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	**Ulundi Local Municipality**
DATE (i.e. date on which this report was written)	Oct 18	2. Category of Municipality	B
TEAM LEADER - (COGTA Official)	N. Mncwabe	3. Population size per municipality	188 319
NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING REPORT (Person Capturing)	N.G. Gumede	4. Number of wards per municipality	24
	ngumede@ulundi.gov.za	5. Number of Councillors per municipality	47
CONTACT DETAILS OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS REPORT	0837087465	6. Number of households in municipality	35 198
	035 874 5100	7. Number of Traditional Councillors participating in municipal council	6

MASTER DOC

VERSION : B2B - October 2018

Phone (landline)	035 874 5100
Phone (cell)	083 708 7465
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	POINTS Q3	SCORE Q3	POINTS Q4	SCORE Q4	ANNUAL POINTS	ANNUAL SCORE
A	Putting People first	8			8,0	100%						
B	Delivering basic services	19			17,0	89%						
C	Good Governance	15			10,0	67%						
D	Sound Financial Management	16			15,0	94%						
E	Building Capable Local Government Institutions	8			1,0	13%						
	TOTALS	66			51,0	77%						

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

	PUTTING PEOPLE FIRST	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING (Do not Amend)	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column) Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 (Answer Column) Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 3 (Answer Column) Target	QUARTER 3 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 4 (Answer Target	QUARTER 4 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
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		72	72	2									

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
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%			

		APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual				
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		24	36	2									

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
What are the main reasons for non-submission of reports?				
Comments:				

		APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual				
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		720	665	2									

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
What are the main reasons for non-submission of reports?		Some Wards are due for by-elections of members		
Does the municipality have a:				
Batho Pele Policy and Procedure Manual?	Yes	Yes		
Service Delivery Charter and Standards?	Yes	Yes		
Service Delivery Improvement Plan (SDIP)?	Yes	Yes		
Does the SDIP for the municipality identify at least 3 services to be improved	Yes	Yes		
Comments:	none	none		

		APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual				
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		24	75	2									

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
What are the main reasons for non-submission of reports?		n/a		
Comments:		n/a		

TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR	8	840	789	0	840	848	8	0	0	0	0	0	0

B — SERVICE DELIVERY

B	SERVICE DELIVERY	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING (Do not Amend)	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column) Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 (Answer Column) Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 3 (Answer Column) Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation/Standard	Source	Baseline	Target			Q2 value											
5	Percentage of households with access to potable water	DM/SC	0	< 60 % = 0 60 % → 80 % = 1 81 % → 90 % = 2 > 90 % = 3	• 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	N/A	N/A			District Function											

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS			QUARTER 1		QUARTER 2		QUARTER 3		QUARTER 4	
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					

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation/Standard	Source	Baseline	Target			Q2 value											
6	Percentage of households served with a sanitation facility	DM/SC	0	< 70 % = 0 70 % → 90 % = 1 > 90 % = 2	• 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	N/A	N/A			District Function											

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS			QUARTER 1		QUARTER 2		QUARTER 3		QUARTER 4	
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					

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation/Standard	Source	Baseline	Target			Q2 value			2								
7	Percentage of households served with electricity.	LM/SC	2	< 60 % = 0 60 % → 85 % = 1 > 85 % = 2	• 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 [Include households with electricity connection provided by municipality AND households connected by Eskom]	Billing system and service delivery data / report	11 160	11 165			11 190	11 190										

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS			QUARTER 1		QUARTER 2		QUARTER 3		QUARTER 4	
Number of Households										
What are blockages challenge it terms of backlog alleviation? E.g. Funding, PMU Capacity, or SCM Delays etc.										
Number of unplanned interruptions										
List Campaigns to reduce electricity losses										
Comments										

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation	Verification	Q1 Target	Q1 Actual		Q2 Target	Q2 Actual	Score	Q3			Q4		
8	Percentage of planned new housing units constructed	LM/SC	2	100 % = 2 80 % → 99 % = 1 < 80 % = 0	• 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%		60%	89%	2						

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
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		

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation	Verification	Q1 Target	Q1 Actual		Q2 Target	Q2 Actual	Score
9	Percentage of households which have access to refuse removal	LM/SC	2	0 → 30 % = 0 31 % → 67 % = 1 > 67 % = 2	• 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	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Households		19962		
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		

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation	Verification	Q1 Target	Q1 Actual		Q2 Target	Q2 Actual	Score
10. A	Does the municipality have an approved roads maintenance plan for the year ?	All	2	Approved roads maintenance plan = 2 No plan = 0	• Calculation : Confirm yes or no • Norm : yes	Approved roads maintenance plan / SDBIP	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	2

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Comments	None	None		

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation	Verification	Q1 Target	Q1 Actual		Q2 Target	Q2 Actual	Score
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	• 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		600m2	800m2	2

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Reasons for non-achievement the target				
Comments				

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation	Verification	Q1 Target	Q1 Actual		Q2 Target	Q2 Actual	Score
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		Yes	Yes	2

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Number of registered indigent households:	5843	6241		
How regular does the municipality update the indigent register?	As an when there is a new apllicant, approved by Council	As an when there is a new apllicant, approved by		
Comments	none	none		

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation	Verification	Q1 Target	Q1 Actual		Q2 Actual	
12	Percentage of registered indigent households receiving Free Basic Water	DM/SC	0	0 → 59% = 0 60%→100% = 1	• 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	N/A - ZDM	N/A - ZDM		District Function	

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Reasons for non-achievement of the target	N/A	n/a		
Comments	None	None		

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation	Verification	Q2 Target	Q2 Actual	Score
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	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Reasons for non-achievement of the target		n/a		
Comments		n/a		

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation	Verification	Q2 Target	Q2 Actual	Score
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	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Reasons for non-achievement of the target				
Comments				

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation	Verification	Q2 Target	Q2 Actual	Score
15	Percentage of jobs maintained in the CWP programme	LM/SC	2	0 - 40% = 0 41% - 60% = 1 >60% = 2			550	543	2

#	Indicator	Resp	Score	Scoring	Calculation	Q1 Target	Q1 Actual		Q2 Target	Q2 Actual	Score
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%		0,33%	0%	0

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | | Due to financial constrains there was no expenditure for the first quarter | | | Due to financial constrains there was no expenditure for the first quarter | | |

No.	Indicator	Applicable To	Weighting	Scoring Range	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	Quarter 1 Target	Quarter 1 Actual	Points Awarded	Quarter 2 Target	Quarter 2 Actual	Points Awarded	Quarter 3 Target	Quarter 3 Actual	Points Awarded	Quarter Target	Quarter Actual	Points Awarded	Challenges	Proposed Intervention	Comments
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		N/A	4 years	1									
	Comments							To be reveiwed 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) Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 (Answer Column) Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 3 (Answer Column) Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
18	Number of Council meetings held over	ALL	2	1 meeting = 2 / 0 meeting = 0	1 meeting per quarter		1	2		1	3	2									
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4					
	What are the main reasons for Council not meeting?						None			None											
	Quorums not reached:						Nil			Nil											
	Reports not submitted:						N/A			N/A											
	Comments						None			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		3	3	2									
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4					
	Reasons for EXCO meeting not being held:						None			None											
	Comments						None			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%	100%		100%	75%	2									
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4					
	Number of Portfolio Committees						6			6											
	Number of functional Portfolio Committees						4			5											
	Number of meetings held per committee per quarter						3			Planning & Development :3; Technical											
	Reasons for Portfolio Committee meeting not being held:						None			reports not submitted by the relevant Department											
	Quorums not reached						None			none											
	Reports not submitted:						n/a			yes											
	Other						None			None											
	Comments						LED and Tourism Portfolio Committees metings are not convened monthly			Tourism Portfolio Committees meetings are not convened monthly(Inconsistency)											
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	3	2									
							QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4					
22	Number of Audit Committee meetings	ALL	2	1 meeting = 2 / 0 meeting = 0	1 meeting per quarter		1	1		1	0	0									
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4					
	Reasons for Audit Committee meeting not being held:						None			Meeting was rescheduled for the 23rd January 2019											
	Comments						None														
23	Number of Audit Committee reports	ALL	2	1 report = 2 / 0 report = 0	1 report per quarter		1	0		1	1	2									
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4					
	Reasons for non-submission of reports to Council:						The Audit committee chair still awaiting for Auditor General result or Report .			1 Report submitted			Report submitted			N/A					
	Comments						None			n/a											
24	Number of MPAC meetings held	All	2	1 meeting = 2 / 0 meeting = 0	1 meeting per quarter		1	2		1	0	0									
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4					
	What are the main reasons for MPAC not meeting? E.g. Quorums not reached, reports not submitted etc.						None			Meeting was rescheduled for the 23rd January 2019											
	Comments						None			None											
25	Is the District Intergovernmental Relations Forum (Mayors Forum) established and functional in accordance with the IGR Framework	DM	2	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		N/A - ZDM	N/A - ZDM		District Function											
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4					
	How often do the IGR structures meet?						n/a			n/a											
	Are Municipalities consulted in drafting the Agenda's?						n/a			n/a											
	Have the IGR Forums implemented a Resolution Register / Decision Matrix to track the implementation of resolutions?						n/a			n/a											
	Are matters from District Mayors Forum/ Municipal Managers Forum escalated to Cogta MuniMec / Technical MuniMec respectively?						n/a			n/a											
	Is there is District Wide Integrated IGR Calendar?						n/a			n/a											
	Is there a dedicated IGR official in the Municipality?						n/a			n/a											
	Do Sector Departments attend/support District IGR Meetings?						n/a			n/a											
	Comments						None			None											
	TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR		15								10										

D	SOUND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column) Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 (Answer Column) Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 3 (Answer Column) Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
26	% of Audit Queries resolved as per the AG action plan in accordance with timeframes.	ALL	0	< 60 % = 0 / 60 % → 80 % = 1 / 81 % → 90 % = 2 / > 90 % = 3	90%		50%	85%		District Function											
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						Quarter 1			Quarter 2											
	Number of Audit findings:						4			13											
	What were the key findings:						Going Concern			Expenditure Management, Consequence Management, Human Resource Management & Procurement and Contract Management											
	Audit action plan comments and status:						3 resolved			Action plan has been prepared, still in progress											
	Reasons for not resolving queries:						Payment plan has been signed with Eskom			New Action Plan for the Audit Report for the 2017/2											
	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%		25%	100%	2									
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4					
	What are blockages and challenges in respect of MIG Expenditure? E.g. PMU Capacity, SCM Delays etc.						None			n/a											
	What measures have been put in place to achieve targets if not achieved:						Target archieved			n/a											
	Comments:						N/A			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%		27%	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	ALL	0			GL, Equitable share, budget	25%	20%		25%	21%	0									
	FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4					
	Allocation:						R750			R750											
	Actual % spent:						20%			21%											
	Reasons for under expenditure if not achieved						None			n/a											

#	Indicator	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 3 Target	QUARTER 3 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 4 Target	QUARTER 4 Actual	POINTS AWARDED
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	ALL	2	90%-100%=2 / <90%=0	R	GL, Budget	25%	90%		25%	100%	2						

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Allocation:		54 923 122.00		
Budget:		53 146 891.00		
Actual % of Budget spent:		100%		
Reasons for under expenditure if targets not achieved:		n/a		

#	Indicator	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED
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%		25%	100%	2

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
What percentage of the total municipal budget has been allocated for repairs and maintenance?	8%	4,7%		
What percentage of the repairs and maintenance budget was spent on infrastructure maintenance?	none	4,7%		
Comments:	none	n/a		

#	Indicator	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED
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;	ALL	2	<80%=0/ 80-95=1/ >95=2	Norm - 95%		50%	30%		100,00%	126,00%	2

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Total Billed Revenue (R):	54 417 226	21 170 707.23		
Actual Collected Revenue (R):	16 160 374	26 717 834.59		
Reasons for under collection:	ITB land, High level of unemlpoyment, indigent.	None		
Comments:	Still awaiting payment from government	There is no undercollection		

#	Indicator	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED
32	Percentage of debtors outstanding for	ALL	1	0%=1/ >0%=0	Norm - 0%	Debtors age analysis	50%	77%		50%	87%	0

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Rand Value >120 days:	93 945 522,00	81 494 413.18		
What measures have been put in place to collect long outstanding debt:	data cleansing,financial Recovery Plan	Data Cleansing, Financial Recovery Plan		
Comments:	none	None		

#	Indicator	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED
33	SUSTAINABILITY - Level of Cash Backed Conditional grants. Formula : (cash and	ALL	2	positive=2/0=1/negative=0	Norm - Positive	TB. GL, Grant Register	17 146 118.95	17 146 118.95		1 248 645	1 248 645	2

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
If not cash backed, what are the reasons?:	100% spending on Grant	n/a		
Comments:	Municipality Operate on the Positive	None		

#	Indicator	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED
34	EXPENDITURE MANAGEMENT -	ALL	2	0%=2 / >0%=0	Norm: 0%					25%	0%	2

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Reasons for the irregular, fruitless and wastefull expenditure:		Interest is due to Eskom debt		
Number of S36 deviations?:		None		
Total value of S36 deviations?:		R0.00		
Number of S36 deviations approved by Council?:		0		
Has the S36 deviation register been updated?:		n/a		
Comments:		n/a		

#	Indicator	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED
35	% of Irregular, Fruitless and Waste Expenditure resolved	ALL	1	75%→100%=1 <75%=0	100%		25%	0%		25%	0%	1

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Did the municipality apply Section 32 of the MFMA in resolving the UIFW expenditure?:	Yes	Yes		
If some were not resolved, what is their current status?	Awaiting Council Resolution	Awaiting Council Resolution		
Is the UIFW Register complete?:	Yes	Yes		
Comments:	None	None		

#	Indicator	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED
36	Budget implementation - Capital Expenditure Budget Implementation Indicator. Formula - Actual Capital Expenditure / Budget Capital Expenditure x 100 . Indicates the extent	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%		90%	96%	2

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
What are blockages and challenges in respect of Capital Expenditure? E.g. PMU Capacity, SCM Delays etc.	N/A	N/A		
What measures have been put in place to achieve targets if not achieved:	N/A	N/A		
Comments:	N/A	N/A		

TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR	16			15

E	BUILDING CAPABLE LOCAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column) Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 (Answer Column) Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 3 (Answer Column) Target	QUARTER 3 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 4(Answer Target	Actual	POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
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		0	0		2	0	0									

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

Number of approved posts		Number of filled posts		7	5		Percentage of filled posts	

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Number of vacant post?	0	2		
Reasons for vacancy	n/a	Contracts Expired		
Period of vacancy (provide details for each post):	n/a	3 months		
Have all employment contracts been signed and submitted to the MEC within the stipulated statutory timeframes?	Yes	No		
Comments	None	Started the process of renewal of contract, MEC for COGTA did not approve. Process of advertising the positions has started.		

#	Indicator	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED
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%	10%		25%	12%	1

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Number approved posts	367	367		
Number filled	322	322		
Vacancy rate	10,00%	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	24 / 5 / 2018		
Any other Comments	None	None		

#	Indicator	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 Target	QUARTER 1 Actual	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 Target	QUARTER 2 Actual	POINTS AWARDED
39	% of budget spent on implementing Workplace Skill Plan.	ALL	3	67%-100%=3 /34%-66%=2 / 1% -33%=1 / 0%=0	% expernditure against quarterly target as per IDP and SDBIP		25%	0%		25%	0%	0

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4
Performance Assessments conducted for each manager: (Yes/No)	Yes	Yes		

Does the municipality have a crediblebe Workplace Skills Plan (WSP)	Yes	Yes		
Is the municipality's WSP approved by Council?	Yes	Yes		
Was it submitted to LGSETA	Yes	Yes		
How much was allocated for training by the municipality?	R576 400.00	R576 400.00		
How much did the municipality pay as the 1% salary levy to LGSETA?	R302 750.00	R302 750.00		
How much was received in the form of the Mandatory Grant?	R0	R0		
How much was received in the form of the Discretionary Grant?	R10 000.00	R10 000.00		
Number of Councilors participating in the training programmes implemented in the current financial year	13	13		
Number of Officials participating in the training programmes implemented in the current financial year	11	11		
Any other Comments	None	None		
TOTAL WEGHTING FOR PILLAR	**8**			1		