

**KZN COGTA : COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING AND EVALUATION TOOL
BACK TO BASICS TEMPLATE WITH INDICATORS
2017 - 2018 MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL YEAR**

BACK TO BASICS INFORMATION SHEET		MUNICIPAL PROFILE											
PERIOD FOR THIS REPORT (i.e. period on which you are reporting, State Quarter)	Quarter 1	1. No. & Name of Municipality					AMAJUBA DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY					MASTER DOC	
DATE (i.e. date on which this report was written)	Oct-17	2. Category of Municipality					Low Capacity					VERSION : B2B - October 2017	
TEAM LEADER - (COGTA Official)		3. Population size per municipality					499839						
NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING REPORT (Person Capturing)	V N NKOSI	4. Number of wards per municipality					46						
CONTACT DETAILS OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS REPORT	343297219	5. Number of Councillors per municipality					25					Phone (landline)	
		6. Number of households in municipality					130464					Phone (cell)	
		7. Number of Traditional Councillors participating in municipal council					5					Email	

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS	
>69	Good
50 - 69%	Satisfactory
<50	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	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A							
B	Delivering basic services	8	3	38%	3	38%							
C	Good Governance	14	12	86%	12	86%							
D	Sound Financial Management	19	9	47%	15	79%							
E	Building Capable Local Government Institutions	8	3	38%	3	38%							
TOTALS		49	27	55%	33	67%							

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	QUARTER 2 (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 3 (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 4 (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
							Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual				
1	Number of Ward Committee meetings held per month in the past quarter (per ward)	LM/SC	0	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1		QUARTER 2		QUARTER 3		QUARTER 4								
Percentage attendance at ward committee meetings:							N/A				N/A										
What are the main reasons for non-functional Ward Committees? E.g. meetings no held, reports not submitted, Quorums not reached, or Other reasons							N/A				N/A										
Comments:																					
2	Number of ward reports on planned activities per ward per quarter?	LM/SC	0	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1		QUARTER 2		QUARTER 3		QUARTER 4								
What are the main reasons for non-submission of reports?							N/A				N/A										
Comments:											N/A										
3	Number of sectoral reports submitted per ward committee per month	LM/SC	0	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1		QUARTER 2		QUARTER 3		QUARTER 4								
What are the main reasons for non-submission of reports?							N/A				N/A										
Does the municipality have a:							N/A				N/A										
Batho Pele Policy and Procedure Manual?							N/A				N/A										
Service Delivery Charter and Standards?							N/A				N/A										
Service Delivery Improvement Plan (SDIP)?							N/A				N/A										
Does the SDIP for the municipality identify at least 3 services to be improved							N/A				N/A										
Comments:																					
4	Number of wards where community meetings were held	LM/SC	0	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1		QUARTER 2		QUARTER 3		QUARTER 4								
What are the main reasons for non-submission of reports?							N/A				N/A										
Comments:																					
TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR			0				N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0			
B	SERVICE DELIVERY	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING (Do not Amend)	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 3 (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 4(Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
							Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual		Target	Actual				
5	Percentage of households with access to potable water	DM/SC	3	< 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		80.1%	1		80.1%	1		80.1%							
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1		QUARTER 2		QUARTER 3		QUARTER 4								
Number of Households							26580		26580		26580										

What are blockages challenge it terms of backlog alleviation? E.g. Funding, PMU Capacity, or SCM Delays etc.						Funding and SCM delays			Amajuba DM has got limited grant funding but has high indigents due to the rural nature of the municipality			Amajuba DM has got limited grant funding but has high indigents due to the rural nature of the municipality					
Number of unplanned interruptions						218			169			168					
Average time taken to repair unplanned interruptions						2-6hrs			2-6hrs			2-6hrs					
% of water losses incurred during the quarter						40%			38.7%			40%					
List Campaigns to reduce water losses						0			0			0					
Comments																	
6	Percentage of households served with a sanitation facility	DM/SC	2	< 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	97.5%	2	98%	2	98%						
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4		
Number of Households						26580			26580			26580					
What are blockages challenge it terms of backlog alleviation? E.g. Funding, PMU Capacity, or SCM Delays etc.						Mostly related to funding and business plan approvals			Amajuba DM has got limited grant funding but has high indigents due to the rural nature of the municipality			Amajuba DM has got limited grant funding but has high indigents due to the rural nature of the municipality					
Number of sewer spillages per quarter						123			144			143					
Average time taken to fix spillages						3-5hrs			3-5hrs			3-5hrs					
Comments						None			None			None					
7	Percentage of households served with electricity.	LM/SC	0	< 60 % = 0 60 % → 85 % = 1 > 85 % = 2	<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 	Billing system and service delivery data / report	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4		
Number of Households						N/A			N/A			N/A					
What are blockages challenge it terms of backlog alleviation? E.g. Funding, PMU Capacity, or SCM Delays etc.						N/A			N/A			N/A					
Number of unplanned interruptions						N/A			N/A			N/A					
List Campaigns to reduce electricity losses						N/A			N/A			N/A					
Comments																	

8	Percentage of planned new housing units constructed	LM/SC	0	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4												
What is the housing backlog ? - number of houses							N/A		N/A													
What are blockages challenge it terms of backlog alleviation? E.g. Funding, PMU Capacity, or SCM Delays etc.							N/A		N/A													
Do you have an approved Housing Sector Plan?							N/A		N/A													
Comments																						
9	Percentage of households which have access to refuse removal	LM/SC	0	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4												
Households							N/A		N/A													
Frequency of refuse removal? (Daily / weekly ?)							N/A		N/A													
How many households receive other forms of refuse removal, define (rural areas)							N/A		N/A													
What are blockages and challenges in terms refuse removal?							N/A		N/A													
Number of land-fill sites.							N/A		N/A													
Number of land-fill sites registered?							N/A		N/A													
Comments																						
10. A	Does the municipality have an approved roads maintenance plan for the year ?	All	0	Approved roads maintenance plan = 2 No plan = 0	• Calculation : Confirm yes or no • Norm : yes	Approved roads maintenance plan / SDBIP	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4												
Comments							N/A		N/A													
10. B	Percentage of targetted municipal roads maintained in terms of the Municipality's approved maintenance plan	All	0	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4												
Reasons for non-achievement the target							N/A		N/A													
Comments																						
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		No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0		
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4												
Number of registered indigent households:							N/A		N/A													
How regular does the municipality update the indigent register?							N/A		N/A													
Comments																						
12	Percentage of registered indigent households receiving Free Basic Water	DM/SC	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4												
Reasons for non-achievement of the target							ADIVI has indigent support applications which must be subjected to the approval process			ADIVI has indigent support applications which must be subjected to the approval process			N/A									
Comments																						
13	Percentage of registered indigent households receiving Free Basic Electricity	LM/SC	0	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4												
Reasons for non-achievement of the target																						
Comments																						
14	Percentage of registered indigent households receiving Free Basic Refuse Removal	LM/SC	0	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4												
Reasons for non-achievement of the target							N/A		N/A													
Comments							N/A		N/A													
TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR			8				3				3				0				0			
C	GOOD GOVERNANCE	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column)		QUARTER 2 (Answer Column)		QUARTER 3 (Answer Column)		QUARTER 4(Answer Column)		CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS					
							Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual								
15	Number of Council meetings held over the past Quarter	ALL	2	1 meeting = 2 / 0 meeting = 0	1 meeting per quarter		1	3	2	1	2	2	1	4								
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS							QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4												
What are the main reasons for Council not meeting?							N/A		N/A													

Quorums not reached:						N/A			N/A			N/A									
Reports not submitted:						N/A			N/A			N/A									
Comments																					
16	Number of EXCO meetings held	All	2	3 meeting = 2 / 2 meeting = 1 / 0 - 1 meeting = 0	1 meeting per month	3	4	2	3	3	2	3	4								
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4						
Reasons for EXCO meeting not being held:						N/A			N/A			N/A									
Comments						N/A			N/A			N/A									
17	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	1	0		100%	80%	2	100%	80%								
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4						
Number of Portfolio Committees COUNCIL DISBANDED PORTFOLIO COMMITTEES FROM 5 TO 3 FROM THE 12/09/2017						Corporate Services Portfolio 16/08/2017			3			3									
Number of functional Portfolio Committees NOT YET FULLY FUNCTIONAL DUE TO PARTIES THAT NEED TO SUBMIT THE NAMES TO FORM PART OF THE PORTFOLIO COMMITTEES									3			3									
Number of meetings held per committee per quarter 3 PER QUARTER									Corporate & Finance 2; Community & LED 2; Planning & Engineering could not seat			Corporate & Finance 3; Community & Soc. Services 2; Planning & Engineering 2									
Reasons for Portfolio Committee meeting not being held:																					
Quorums not reached PORTFOLIO COMMITTEES HAVE BEEN RECONFIGURED AND POLITICAL PARTIES ARE TO SUBMIT THE NAMES TO BE MEMBERS OF EACH PORTFOLIO									Quorum could not be reached			n/a									
Reports not submitted: NIL																					
Other																					
Comments																					
18	Number of Audit Committee meetings held	ALL	2	1 meeting = 2 / 0 meeting = 0	1 meeting per quarter	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1								
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4						
Reasons for Audit Committee meeting not being held:						1			2			1									
Comments																					
19	Number of Audit Committee reports submitted to Council	ALL	2	1 report = 2 / 0 report = 0	1 report per quarter	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0								
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4						
Reasons for non-submission of reports to Council:						1			1			0									
Comments												Audit Committee Chairperson will report during the 4th Quarter for Q3									
20	Number of MPAC meetings held	All	2	1 meeting = 2 / 0 meeting = 0	1 meeting per quarter	1	1	2	1	3	2	1	1								
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.						N/A			N/A			N/A									
Comments																					
21	Is the District Intergovernmental Relations Forum (Mayors Forum) established and functional in accordance with the IGR Framework Act	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	YES, 89%	2		89%	2		89%									
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4						
How often do the IGR structures meet?						Quarterly			Quarterly			Quarterly									
Are Municipalities consulted in drafting the Agenda's?						YES			YES			YES									
Have the IGR Forums implemented a Resolution Register / Decision Matrix to track the implementation of resolutions?						YES, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT			YES, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT			YES, BUT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT									
Are matters from District Mayors Forum/ Municipal Managers Forum escalated to Cogta MuniMec / Technical MuniMec respectively?						NO			NO												
Is there is District Wide Integrated IGR Calendar?						YES			YES			YES									
Is there a dedicated IGR official in the Municipality?						YES			YES			YES									
Do Sector Departments attend/support District IGR Meetings?						YES, UPON INVITE			YES, UPON INVITE			YES, UPON INVITE									
Comments																					
TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR			14			12			12												
D	SOUND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED		QUARTER 2 (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED		QUARTER 3 (Answer Column)		POINTS AWARDED		CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
							Target	Actual			Target	Actual			Target	Actual					
22	% 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%	AG Report, Audit Committee agenda and register, Audit action plan and status report		96%	3	0	0	3									
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1			QUARTER 2			QUARTER 3			QUARTER 4						
Number of Audit findings:						Audit in progress			46			46									
What were the key findings:						Revenue, Going Concern			Revenue, water inventory/ Loss/ conditional grants			Revenue, water inventory/ Loss/ conditional grants									
Audit action plan comments and status:						14 Findings Resolved and Completed, Revenue Management Findings are Ongoing/In progress			At a compilation phase			18 Completed 6 Continuous 22 Work In Progress									
Reasons for not resolving queries:						Revenue Data cleansing is a ongoing process			At a compilation phase												
Comments:									AG Action Plan was finalised in the second Quarter												
23 (a)	% 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%	35%	2	50%	73%	2	75%	87%							
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			None			None									
What measures have been put in place to achieve targets if not achieved:						N/A			N/A			N/A									
Comments:						N/A			N/A			N/A									

30	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%	0.43%	0	0%	2	0%					
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4								
Reasons for the irregular, fruitless and wasteful expenditure:						Late payments of creditors	Late payments of creditors	Late payments of creditors									
Number of S36 deviations?:						3	8	9									
Total value of S36 deviations?:						29 166	220 501	458 256									
Number of S36 deviations approved by Council?:						3	8	9									
Has the S36 deviation register been updated?:						Yes	Yes	Yes									
Comments:						N/A	N/A	N/A									
31	% of Irregular, Fruitless and Waste Expenditure resolved	ALL	1	75%→100%=1 <75%=0	100%		0,43%	0	0%	2							
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?:						NO	NO	NO									
If some were not resolved, what is their current status?						Municipality poor cash flow is the cause	Municipality poor cash flow is the cause	Municipality poor cash flow is the cause									
Is the UIFW Register complete?:						Yes	Yes	Yes									
Comments:						None	None	None									
32	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%	20%	0	50%	45%	2	75%	54%			
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.						None	None	None									
What measures have been put in place to achieve targets if not achieved:						N/A	N/A	N/A									
Comments:						None	None	None									
TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR			19				9	15									
E	BUILDING CAPABLE LOCAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS	APPLICABLE TO:	WEIGHTING	SCORING RANGE	Norm/Standard	Portfolio of Evidence	QUARTER 1 - (Answer Column)	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 2 (Answer Column)	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 3 (Answer Column)	POINTS AWARDED	QUARTER 4(Answer Column)	POINTS AWARDED	CHALLENGES	PROPOSED INTERVENTION	COMMENTS
							Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual			
33	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		6	4	2	6	4	2	6	3			
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4								
Number of vacant post?						2	2	3									
Reasons for vacancy						Resignation(DCS) and End of the contract(DCOMS)	Resignation(DCS) and End of the contract(DCOMS)	Resignation(DCS) and end of the contract(DIK, (DirCorp)3yrs (1 months) - 5 months) - 21months)									
Period of vacancy (provide details for each post):						3yrs(DCS) - 3 mnths(DCOMS)	3yrs(DCS) - 5months (DCOMS)	3yrs(DCS) - 5 months (DCOMS)									
Have all employment contracts been signed and submitted to the MEC within the stipulated statutory timeframes?						Yes	Yes	Yes									
Comments:																	
34	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		24%	1	24%	1	24%						
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4								
Number approved posts						245	245	245									
Number filled						85	185	180									
Vacancy rate						24.00%	24%										
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)						31	March	2017	31	March	2017	Consultation Phase					
Any other Comments																	
35	% 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			0	0	0							
FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS						QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4								
Does the municipality have a credible Workplace Skills Plan (WSP)						Yes	Yes	YES									
Is the municipality's WSP approved by Council?						Yes	No	NO									
Was it submitted to LGSETA						Yes	Yes	YES									
How much was allocated for training by the municipality?						10000(Total Budget R40000)	1000(Total Budget R40000)	1000(Total Budget R40000)									
How much did the municipality pay as the 1% salary levy to LGSETA?						194932	194932	194932									
How much was received in the form of the Mandatory Grant?						49341(Skills Development Refund)	49341 (Skills Development Refund)	49341 (Skills Development Refund)									
How much was received in the form of the Discretionary Grant?																	
Number of Councilors participating in the training programmes implemented in the current financial year						2	1	1									
Number of Officials participating in the training programmes implemented in the current financial year						9	9	9									
Any other Comments																	
TOTAL WEIGHTING FOR PILLAR			8				3	3									