting for Auditor General result or Report .					
	Comments						None					
24	Number of MPAC meetings held	All	2	1 meeting = 2 / 0 meeting = 0	1 meeting per quarter		1	2	2			
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1					
	What are the main reasons for MPAC not meeting? E.g. Quorums not reached, reports not submitted etc.						None					
	Comments						None					
25	Is the District Intergovernmental Relations Forum (Mayors Forum) established and functional in accordance with the IGR Framework Act	DM	0	Functionality: of IGR structures 100% to 67% = 2 / 66% to 34% = 1 / 33% to 0% = 0	District Mayors Forum, MM's forum and District technical Fora meeting once a quarter		District Indicator					
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1					
	How often do the IGR structures meet?						n/a					
	Are Municipalities consulted in drafting the Agenda's?						n/a					
	Have the IGR Forums implemented a Resolution Register / Decision Matrix to track the implementation of resolutions?						n/a					
	Are matters from District Mayors Forum/ Municipal Managers Forum escalated to Cogta MuniMec / Technical MuniMec respectively?						n/a					
	Is there is District Wide Integrated IGR Calendar?						n/a					
	Is there a dedicated IGR official in the Municipality?						n/a					
	Do Sector Departments attend/support District IGR Meetings?						n/a					
	Comments						None					
	TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR		13						11			
D	SOUND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
							Target	Actual				
26	% of Audit Queries resolved as per the AG action plan in accordance with timeframes.	ALL	3	< 60 % = 0 60 % → 80 % = 1 81 % → 90 % = 2 > 90 % = 3	90%		50%	85%	2			
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						Quarter 1					
	Number of Audit findings:						4					
	What were the key findings:						Going Concern					
	Audit action plan comments and status:						3 resolved					
	Reasons for not resolving queries:						Payment plan has been signed with Eskom					
	Comments:						17-18 Financial year audit is still in progress					
27	% of MIG Expenditure spent compared to accumulative budget for the period: Actual MIG/ Planned MIG for the relevant period *100	If applicable	2	90%→100%=2, <90%=0	100%	AG Report, Audit Committee agenda and register, Audit action plan and status report	25%	71,38%	0			
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1					
	What are blockages and challenges in respect of MIG Expenditure? E.g. PMU Capacity, SCM Delays etc.						None					
	What measures have been put in place to achieve targets if not achieved:						Target achieved					
	Comments:						N/A					
28 (a)	% of INEP Expenditure spent compared to accumulative budget for the period: Actual INEP/ MWIG planned for the relevant period*100 (If applicable)		0		100%		25%	100%	0			INEP = Integrated Electrification Program MWIG = Municipal Water Infrastructure Grant
28 (b)	% spent of the municipalities operating budget on the free basic services in the past quarter. Formula: actual spent on free basic services/ allocation in terms of the equitable share formula.	ALL	0			GL, Equitable share, budget	25%	20%	0			
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1					
	Allocation:						R750					
	Actual % spent:						20%					
	Reasons for under expenditure if not achieved						None					

29	% of the annual operating budget spent in the past quarter. Formula : Operating Expenditure Budget ; Formula : Actual Operating Expenditure/Budgeted Operating Expenditure × 100 The indicator measures the extent to which budgeted operating expenditure has been spent during the financial period assessed. It assesses the effectiveness of controls over the budget.	ALL	2	90%-100%=2 / <90%=0	R	GL, Budget	25%	130%	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Allocation:							N/A					
Budget:							R15 791 927.40					
Actual % of Budget spent:							130%					
Reasons for under expenditure if targets not achieved:							N/A					
30	Actual Repairs and Maintenance as a % of budgeted Repairs and Maintenance expenditure Formula: (actual R&M/ Budgeted R&M)*100	ALL	2	90%→100%=2/ <90%=0	100%		25%	44,54%	0			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
What percentage of the total municipal budget has been allocated for repairs and maintenance?							8%					
What percentage of the repairs and maintenance budget was spent on infrastructure maintenance?							none					
Comments:							none					
31	DEBTORS MANAGEMENT - Collection Rate Formula : (Gross Debtors Opening Balance + Billed Revenue - Gross Debtors Closing Balance - Bad Debts Written Off)/Billed Revenue) x 100 - The Ratio indicates the collection rate; i.e. level of payments. It measures increases or decreases in Debtors relative to annual billed revenue. The indicator reflects the percentage of debtors that has been collected in relation to billed revenue.	ALL	2	<80%=0/ 80-95=1/ >95=2	Norm - 95%		50%	30%	0			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Total Billed Revenue (R):							54 417 226					
Actual Collected Revenue (R):							16 160 374					
Reasons for under collection:							ITB land, High level of unemployment, indigent.					
Comments:							Still awaiting payment from government					
32	Percentage of debtors outstanding for more than 120 days. Formula: (Debtors over 120 days/ Total debtors)*100	ALL	1	0%=1/ >0%=0	Norm - 0%	Debtors age analysis	50%	77%	0			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Rand Value >120 days:							93 945 522,00					
What measures have been put in place to collect long outstanding debt:							data cleansing,financial Recovery Plan					
Comments:							none					
33	SUSTAINABILITY - Level of Cash Backed Conditional grants. Formula : (cash and cash equivalents-bank overdraft+short term investment (cash)+long term investment(cash))-unspent conditional grants	ALL	2	positive=2/0=1/negative=0	Norm - Positive	TB. GL, Grant Register	17 146 118.95	17 146 118.95	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
If not cash backed, what are the reasons?:							100% spending on Grant					

Comments:							Municipality Operate on the Positive					
34	EXPENDITURE MANAGEMENT - Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful and Unauthorized Expenditure / Total Operating Expenditure. Formula: (Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful and Unauthorized Expenditure) / Total Operating Expenditure x100	ALL	2	0%=2 / >0%=0	Norm: 0%		0%	0%	2			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Reasons for the irregular, fruitless and wasteful expenditure:							None					
Number of S36 deviations?:							None					
Total value of S36 deviations?:							None					
Number of S36 deviations approved by Council?:							None					
Has the S36 deviation register been updated?:							None					
Comments:							There were no deviations					
35	% of Irregular, Fruitless and Waste Expenditure resolved	ALL	1	75%→100%=1 <75%=0	100%		25%	0%	1			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Did the municipality apply Section 32 of the MFMA in resolving the UIFW expenditure?:							Yes					
If some were not resolved, what is their current status?:							Awaiting Council Resolution					
Is the UIFW Register complete?:							Yes					
Comments:							None					
36	Budget implementation - Capital Expenditure Budget Implementation Indicator. Formula - Actual Capital Expenditure / Budget Capital Expenditure x 100 . Indicates the extent to which the capital budget has been implemented. Indicates effectiveness of budgetary control.	ALL	2	90%→100%=2/ <90%=0	Norm - The norm range between 95% and 100%	Statement of Financial Position, Budget, AFS, Appendices, In year reports	25%	79,00%	0			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
What are blockages and challenges in respect of Capital Expenditure? E.g. PMU Capacity, SCM Delays etc.							N/A					
What measures have been put in place to achieve targets if not achieved:							N/A					
Comments:							N/A					
TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR			19						9			
E	BUILDING CAPABLE LOCAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
							Target	Actual				
37	Number of Section 54/56 posts filled	ALL	3	80%-100%=3 50%-79%=2 33%-49%=1 <33%=0	• Critical posts vacant – Section S54 & S56 posts filled within 2 quarters (6 months) after post is vacant • Critical posts filled in terms of Municipal Systems Act Regulations Calculation : % of filled S54 – S56 posts		7	7	3			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Number of approved posts				Number of filled posts			Percentage of filled posts					
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS				Quarter 1			Quarter 3		Quarter 4			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Number of vacant post?:							0					
Reasons for vacancy:							n/a					
Period of vacancy (provide details for each post):							n/a					
Have all employment contracts been signed and submitted to the MEC within the stipulated statutory timeframes?:							Yes					
Comments:							None					
38	Number of vacant budgetted posts against approved organogram	ALL	2	Vacancy rate : 0%-10% = 2 11%-50%=1 51%-100%=0	• Approved and funded organizational structure Calculation : Vacancy rate should be less than 10% of the entire staff establishment		25%	12%	1			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1					
Number approved posts							367					
Number filled							322					

Vacancy rate					12,00%					
Date of review of the organogram by the Council? (note that all municipalities had 12 months from the election of new councils to review their organograms)					24	5	2018			
Any other Comments					None					
39	% of budget spent on implementing Workplace Skill Plan.	ALL	3	67%-100%=3 / 34%-66%=2 / 1% - 33%=1 / 0%=0	% expenditure against quarterly target as per IDP and SDBIP	25%	0%	0		
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS					QUARTER 1					
Performance Assessments conducted for each manager: (Yes/No)					Yes					
Does the municipality have a credible Workplace Skills Plan (WSP)					Yes					
Is the municipality's WSP approved by Council?					Yes					
Was it submitted to LGSETA					Yes					
How much was allocated for training by the municipality?					R576 400.00					
How much did the municipality pay as the 1% salary levy to LGSETA?					R302 750.00					
How much was received in the form of the Mandatory Grant?					R0					
How much was received in the form of the Discretionary Grant?					R10 000.00					
Number of Councilors participating in the training programmes implemented in the current financial year					13 No correction!					
Number of Officials participating in the training programmes implemented in the current financial year					11					
Any other Comments					None					
TOTAL WEGHTING FOR PILLAR			8					4		