

LIMPOPO PROVINCE  
LIMPOPO PROVINSIE  
XIFUNDZANKULU XA LIMPOPO  
PROFENSE YA LIMPOPO  
VUNDU LA LIMPOPO  
IPHROVINSI YELIMPOPO

**Provincial Gazette • Provinsiale Koerant • Gazete ya Xifundzankulu  
Kuranta ya Profense • Gazethe ya Vundu**

*(Registered as a newspaper) • (As 'n nuusblad geregistreer) • (Yi rhijistariwile tanihi Nyuziphepha)  
(E ngwadisits'we bjalo ka Kuranta) • (Yo redzhistariwa sa Nyusiphepha)*

**Vol. 27**

**POLOKWANE,**  
19 JUNE 2020  
19 JUNIE 2020  
19 KHOTAVUXIKA 2020  
19 JUNE 2020  
19 FULWI 2020

**No. 3083**



**CONTENTS**

	<i>Gazette No.</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
<b>GENERAL NOTICES • ALGEMENE KENNISGEWINGS</b>		
31 Thulamela Municipality Spatial Planning and Land Use Management By-Law 2016: Erf 553, Thohoyandou P-East.....	3083	14
32 Local Government: Municipal Systems Act (32/2000): Notice in terms of Section 47 (2) (c) of the Act.....	3083	15
<b>PROCLAMATION • PROKLAMASIE</b>		
19 Makahado Municipality: Portion 1 of Erf 778 Louis Trichardt Township.....	3083	158
19 Makahado Munisipaliteit: Gedeelte 1 van Erf 778 Louis Trichardt Dorp.....	3083	158
<b>LOCAL AUTHORITY NOTICES • PLAASLIKE OWERHEIDS KENNISGEWINGS</b>		
46 Lephalale Municipal Spatial Planning and Land Use Management By-Law, 2017: Portion 35, of the farm Rietspruit 527 LQ.....	3083	159
46 Lephalale Munisipale Ruimtelike Beplanning en Grondgebruikbestuur Verordening, 2017: Gedeelte 35, van die plaas Rietspruit 527 LQ .....	3083	159
47 Local Government Municipal Property Rates Act (6/2004): Resolution Levying Property Rates for the Financial Year 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021 .....	3083	160
48 Lephalale Municipal Spatial Planning and Land Use Management By-Law, 2017: Erf 467, Marapong Township .....	3083	163
48 Lephalale Munisipale Ruimtelike Beplanning en Grondgebruikbestuur Verordening, 2017: Erf 467, Marapong Dorpsgebied .....	3083	163























---

**GENERAL NOTICES • ALGEMENE KENNISGEWINGS**

---

**NOTICE 31 OF 2020****THULAMELA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY****NOTICE FOR THE APPLICATION FOR REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIVE CONDITIONS AND AMENDMENT OF THULAMELA LAND USE MANAGEMENT SCHEME BY REZONING OF ERF 553, THOHoyANDOU P-EAST FROM RESIDENTIAL 1 TO BUSINESS 1 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING OFFICES**

It is hereby notified that application has been made by Thavha G6 Projects (Pty) Ltd as the authorised agent of the property mentioned above for the removal of restrictive conditions and amendment of Thulamela Land Use Management scheme by rezoning of Erf 553, Thohoyandou P-East from residential 1 to business 1 for the purpose of establishing offices in terms of section 63 (2) and 62 (1) of the Thulamela Municipality Spatial Planning and Land Use Management By-Law 2016 and provision of Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act 16 of 2013.

Particulars of the applications will lie open for inspection during office hour at the office of Senior Manager: Planning and Development: Thulamela Local Municipality. First Floor, Thohoyandou, 0950 for a period of 28 days. Objections or representations in respect of the application must be lodged with or made to Municipal Manager, Thulamela Local Municipality, P O Box 5066, Thohoyandou, 0950 for a period of 28 days.

**Address of authorized:** Thavha G6 Projects (Pty) Ltd, 120 Lengau Street, Southern Gateway, Polokwane, 0699. Tel: +27 79 589 4158/ Fax: 086 267 4546/ Email: mususu2009@gmail.com

**THULAMELA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY****NDIVHADZO YA KHUMBLEO YA U SHANDUKISA KUSHUMISELE KWA MAVU NA U BVISA NYIMELE DZA U TSIRELEDZA U SHANDUKISWA HA KUSHUMISELE KWA MAVU U BVA KHA VHUPU HA VHUDZULO UYA KHA VHUPU HA VHUBINDUDZI U ITELA DZIOFISI**

Vha khou divhadziwa uri khumbelo yo itiwaho nga vha Thavha G6 Projects (Pty) Ltd ya u bvisa nyimele dza u tsireledza u shandukiswa ha kushumisele kwa mavu na u shandukisa kushumisele kwa mavu u bva kha vhupo ha vhudzulo uya kha vhupo ha vhubindudzi u itela dziofisi.

Vhane vha takalela u vhalo nga khumbelo iyi na manwalo a yelanaho na iyi khumbelo. Vha nga a wana ofisini ya minidzhere muhulwane wa kudzudzanyele na mvelaphanda. Kha luta lwa u thoma kha masipala wa Thulamela, Thohoyandou. Manwalo ayo ado wanala lwa tshifhinga tshi edanaho maduvha a fumbili malo (28). Vhane vha vha na mbilaelo malugana na iyi kumbelo, vha nwalele minidzhere wa masipala wa Thulamela kha diresi itevhelaho: Thulamela Local Municipality, P O Box 5066, Thohoyandou, 0950. Mbilaelo dzi do tangedziwa lwa maduvha a fumbili malo (28).

**Diresi ya dzhendedzi lire mulayoni malugana na iyi khumbelo:** Thavha G6 Projects (Pty) Ltd, 120 Lengau Street, Southern Gateway, Polokwane, 0699. Tel: +27 79 589 4158/ Fax: 086 267 4546/ Email: mususu2009@gmail.com

## NOTICE 32 OF 2020

**LIMPOPO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT****NOTICE IN TERMS OF SECTION 47(2) (C) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT: MUNICIPAL SYSTEMS ACT 2000 (ACT 32 OF 2000)**

I, Rodgers Basikopo Makamu Member of the Executive Council responsible for Co-Operative Governance, Human Settlements & Traditional Affairs in Limpopo Province, by the powers vested in me in terms of section 47 (2) (c) of the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000), hereby publish the attached consolidated report on annual performance of municipalities in Limpopo Province for 2017/2018 financial year.



**RB MAKAMU (MPL) MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:  
CO-OPERATIVE GOVERNANCE, HUMAN SETTLEMENTS &  
TRADITIONAL AFFAIRS**

---

20 Rabe Street, POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, POLOKWANE, 0700  
Tel: (015) 284 5000, Fax (015) 293 1520, Website: [www.limpopo.coghsta.gov.za](http://www.limpopo.coghsta.gov.za)

***The heartland of Southern Africa – development is about people!***

CONFIDENTIAL



LIMPOPO  
PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT OF  
CO-OPERATIVE GOVERNANCE,  
HUMAN SETTLEMENTS & TRADITIONAL AFFAIRS

# SECTION 47 REPORTS LIMPOPO ANNUAL MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2017/18

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street. POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	MEC's foreword	3
2	Abbreviations and Acronyms	4-5
3	Executive Summary	6-21
4	Background to Reporting	21
5	Purpose of the report	22
6	Assessment Process and Methodology	22-23
7	Other sources of data	23
8	Comparative analysis	24
9	Reporting Scope	25
10	Summary of performance per municipality	26-27
11	Submission rate of S46 report	28-30
12	Population and Household Distribution	31-34
13	Key Performance Areas	35
14	KPA 1: Municipal Transformation and Organizational Development	36-68
15	KPA 2: Basic Service Delivery and Infrastructure Development	69-93
16	KPA 3: Local Economic Development	94-107
17	KPA 4: Financial Viability and Management	108-118
18	KPA 5: Good Governance and Public Participation	119-134
19	Other Related Matters	134-141
20	Conclusion	141

## MEC FOREWORD

It is a great honour and pleasure to present The State of Municipal Performance Report 2017/18 financial year to the people of Limpopo Province, Members of the Provincial Legislature, the Minister of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs and National Council of Provinces in accordance with Local Government Municipal Systems Act, No.32 of 2000 section 47.

The report contains detailed performance of municipalities as per the key performance areas and also identifies municipalities which did not perform, particularly focusing on operation clean audit 2016 and implementation of Back to Basics approach. There was one (1) municipality with adverse opinion for 2015/16, three (3) for 2016/17 and (01) one for 2017/18 respectively. Two (2) municipalities received disclaimer audit opinions in 2015/16 2016/17 and (4) four municipalities in 2017/18 financial years. There were thirteen (13) municipalities in 2015/16 with unqualified audit opinions and decreased to (9) nine in 2016/17 and in 2017/18 unqualified opinions were (10). Qualified audit opinions were ten (10) in 2015/16, increased to eleven (11) in 2016/17 financial year and remained at (11) eleven in 2017/18.

It is also worrying that there was no municipality which achieved 100% of its planned targets. The department developed plans that will ensure support to municipal performance.

The status of Municipal Infrastructure Grant was at 82% in 2015/16, increased to 86% in 2016/17, but decreased to 82% in 2017/18 with most municipalities unable to spend 100% of their allocation.

Two Special Economic Zones were declared in Musina-Makhado and Tubatse in order to stimulate economic growth in the province.

The department had supported municipalities on the appointment of competent senior managers in accordance with Municipal Systems Act and related regulations. The filling of posts for senior managers was 73% (119/162). vacancy rate was at 27%.



RB MAKAMU  
MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

2020/02/20  
DATE

RDP	Reconstruction and Development Programme
SDBIP	Service Delivery Budget and Implementation Plan
SDM	Sekhukhune District Municipality
SEZ	Special Economic Zones
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
TM	Technical Manager
VDM	Vhembe District Municipality
WSA	Water Services Authorities
WSP	Water Services Providers
WTW	Water Treatment Works
WWTW	Waste Water Treatment Works

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1.1. INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION AND ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT /INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

This section looks at the annual performance progress made by Limpopo municipalities with regard to the Key Performance Area (KPA) Institutional Transformation and Organisational Development for 2017/18 financial year. The purpose is to report on municipal performance around the transformation of their institutional capacity and various efforts in the development of human resources systems, policies and management capabilities' during the year under review. This section indicates how municipalities have continued to enhance their organisational capacity in order to deliver quality services to their communities by making sure that they build solid administrative institutions. It shows progress on how municipalities have organised themselves in terms of building capacity to deliver compliance with equity targets, as well as implementing both the organisational and individual performance management systems and filling of senior managers/ critical posts.

There were one hundred and sixty-two (162) approved municipal senior manager positions in Limpopo municipalities; one hundred and nineteen (119) positions were filled. Forty-three (43) positions remained vacant which equated to a combined vacancy rate of twenty-seven percent (27%) for senior managers. There was improvement from the previous financial year in municipalities like Greater Letaba which had six (6) vacancies and managed to fill them all, Thabazimbi had six (6) vacancies and managed to fill five (5), Thulamela had five (5) vacancies and filled four (4) and Mogalakwena had five (5) vacancies and filled three (3). It is only in Makhuduthamaga where the vacancy level in respect of all positions was above fifty percent (50%) with 5 vacancies. On employment equity targets, twenty-two percent (22%) in 2016/17 of senior management positions in Limpopo municipalities were occupied by women as compared to 25% in 2015/16. The status remained the same at 22% in 2017/18. This achievement is far below the required fifty percent (50%) regarding women employment in municipal senior management posts in terms of the Employment Equity Act.

## 1.2. SERVICE DELIVERY AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

Municipalities continued to provide quality basic services to communities. Provision of water still remains a huge challenge in communities. Municipalities have developed indigent registers to ensure that the poor, vulnerable and the unemployed enjoy delivery of quality services. These registers are constantly updated to ensure that those that secure jobs and income begin to pay for services.

### 1.2.1. MIG ALLOCATION PER SECTOR

#### SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT

Municipality	2017/2018 allocation R'000	Amount spent 17/18 R'000	2017/2018 expenditure in %
Ephraim Mogale	R 44 810 000	R 43 008 217.00	96%
Elias Motsoaledi	R66 860 000	R66 119 000	99%
Makhuduthamaga	R68 646 000	R68 646 000	100%
Fetakgomo/Tubatse	R85 863 000	R80 502 000	94%
Sekhukhune	R464 042 000	R425 163 000	92%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>R730 221</b>	<b>R683 449 000</b>	<b>96%</b>

**VHEMBE DISTRICT**

Municipality	2017/2018 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2017/2018 expenditure in %
Musina	47 468	18 774	39,6%
Collins Chabane	131 615	50 267	38,2%
Thulamela	217 403	163 299	75,1%
Makhado	182 816	190 130	104%
Vhembe	634 432	411 089	64,8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1 213 734</b>	<b>833 559</b>	<b>69%</b>

**CAPRICORN DISTRICT**

Municipality	2017/2018 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2017/2018 expenditure in %
Blouberg	2, 254,500.00	1,742,621.99	77%
Molemole	5,357,700.00	2,395,531.41	45%
Polokwane	352,178,000.00	322 790 060.70	92%
Lepelle-Nkumpi	63,954,866.22	11, 997,046.05	20%
Capricorn	11, 751,850.00	11,751,850.00	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>435 496 916</b>	<b>350 677 110</b>	<b>81%</b>

**MOPANI DISTRICT**

Municipality	2017/2018 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2017/2018 expenditure in %
Greater Giyani	78736000	63790806	81%
Greater Letaba	90142183	61162000	70%
Greater Tzaneen	95 942 000	93 116 093	97%
Ba-Phalaborwa	39619000	39619000	100%
Maruleng	27259157	27259157	100%
Mopani	474728410	402455624	85%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>806426750</b>	<b>687402680</b>	<b>85%</b>

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street, POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
 Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**



**WATERBERG DISTRICT**

Municipality	2017/2018 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2017/2018 expenditure in %
Thabazimbi/Waterberg	33 759.00	10 400.00	54%
Lephalale	44,370	58,697	100%
Modimolle-Mookgophong	39,190	28,879	74%
Bela- Bela	26,304	26,305	100%
Mogalakwena	159,266	125,179	79%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>302 889</b>	<b>249 460</b>	<b>81%</b>

**1.2.2. MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE PER CATEGORY ON MIG**

<b>MUNICIPALITIES</b>	<b>CATEGORY</b>
Bela-Bela, Lephalale, Capricorn, Ba-Phalaborwa, Maruleng, Makhado	100%
Polokwane, Greater Tzaneen, Ephraim Mogale, Elias Motsoaledi, Fetakgomo Tubatse, Sekhukhune	90-99%
Greater Giyani and Mopani	80-89%
Thabazimbi, Modimolle-Mookgophong, Mogalakwena, Lepelle Nkumpi, Molemole, Blouberg, Greater Letaba, Musina, Collins Chabane, Thulamela, Vhembe	Less than 80%

Provincial MIG expenditure was at 82% in 2015/16. In 2016/17 expenditure improved to 86% but declined to 82% in 2017/18.

According to Stats SA CS 2016; the province provided 1 195 751 households with safe drinking water, 1 463 519 households with electricity, 367 341 households with flush toilet (connected to sewer system and septic or conservatory tank) and 401 225 households with refuse removal.

**1.3. LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (LED)**

Municipalities demonstrated efforts in facilitating a conducive environment to stimulate and facilitate local economic development and investment. Municipalities are developing implementation plans for LED strategies.

The continued high levels of unemployment and poverty remains a concern. In 2015/16, 20 627 LED jobs were created, EPWP created 19 227 and CWP created 25 489. In 2016/17, 24 409 jobs were created through LED, 10 557 created through EPWP and 10 081 created through CWP. In 2017/18, 11 377 jobs were created through LED, 15 395 through EPWP and 19 078 through CWP.

## 1.4. FINANCIAL VIABILITY AND MANAGEMENT

The constitutional assignment of powers and functions to local government has a direct bearing on the local government fiscal framework. Collection of revenue by municipalities should be prioritised to ensure that municipalities remain financially viable, especially households and government debts which remained high over a period of time.

Unqualified audit opinions were (13) in 2015/16, (09) in 2016/17 and (10) in 2017/18. Qualified audit opinions were (11) in 2015/16, (11) in 2016/17 and remained the same at (11) in 2017/18. Disclaimers were (2) in 2015/16, (5) in 2016/17 and (4) in 2017/18. Adverse audit findings were (2) in 2015/16, (3) in 2016/17 and (1) in 2017/18.

### 1.4.1. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PER DISTRICT

#### WATERBERG DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY

Municipality	% of capital budget expenditure (17/18)	Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual (17/18)
Waterberg	0%	15%
Bela-Bela	41%	56%
Lephalale	8%	57%
Mogalakwena	74%	27%
Thabazimbi	0%	0%
Modimolle-Mookgopong	34%	0%

**VHEMBE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>% of capital budget expenditure (17/18)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual (17/18)</b>
Thulamela	75%	20%
Collins Chabane	98%	7%
Musina	40%	52%
Makhado	104%	47%
Vhembe	65%	7%

**CAPRICORN DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>% of capital budget expenditure (17/18)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual (17/18)</b>
CDM	72%	87%
Blouberg	92%	72%
Lepelle Nkumpi	61.14%	33%
Molemole	45%	30%
Polokwane	96.8%	95%

**SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>% capital budget expenditure (17/18)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual budget (17/18)</b>
Sekhukhune	88%	84%
Elias Motsoaledi	88,69%	91%
Ephraim Mogale	83%	93%
Makhuduthamaga	100%	21%
Fetakgomo/Tubatse	55%	31%

**MOPANI DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>% capital budget expenditure (17/18)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual budget (17/18)</b>
Mopani	100%	13%
Greater Letaba	103%	15%
Greater Tzaneen	74%	61%
Maruleng	81%	66%
Phalaborwa	74%	63%
Greater Giyani	67%	18%

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street, POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

### 1.5. GOOD GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

During the 2017/18 financial year 560 ward committees were established and 500 were functioning to a satisfactory level. Ward-based operational plans were developed to ensure proper monitoring and facilitation of projects within wards. All ward committee members in the province received stipends as a way of encouragement to members. In Mopani 129 ward committees were established and 129 were functional. 117 wards committees were established and 117 are functional in Sekhukhune, 80 ward committees were established in Waterberg and 62 were functional. In Vhembe 127 ward committees were established and 105 were functional. Capricorn had 107 established ward committees and 87 were functional. In ensuring maximum public participation, ward councilors ensured that ward committee meetings were convened on monthly and quarterly basis.

There were 615 councillors elected in 2016/17 as compared to 564 councillors elected in 2015/16 and 251 were women. Women councillors were 300 in 2016/17. In 2017/18 there were 1364 councillors and women councillors were 600. IGR structures were functional in the province and all municipalities had functional websites.

All 27 municipalities in the province established MPAC committees, Audit Committees and Internal Audit Units.

### 1.5.1. MANAGEMENT OF FRAUD AND CORRUPTION

#### Progress on Implementation of Anti-Corruption Strategies by Municipalities

Municipality	Anti-corruption plan compiled (17/18)	Has council adopted anti-corruption plan (17/18)	Anti-corruption plan implemented (17/18)
Polokwane	Yes	Yes	Yes
Blouberg	Yes	Yes	Yes
Molemole	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lepelle-Nkumpi	Yes	Yes	Yes
Capricorn	Yes	Yes	Yes
Makhado	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thulamela	Yes	Yes	Yes(shared with Vhembe)
Musina	Yes	Yes	Yes(shared with Vhembe)
Collins Chabane	Yes	Yes	Yes(shared with Vhembe)
Vhembe	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greater Giyani	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maruleng	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greater Letaba	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greater Tzaneen	Yes	Yes	Yes

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Anti-corruption plan compiled (17/18)</b>	<b>Has council adopted anti-corruption plan (17/18)</b>	<b>Anti-corruption plan implemented (17/18)</b>
Ba-Phalaborwa	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mopani	Yes	Yes	Yes
Makhuduthamaga	Yes	Yes	Yes
Elias Motsoaledi	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fetakgomo/Tubatse	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ephraim Mogale	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sekhukhune	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mogalakwena	Yes	Yes	Yes
Modimolle-Mookgophong	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bela-Bela	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lephalale	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thabazimbi	Yes	Yes	Yes
Waterberg	Yes	Yes	Yes



### 1.5.2. FUNCTIONALITY OF AUDIT COMMITTEES AND MPAC

All 27 municipalities in the province established MPAC committees, Audit Committees and Internal Audit Units.

The table below indicates the status of MPAC and Audit Committees in municipalities:

NO	NAME OF THE MUNICIPALITY	PERFORMANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE	MUNICIPAL ACCOUNT COMMITTEE	PUBLIC INTERNAL AUDIT COMMITTEE
1	Waterberg	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Thabazimbi	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Modimolle/Mookgopong	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Bela-Bela	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Mogalakwena	Yes	Yes	Yes
6	Lephalale	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	Capricorn	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	Polokwane	Yes	Yes	Yes
9	Blouberg	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	Molemole	Yes	Yes	Yes
11	Lepelle Nkumpi	Yes	Yes	Yes
12	Vhembe	Yes	Yes	Yes
13	Thulamela	Yes	Yes	Yes

NO	NAME OF THE MUNICIPALITY	PERFORMANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE	MUNICIPAL ACCOUNT COMMITTEE	PUBLIC INTERNAL AUDIT COMMITTEE
14	Musina	Yes	Yes	Yes
15	Makhado	Yes	Yes	Yes
16	Collins Chabane	Yes	Yes	Yes
17	Mopani	Yes	Yes	Yes
18	Greater Giyani	Yes	Yes	Yes
19	Greater Letaba	Yes	Yes	Yes
20	Greater Tzaneen	Yes	Yes	Yes
21	Maruleng	Yes	Yes	Yes
22	Ba-Phalaborwa	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	Sekhukhune	Yes	Yes	Yes
24	Elias Motsoaledi	Yes	Yes	Yes
25	Ephraim Mogale	Yes	Yes	Yes
26	Fetakgomo/Tubatse	Yes	Yes	Yes
27	Makhuduthamaga	Yes	Yes	Yes

**Internal Audit:** All municipalities had audit, internal and MPAC committees. The Department together with Provincial Treasury continued to support Audit Committees and Internal Audit units in municipalities.

## **2. BACKGROUND TO MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE REPORTING**

This report is in accordance with Local Government: Municipal Systems Act as Amended (MSA), Number 32 of 2000. Subsection (1) of Section 46 which provides that: *"A municipality must prepare for each financial year a performance report reflecting:*

- a) The performance of the municipality and of each external service provider during that financial year;*
- b) A comparison of the performances referred to in paragraph (a) with targets set for and performances in the previous financial year;*
- c) Measures taken to improve performance".*

Section 47 of the Act then provides that *"the MEC for local government must annually compile and submit to the provincial legislature and the Minister, a consolidated report on the performance of municipalities in the province. The report serves as a very important instrument for the legislature to provide oversight in terms of how municipalities have performed"*

*Section 47 (2) prescribe that the report must:*

- a) Identify municipalities that under-performed during the year;*
- b) Propose remedial action to be taken;*
- c) Be published in the Provincial Gazette.*

The MEC for local government must submit a copy of the National Council of Province.

### 3. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The main purpose of this report is to account to the Limpopo Provincial legislature, National Council of Provinces (NCOP), Minister of Co-operative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA), National Treasury, Auditor-General and to the citizens of South Africa on progress made by Limpopo municipalities towards achieving the overall goal of “a better life for all” and a developmental Local Government as espoused in outcome 9. Furthermore, this is a key performance report to communities and other stakeholders in keeping with the principles of transparency and accountability of government to the citizens. It subscribes to the South African developmental nature of participatory democracy and co-operative governance and also responds to the principles of the Constitution, Batho Pele, and the White Paper on Local Government, the Municipal Systems Act and the Municipal Financial Management Act.

### 4. ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND THE METHODOLOGY OF COMPILING THE REPORT

According to the provisions of the Municipal Systems Act as Amended, municipalities must monitor and measure the progress of their performance by preparing quarterly and mid-year performance reports in terms of Chapter 6 of the MSA on performance management systems.

These quarterly and mid-year reports should then make up the municipalities’ annual performance reports (Section 46 report), which are submitted to the Auditor General, together with the Annual Financial Statements, for auditing. After adoption of the audited performance report by the Municipal Council, it must then be submitted to the MEC for Local Government.

This report was compiled primarily from the 2017/18 Limpopo Municipal Annual Reports. These reports were presented to their respective municipal Councils between January and March 2019. The annual reports were further subjected to an oversight process through Municipal Public Accounts Committees (MPACs) in municipalities. In terms of Section 129 (1) of the Municipal Finance Management Act, *“The Council of a municipality must consider the annual report of the municipality and of any municipal entity under the municipality’s sole or shared control, and by no later than two months from the date which the annual report was tabled in council in terms of section 127, adopt an oversight report containing the council’s comments on the annual report”*.

In view of the above, it must be noted that only the following municipalities submitted their annual reports to the Department at the time of compiling this report: Mopani District, Greater Tzaneen, Greater Letaba, Greater Giyani, Maruleng, Ba-Phalaborwa, Capricorn District, Polokwane, Blouberg, Molemole, Lepelle Nkumpi, Vhembe District, Thulamela, Makhado, Musina, Collins Chabane, Sekhukhune District, Elias Motsoaledi, Ephraim Mogale, Makhuduthamaga, Fetakgomo/Tubatse, Waterberg District, Bela-Bela, Lephalale. In light of the above, this report was therefore compiled using information from twenty-four (24) 2017/18 Municipal Annual Reports which were presented before their respective council's for adoption. Three (3) municipalities did not submit their annual report, namely; Thabazimbi, Modimolle/Mookgophong and Mogalakwena as a result their assessment is largely informed by secondary data gathered from the quarterly, mid-year and annual performance reports.

#### **5. Other sources of data**

In addition to the municipal annual reports the department utilized secondary data to complement the municipal performance reports, namely

- Municipal quarterly and Mid-Year Performance Reports submitted to the Department;
- Outcome 9 reports as they have been subjected to various IGR clusters including PIGF and Executive Council;
- Programme Performance Reports from the Departments and Municipal Infrastructure Grant reports,
- DWS, Water Service Authority Report
- Back to Basics Reports
- Community Survey 2007 Report
- Census 2011 Report
- General Household Survey 2016

## 6. Comparative analysis

The report has been compiled based on a comparative overview of progress made in the previous three financial years, namely; 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18 financial years. The report demonstrates the performance trends across all five key performance areas and identifies municipalities that have under-performed in certain key performance areas. It further provides a detailed overview on areas that need further interventions in improving the overall performance of the municipalities in Limpopo.

The report presents an analysis and comparison of past and current progress on municipal performance and a brief assessment summary which is presented at the end of each Key Performance Area (KPA) as per municipal section 46 reports. A sub-section that relates to the challenges experienced by municipalities in performing in these KPAs will then follow. The interventions by the national and provincial governments, together with other agencies in support of municipalities are presented in the next sub-section. This will be accompanied by a trend analysis of performance over a period of three years. This information is categorized under each of the Key Performance Area and other related issues. The challenges encountered by municipalities and the interventions carried out by other spheres of government and stakeholders are contained in each KPA analysis. Analysis of municipal performance in this report will be according to the below five (5) Key Performance Areas (KPA) of Local Government:

1. Institutional Transformation and Organisational Development;
2. Service Delivery and Infrastructure Development;
3. Local Economic Development (LED);
4. Financial Viability and Management; and
5. Good Governance and Intergovernmental Relations.
6. Other related matters

Furthermore, the report includes additional sections on related issues, Summary of Findings and Recommendations. This report is a reflection of Limpopo municipal financial and non-financial performance for the 2017/18 financial year. The report covers all municipalities within the province although secondary data was used for Thabazimbi Local Municipality, Mogalakwena and Modimolle Mookgophong.

## 7. REPORTING SCOPE ON FIVE KEY PERFORMANCE AREAS

**Key Performance Area 1: Municipal Transformation and Institutional Development:** This focus area measures the extent to which the administrative and overall management capacity is developed, with special emphasis on organizational design and human resources capacity, employment equity, capacity for strategic planning in the form of the IDP and performance management within the municipality

**Key Performance Area 2: Basic Service Delivery and Infrastructure Development:** The focus is on accelerating basic service delivery in order to reduce municipal service delivery backlog and improve the ability of local government to develop infrastructure that will sustain the provision of the municipal services. It measures whether there is progress towards provision of water and sanitation services, electricity, waste removal, roads and storm water maintenance, as well as the municipalities' state of readiness to deliver housing in partnership with the provincial government. Linked to this, it focuses on the national targets set in line with the Sustainable Development Goals as well as the capacity to implement the infrastructure grants projects which are implemented at municipal level through the Municipal Infrastructure Grant.

**Key Performance Area 3: Local Economic Development:** This focuses on the strategic intent, and as well as the ability to implement local economic development programmes. The key aspects of the assessment is on measuring whether the municipalities have an approved strategies for the implementation of LED projects, if there is sufficient capacity within the municipality to implement LED functions, assessment of poverty alleviation programme and as well as the creation of jobs through LED initiatives e.g. EPWP and CWP

**Key Performance Area 4: Financial Viability and Financial Management:** The critical element of this focus area provides an assessment of the extent to which the municipalities develop the capacity to implement the MFMA requirements, the capacity to raise revenue through municipal trading services as well as the capacity

for overall budget and expenditure management. Linked to this, is the status quo in terms of the Auditor General Reports on the municipalities' performance information and financial statements.

**Key Performance Area 5: Good Governance, Public Participation, and Ward Committee:** the focus is to assess the running of council, establishment and functionality of the ward committees, assess the extent at which public participation is encouraged, and the level of corporate governance in the municipality.

## 8. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE PER MUNICIPALITY

Municipality	Targets	Targets Achieved	Targets not achieved	% achievement
Mopani	250	160	90	64%
Greater Tzaneen	232	128	104	55%
Greater Letaba	71	57	14	80%
Maruleng	143	76	99	53%
Greater Giyani	140	90	43	64%
Ba-Phalaborwa	80	72	8	81%
Sekhukhune	236	164	72	69%
Elias Motsoaledi	92	64	28	69%
Ephraim Mogale	163	119	44	73%
Makhuduthamaga	116	94	22	81%
Fetakgomo/Tubatse	241	165	76	68%
Capricorn	177	171	06	97%
Polokwane	49	40	09	72%
Blouberg	175	155	20	88%
Molemole	84	62	22	78%
Lepelle-Nkumpi	115	46	69	40%
Vhembe	230	156	74	68%
Thulamela	270	192	78	71%
Makhado	50	33	17	66%



Musina	224	137	113	61%
Collins Chabane	76	56	20	74%
Waterberg	30	18	12	60%
Modimolle/Mookgophong	60	30	15	50%
Mogalakwena	108	85	23	81%
Belabela	107	87	20	81%
Lephalale	111	88	23	79%
Thabazimbi	45	30	15	66%

Lepelle Nkumpi Local Municipality performed the least at 40%, whereas Capricorn District Municipality achieved the highest at 97%, even in the previous financial year Capricorn District performed highest at 93%. None of the municipalities in the province managed to achieve 100% of planned targets.

## 9. SUBMISSION RATE OF SECTION 46 REPORTS PER MUNICIPALITY

### Provincial analysis

There were 24 municipalities which adopted their annual reports within the legislated time frames. Thabazimbi, Mogalakwena and Modimolle-Mookgophong adopted their reports outside the legislated time frame. It is also worth mentioning and encouraging that in the year under review some of the annual reports were published in municipal websites as per the table below.

MUNICIPALITY	SECTION 46 REPORT SUBMISSION & COMPLIANCE PER MUNICIPALITY				
	Tabling Council	to	Compliant	Date of receipt by the department	Publication/website
Vhembe District municipality	27 March 2019		Yes	02 April 2019	Yes
Thulamela Local municipality	28 March 2019		Yes	02 April 2019	Yes
Musina Local municipality	28 March 2019		Yes	04 April 2019	Yes
Makhado Local municipality	29 March 2019		Yes	04 April 2019	No
Collins Chabane Local Municipality	28 March 2019		Yes	05 April 2019	No

Municipality	SECTION 46 REPORT SUBMISSION & COMPLIANCE PER MUNICIPALITY				
	Tabling Council	to	Compliant	Date of receipt by the department	Publication/website
Mopani District municipality	29/03/2019		Yes	03/04/2019	No
Greater Tzaneen Local municipality	28/03/2019		Yes	03/04/2019	No
Greater Giyani Local municipality	29/03/2019		Yes	09/04/2019	No
Ba-Phalaborwa Local municipality	28/03/2019		Yes	08/04/2019	No
Greater Letaba Local municipality	28/03/2019		Yes	08/04/2019	No
Maruleng Local Municipality	25/03/2019		Yes	01/04/2019	No

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street, POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

<b>SECTION 46 REPORT SUBMISSION &amp; COMPLIANCE PER MUNICIPALITY</b>				
<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Tabling Council</b>	<b>to Compliant</b>	<b>Date of receipt by the department</b>	<b>Publication/website</b>
<b>Waterberg District municipality</b>	28 March 2019	Yes	09/04/2019	No
Mogalakwena Local municipality	No sitting	Did not submit	Did not submit	Did not submit
Thabazimbi Local municipality	No sitting	Did not submit	Did not submit	Did not submit
Lephalale Local municipality	26 March 2019	Yes	11/04/2019	Yes
Bela-Bela Local municipality	27 March 2019	Yes	03/04/2019	Yes
Modimolle-Mookgophong Local municipality	No sitting	Did not submit	Did not submit	Did not submit

	SECTION 46 REPORT SUBMISSION & COMPLIANCE PER MUNICIPALITY				
Municipality	Tabling Council	to	Compliant	Date of receipt by the department	Publication/website
Sekhukhune District municipality	28/03/2019		Yes	04/04/2019	No
Ephraim Mogale local municipality	02/04/2019		Yes	04/04/2019	Yes
Elias Motsoaledi local municipality	27/03/2019		Yes	04/04/2019	Yes
Makhuduthamaga local municipality	27/03/2019		Yes	12/04/2019	Yes
Fetakgomo-Tubatse Local municipality	03/04/2019		Yes	05//04/2019	Yes

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Tabling Council</b>	<b>to</b>	<b>Compliant</b>	<b>Date of receipt by the department</b>	<b>Publication/website</b>
Capricorn District municipality	28/03/2019		Yes	08/04/2019	Yes
Polokwane local municipality	27/03/2019		Yes	04/04/2019	No
Molemole local municipality	29/03/2019		Yes	05/04/2019	Yes
Blouberg local municipality	29/03/2019		Yes	05/04/2019	No
Lepelle-Nkumpi local municipality	29/03/2019		Yes	09/04/2019	No

## 10. POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD DISTRIBUTION PER DISTRICT

### CAPRICORN DISTRICT

Municipality	2007	2011		
	Population	No of households	Population	No of households
Blouberg	145 454	33 826	162, 629	41 192
Lepelle-Nkumpi	100 408	27 296	230 350	59 682
Molemole	561 772	130 361	108 321	30 043
Polokwane	241 414	58 483	628 999	178 001
<b>Capricorn District</b>	<b>1 243 167</b>	<b>285 564</b>	<b>1 261,463</b>	<b>342 836</b>

**MOPANI DISTRICT**

<b>2007</b>			<b>2011</b>	
<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>No of households</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>No of households</b>
Greater Letaba	247 739	59 539	212 362	58 261
Greater Tzaneen	349 087	89 831	389 549	108 926
Greater Giyani	247 657	57 537	243 058	63 548
Maruleng	95 779	24 589	94 691	4 470
Ba-Phalaborwa	127 308	33 792	150 495	41 115
<b>Mopani District</b>	<b>1 067 570</b>	<b>265 288</b>	<b>1 090 155</b>	<b>276 320</b>

**VHEMBE DISTRICT**

<b>2007</b>			<b>2011</b>	
<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>No of households</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>No of households</b>
Collins Chabane	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Thulamela	602 819	137 852	617 973	156 594
Musina	57 195	14 203	68 128	20 042
Makhado	471 805	114 060	515 514	134 889
<b>Vhembe District</b>	<b>1 240 034</b>	<b>287 190</b>	<b>1 293 408</b>	<b>335 276</b>

**WATERBERG DISTRICT**

<b>2007</b>			<b>2011</b>	
<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>No of households</b>	<b>No of households</b>	<b>Population</b>
Thabazimbi	60 039	962 32	23 872	84 887
Lephalale	80 141	140 240	23 745	115 450
Modimolle-Mookgophong	52 602		15 826	68 286
Bela-Bela	55 844	762 96	14 290	66 304
Mogalakwena	330 649	325 291	75 313	307 119
<b>Waterberg District</b>	<b>596 093</b>	<b>745 758</b>	<b>160 720</b>	<b>677 477</b>

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street, POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
 Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

**SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT**

2007			2011	
Municipality	Population	No of households	No of households	Population
Elias Motsoaledi	247 488	268 256	46 840	248 956
Ephraim Mogale	124 510	127 699	28 215	123 313
Makhuduthamaga	262 726	284 435	53 654	274 154
Fetakgomo-Tubatse	112 232	489 902	21 851	93 687
<b>Sekhukhune District</b>	<b>1 090 424</b>	<b>117 292</b>	<b>217 171</b>	<b>1075509</b>

**Area coverage in relation to the Province: Provincial coverage**

District Municipality	Area (km)	Percentage (%)	Number of Local Municipalities
Capricorn District Municipality	21 706.96	16.7	4
Mopani District Municipality	25 344.13	19.3	5
Sekhukhune District Municipality	13 528	10.3	4
Vhembe District Municipality	25597	19.5	4
Waterberg District Municipality	44 913	34.2	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>131 089 09</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>22</b>

\*source; (Stats SA) CENSUS 2011; Community Survey 2016



## 11. MUNICIPAL KEY PERFORMANCE AREAS

Analysis of performance information in this report consists of the following KPA's of Local Government:

- KPA 1: Institutional Transformation and Organisational Development;
- KPA 2: Basic Service Delivery;
- KPA 3: Local Economic Development;
- KPA 4: Financial Viability and Management;
- KPA 5: Good Governance and Public Participation; and
- Other Related Matters.

## **12.KEY PERFORMANCE AREA ONE:**

### **12.1. INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION AND ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

#### **12.1.1. INTRODUCTION**

The main focus of this key performance area is the institutional and organisational capacity of municipalities to perform their functions and fulfil their developmental role as stipulated in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, and the White Paper on Local Government. Institutional and organisational reform in local government is key towards the realisation of sustainable municipalities. Having been allocated separate powers and functions enshrined in the Constitution, municipalities had to organise themselves in preparation to fulfil these functions and powers.

This key performance area also includes indicators that show progress on how municipalities have organised themselves in terms of building capacity to deliver compliance with equity targets as well as implementing both the organisational and individual performance management systems. Municipal performance in this KPA was assessed in the following focus areas:

1. Implementation of the Performance Management System Framework.
2. Filling of Municipal Senior Management Posts (Section 57 Managers)
3. Employment Equity Plans.
4. Challenges experienced in Municipal Institutional Transformation and Organisational Development; and
5. Interventions by National and Provincial Government

### 12.1.2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS (PMS) FRAMEWORK

#### Provincial analysis

Section 40 of the Municipal Systems Act as Amended (MSA) stipulates that, “*A municipality must establish mechanisms to monitor and review its performance management system (PMS)*”. The MSA further provides that a performance management system applied by a municipality in compliance with this section must be devised in such a way that it may serve as an early warning indicator of underperformance. Additionally, Section 38 (b) and (c) of the MSA provides that the establishment of a PMS by a municipality must promote a culture of performance management among its political structures, political office bearers, Councillors and its administration. The significance for the performance management system is to administer the municipality’s affairs in an economical, effective, efficient and accountable manner.

The table below indicates the status of Limpopo municipal PMS as at the end of the of the 2017/18 financial year. Limpopo municipalities must be commended for complying with Section 40 of the MSA for institutionalising and ensuring that their PMS are functional and that they also included the required key components as prescribed in the Act. A number of the core components and compliance areas that should accompany a municipality’s PMS can be said to be in place as indicated. 03 municipalities did not submit their annual report (Thabazimbi, Modimolle Mookgophong and Mogalakwena), however secondary information was used to analyse the performance reports.

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Function al PMS Unit</b>	<b>Adoption of IDP &amp; SDBIP 2018/19</b>	<b>PMS Framework developed &amp; adopted</b>	<b>S57 Performance Agreements signed 18/19</b>	<b>Appointed MPAC</b>	<b>2017/18 AR Approved</b>	<b>2017/18 AR Submitted to MEC</b>
<b>Regulation</b>	<b>Sec.40 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.25 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.39 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.57 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.45 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.46 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.46 MSA</b>
Mopani	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Giyani	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Letaba	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tzaneen	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maruleng	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ba-Phalaborwa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Capricorn	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Polokwane	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Molemole	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lepelle Nkumpi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Blouberg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Waterberg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Modimolle-Mookgophong	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Lephalale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bela-Bela	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thabazimbi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Mogalakwena	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Vhembe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Makhado	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thulamela	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Collins Chabane	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Musina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street, POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

Municipality	Function al PMS Unit	Adoption of IDP & SDBIP 2018/19	PMS Framework developed & adopted	S57 Performance Agreements signed 2018/19	Appointed MPAC	2017/18 AR Approved	2017/18 AR Submitted to MEC
<b>Regulation</b>	<b>Sec.40 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.25 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.39 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.57 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.45 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.46 MSA</b>	<b>Sec.46 MSA</b>
Sekhukhune	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Elias Motsoaledi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ephraim Mogale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Makhuduthamaga	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fetakgomo-Tubatse	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

### 12.1.3. PROVINCIAL OVERVIEW OF FILLING OF SECTION 57 MANAGERS POSTS

Hereunder is an overview of the filling of senior manager's posts in the twenty-seven (27) Municipalities for the 2017/18 municipal financial year. The *Regulations on the Appointment and Conditions of Employment for Local Government Senior Managers, Annexure B* identifies the following senior management level posts as critical:

1. Municipal Manager.
2. Chief Financial Officer.
3. Technical Services Manager.
4. Corporate Services Manager.
5. Community Services Manager; and
6. Development and Town Planning Manager.

- **Municipal Managers:** The filling of Municipal Managers posts was at 77% (23/30) in 2015/16, declined to 56% (15/27) in 2016/17 and improved to 85% (23/27) in 2017/18.
- **Chief Financial Officers:** The filling of Chief Financial Officer's posts was at 73% (22/30) in 2015/16, declined to 55% (15/27) in 2016/17 and improved to 78% (21/27) in 2017/18.
- **Technical Services Managers:** The filling of Technical Manager's posts was at 77% (23/30) in 2015/16, declined in 2016/17 to 44% (12/27) and improved to 56% (15/27) in 2017/18.
- **Development Planning:** The filling of Development Planning posts was at 74% (20/30) in 2015/16, declined in 2016/17 to 48% (13/27) and the status improved to 67% (18/27) in 2017/18.
- **Corporate Services:** The filling of Corporate Services posts was at 67% (20/30) in 2015/16, declined to 59% (16/27) in 2016/17 and improved to 81% (22/27) in 2017/18.
- **Community Services:** The filling of Community services posts was at 75% (21/28) in 2015/16, declined to 56% (15/27) in 2016/17 and improved to 74% (20/27) in 2017/18.

The table below provides three financial year analysis of the filling of section 54A/56 Managers posts per district

	Mopani			Sekhukhune			Vhembe			Capricorn			Waterberg		
	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18
<b>MM</b>	3/6 50%	3/6 50%	5/6 83%	6/6 100%	4/5 80%	4/5 80%	4/5 80%	3/5 60%	5/5 100%	5/6 83%	2/5 40%	5/5 100%	5/7 71%	4/6 67%	4/6 67%
<b>CFO</b>	5/6 83%	3/6 50%	4/6 67%	5/6 83%	4/5 80%	4/5 80%	4/5 80%	3/5 60%	3/5 50%	4/6 67%	3/5 60%	4/5 80%	3/7 43%	4/6 67%	6/6 100%
<b>Tech</b>	5/6 83%	3/6 50%	4/6 67%	4/6 67%	2/5 40%	3/5 60%	3/5 60%	2/5 40%	2/5 40%	5/6 83%	2/5 40%	3/5 60%	6/7 86%	3/6 50%	3/6 50%
<b>DP</b>	3/6 50%	2/6 33%	4/6 67%	4/6 67%	3/5 60%	3/5 60%	3/5 75%	1/5 20%	3/5 60%	6/6 100%	4/5 80%	4/5 80%	4/5 80%	3/6 50%	4/6 67%
<b>DCO</b>	4/6 67%	3/6 50%	5/6 83%	4/6 67%	4/5 80%	3/5 60%	3/5 60%	3/5 60%	4/5 80%	5/6 83%	3/5 60%	4/5 80%	4/7 57%	3/6 50%	6/6 100%
<b>DCS</b>	5/6 83%	5/6 83%	6/6 100%	3/5 60%	3/5 60%	3/5 60%	3/5 75%	3/5 60%	5/5 100%	5/6 83%	3/5 60%	3/5 60%	5/7 71%	5/6 83%	3/6 50%
<b>TOTAL</b>	25/36 69%	19/36 53%	28/36 78%	26/35 72%	20/30 67%	20/27 74%	20/28 71%	15/30 50%	22/30 73%	31/36 86%	17/30 57%	23/27 85%	27/40 68%	22/36 57%	26/36 72%

**CAPRICORN DISTRICT**

Designation	Capricorn			Polokwane			Lepelle Nkumpi			Blouberg			Molemole		
	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18
MM	V		F	V	F	F	F	V	F	F	V	F	F	F	F
CFO	V		F	V	V	F	F	F	F	V	F	V	F	F	F
TM	F		V	F	V	F	F	F	F	F	F	V	F	V	F
DP	F	F	F	F	V	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
CPS	F	V	F	F	F	F	F	F	V	F	F	F	F	V	F
CS	F	F	F	F	V	V	F	F	F	F	F	V	F	V	V

V = Vacant F = Filled

- **Municipal Managers** posts were at 67% (4/6) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Polokwane and Capricorn and declined to 57% (2/5) in 2016/17 with only Polokwane and Molemole filled. There was 100% of filling of positions in 2017/18
- **Chief Financial Officers** posts were at 50% (3/6) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Capricorn, Polokwane and Blouberg. There was slight improvement in 2016/17 of 60% (3/5) posts filled at Lepelle Nkumpi, Blouberg and Molemole. The status remained the same at 60% (3/5) in 2017/18 with vacancies at Polokwane, Blouberg and Molemole



- **Technical Managers** posts were at 83% (5/6) in 2015/16 with a vacancy at Aganang Local Municipality. There was a decline in 2016/17 to 40% (2/5) with only Lepelle Nkumpi and Blouberg filled. There was improvement in 2017/18 to 60% (3/5) with vacancies at Capricorn and Blouberg.
- **Development Planning** posts were at 100% (6/6) in 2015/16, declined to 80% (4/5) in 2016/17 with a vacancy in Polokwane but improved to 100% in 2017/18.
- **Corporate Services** posts were at 83% in 2015/16 with a vacancy at Aganang. It declined to 60% (3/5) in 2016/17 with vacancies at Capricorn and Molemole. The status improved to 80% (4/5) in 2017/18 with a vacancy at Lepelle Nkumpi.
- **Community Services** posts were at 83% (5/6) in 2015/16 with a vacancy at Aganang. There was a decline in 2016/17 at 60% (3/5) with vacancies at Polokwane and Molemole. The status declined to 40% (2/5) with vacancies at Polokwane, Blouberg and Molemole.

**WATERBERG DISTRICT**

Designation	Waterberg			Belabela			Thabazimbi			Lephalale			Mogalakwena			Modimolle-Mookgopong		
	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18
<b>MM</b>	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	V	F	F	F	F	V	V	V	V	F	V
<b>CFO</b>	F	F	F	F	F	F	V	V	F	F	V	F	V	V	F	V	F	F
<b>TS</b>	F	F	V	F	F	F	F	V	F	F	F	V	F	V	F	V		V
<b>DP</b>	F	F	V	F	F	V	N/A	V	F	F	F	F	F	V	F	V		F
<b>CPS</b>	F	F	F	V	F	F	F	V	F	V	F	F	F	V	F	V		F
<b>CS</b>	F	F	F	V	F	V	V	V	V	F	F	F	F	F	V	F	F	F

V = Vacant F = Filled

- **Municipal Managers** posts were at 71% (5/7) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Thabazimbi and Mogalakwena Local Municipality. There was a decline in 2016/17 to 67% (4/6) with vacancies at Mogalakwena and Thabazimbi. The status remained the same in 2017/18 at 67% (4/6) with vacancies at Modimolle-Mookgophong and Mogalakwena.
- **Chief Financial Officers** posts were at 43% (3/7) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Modimolle, Thabazimbi, Lephalale and Mogalakwena Local Municipalities. In 2016/17 it improved to 67% (4/6) with vacancies at Mogalakwena and Thabazimbi. The status improved to 100% (6/6) in 2017/18.
- **Technical Managers:** posts were at 86% (6/7) in 2015/16 with a vacancy at Mogalakwena Local Municipality but declined to 50% (3/6) in 2016/17 with vacancies at Modimolle-Mookgophong, Mogalakwena and Thabazimbi. The status remained the same at 50% (3/6) in 2017/18 with vacancies at Waterberg, Lephalale and Modimolle-Mookgophong.

- **Development planning** posts were at 80% (4/5) in 2015/16 with a vacancy at Mogalakwena. The post was not applicable in Mookgopong and Modimolle Local Municipalities. In 2016/17 it declined to 50% (3/6) with vacancies at Modimolle-Mookgophong, Mogalakwena and Thabazimbi. The status improved to 67% (4/6) in 2017/18 with vacancies at Waterberg and Belabela.
- **Corporate Services** posts were at 57% (4/7) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Bela-Bela, Mogalakwena and Mookgopong Local Municipalities. In 2016/17 it declined to 50% (3/6) with vacancies at Modimolle-Mookgophong, Mogalakwena and Thabazimbi. The status improved to 100% (6/6) in 2017/18.
- **Community Services** posts were at 71% (5/7) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Thabazimbi and Bela-Bela Local Municipalities. It improved to 83% (5/6) in 2016/17 with a vacancy at Thabazimbi. The status declined to 50% (3/6) in 2017/18 with vacancies at Belabela, Thabazimbi and Mogalakwena.

#### VHEMBE DISTRICT

Designation	Vhembe			Musina			Collins Chabane			Thulamela			Makhado		
	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18
MM		F	F	F	F	F	N/A	F	F	F	V	F	F	V	F
CFO		F	F	F	F	V	N/A	F	F	F	V	F	F	V	V
TS		F	F	V	V	V	N/A	V	F	F	V	V	F	F	V
DP	F		F	F	V	V	N/A	V	F	N/A	V	V	F	F	F
CPS	F		F	V	V	F	N/A	F	F	V	F	V	F	F	F
CS	F	F	F	F	F	F	N/A	V	F	N/A	V	F	F	F	F

V = Vacant F = Filled

- **Municipal Managers posts** were at 80% (4/5) 2015/16 with a vacancy at Vhembe District Municipality. In 2016/17 it declined to 60% (3/5) with vacancies at Thulamela and Makhado. In 2017/18 the status improved to 100% (5/5).
- **Chief Financial Officer's posts** were at 80% (4/5) in 2015/16 with a vacancy at Vhembe. It declined in 2016/17 to 60% (3/5) with vacancies at Thulamela and Makhado. The status remained at 60% (3/5) in 2017/18 with vacancies at Musina and Makhado.
- **Technical Managers posts** were at 60% (3/5) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Vhembe and Musina, declined in 2016/17 to 40% (2/5) with vacancies at Musina, Collins Chabane and Thulamela. The status remained the same at 40% (2/5) with vacancies at Musina, Thulamela and Makhado.
- **Development Planning posts** were at 80% (3/4) in 2015/16 with a vacancy at Thulamela. The position did not exist in Mutale Local Municipality. It declined to 20% (1/5) in 2016/17 with the position filled only at Makhado. The status improved to 60% (3/5) in 2017/18 with vacancies at Musina and Thulamela.
- **Corporate Services posts** were at 60% (3/5) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Musina and Mutale Local municipalities. The posts remained at 60% (3/5) in 2016/17 with vacancies at Vhembe and Musina. It improved to 80% (4/5) in 2017/18 with a vacancy at Thulamela.
- **Community Services posts** were at 75% 2015/16 with a vacancy at Thulamela Local Municipality. The position did not exist at Mutale Local Municipality. It declined to 60% (3/5) in 2016/17 with vacancies at Thulamela and Collins Chabane. It improved to 100% (5/5) in 2017/18 with all positions filled.

## SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT

Designation	Sekhukhune			Fetakgomo-Tubatse			Ephraim Mogale			Makhuduthamaga			Elias Motsoaledi		
	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18
MM	F	F	F	N/A	F	F	F	F	F	F	V	V	F	F	F
CFO	V		V	N/A	F	F	F	F	F	V	F	F	F	F	F
TS	F	V	F	N/A	V	F	F	F	V	F	F	V	V	V	F
DP	F	F	F	N/A	F	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	F	F	F
CPS	F	F	F	N/A	F	F	V	V	F	F	F	V	F	F	V
CS	F	F	F	N/A	F	V	V	F	F	V	V	V	F	V	F

V = Vacant F = Filled

- **Municipal Managers** posts were at 100% (6/6) in 2015/16. In 2016/17 and 2017/18 it was at 80% (4/5) with a vacancy at Makhuduthamaga
- **Chief Financial Officers:** In 2015/16 it was at 67% (4/6) with two vacancies at Sekhukhune and Makhuduthamaga. In 2016/17 and 2017/18 it was at 80% (4/5) with a vacancy at Sekhukhune.
- **Technical Managers:** Technical Manager's posts were at 67% (4/6) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Fetakgomo and Elias Motsoaledi. In 2016/17 it declined to 40% (2/5) with vacancies at Sekhukhune, Elias Motsoaledi and Fetakgomo-Tubatse. The status improved to 60% (3/5) in 2017/18 with vacancies only at Ephraim Mogale and Makhuduthamaga.

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street, POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

- **Development Planning:** The filling of Development Planning posts was at 80% (4/6) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Ephraim Mogale and Makhuduthamaga. In 2016/17 it was at 60% (3/5) with vacancies at Ephraim Mogale and Makhuduthamaga. The status declined to 40% in 2017/18 with vacancies at Fetakgomo-Tubatse, Ephraim Mogale and Makhuduthamaga.
- **Corporate Services:** Corporate Services posts were at (4/6) 67% in 2015/16 with vacancies at Ephraim Mogale and Tubatse Local Municipalities. In 2016/17 it increased to 80% (4/5) with a vacancy at Ephraim Mogale but declined in 2017/18 to 60% (3/5) with vacancies at Makhuduthamaga and Elias Motsoaledi.
- **Community Services:** The filling of Community Services posts was at 3/5 (60%) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Ephraim Mogale and Makhuduthamaga Local Municipalities. In 2016/17 it remained at 60% (3/5) with vacancies at Makhuduthamaga and Elias Motsoaledi. The status remained the same in 2017/18 at 60% (3/5) with vacancies in Fetakgomo-Tubatse and Makhuduthamaga

**MOPANI DISTRICT**

Designation	Mopani			Tzaneen			Letaba			Ba-Phalaborwa			Giyani			Maruleng		
	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18
MM	V	F	F	F	V	F	F	V	F	F	F	F	V	V	F		F	V
CFO	F	F	F	F	V	F	F	V	F	V	F	F	F	F	V	F	V	V
TS	F	F	F	F	V	F	V	V	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	V	V
DP	V		F	F	V	F	V	V	F	F	F	F	V	V	V	F	F	F
CPS	F	F	F	V	F	F	F	V	F	F	V	F	F	F	F		V	F
CS	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	V	F	F	F	F	V	F	F	F	F	F

V = Vacant F = Filled

- **Municipal Managers** posts were at 50% (3/6) in 2015/16 with vacancies in Greater Giyani, Mopani and Maruleng. In 2016/17 it remained the same at 50% (3/6) with vacancies at Greater Letaba, Greater Giyani and Greater Tzaneen. The status improved to 83% (5/6) in 2017/18 with a vacancy at Maruleng.
- **Chief Financial Officer** posts were at 83% (5/6) in 2015/16 with a vacancy in Ba-Phalaborwa. In 2016/17 it declined to 50% (3/6) with vacancies at Maruleng, Greater Letaba and Greater Tzaneen. In 2017/18 the status improved to 60% (3/5) with vacancies at Greater Giyani and Maruleng.
- **Technical Managers** posts were at 83% (5/6) in 2015/16 financial year with a vacancy in Greater Letaba Local Municipality. In 2016/17 it declined to 50% (3/6) with vacancies at Maruleng, Greater Letaba and Greater Tzaneen. It improved in 2017/18 to 83% (5/6) with a vacancy at Maruleng.

- **Development Planning Managers** posts were at 50% (3/6) in 2015/16 with vacancies in Mopani, Greater Letaba and Greater Giyani. In 2016/17 it declined to 33% (2/6) with vacancies at Mopani, Greater Giyani and Greater Letaba and Greater Tzaneen. The status improved in 2017/18 to 83% (5/6) with a vacancy at Greater Giyani.
- **Corporate Services** posts were at 67% (4/6) in 2015/16 with vacancies at Greater Tzaneen and Maruleng. In 2016/17 it was at 50% (3/6) with vacancies at Maruleng, Greater Letaba and Ba-Phalaborwa. In 2017/18 the status improved to 100% (6/6) with all positions filled.
- **Community Services** posts remained constant at 83% (5/6) in 2015/16 with a vacancy at Greater Giyani Local Municipality. In 2016/17 it was still at 83% (5/6) with a vacancy at Greater Letaba. In 2017/18 it improved to 100% (6/6) with all positions filled.

#### 12.1.4. EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

This indicator provides for determination of targets that municipalities have either successfully achieved or partly achieved, as stipulated in their employment equity plans approved by the municipal councils. It incorporates the general key performance indicator prescribed by the Minister in terms of Regulation 10 (e) of the Municipal Performance Management Regulations of 2001 which reads as follows: *“Number of people employed from employment equity target groups employed in the three highest levels of management in compliance with the municipality’s employment equity plan”*.



### **Analysis of provincial status of women appointments**

- The appointment of women in section 57 positions was 13% in Sekhukhune District in 2015/16 and improved to 31% in 2016/17. In 2017/18 it declined to 20%. Vhembe was at 24% in 2015/16 but declined to 21% in 2016/17. In 2017/18 the status declined to 17%. Mopani was at 30% in 2015/16 declined to 23% in 2016/17, then declined further to 19% in 2017/18. Capricorn was at 32% in 2015/16 and 39% in 2016/17 and in 2017/18 it was at 40% respectively. Waterberg was at 16% in 2015/16 and 14% in 2016/17 respectively. In 2017/18 there was slight improvement to 16%.
- The overall provincial performance was at 25% in 2015/16 but declined to 22% in 2016/17. In 2017/18 the status remained the same at 22%.
- The appointment of women against the total staff was at 50% in 2015/16 and there was improvement in 2016/17 to 62% but declined to 50% in 2017/18. Mopani was at 56% in 2015/16 and at 55% in 2016/17. It declined to 32% in 2017/18. Sekhukhune was at 41% in 2015/16 and there was improvement to 53% in 2016/17 but declined to 37% in 2017/18. Vhembe was at 50% in 2015/16; it improved to 87% in 2016/17 but declined to 71% in 2017/18. Waterberg was at 53% in 2015/16 had a slight improvement in 2016/17 to 54% but declined to 52% in 2017/18. Capricorn was at 40% in 2015/16 and improved to 61% in 2016/17 but declined to 53% in 2017/18.

% of female appointment at senior managerial (Sec 57) level				% of total female staff appointed		
Municipalities	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Mopani	9/33 (27%)	9/39 (23%)	6/32(19%)	1726/3077 (56%)	1680/3060 (55%)	677/2097(32%)
Waterberg	7/44 (16%)	5/37 (14%)	6/37 (16%)	1453/2754(53%)	1545/2854 (54%)	1467/2830 (52%)
Sekhukhune	10/38(26%)	11/35 (31%)	7/35 (20%)	774/1903(41%)	790/1482 (53%)	335/894(37%)
Vhembe	6/29(21%)	5/31 (16%)	05/30 (17%)	1335/2657 (50%)	1075/1230 (87%)	1324/1857(71%)
Capricorn	12/31(39%)	9/33 (27%)	11/28 (40%)	219/544 (40%)	873/1424 (61%)	538/1006(53%)
Provincial aggregate	44/175 (25%)	39/175 (22%)	35/162 (22%)	5507/10935 (50%)	5963/10 050 (59%)	4341/8684 (50%)

### 12.1.5. SUBMISSION OF PERFORMANCE AGREEMENTS AND INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

District	PAs Submission 2015/16	PAs Submission 2016/17	PAs Submission 2017/18	Performance reviews(15/16)	Performance reviews(16/17)	Performance reviews(17/18)
Mopani	6/6(100%)	5/6 (83%)	6/6 (100%)	2/6 (33%)	5/6 (83%)	3/6(50%)
Waterberg	6/7(86%)	3/6 (50%)	6/6 (100%)	3/7(43%)	3/6 (50%)	1/6(17%)
Vhembe	4/5 (80%)	4/5 (80%)	5/5 (100%)	1/5 (20%)	0/5 (0%)	2/5 (40%)
Capricorn	6/6 (100%)	5/5 (100%)	5/5(100%)	5/6(83%)	3/5 (60%)	5/5(100%)
Sekhukhune	6/6 (100%)	4/5 (80%)	5/5 (100%)	2/6 (33%)	5/5 (100%)	3/5(60%)
<b>Provincial Total</b>	<b>28/30 (93%)</b>	<b>21/27 (44%)</b>	<b>27/27 (100%)</b>	<b>13/30 (43%)</b>	<b>16/27 (59%)</b>	<b>14/27 (52%)</b>

### Provincial Analysis

- Submission of performance agreements has been stable at 93% in 2015/16 financial years, with Mutale Local Municipality unable to submit. It declined to 44% (21/27) in 2016/17 with the following municipalities being unable to submit: Collins Chabane, Greater Letaba, Makhuduthamaga, Thabazimbi, Modimolle/Mookgophong and Mogalakwena. In 2017/18 the submission improved to 100% (27/27) with all municipalities submitting.
- Performance assessment reviews were at 43% in 2015/16, with improvement of 59% (16/27) in 2016/17 but declined to 52% (14/27) in 2017/18.
- Some of the municipalities which conducted their Section 57 managers' performance reviews did not submit minutes or assessment reports to the MEC in accordance with the Regulations 2006. The following 11 municipalities conducted individual assessments for 2017/18 but did not submit reports in accordance with the regulation: Mopani, Greater Tzaneen, Lephalale, Capricorn, Polokwane, Molemole, Lepelle Nkumpi, Blouberg, Elias Motsoaledi, Makhado and Vhembe.
- Implementation of performance management system particularly the signing of performance agreements has always been 100%. However the challenge has been with the individual performance reviews. The following 16 municipalities did not conduct individual performance reviews for 2017/18: Greater Letaba, Greater Giyani, Ba-Phalaborwa, Maruleng, Modimolle/Mookgophong, Thabazimbi, Mogalakwena, Belabela, Waterberg, Thulamela, Collins Chabane, Musina, Ephraim Mogale, Sekhukhune, Makhuduthamaga and Fetakgomo-Tubatse.

**MOPANI DISTRICT**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Performance Agreement</b>			<b>Individual Performance Reviews</b>		
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Mopani District	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Greater Letaba	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Greater Tzaneen	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Greater Giyani	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Ba Phalaborwa	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Maruleng	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6/6 (100%)</b>	<b>5/6 (83%)</b>	<b>6/6 (100%)</b>	<b>3/6 (50%)</b>	<b>5/6 (83%)</b>	<b>2/6 (33%)</b>

- There has been 100% compliance in terms of submission of Performance Agreements in 2015/16. There was a decline in 2016/17 to 5/6 (83%) with Greater Letaba not submitting as there were no Senior Managers at the municipality. The status improved to 100% with all municipalities submitting in 2017/18.
- In 2015/16, only 3/6 (50%) municipalities conducted reviews: Maruleng, Greater Letaba and Greater Giyani (50%). There was improvement in 2016/17 with 5/6 (83%) municipalities conducting reviews with the exception of Greater Tzaneen. The status declined in 2017/18 with only 2/6 (33%) municipalities conducting reviews being Greater Tzaneen and Mopani.

**WATERBERG DISTRICT**

<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>Performance Agreement</b>			<b>Individual Performance Reviews (MSA Section 54A and 56)</b>		
	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>
Waterberg District	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Modimolle/ Mookgophong	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
BelaBela	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Mogalakwena	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Lephalale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thabazimbi	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6/7 (86%)</b>	<b>3/6 (50%)</b>	<b>6/6 (100%)</b>	<b>3/7(43%)</b>	<b>3/6 (50%)</b>	<b>1/6 (17%)</b>

- There was 6/7 (86%) compliance in terms of submission of Performance Agreements in Waterberg in 2015/16 financial year with Mookgopong unable to submit. In 2016/17 the status declined to 50% (3/6) with Thabazimbi, Mogalakwena and Modimolle/Mookgophong unable to submit. The status improved to 100% submission (6/6) in 2017/18.

- Bela-Bela, Lephalale Local Municipalities and Waterberg District conducted individual reviews in 2015/16, at 43% (3/7). In 2016/17 the status remained the same at 50% (3/6) with Thabazimbi, Mogalakwena and Modimolle/Mookgophong unable to conduct reviews. The status declined to 17% (1/6) in 2017/18 with only Lephalale local municipality conducting reviews.

### VHEMBE DISTRICT

MUNICIPALITY	Performance Agreement			Individual Performance Reviews conducted (MSA Section 54A and 56)		
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Makhado	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Collins Chabane	N/A	No	Yes	N/A	No	No
Musina	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Thulamela	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Vhembe	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4/5 (80%)</b>	<b>5/5 (100%)</b>	<b>1/5 (20%)</b>	<b>0/5 (0)</b>	<b>2/5 (40%)</b>

- The district submission of performance agreements in 2015/16 was at 80% (4/5) in compliance with the laws and regulations, with Mutale not submitting. In 2016/17 the status remained the same at 80% (4/5) with Collins Chabane unable to submit. The status improved to 100% (5/5) in 2017/18 with all municipalities submitting.
- Only 1/5 (20%) municipality, Makhado, conducted performance assessments for 2015/16 financial year. In 2016/17 none of the municipalities in Vhembe conducted reviews. In 2017/18, 2/5 (40%) municipalities conducted reviews being Vhembe District and Makhado Local Municipality.

#### CAPRICORN DISTRICT

Municipality	Performance Agreement			Individual Performance Reviews (MSA Section 54A and 56)		
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Capricorn District	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Polokwane	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Molemole	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lepelle- Nkumpi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Blouberg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>100%</b>



- There has been stability in the submission of performance agreements. All municipalities have signed and submitted their performance agreements for senior managers consistently from 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18 financial years at 100%.
- Only one municipality (Aganang) did not conduct reviews in 2015/16, the status being at 83%. The status declined to 60% (3/5) in 2016/17 with Polokwane and Lepelle Nkumpi failing to conduct reviews. The status improved to 100% (6/6) in 2017/18 with all municipalities conducting reviews.

#### SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT

Municipality	Performance Agreement signed and submitted			Individual Performance Reviews (MSA Section 54A and 56)		
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Sekhukhune	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Fetakgomo/ Tubatse	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Makhuduthamaga	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Elias Motsoaledi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ephraim Mogale	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6/6 (100%)</b>	<b>4/5 (80%)</b>	<b>5/5(100%)</b>	<b>2/6 (33%)</b>	<b>5/5 (100%)</b>	<b>1/5(20%)</b>

- The district has maintained 100% submission of performance agreements in 2015/16 financial years and declined in 2016/17 to 80% (4/5) with Makhuduthamaga not submitting. In 2017/18 all municipalities submitted (6/6) their performance agreements.
- The performance assessments were at 33% (2/6) in 2015/16 with only Fetakgomo and Elias Motsoaledi conducting individual assessments. The status improved in 2016/17 with all municipalities (5/5) 100% conducting individual reviews for senior managers but declined in 2017/18 to 20% (1/5) with only Elias Motsoaledi conducting reviews.

#### **12.1.6. COMPLIANCE ON SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL, MID-YEAR AND OVERSIGHT REPORT**

- **Midyear (section 72) Reports:** The submission of these reports was at 97% (29/30) in 2015/16 with Thabazimbi not submitting. In 2016/17 submission was at 88% (26/27) with Modimolle-Mookgophong unable to submit. In 2017/18 the status remained at 88% (26/27) with Lepelle Nkumpi not submitting.
- **Annual (section 46) Reports:** There has been sustainability in submission of these reports with 83% (25/30) in 2015/16 with Mutale, Mogalakwena, Thabazimbi, Lepelle Nkumpi and Aganang Local Municipalities unable to submit. In 2016/17 the submission was at 88% (24/27) with the following municipalities not submitting: Thabazimbi, Mogalakwena and Modimolle-Mookgophong. In 2017/18 submission rate was at 88% (24/27) with three municipalities not submitting, Thabazimbi, Modimolle/Mookgophong and Mogalakwena.

- **Oversight Reports:** In 2015/16 the submission was at 86% (26/30) with Mutale, Mogalakwena, Thabazimbi and Aganang Local Municipalities unable to submit. In 2016/17 submission was at 85% (23/27) with Mopani, Thabazimbi, Mogalakwena and Modimolle-Mookgophong not submitting. In 2017/18 the submission was at 85% (23/27) with Mopani, Thabazimbi, Modimolle/Mookgophong and Mogalakwena unable to submit.
- The implication of non-submission of statutory reports constitutes non-compliance.

#### MOPANI DISTRICT

Municipality	Mid-Year Report (MFMA Section 72)			Annual report (MSA Section 46)			Oversight reports (MFMA Section 129)		
	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18	15/16	16/17	17/18
Mopani District	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Greater Letaba	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greater Tzaneen	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greater Giyani	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ba-Phalaborwa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maruleng	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total	6/6	6/6	6/6	6/6	6/6	5/6	6/6	5/6	5/6
%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	100%	83%	83%

- There has been 100% compliance in the submission of Section 72 reports and Annual reports for the past three financial years (2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18). Submission of oversight report was at 100% in 2015/16 but declined to 83% in 2016/17 and 2017/18 with Mopani not submitting.

### WATERBERG DISTRICT

	Mid-Year Report (MFMA Section 72)			Annual Report (MSA Section 46)			Oversight Reports (MFMA Section 129)		
	2015/16	16/17	17/18	2015/16	16/17	17/18	2015/16	16/17	17/18
Waterberg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thabazimbi	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Lephalale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Bela-Bela	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mogalakwena	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Modimolle/ Mookgopong	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
<b>Total</b>	<b>6/7</b>	<b>3/6</b>	<b>6/6</b>	<b>5/7</b>	<b>3/6</b>	<b>3/6</b>	<b>4/7</b>	<b>3/6</b>	<b>3/6</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>

- Mogalakwena, Thabazimbi and Modimolle/Mookgophong Local Municipalities did not submit their section 72 reports for 2016/17, the submission rate was at 50% (3/6). In 2017/18 all municipalities submitted their section 72 reports.
- The submission of section 46 reports was at 71% (5/7) in 2015/16 with non-submission from Thabazimbi and Mogalakwena Local Municipalities. In 2016/17 the submission rate was at 50% (3/6) with non-submission from Thabazimbi, Mogalakwena and Modimolle-Mookgophong. The status remained the same in 2017/18 at 50% with Thabazimbi, Modimolle- Mookgophong and Mogalakwena not submitting.
- The submission of oversight report was at 57% (4/7) in 2015/16 with Thabazimbi, Lephalale and Mogalakwena not submitting. In 2016/17 it declined to 50% (3/6) with Mogalakwena, Thabazimbi and Modimolle/Mookgophong failing to submit. The status remained the same at 50% (3/6) in 2017/18 with Mogalakwena, Thabazimbi and Modimolle/Mookgophong not submitting.

**VHEMBE DISTRICT**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Mid-Year Report (MFMA Section 72)</b>			<b>Annual Report (MSA Section 46)</b>			<b>Oversight Reports (MFMA Section 129)</b>		
	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>
<b>Vhembe</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Collins Chabane</b>	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes
<b>Musina</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Thulamela</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Makhado</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>4/5</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>4/5</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>5/5</b>
	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

- The submission of Section 72 reports was at 100% (5/5) for the past three financial years in the district.
- The submission of Section 46 reports was at 80% (4/5) in 2015/16 with non-submission by Mutale Local Municipality and improving to 100% (5/5) in 2016/17 and 2017/18 respectively.
- Submission of oversight reports was at 80% in 2015/16 with non-submission by Mutale Local Municipality. In 2016/17 and 2017/18 the submission improved to 100%.

**SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Mid-Year Report (MFMA Section 72)</b>			<b>Annual Report (MSA Section 46)</b>			<b>Oversight Reports (MFMA Section 129)</b>		
	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>
<b>Sekhukhune</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Fetakgomo/Tubatse</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Makhuduthamaga</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Elias Motsoaledi</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Ephraim Mogale</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Total</b>	<b>6/6</b>	<b>4/5</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>6/6</b>	<b>4/5</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>6/6</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>5/5</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

- The submission of section 72 reports has been stable at 100% for 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18. Submission of Section 46 reports was at 100% in 2015/16 and at (4/5) 80% in 2016/17 with Makhuduthamaga not submitting but improved to 100% in 2017/18. The submission of oversight reports remained constant at 100% in the past three financial years.

**CAPRICORN DISTRICT**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Mid-Year Report (MFMA Section 72)</b>			<b>Annual Report (MSA Section 46)</b>			<b>Oversight Reports (MFMA Section 129)</b>		
	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>	<b>15/16</b>	<b>16/17</b>	<b>17/18</b>
<b>Capricorn</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Polokwane</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Blouberg</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Lepelle-Nkumpi</b>	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
<b>Molemole</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6/6</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>4/5</b>	<b>4/6</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>4/6</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>3/5</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>(100 %)</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>60%</b>

- There has been 100% compliance regarding submission of section 72 reports in 2015/16 and 2016/17 but declined to 80% in 2017/18 with Lepelle Nkumpi not submitting. Annual reports submission was at 66% in 2015/16 with Lepelle Nkumpi not submitting. In 2016/17 and 2017/18 there was improvement of 100% (5/5) with all municipalities in Capricorn submitting their Section 46 reports.



- Submission of Oversight Reports has not been stable; it was at 66% in 2015/16 with Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality not submitting. In 2016/17 the status was at 100% with all municipalities submitting. In 2017/18 the status was at 60% (3/5) with Polokwane and Blouberg not submitting.

### **CHALLENGES**

- There were challenges regarding compliance with Section 57A (6), (7) and (8) of the Local Government Municipal Systems Act as Amended, and Section 19 of the Local Government Disciplinary Regulations for Senior Managers (the above provisions require municipalities to submit quarterly reports on the status of disciplinary cases in their municipalities to the MEC responsible for local government in the province).
- It is a cause for concern that only twenty five percent (25%) of senior management positions in Limpopo municipalities were occupied by women in 2015/16. There was decline in 2016/17 at 22% and the status remained at 22% in 2017/18.
- There were delays in signing employment contracts and submission of performance agreements to the department by some municipalities in accordance with Local Government: Municipal Performance Regulations for Municipal Managers and Managers Directly accountable to Municipal Managers, 2006 Section (5) read together with MFMA 56 of 2006 section (53)(3)(b).
- The rate of vacancies in respect of all approved posts remained a serious challenge; vacancies in respect of all approved posts in some municipalities were beyond fifty percent (50%) in 2015/16. The status quo remained the same at 50% in 2016/17. In 2017/18 vacancy rate decreased to 43%.
- A number of municipalities also struggled to achieve their targets on this KPA as planned in their respective SDBIPs and none of the municipalities achieved 100% of their planned targets.

### 12.1.7. SUPPORT INTERVENTIONS

- To ensure compliance with the Local Government, Regulations on Appointment and Conditions of Senior Managers, and to ensure continued institutional stability, capacity and functionality of municipalities, a number of letters approved and signed by the MEC were addressed to Executive Mayors/Mayors of respective municipalities requesting them to expedite the filling of the vacant municipal senior manager positions.
- The department has established a dedicated unit that support and monitor the recruitment process for senior managers in municipalities.
- Letters were addressed to Executive Mayors /Mayors of municipalities regarding outstanding 2017/18 financial year employment contracts and performance agreements to the Department. The department further developed a standard framework for employment contracts and performance agreements across all municipalities.
- Municipalities were also assisted in to the framework for determination of categorization of remuneration packages of senior managers.
- Hands on support on the review and analysis of Human Resources strategies and Plans was offered to municipalities
- Municipalities were supported on the Audit of Predetermined Objectives.

## **13. KEY PERFORMANCE AREA TWO**

### **13.1. BASIC SERVICE DELIVERY**

#### **13.1.1. INTRODUCTION**

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa directs municipalities to ensure that all citizens are provided with services to satisfy their basic needs. The basic or municipal services being referred to are as follows:

- Water provision.
- Sanitation provision.
- Refuse removal (Waste management services), and
- Electricity provision.

This KPA entails the assessment of the ability of municipalities to deliver infrastructure and basic services, and also report on the role played by national and provincial departments in the different sectors in the execution of their functions. Local Government works in partnership with communities to find sustainable ways to meet their needs and improve the quality of their lives. As entrenched in the Constitution, the Sustainable Development, Government has geared itself to achieve targets for universal access to basic services.

Municipalities are at the forefront of delivering high levels of services to South African people. Service delivery has assumed centre stage in South Africa, due to highly publicised wide-spread protests within various communities. This has put even greater pressure on municipalities to deliver on their mandates and to ensure effective service delivery. The role of municipalities is crucial in dealing with many of the challenges that led to such high levels of discontent. A crucial aspect of this process is the provision of basic services such as water, electricity and sanitation for all communities.

The historical backlogs in the provision of basic infrastructure for service delivery require that municipalities establish a delicate balance between delivering and improving current services, maintaining existing infrastructure and extending the infrastructure to eradicate the backlog in service delivery. The department

ensured that municipalities in the province are fully functional to enable the delivery of infrastructure and municipal services. This chapter attempts to give an indication of the performance of the municipalities during the 2017/18 financial year.

The report reflects on service delivery trends and progress achieved over a number of years to enable an informed assessment of improvement or underperformance. The analysis provides information on achievements per targeted services and variance for non-achievement.

### **13.1.2. PERFORMANCE OF MUNICIPALITIES ON CORE INDICATORS**

This section of the report looks at municipal performance based on the following indicators:

- Number of households with access to potable water.
- Number of households with access to sanitation.
- Number of households with access to electricity.
- Number of households with refuse removal (once weekly).
- Number of households with access to free basic water.
- Number of households with access to free basic sanitation.
- Number of households with access to free basic electricity; and
- Number of households with access to free basic refuse-removal.

The report also highlights challenges experienced by municipalities and support interventions by provincial and national government. It makes a reflection on municipal performance for the 2017/18 financial year.

Tables below indicate the number of households with access to the four (4) basic services with minimum service level and above.

### 13.1.3 . PROVINCIAL OVERVIEW ON FREE BASIC SERVICES DELIVERY

Municipality	Portable Water	FBW	Sanitation	FBS	Electricity	FBE	Refuse Removal
Mopani	269 884	6494	280 921	5389	288 728	30 104	207 489
Vhembe	335 276	236 343	157 638	236 343	114 859	193 40	135 475
Capricorn	224 281	364 22	175 938	247 893	267 581	3940	100 011
Waterberg	181 220	14 776	181 220	14 776	181 220	17 973	138 018
Sekhukhune	198272	162436	73384	30 926	158 115	30 926	11 534
<b>TOTAL DISTRICT</b>	<b>1,208,933</b>	<b>456, 471</b>	<b>869, 101</b>	<b>535,327</b>	<b>1,010,503</b>	<b>102 283</b>	<b>592 527</b>

\* Source; STATS SA CENSUS 2011

Analysis of municipal performance on basic services

This section of the report provides analysis of performance of basic and free basic services by municipalities. Municipalities continue to provide free basic services to registered indigents. Free basic services are provided in varying ways and quantities by municipalities. In terms of access to basic services, municipalities continued to prioritize the provision of these basic services in households.

**Mopani District** provided water to 295 086 households with 14 455 having access to Free Basic Water. 280 325 households had access to sanitation, with 152 63 having access to Free Basic Sanitation. 286 366 households had access to electricity and 48 575 had access to Free Basic Electricity. 183 652 households had access to refuse removal.

179 830 households in **Waterberg** had access to portable water and 12 516 had access to Free Basic Water. 175 491 households had access to Sanitation and 12 638 had access to Free Basic Sanitation. 186 318 households had access to electricity with 11 102 having access to Free Basic Electricity. 99 960 households are provided with refuse removal.

**Capricorn District** provided water to 119 202 households and 109 202 had access to Free Basic Water. 122 222 households had access to Sanitation with 122 798 having access to Free Basic Sanitation. 110 299 households had access to electricity and 103 299 had access to Free Basic Electricity. 135 958 households had access to refuse removal.

**Sekhukhune District** provided portable water to 198 272 households. Free Basic Water was provided to 162 436 households. Sanitation was provided to 57 045 households and Free Basic Sanitation to 30 926. 100 266 households had access to electricity and 20 465 households had access to Free Basic Electricity. 29 327 households had access to refuse removal.

**Vhembe District;** 337 444 households had access to portable water and 181 77 had access to Free Basic Water. 248 018 households had access to Sanitation with 34 187 having access to Free Basic Sanitation. 201 978 households had access to electricity and 33 511 had access to Free Basic Electricity. 391 092 households had access to refuse removal.

There are no bucket sanitation systems in Limpopo; however the provision of sanitation and waste removal should receive necessary attention.

District	Water	FBW	Sanitation	FBS	Electricity	FBE	Refuse Removal
Mopani	259 086	14 455	280 325	15 263	286 366	48 575	183 652
Capricorn	119 202	109 202	122 222	122 798	110 299	103 299	135 958
Sekhukhune	198 272	162 436	57 045	30 926	100 266	20 465	29 327
Waterberg	179 830	12 516	175 491	12 638	186 318	11 102	99 960
Vhembe	337 444	18177	248 018	34 187	201 978	33 511	391 092
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1 093 834</b>	<b>316 786</b>	<b>883 101</b>	<b>215 812</b>	<b>885 227</b>	<b>216 952</b>	<b>839 989</b>

The tables below show access to services per municipality per district

#### CAPRICORN DISTRICT

Municipality	# of HH with access to portable water	# of HH with access to FBW	# of HH with access to sanitation	# of HH with access to FBS	# of HH with access to electricity	# of HH with access to FBE	# of HH with access to refuse removal
Polokwane	47 852	13 935	32 144	41 700	50 852	14 935	102 819
Molemole	15 689	9 848	36 911	32 653	16 689	10 848	4 872
Blouberg	14 333	12 343	47 911	26 837	17 333	13 343	14 890
Lepelle Nkumpi	25 424	16 020	25 544	26 530	28 424	16 030	13 377
<b>Capricorn</b>	<b>103 298</b>	<b>52 146</b>	<b>142 510</b>	<b>127 720</b>	<b>113 298</b>	<b>55 156</b>	<b>135 958</b>

**VHEMBE DISTRICT**

Municipality	# of HH with access to portable water	# of HH with access to FBW	# of HH with access to sanitation	# of HH with access to FBS	# of HH with access to electricity	# of HH with access to FBE	# of HH with access to refuse removal
Thulamela	VDM	VDM	VDM	12 476	2 188	8559	57 997
Musina	VDM	VDM	VDM	3045	3 372	1160	68 934
Makhado	VDM	VDM	VDM	18 666	109 186	18 592	104 681
Collins Chabane	VDM	VDM	VDM	VDM	87 232	5200	159 480
<b>Vhembe</b>	<b>337 444</b>	<b>18177</b>	<b>248 018</b>	<b>34 187</b>	<b>201 978</b>	<b>33 511</b>	<b>391 092</b>

**MOPANI DISTRICT**

Municipality	# of HH with access to portable water	# of HH with access to FBW	# of HH with access to sanitation	# of HH with access to FBS	# of HH with access to electricity	# of HH with access to FBE	# of HH with access to refuse removal
Greater Letaba	43 696	5804	48 412	5804	56 905	1607	4 080
Greater Tzaneen	108 926	1457	108 926	1457	108 926	25 963	108 687
Maruleng	16662	2405	22983	3213	22297	2016	11206
Phalaborwa	33880	3489	44082	3489	42316	3489	41115
Greater Giyani	55922	1300	55922	1300	55922	15500	18564
<b>Mopani</b>	<b>259086</b>	<b>14455</b>	<b>280325</b>	<b>15263</b>	<b>286366</b>	<b>48575</b>	<b>183652</b>



**SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT**

Municipality	# of HH with access to portable water	# of HH with access to FBW	# of HH with access to sanitation	# of HH with access to FBS	# of HH with access to electricity	# of HH with access to FBE	# of HH with access to refuse removal
Elias Motsoaledi	31260		9317		66330	1967	9578
Fetakgomo-Tubatse	62302		19999		107 770	8496	11741
Ephraim Mogale	26668		12360		33 936	1900	6369
Makhuduthamaga	29 663		15423		26 470	8102	1639
<b>Sekhukhune</b>	<b>149 902</b>		<b>57045</b>		<b>234 506</b>	<b>20 465</b>	<b>29 327</b>

**WATERBERG DISTRICT**

Municipality	# of HH with access to portable water	# of HH with access to FBW	# of HH with access to sanitation	# of HH with access to FBS	# of HH with access to electricity	# of HH with access to FBE	# of HH with access to refuse removal
Belabela	21 134	4633	18 791	4755	18 695	3219	14 743
Modimolle-Mookgopong	28 047	2177	25 454	2177	27 173	2177	27 173
Lephalale	32 109	1610	32 426	1610	35 304	1610	17 672
Mogalakwena	72 922	3561	75 645	3561	78 105	3561	16 500
Thabazimbi	25 618	535	23 175	535	27 041	535	23 872
<b>Waterberg District</b>	<b>179 830</b>	<b>12 516</b>	<b>175 491</b>	<b>12 638</b>	<b>186 318</b>	<b>11 102</b>	<b>99 960</b>

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street. POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
 Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

**13.1.4. BASIC SERVICE DELIVERY****Provincial overview on basic services delivery**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Flush connected toilet to sewerage</b>	<b>Weekly refuse removal</b>	<b>Piped water inside dwellings</b>	<b>Electricity Lighting</b>
<b>Mopani</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>88.7</b>
<b>Vhembe</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>87.2</b>
<b>Capricorn</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>87.4</b>
<b>Waterberg</b>	<b>43.6</b>	<b>44.2</b>	<b>30.7</b>	<b>86.7</b>
<b>Sekhukhune</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>85.5</b>
<b>TOTAL DISTRICT</b>	<b>21,24</b>	<b>22,54</b>	<b>19.1</b>	<b>87.18</b>

\*Source; STATS SA CENSUS 2011

<b>*PROVINCIAL HOUSEHOLD SERVICES</b>		
	<b>2002</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>Sanitation</b>	<b>27.0%</b>	<b>57.1%</b>
<b>Weekly Refuse Removal</b>	-	<b>21.9%</b>
<b>Piped Water</b>	<b>73.9%</b>	<b>75.1%</b>
<b>Electricity</b>	<b>72.5%</b>	<b>94.1%</b>

### **Sanitation**

Environmental hygiene plays an essential role in the prevention of many diseases. It also impacts on the natural environment and the preservation of important natural assets, such as water resources. Proper sanitation is one of the key elements in improving environmental sanitation. Improved sanitation facilities were least common in Limpopo (57, 1%)

### **Refuse Removal**

Weekly household refuse removal is less common in the province at 21.9%. Refuse removal provided less than once week is at 1.8%. Communal refuse dump is at 1.9%. Own refuse dump is at 71.3% and those dump or leave rubbish anywhere is at 2.5%

### **Water**

The functionality of municipal water supply services measures the extent to which households that received water from a municipality had reported, over the 12 months before the survey, interruptions that lasted more than 2 days at a time, or more than 15 days in total during the whole period. Households in Limpopo (68, 1%) consistently reported the most interruptions. Provinces in which interruptions were more frequent were less likely to rate water service delivery as 'good'. In Limpopo 68, 1% of households reported having had interruptions while only 28, 0% rated water service delivery as 'good'.

### **Electricity**

Household connected to the mains electricity supply is most common in the province at 94.1%. The largest increase between 2002-2016 was observed in the province at 21, 6%

**\*Source; STATS SA General Household Survey 2016**

**MOPANI DISTRICT**

<b>MOPANI DISTRICT HOUSEHOLD SERVICES CENSUS 2011</b>					
<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Flush toilet connected to sewerage</b>	<b>Weekly refuse removal</b>	<b>Piped water inside dwellings</b>	<b>Electricity lighting</b>
<b>Greater Giyani</b>	<b>63 548</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>Greater Letaba</b>	<b>58 261</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>90.8</b>
<b>Tzaneen</b>	<b>108 926</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>86.2</b>
<b>Ba-Phalaborwa</b>	<b>41 115</b>	<b>40.5</b>	<b>48.8</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>90.8</b>
<b>Maruleng</b>	<b>24 470</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>90.6</b>
<b>TOTAL DISTRICT</b>	<b>296 320</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>16,8</b>	<b>88.7</b>

**VHEMBE DISTRICT**

<b>VHEMBE DISTRICT HOUSEHOLD SERVICES CENSUS 2011</b>					
<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Flush toilet connected to sewerage</b>	<b>Weekly refuse removal</b>	<b>Piped water inside dwellings</b>	<b>Electricity Lighting</b>
<b>Mutale</b>	<b>23 751</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>83.3</b>
<b>Thulamela</b>	<b>156 594</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>87.2</b>
<b>Musina</b>	<b>20 942</b>	<b>63.2</b>	<b>61.5</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>76.4</b>
<b>Makhado</b>	<b>134 589</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>89.4</b>
<b>TOTAL DISTRICT</b>	<b>335 276</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>87.2</b>

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street, POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
 Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

**CAPRICORN DISTRICT**

<b>CAPRICORN DISTRICT HOUSEHOLD SERVICES CENSUS 2011</b>					
<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Flush toilet connected to sewerage</b>	<b>Weekly refuse removal</b>	<b>Piped water inside dwellings</b>	<b>Electricity Lighting</b>
<b>Blouberg</b>	<b>41 192</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Aganang</b>	<b>33 918</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>94.6</b>
<b>Molemole</b>	<b>30 043</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>95.7</b>
<b>Polokwane</b>	<b>178 001</b>	<b>41.1</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>33.7</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Lepelle- Nkumpi</b>	<b>59 682</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>91.9</b>
<b>TOTAL DISTRICT</b>	<b>342 838</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>87.4</b>

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street. POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
 Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

**WATERBERG DISTRICT**

<b>WATERBERG DISTRICT HOUSEHOLD SERVICES CENSUS 2011</b>					
<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Flush toilet connected to sewerage</b>	<b>Weekly refuse removal</b>	<b>Piped water inside dwellings</b>	<b>Electricity Lighting</b>
<b>Thabazimbi</b>	<b>25 080</b>	<b>63.1</b>	<b>60.4</b>	<b>47.3</b>	<b>76.8</b>
<b>Lephalale</b>	<b>29 880</b>	<b>39.5</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>31.4</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Mookgopong</b>	<b>9 918</b>	<b>61.4</b>	<b>64.1</b>	<b>41.6</b>	<b>85.3</b>
<b>Modimolle</b>	<b>17 525</b>	<b>66.1</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>35.7</b>	<b>83.3</b>
<b>Bela-Bela</b>	<b>18 068</b>	<b>69.7</b>	<b>64.2</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Mogalakwena</b>	<b>79 395</b>	<b>25.8</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>91.8</b>

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street. POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
 Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**



**SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT**

<b>SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT HOUSEHOLD SERVICES CENSUS 2011</b>					
<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Households</b>	<b>Flush toilet connected to sewerage</b>	<b>Weekly refuse removal</b>	<b>Piped water inside dwellings</b>	<b>Electricity Lighting</b>
<b>Ephraim Mogale</b>	<b>32 284</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>89.6</b>
<b>Elias Motsoaledi</b>	<b>60 251</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>91.1</b>
<b>Makhuduthamaga</b>	<b>65 217</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>90.4</b>
<b>Fetakgomo</b>	<b>22 851</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>91.5</b>
<b>Greater Tubatse</b>	<b>83 199</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>75.7</b>
<b>TOTAL DISTRICT</b>	<b>268 802</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>85.9</b>

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street. POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
 Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

**13.1.5. MIG EXPENDITURE PER DISTRICT****Provincial MIG expenditure 2017/18 financial year**

<b>District</b>	<b>Allocation (R'000)</b>	<b>Amount spent (R'000)</b>	<b>% Expenditure</b>	<b>Amount remaining to be spent</b>
Sekhukhune	730 221 000	683 449 000	96%	46 772 000
Mopani	806 426 750	687 402 680	85%	119 024 070
Vhembe	1 213 734 000	833 559 000	69%	380 175 000
Capricorn	435 496 916	350 677 110	81%	84 819 806
Waterberg	302 889 000	249 460 000	81%	53 429 000
<b>Province</b>	<b>3 488 767 666</b>	<b>804 547 790</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>684 219 876</b>

- **Sekhukhune District** was at 90% in 2015/16, declined to 86% in 2016/17 and in 2017/18 it improved to 96%. **Vhembe District** was at 60% in 2015/16 and there was improvement to 76% in 2016/17 financial year, in 2017/18 it declined to 69%. **Mopani District** was at 80% in 2015/16 and improved to 90% in 2016/17, in 2017/18 it declined to 85%. **Capricorn District** was at 93% in 2015/16 and declined to 89% in 2016/17, in 2017/18 it declined further to 81%. **Waterberg District** was at 62% in 2015/16 and improved to 87% in 2016/17, in 2017/18 it declined to 81%.
- In the Province, it is only Sekhukhune district which improved from previous financial year whereas all the other districts declined. No district was able to spend the whole allocated MIG funds with Vhembe District spending lowest at 69% in the financial year 2017/18. Generally, municipalities' performance on MIG expenditure is unsatisfactory. Provincial expenditure was at 79% in 2015/16. In 2016/17 overall provincial expenditure was at 86%. The overall provincial expenditure declined in 2017/18 to 82%.

### 13.1.6. THREE YEAR COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON MIG EXPENDITURE

MUNICIPALITY	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Sekhukhune	90%	86%	96%
Vhembe	60%	76%	69%
Mopani	80%	90%	85%
Capricorn	93%	89%	81%
Waterberg	73%	87%	81%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>82%</b>

**Performance analysis**

- In 2015/16, ten (10) municipalities spent 100% of their allocation (Lephalale, Mookgophong, Bela-Bela, Polokwane, Capricorn, Ba-Phalaborwa, Ephraim Mogale, Elias Motsoaledi, Makhuduthamaga and Fetakgomo). In 2016/17 the following 06 municipalities managed to spend 100% of their MIG allocation (Capricorn, Makhuduthamaga, Fetakgomo/Tubatse, Thulamela, Maruleng and Lephalale) which is a decrease from 2015/16 of 10 municipalities. In 2017/18, 7 municipalities were able to spend 100% of their allocation (Makhuduthamaga, Makhado, Ba-Phalaborwa, Maruleng, Capricorn, Lephalale and Belabela).
- The province improved spending MIG allocation from 79% in 2015/16 to 86% in 2016/17 but declined in 2017/18 to 82%.

**SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>2016/2017 allocation R'000</b>	<b>Amount spent 16/17 R'000</b>	<b>2016/2017 expenditure in %</b>	<b>2017/2018 allocation R'000</b>	<b>Amount spent 17/18 R'000</b>	<b>2017/2018 expenditure in %</b>
Ephraim Mogale	29,313	23,027	79%	R 44 810 000	R 43 008 217.00	96%
Elias Motsoaledi	70 725	56 088	79%	R66 860 000	R66 119 000	99%
Makhuduthamaga	872 100	872 100	100%	R68 646 000	R68 646 000	100%
Fetakgomo/Tubatse	110 885 00	110 885 00	100%	R85 863 000	R80 502 000	94%
Sekhukhune	462 8m	333 216m	72%	R464 042 000	R425 163 000	92%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,083,485.8</b>	<b>1,395,316</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>R730 221</b>	<b>R683 449 000</b>	<b>96%</b>

The district MIG expenditure in 2015/16 financial year was at 90% with 04 municipalities spending 100% of their allocation (Ephraim Mogale, Elias Motsoaledi, Makhuduthamaga and Fetakgomo), Sekhukhune district being the highest at 97% and the lowest being Tubatse at 72%. In 2016/17 expenditure decreased to 86% with only Makhuduthamaga and Fetakgomo/Tubatse spending at 100%. Expenditure improved to 96% in 2017/18 with only Makhuduthamaga spending their whole MIG allocation.

**VHEMBE DISTRICT**

Municipality	2016/2017 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2016/2017 expenditure in %	2017/2018 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2017/2018 expenditure in %
Musina	3 508 140	3 263 136	93%	47 468	18 774	39,6%
Collins Chabane	881 770 00	596 806 91	68%	131 615	50 267	38,2%
Thulamela	946 610 00	9 466 100	100%	217 403	163 299	75,1%
Makhado	120 417 564	86 236 511	72%	182 816	190 130	104%
Vhembe	801,285	706,322	88%	634 432	411 089	64,8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>126,555,369</b>	<b>159 352 760</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>1 213 734</b>	<b>833 559</b>	<b>69%</b>

- In Vhembe District no municipality was able to spend the entire Municipal Infrastructure Grant allocation with Musina spending lowest at 50%. MIG expenditure in 2015/16 was at 60%. Generally in the district municipalities 'performance on MIG expenditure is unsatisfactory. In 2016/17 Thulamela was able to spend 100% on its allocation. The district overall improved from 60% in 2015/16 to 76% in 2016/17. In 2017/18 the status declined to 69% with none of the municipalities in Vhembe spending 100% of their allocation.

**MOPANI DISTRICT**

Municipality	2016/2017 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2016/2017 expenditure in %	2017/2018 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2017/2018 expenditure in %
Greater Giyani	87 902	80 271	91%	78736000	63790806	81%
Greater Letaba	54 976	51 246	93%	90142183	61162000	70%
Greater Tzaneen	154 797	135 448	87%	95 942 000	93 116 093	97%
Ba-Phalaborwa	30 568	28 616	93%	39619000	39619000	100%
Maruleng	29 418	29 418	100%	27259157	27259157	100%
Mopani	208 500	186 073	89%	474728410	402455624	85%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>566 161</b>	<b>511 072</b>	<b>90.2%</b>	<b>806426750</b>	<b>687402680</b>	<b>85%</b>

In 2015/16, Ba-Phalaborwa spent 100% of MIG with Mopani spending lowest at 60.63%. Generally in the District municipalities 'performance on MIG expenditure is unsatisfactory. Overall expenditure for 2015/16 was at 80%. In 2016/17 the district expenditure was at 90% with only Maruleng spending 100%. In 2017/18 district expenditure was at 85% which is a decline from 2016/17 with Ba-Phalaborwa and Maruleng spending 100% of their allocation.

90

**CAPRICORN DISTRICT**

Municipality	2016/2017 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2016/2017 expenditure in %	2017/2018 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2017/2018 expenditure in %
Blouberg	44,381	42,009	94.66%	2, 254,500.00	1,742,621.99	77%
Molemole	42,642	26,495	62.13%	5,357,700.00	2,395,531.41	45%
Polokwane	299,943	241,697	80.58%	352,178,000.00	322 790 060.70	92%
Lepelle-Nkumpi	37,102	36,678	98.86%	63,954,866.22	11, 997,046.05	20%
Capricorn	273,872	273,872	100.00%	11, 751,850.00	11,751,850.00	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>697,940</b>	<b>620,751</b>	<b>88.94%</b>	<b>435 496 916</b>	<b>350 677 110</b>	<b>81%</b>

MIG expenditure was at 93.8% for the financial year 2015/16 with Polokwane and Capricorn spending 100% of their allocation. Generally the District municipalities' performance on MIG expenditure declined to 89% in 2016/17 financial year. In 2017/18, MIG expenditure declined to 81% with only Capricorn District spending 100% of its allocation.



**WATERBERG DISTRICT**

Municipality	2016/2017 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2016/2017 expenditure in %	2017/2018 allocation R'000	Amount spent R'000	2017/2018 expenditure in %
Thabazimbi/Waterberg	287 140 00	224 730 00	78%	33 759.00	10 400.00	54%
Lephalale	540 737 36	540 737 36	100%	44,370	58,697	100%
Modimolle/Mookgophong	362 350 00	264 230 00	73%	39,190	28,879	74%
Bela- Bela	24 130	22 571	94%	26,304	26,305	100%
Mogalakwena	139 486 00	128 881 00	93%	159,266	125,179	79%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1 353 843</b>	<b>1 181 149</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>302 889</b>	<b>249 460</b>	<b>81%</b>

In 2015/16 Lephalale, Mookgophong and Bela-Bela spent 100%, with Thabazimbi not spending their MIG allocation (0.00). In 2016/17 only Lephalale spent 100% of their allocation. The district expenditure in 2015/16 was at 73%. In 2016/17 expenditure improved to 87% with Lephalale spending 100% of their allocation. In 2017/18 MIG expenditure was at 81% with Lephalale and Belabela spending 100% of their allocation.

**13.1.7. LANDFILL SITES**

DISTRICT	LICENSED 2015/16	UNLICENSED 2015/16	LICENSED 2016/17	UNLICENSED 2016/17	LICENSED 2017/18	UNLICENSED 2017/18
Sekhukhune	7	0	08	0	08	0
Mopani	4	2	09	07	05	0
Vhembe	2	1	05	01	05	0
Waterberg	5	0	14	05	14	05
Capricorn	1	3	06	02	11	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>05</b>

- The province has 43 licensed landfill sites and 05 unlicensed landfill sites.

**13.1.8. CHALLENGES**

- Violent service delivery protests took place. The protests were mainly due to lack of service delivery over housing, electricity, inadequate sanitation, roads, water supply and employment opportunities.
- Municipalities experienced challenges on providing services on land that is not proclaimed for development and occupied illegally.
- Electricity and water losses were experienced in all municipalities, although at different rates. The losses were attributed to ageing infrastructure, vandalism and illegal connections.
- Municipalities supplied free basic services and there were inconsistencies around the number of registered indigents and the number of indigents receiving free basic services.

### **13.1.9. SUPPORT INTERVENTIONS**

As part of the response to the Back to Basics diagnostic report, the Department undertook the following measures to support municipalities on service delivery matters:

- Establishment of Provincial Back to Basic Task Team looking at various sectoral interventions in relation to infrastructure on water services.
- Municipalities have been encouraged to embark on forward planning in order to expedite the appointment of service providers.
- Continuous reminder and support municipalities to update indigent register
- MISA is providing technical support to municipalities

## **14. KEY PERFORMANCE AREA THREE**

### **14.1. LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (LED)**

#### **14.1.1. INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of Local Economic Development (LED) is to build the capacity of a local area to improve its economic future and the quality of life for all. An effective LED strategy has the potential to improve the quality of life of local communities; however, this is dependent upon the genuine prioritization of the LED by all stakeholders. LED is implemented by a process through which the public sector, private business and non-governmental partners work collectively to create better conditions for economic growth and employment generation.

This KPA entails the assessment of the ability of Limpopo municipalities in improving community's quality of life, creating new economic opportunities, fighting poverty and bringing together resources from within and outside the community to address challenges and promote local economic growth in a systematic and organised manner. Strategically planned interventions are aimed at strengthening the economic capacity of an area, improving its investment climate and increasing the productivity and competitiveness of local businesses.

The essence of this section is to assess how municipalities fared around the LED policy commitments. Municipal LED commitments include the following:

- Job Creation (EPWP)
- Small, Micro and Medium Enterprise (SMME) development.
- Small business skills development.
- Local economic growth and development and
- CWP
- Development of public private partnerships.

### Provincial overview

	2015/16			2016/17			2017/18		
District	LED	EPWP	CWP	LED	EPWP	CWP	LED	EPWP	CWP
Vhembe	3370	3147	4454	4875	1621	1446	200	999	135
Sekhukhune	6100	3498	5580	6961	995	4674	5183	4737	5453
Capricorn	3314	9170	4966	5929	5283	64	3050	3 528	5 658
Mopani	4583	2692	7123	4898	2251	3242	2552	4282	5069
Waterberg	3260	720	3366	1746	407	655	392	1849	2763
<b>PROVINCIAL AGGREGATE</b>	<b>20 627</b>	<b>19 227</b>	<b>25 489</b>	<b>24 409</b>	<b>10 557</b>	<b>10 081</b>	<b>11 377</b>	<b>15 395</b>	<b>19 078</b>

- All the municipalities in the province have LED units and all developed LED plans and strategies.
- LED stakeholder forum is functional and have been meeting regularly.
- In 2015/16, 20 627 LED jobs were created, EPWP created 19 227 and CWP created 25 489. In 2016/17, 24 409 jobs were created through LED, 10 557 created through EPWP and 10 081 created through CWP. In 2017/18, 11 377 jobs were created through LED, 15 395 through EPWP and 19 078 through CWP.
- The purpose of the table above is to demonstrate the extent to which municipalities contributed towards creating jobs through the implementation of capital projects, as well as their own LED initiatives. Municipalities recognized that unemployment is at the heart of poverty. As a result, municipalities played an essential role in creating favorable environments for business success and job creation. LED then became a main thrust in partnership between local government, business and community interests. Private enterprises, however, depended on favorable local business conditions to achieve prosperity. Limpopo

municipalities had initiatives that derive short-term employment opportunities in the form of the Extended Public Works Program and Community Works Programme. Agricultural development is also one of the local economic development thrusts and service delivery priorities that some of Limpopo municipalities identified to contribute to job creation during the year under review.

- There are two Special Economic Zones (SEZ) in the province mainly Musina-Makhado and Fetakgomo/Tubatse Tubatse which were established in order to stimulate economic growth whilst creating employment.

#### **14.1.2. PERFORMANCE OF MUNICIPALITIES ON LED CORE INDICATORS**

This section looks at the performance of municipalities for the financial year 2017/18 around initiatives that drive their local economies and improve peoples' lives from a local economic front. This assessment gives a reflection of LED performance per municipality on specific key focus areas associated with some of the LED commitments identified in municipal growth and development strategies. Municipalities' performance is based on the following core indicators:

- LED unit capacity.
- Development of LED strategies and plans.
- Functionality of LED Forums.
- Number of SMME supported.
- Employment opportunities created through EPWP and PPP.
- Challenges Experienced; and
- Support interventions by National and Provincial Government.

#### 14.1.3. MUNICIPAL CAPACITY ON PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING LED FUNCTIONS

- The Department is still concerned with the high vacancy rates in LED units for the year under review and the previous financial years. This means that municipalities have not been expediting the filling of posts or appointment of suitable personnel in LED units. The evidence to that is non-achievement on planned targets by some municipalities.
- Table below provides an indication of the composition of LED units in Limpopo municipalities.

#### 14.1.4. MUNICIPAL CAPACITY OF LED UNITS

Municipality	LED Units in place	No. of LED approved posts	No. of LED filled posts	Functionality of LED forums	No. of jobs created through PPP	LED Strategy in place
Waterberg	Yes	03	03	Yes	None	Yes
Modimolle/Mookgophong	Yes	07	07	No	None	Due for Review
Thabazimbi	Yes	03	03	Yes	None	Due for Review
Belabela	Yes	05	04	No	None	Due for Review
Mogalakwena	Yes	08	03	No	None	Due for Review
Lephalale	Yes	02	02	Yes	None	Yes
Mopani	Yes	06	03	Yes	None	Yes
Giyani	Yes	01	01	Yes	498	Yes
Tzaneen	Yes	08	05	Yes	none	Yes
Letaba	Yes	02	01	Yes	none	Yes

Municipality	LED Units in place	No. of LED approved posts	No. of LED filled posts	Functionality of forums	No. of jobs created through PPP	LED Strategy in place
Maruleng	Yes	01	01	Yes	None	Yes
Ba-Phalaborwa	Yes	04	01	Yes	None	Yes
Vhembe	Yes	05	04	Yes	200	Yes
Thulamela	Yes	04	03	No	No	No
Makhado	Yes	05	05	Yes	36	Yes
Musina	Yes	10	02	No	790	Yes
Collins Chabane	Yes	02	01	No	None	No
Sekhukhune	Yes	03	01	Yes	800	Yes
Elias Motsoaledi	Yes	05	03	Yes	1000	Yes
Ephraim Mogale	Yes	03	01	Yes	1757	Yes
Fetakgomo-Tubatse	Yes	04	02	Yes	1757	Yes
Makhuduthamaga	Yes	03	02	Yes	104	Yes
Capricorn	Yes	27	12	Yes	2412	Yes
Polokwane	Yes	10	04	Yes	3288	Yes
Blouberg	Yes	03	01	Yes	200	Yes
Molemole	Yes	08	05	Yes	70	Yes
Lepelle Nkumpi	Yes	18	17	Yes	150	Yes
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>158</b>	<b>95</b>		<b>13 062</b>	

\*Source; Municipal Annual Reports



#### **14.1.5. EXISTENCE OF LED STRATEGIES AND PLANS**

Local Economic Development (LED) strategies are at the centre of efforts by municipalities to create economic growth and development. These strategies are vital tools at the disposal of municipalities and have the potential to radically improve the lives of all municipal constituents by enabling growth and reducing poverty. In essence, the aim of an effective LED strategy is to reduce the impact of factors that adversely affect local economic growth, as well as global economic ruptures, such as the financial crisis which had a significant impact during the year under review. Notwithstanding, there are challenges and obstacles that municipalities need to overcome in implementing such comprehensive strategies, from local political conditions to the impact of globalization. In order to mitigate these risks, LED requires absolute commitment from the various stakeholders involved in its development and implementation.

All municipalities in the province are commended for developing implementation plans for LED strategies except in Modimolle/Mookgopong and ensuring that LED forums are functional except in Modimolle, Mookgopong, Mopani and Capricorn. Municipalities were encouraged to ensure the implementation of their plans within their limited resources. Municipalities were continually revising their LED strategies, with comprehensive reviews taking place at least once every five years.

**14.1.6. SMMEs Supported by Limpopo Municipalities**

<b>Municipalities</b>	<b>No. of supported SMMEs</b>	<b>No. of jobs planned through SMMEs</b>	<b>Actual jobs created through SMMEs</b>
Waterberg	114	56	56
Modimolle	0	0	0
Thabazimbi	0	0	0
Belabela	56	186	186
Mogalakwena	3	44	44
Lephalale	33	15	15
Mopani	59	55	55
Giyani	15	None	09
Tzaneen	52	45	150
Letaba	315	1207	315
Maruleng	112	11	206
Ba-Phalaborwa	241	348	241
Vhembe	0	0	0
Thulamela	99	200	150
Makhado	06	41	41
Musina	32	44	44
Collins Chabane	35	327	50
Sekhukhune	2	5 622	800
Elias Motsoaledi	539	n/a	717
Ephraim Mogale	24	None	None
Fetakgomo	None	None	2702
Makhuduthamaga	14	None	None

Municipalities	No. of SMMEs supported	No. of jobs planned through SMMEs	Actual jobs created through SMMEs
Capricorn	15	04	07
Polokwane	27	none	27
Blouberg	70	none	42
Molemole	20	18	20
Lepelle Nkumpi	04	None	None

\*Source; Municipal Annual Reports

#### 14.1.7. Employment Opportunities through Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) and Local Economic Development (LED) and Community Works Programme (CWP)

##### SEKHUKHUNE LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

	2015/16			2016/17			2017/18		
MUNICIPALITY	LED	EPWP	CWP	LED	EPWP	CWP	LED	EPWP	CWP
Sekhukhune	6100	3498	2773	5621	952	4674	751	49	n/a
Elias Motsoaledi	29	99	619	1662	373	1264	370	370	370
Fetakgomo/Tubatse	2956	212	1023	2561	155	2406	2702	2702	2702
Ephraim Mogale	1800	1800	1165	198	183	46	160	416	1181
Makhuduthamaga	242	-	-	1200	242	958	1200	1200	1200
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11 127</b>	<b>5609</b>	<b>5580</b>	<b>11 242</b>	<b>1905</b>	<b>9348</b>	<b>5 183</b>	<b>4 737</b>	<b>5 453</b>

- All the municipalities in Sekhukhune have LED units, LED plans and strategies.
- LED stakeholder forum is functional and meet regularly
- Number of jobs created through LED in 2016/17 was 11 242, through EPWP was 1905 and jobs created through CWP was 9348. In 2017/18 jobs created through LED were 5 183, EPWP were 4 737 and CWP were 5 453.

#### VHEMBE LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

MUNICIPALITY	2015/16			2016/17			2017/18		
	LED	EPWP	CWP	LED	EPWP	CWP	LED	EPWP	CWP
Vhembe	-	3147	4454	80	125	N/A	200	999	135
Musina	1251	-	1083	1419	168	0	198	1583	1800
Thulamela	241	-	1221	1688	775	101	10	1597	912
Makhado	1878	-	1046	1688	351	1345	41	826	0
Collins Chabane	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	202	0	164	202	612
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3370</b>	<b>3147</b>	<b>4454</b>	<b>4875</b>	<b>1621</b>	<b>1446</b>	<b>613</b>	<b>5207</b>	<b>3459</b>

- All the municipalities in Vhembe have LED units, LED plans and strategies.
- LED stakeholder forum is functional and meeting regularly

- In 2016/17 4875 jobs were created through LED, 1621 jobs through EPWP and 1446 jobs created through CWP. In 2017/18, 613 jobs were created through LED, 5207 jobs were created through EPWP and 3459 jobs were created through CWP.

#### MOPANI LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

	2015/16				2016/17			2017/18		
MUNICIPALITY	LED	LED	EPWP	CWP	LED	EPWP	CWP	LED	EPWP	CWP
Mopani	700	810	570	N/A	921	618	N/A	N/A	683	N/A
Greater Giyani	16	1028	320	1720	2011	485	354	N/A	462	200
Maruleng	1700	1042	150	1106	1042	150	465	112	1339	1033
Greater Letaba	203	116	422	1077	800	261	535	333	385	1029
Greater Tzaneen	803	2179	712	2115	1045	860	860	1022	1084	2187
Ba-Phalaborwa	2376	218	1088	1105	310	185	1028	1085	1012	620
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5798</b>	<b>5393</b>	<b>3262</b>	<b>7123</b>	<b>6129</b>	<b>2559</b>	<b>3242</b>	<b>2552</b>	<b>4282</b>	<b>5069</b>

- All the municipalities in Mopani have LED units, LED plans and strategies.
- LED stakeholder forum is functional and meeting regularly
- 6129 jobs were created through LED, 2559 jobs were created through EPWP and 3242 jobs created through CWP in 2016/17 financial year. In 2017/18 2552 jobs were created through LED, 4282 jobs created through EPWP and 5069 jobs created through CWP.

**WATERBERG LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

	<b>2015/16</b>			<b>2016/17</b>			<b>2017/18</b>		
<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>LED</b>	<b>EPWP</b>	<b>CWP</b>	<b>LED</b>	<b>EPWP</b>	<b>CWP</b>	<b>LED</b>	<b>EPWP</b>	<b>CWP</b>
Thabazimbi	743	100	155	30	1084	500	30	106	495
Modimolle- Mookgophong	31	63	355	450	100	50	105	0	1 200
Lephalale	1385	115	0	900	45	655	210	102	123
Mogalakwena	200	653	1398	310	144	570	0	1500	0
Bela-Bela	765	372	1072	837	347	0	47	1 26	945
Waterberg	3204	720	N/A	09	15	N/A	0	15	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3444</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>3366</b>	<b>2536</b>	<b>1735</b>	<b>1775</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>1849</b>	<b>2763</b>

- All the municipalities in Waterberg have LED unit, LED plans and strategies.
- LED stakeholder forum is functional and meet regularly
- 1735 jobs were created through EPWP, 2536 LED jobs and 1775 CWP jobs created in 2016/17. In 2017/18 jobs created through LED were 392, through EPWP were 1849 and through CWP were 2763.

**CAPRICORN LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

	<b>2015/16</b>			<b>2016/17</b>			<b>2017/18</b>		
<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>LED</b>	<b>EPWP</b>	<b>CWP</b>	<b>LED</b>	<b>EPWP</b>	<b>CWP</b>	<b>LED</b>	<b>EPWP</b>	<b>CWP</b>
Capricorn	1509	3028	4966	5273	2045	0	2050	2 412	0
Polokwane	413	4517	623	670	2830	0	80	3 288	2 307
Blouberg	1387	600	1105	02	254	64	156	200	1156
Molemole	05	1025	1032	0	0	0	22	70	1117
Lepelle-Nkumpi	No AR	No AR	1101	0	154	0	2500	100	150
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3314</b>	<b>9170</b>	<b>4966</b>	<b>5945</b>	<b>5029</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>4 808</b>	<b>6 070</b>	<b>4 595</b>

- All the municipalities in Capricorn have LED units, LED plans and strategies.
- LED stakeholder forum is functional and meet regularly
- 5945 jobs were created through LED, 5029 through EPWP and 64 jobs through CWP in 2016/17. In 2017/18 jobs created through LED were 4 808, through EPWP were 6 070 and through CWP were 4 595.

#### 14.1.8. SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS (SDF's)

The disintegrated nature of development planning confronted the government during its first term into democracy. The situation was compounded by a lack of clear guiding planning principles that support strategic interventions to address the country's skewed spatial settlement patterns. In 2003, government published the guiding principles in the National Spatial Development Perspective (NSDP). As part of the implementation of the NSDP principles, Cabinet approved the intergovernmental planning framework which crystallised the harmonisation and alignment of the NSDP, Provincial Growth and Development Strategies and IDP's.

As provided in the Municipal Systems Act, the IDPs of municipalities must include Spatial Development Frameworks (SDFs).

The intergovernmental planning framework thus sets the tone for spatial frameworks of all three (3) spheres to be aligned and be guided by the NSDP principles. Failure by some municipalities to adopt Spatial Development Frameworks resulted in continuous misdirected public and private sector investment. The development outcome of creating sustainable human settlements cannot be achieved if municipalities fail to create conducive environment for development.

In terms of SPLUMA implementation, the following municipalities had appointed Tribunals and gazetted by-laws; Makhado, Thulamela, Greater Tzaneen, Ba-Phalaborwa and Maruleng.

All municipalities in the province were implementing well planned Spatial Development Frameworks.

#### 14.1.9. CHALLENGES

- Understaffing of LED units were major challenges faced by municipalities.
- Established LED initiatives and cooperatives were not adequately supported due to budget/financial constraints.



#### **14.1.10. SUPPORT INTERVENTIONS**

- There is a need to capacitate municipalities and enhance their ability to implement LED initiatives and programmes.
- Municipalities should create conducive environment for building and attracting investor confidence.

## **15. KEY PERFORMANCE AREA FOUR**

### **15.1. FINANCIAL VIABILITY AND MANAGEMENT**

#### **15.1.1. INTRODUCTION**

Profound fiscal efficacy, discipline, prudence and monitoring all provide a sound basis for the delivery of all the key and fundamental municipal objectives. It is, therefore, imperative that municipalities not only purport to portray but embrace an intrinsic and frugal duty to maximise revenue potential while transparently managing public finances as set out in the Municipal Finance Management Act 2003, and the Municipal Property Rates Act 2004 following the proper International Accounting Standards as prescribed in policy and regulation. The guidelines set therein provide for effective accountability, evident financial sustainability and a financial viability conducive to infrastructure investment and service delivery.

This KPA was assessed in the following focus areas:

- Sources of Finance.
- Debtors Analysis.
- Local Government Conditional Grants.
- Submission of Annual Financial Statements
- Municipal Audit Opinions
- Valuation rolls
- Challenges Experienced in Financial Viability and Management; and
- Support Interventions by National and Provincial Government

### 15.1.2. SOURCES OF FINANCE

- Municipalities use the following items as sources of their finances: Own Revenue (Sale of bid document, rental of municipal buildings, approval of building plans etc.)
- Grant funding (Equitable Share, MSIG, INEP, RBIG, FMG)

### 15.1.3. DEBTORS ANALYSIS

The Department has established the Provincial Debt Forum to ensure that all stakeholders meet in an effort to assist in collecting the outstanding government debts and resolve disputes. The Forum comprises of provincial, national departments and municipalities.

The forum managed to discuss all the gaps or challenges with regard to the implementation of the Municipal Property Rates Act (MPRA). The main challenge that the Province is faced with is in relation to the unregistered properties and properties built on communal land, and there are no provisions in the Act on how to deal with such. The land that government properties are built on or occupied are not surveyed and some of the properties have not been registered with the Deeds Office.

### 15.1.4. SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

In terms of section 126(1)(a) of the MFMA, the accounting officer of a municipality must prepare the Annual Financial Statements of the municipality and, within two (2) months after the end of the financial year (31 August) to which those statements relate, submit the statements to the Auditor-General for auditing. The financial performance, cash flow and disclosure on all relevant items as required. The Act further requires the accounting officer of a municipal entity to submit those statements to the parent municipality for consolidation and submission to the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General must audit and report on the accounts, financial statements and financial management of all municipalities and all municipal entities within three months on receipt of those statements as stipulated in the Public Audit Act, 2004, Act. No. 25 of 2004 read in conjunction with section 126 (3) of the MFMA. However, Modimolle/Mookgophong and Thabazimbi Local Municipalities submitted their Annual Financial Statements after the legislated deadline and the outcomes for Thabazimbi and Modimolle/Mookgophong Local Municipalities are still pending.

#### **15.1.5. VALUATION ROLLS**

- All other municipalities had their valuation rolls compiled and implemented.

#### **15.1.6. OPERATION CLEAN AUDIT**

- Unqualified audit opinions were (13) in 2015/16, (09) in 2016/17 and (10) in 2017/18. Qualified audit opinions were (11) in 2015/16, (10) in 2016/17 and in 2017/18 were (11). Disclaimers were (2) in 2015/16, (5) in 2016/17 and in 2017/18 they were (4). Adverse audit findings were (2) in 2015/16, (3) in 2016/17 and in 2017/18 there was (1) finding. Audit opinions were pending in two municipalities Thabazimbi and Modimolle-Mookgophong.
- Most issues raised by the Auditor General findings were asset management, governance and leadership, records management and supply chain management processes.
- The following municipalities have consistently maintained unqualified audit opinions; Capricorn District, Sekhukhune District, Molemole, Thulamela, Musina, Greater Tzaneen and Maruleng Local Municipalities.
- The following municipalities have been getting either disclaimer or adverse audit opinions; Vhembe District, Thabazimbi Local Municipalities and Mopani District Municipality.

Municipality	Audit committee	Supply chain management policy	Submission of AFS	Audit opinion 15/16	Audit opinion 16/17	Audit opinion 17/18	Valuation rolls compiled
Capricorn	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	U	U	N/A
Polokwane	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	Q	Q	Yes
Blouberg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Q	Q	Q	Yes
Molemole	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	U	U	Yes
Lepelle-Nkumpi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Q	Q	Q	Yes
Waterberg	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	Q	Q	N/A
Mogalakwena	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	A	A	Yes
Modimolle/Mookgopong	Yes	Yes	Yes	Q	D	Pending	Yes
Bela-Bela	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	Q	Q	Yes
Lephalale	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	U	Q	Yes
Thabazimbi	Yes	Yes	Yes	D	D	Pending	Yes
Vhembe	Yes	Yes	Yes	D	D	D	N/A
Makhado	Yes	Yes	Yes	Q	A	D	Yes
Thulamela	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	U	U	Yes
Musina	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	U	U	Yes
Collins Chabane	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Q	D	Yes
Mopani	Yes	Yes	Yes	A	D	D	N/A
Greater Giyani	Yes	Yes	Yes	Q	A	Q	Yes

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street. POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
 Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Audit committee</b>	<b>Supply chain management policy</b>	<b>Submission of AFS</b>	<b>Audit opinion 15/16</b>	<b>Audit opinion 16/17</b>	<b>Audit opinion 17/18</b>	<b>Valuation rolls compiled</b>
Maruleng	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	U	U	Yes
Greater Letaba	Yes	Yes	Yes	Q	Q	U	Yes
Greater Tzaneen	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	U	U	Yes
Ba-Phalaborwa	Yes	Yes	Yes	D	D	Q	Yes
Sekhukhune	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	U	U	N/A
Elias Motsoaledi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Q	Q	U	Yes
Ephraim Mogale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Q	Q	U	Yes
Fetakgomo/Tubatse	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	Q	Q	Yes
Makhuduthamaga	Yes	Yes	Yes	U	U	Q	Yes

### 15.1.7. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PER DISTRICT

#### WATERBERG DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>% of capital budget expenditure (16/17)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual (16/17)</b>	<b>% of capital budget expenditure (17/18)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual (17/18)</b>
Waterberg	53%	15%	0%	15%
Bela-Bela	73%	58%	41%	56%
Lephalale	129%	66%	8%	57%
Mogalakwena	100%	94%	74%	27%
Thabazimbi	36%	68%	0%	0%
Modimolle/Mookgopong	78%	54%	34%	0%

**CONTINUES ON PAGE 130 - PART 2**



LIMPOPO PROVINCE  
LIMPOPO PROVINSIE  
XIFUNDZANKULU XA LIMPOPO  
PROFENSE YA LIMPOPO  
VUNDU LA LIMPOPO  
IPHROVINSI YELIMPOPO

**Provincial Gazette • Provinsiale Koerant • Gazete ya Xifundzankulu  
Kuranta ya Profense • Gazethe ya Vundu**

*(Registered as a newspaper) • (As 'n nuusblad geregistreer) • (Yi rhijistariwile tanihi Nyuziphepha)  
(E ngwadisits'we bjalo ka Kuranta) • (Yo redzhistariwa sa Nyusiphepha)*

**Vol. 27**

**POLOKWANE,**  
19 JUNE 2020  
19 JUNIE 2020  
19 KHOTAVUXIKA 2020  
19 JUNE 2020  
19 FULWI 2020

**No. 3083**

**VHEMBE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>% of capital budget expenditure (16/17)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual (16/17)</b>	<b>% of capital budget expenditure (17/18)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual (17/18)</b>
Thulamela	78%	24%	75%	20%
Collins Chabane	61%	5%	98%	7%
Musina	72%	64%	40%	52%
Makhado	67%	47%	104%	47%
Vhembe	47%	7%	65%	7%

**CAPRICORN DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>% capital budget expenditure (16/17)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual budget (16/17)</b>	<b>% of capital budget expenditure (17/18)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual (17/18)</b>
CDM	98%	143%	72%	87%
Blouberg	78%	87%	92%	72%
Lepelle Nkumpi	52%	40%	61.14%	33%
Molemole	41%	31%	45%	30%
Polokwane	77%	88%	96.8%	95%

**SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY (2016/17)**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>% capital budget expenditure (16/17)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual budget (16/17)</b>	<b>% capital budget expenditure (17/18)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual budget (17/18)</b>
Sekhukhune	37%	5%	88%	84%
Elias Motsoaledi	69%	31%	88,69%	91%
Ephraim Mogale	74%	37%	83%	93%
Makhuduthamaga	82%	7%	100%	21%
Fetakgomo/Tubatse	78%	14%	55%	31%

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street. POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
 Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

**MOPANI DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>% capital budget expenditure (16/17)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual budget (16/17)</b>	<b>% capital budget expenditure (17/18)</b>	<b>Total municipal own revenue as per % of actual budget (17/18)</b>
Mopani	62%	13%	100%	13%
Greater Letaba	64%	98%	103%	15%
Greater Tzaneen	102%	55%	74%	61%
Maruleng	71%	29%	81%	66%
Phalaborwa	68%	63%	74%	63%
Greater Giyani	79%	17%	67%	18%

**15.1.8. CHALLENGES**

- Poor record management system
- Poor implementation of the audit remedial plan
- Lack of technical capacity within Budget and Treasury Units
- Non availability of key staff members during the audit process.
- Lack of capacity in terms of skills and under staffing in Assets Management Unit

- Non- compliance with laws and regulations.
- Inconsistency with reported objectives/targets against planned objectives
- Delay with procurement of service providers
- Late registration of projects
- Use of MIG allocation for operations
- Municipalities implementing unregistered projects
- Unauthorized, fruitless and wasteful expenditure.

#### **15.1.9. SUPPORT INTERVENTIONS**

- Establishment of debt forum
- Assisted Municipalities to develop calendar for District CFO's Forums and monitor implementation of resolutions thereof.
- Monitor and assisted municipalities with reconciliation of control accounts i.e. Bank reconciliations, VAT, creditors, debtors, salaries control and other accounts. Monitor full implementation of the audit remedial action plans.
- Assist municipalities in resolving audit queries.
- COGHSTA providing hands-on support to all municipalities to attain unqualified audit without matters of emphasis
- Establishment of MEC/MAYORS forum ensured consistent political oversight.
- Implementation of Back to Basics approach particularly quarterly engagement sessions assisted in monitoring progress.

## **16. KEY PERFORMANCE AREA FIVE:**

### **16.1. GOOD GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

#### **16.1.1. INTRODUCTION**

According to democratic principles, good governance is achieved through effective public participation. Not only does public participation allow constituents to monitor the governance record of its elected officials, but it also encourages the public to take an active interest in the performance of their municipalities. It is only through broad public participation that citizens will recognise that their interests are taken to heart – especially the needs of the most vulnerable members of society. This allows all citizens to be heard in determining the political, social and economic priorities through the establishment of a broad societal consensus that includes civil society, government and the private sector. Active ward-based plans and consultative forums are central structures through which public participation and, ultimately, good governance can be achieved.

Municipalities should perform their duties in order to ensure the implementation of good governance practices and public participation. Section 151 of Chapter 7 of the South African Constitution gives each municipality the right to govern the local government affairs of its community on its own initiative, subject to national and provincial legislation. This also includes development and gazetting of by-laws.

However, community participation alone is not sufficient in ensuring that good governance practices are adopted. Institutional integrity is of equal importance and individual municipalities should ensure that its Finance Committee, Audit Committee, Council and Sub-Committees are fully functional. This should be done through the adoption by-laws and policies that entrench the effective performance of all aspects of municipal governance. As such, this chapter will analyse various indicators related to good governance and public participation in order to determine the extent to which municipalities in the provinces have succeeded in implementing these strategies.

### **16.1.2. WARD COMMITTEES**

Ward Committees were established in terms of Chapter 4 of the Municipal Structures Act (1988), to ensure that citizens' inputs are taken into account during planning and decision-making processes at local government level. The department developed a Provincial Framework for Ward Committee establishment and operation to ensure that there was similar understanding within municipalities on the establishment and functioning of ward committees and also to provide a clear framework for ward committee members.

### **16.1.3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Provincial Public Participation Framework was developed for all municipalities. All municipalities developed public participation strategies. 22 municipalities have functional ward committees. All 22 local municipalities are remunerating ward committee members for their out of pocket expenses.

### **16.3.4. ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNCTIONALITY STATUS OF WARD COMMITTEES**

#### **Provincial analysis**

During the 2017/18 financial year 560 ward committees were established and 500 were functioning to a satisfactory level. Ward-based operational plans were developed to ensure proper monitoring and facilitation of projects within wards. All ward committees in the province received stipends as a way of encouragement to members. In Mopani 129 ward committees were established and 129 were functional. 117 wards committees were established and 117 are functional in Sekhukhune, 80 ward committees were established in Waterberg



and 62 are functional. In Vhembe 127 ward committees were established and 105 were functional. Capricorn had 107 established ward committees and 87 were functional. In ensuring maximum public participation, ward councilors ensured that ward committee meetings were convened on monthly and quarterly basis.

Table below indicates progress made by Limpopo municipalities in establishing Ward Committees:

	2015/16		2016/17		2017/18	
<b>Name of the Municipality</b>	<b>No. of established Ward committees</b>	<b>No. of functional ward committees</b>	<b>No. of established Ward committees</b>	<b>No. of functional ward committees</b>	<b>No. of established Ward committees</b>	<b>No. of functional ward committees</b>
Polokwane	38	38	45	28	45	39
Blouberg	21	21	22	17	22	17
Aganang	19	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Molemole	14	14	16	10	10	10
Lepelle-Nkumpi	29	29	30	21	30	21
<b>Capricorn</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>87</b>
Makhado	38	38	38	19	38	19
Thulamela	40	40	41	22	41	41

	2015/16		2016/17		2017/18	
Name of the Municipality	No. of established Ward committees	No. of functional ward committees	No. of established Ward committees	No. of functional ward committees	No. of established Ward committees	No. of functional ward committees
Musina	06	06	12	08	12	12
Mutale	No AR	No AR	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Collins Chabane	N/A	N/A	33	18	36	33
Vhembe	84	84	127	67	127	105
Greater Giyani	30	30	31	21	31	31
Maruleng	14	14	14	08	14	14
Greater Letaba	29	29	30	19	30	30
Greater Tzaneen	34	34	35	26	35	35
Ba-Phalaborwa	18	18	19	10	19	19
Mopani	125	125	129	84	129	129
Makhuduthamaga	31	31	31	25	31	31
Fetakgomo-Tubatse	31	31	Merged		39	39
	16	16				
Elias Motsoaledi	30	30	31	27	31	31

	2015/16		2016/17		2017/18	
Name of the Municipality	No. of established Ward committees	No. of functional ward committees	No. of established Ward committees	No. of functional ward committees	No. of established Ward committees	No. of functional ward committees
Ephraim Mogale	16	16	16	13	16	16
Sekhukhune	93	93	117	100	117	117
Mogalakwena	32	13	32	24	32	24
Bela-Bela	9	9	9	8	9	8
Lephalale	12	12	13	11	13	11
Thabazimbi	12	7	11	6	12	6
Modimolle-	5	5	Merged		14	13
Mookgophong	9	9				
<b>Waterberg</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>611</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>500</b>

### **16.1.5.INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (IGR)**

For municipalities to succeed in developmental roles, proactive co-operation between all the spheres of government is critical for efficient and effective service delivery. Each sphere of government has a role in development planning, prioritisation and resource allocation. The Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act (IGRFA) was passed in 2005. The Act provides a framework for the co-operation among the three spheres of government as distinctive, interdependent and interrelated, and defines the responsibilities and institutional structures to support closer cooperation.

The Department championed cooperative governance and intergovernmental relations in the province with special focus on the alignment of IGR structures and facilitation of engagements between sector departments and municipalities.

There were 615 councillors elected in 2016/17 as compared to 564 councillors elected in 2015/16 and 251 were women. In 2017/18 the province had 1 326 councillors. Women councillors were 300 in 2016/17 and 591 in 2017/18. IGR structures were functional in the province and all municipalities had functional websites. In 2017/18 there were 1364 councillors and women councillors were 600.

Municipality	2016/17				2017/18			
	No. of Councillors elected	No. of women councillors	IGR Functionality	Website Functionality	No. of Councillors elected	No. of women councillors	IGR Functionality	Website Functionality
Polokwane	90	46	Yes	Yes	93	44	Yes	Yes
Blouberg	43	23	Yes	Yes	44	20	Yes	Yes
Molemole	32	16	Yes	Yes	35	15	Yes	Yes
Lepelle-Nkumpi	60	30	Yes	Yes	60	31	Yes	Yes
<b>Capricorn</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Makhado	75	34	Yes	No	75	34	Yes	Yes
Collins	71	31	Yes	No	71	31	Yes	Yes
Thulamela	81	39	Yes	Yes	81	39	Yes	Yes
Musina	24	09	Yes	Yes	24	09	Yes	Yes
<b>Vhembe</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Greater Giyani	62	35	Yes	Yes	62	20	Yes	Yes
Maruleng	27	10	Yes	Yes	27	10	Yes	Yes
Greater Letaba	57	27	Yes	Yes	61	24	Yes	Yes
Greater Tzaneen	68	32	Yes	Yes	69	31	Yes	Yes
Ba-Phalaborwa	37	18	Yes	Yes	36	14	Yes	Yes

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street. POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
 Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

Municipality	2016/17				2017/18			
	No. of Councilors	Women councillors	IGR Functionality	Website Functionality	No. of Councillors	Women councillors	IGR Functionality	Website Functionality
<b>Mopani</b>	53	30	Yes	Yes	53	27	Yes	Yes
Makhuduthamaga	62	32	Yes	Yes	62	31	Yes	Yes
Elias Motsoaledi	61	28	Yes	Yes	61	28	Yes	Yes
Fetakgomo/Tubatse	77	33	Yes	Yes	77	33	Yes	Yes
Ephraim Mogale	32	15	Yes	Yes	32	17	Yes	Yes
<b>Sekhukhune</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>108</b>	Yes	Yes	20	8	Yes	Yes
Mogalakwena	64	23	Yes	No	63	23	Yes	No
Modimolle/Mookgophong	28	12	Yes	No	28	12	Yes	No
Bela-Bela	17	7	Yes	Yes	17	7	Yes	Yes
Lephalale	26	13	Yes	Yes	26	13	Yes	Yes
Thabazimbi	23	9	Yes	No	23	9	Yes	Yes
<b>Waterberg</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>17</b>	Yes	Yes	<b>38</b>	<b>9</b>	Yes	Yes
<b>Total</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>300</b>	Yes	Yes	<b>1 364</b>	<b>600</b>		

The following IGR structures were established in the province:

1. District Intergovernmental Fora
2. District Development Planning forum.
3. Premier IGR Forum.
4. HOD/Municipal Managers Forum (Technical committees)
5. Provincial Development Planning Forum.
6. MEC/Mayors OPCA Oversight Committee

#### **16.1.6. MANAGEMENT OF FRAUD AND CORRUPTION**

##### **Progress on Implementation of Anti-Corruption Strategies by Municipalities**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Anti-corruption plan compiled (17/18)</b>	<b>Has council adopted anti-corruption plan (17/18)</b>	<b>Anti-corruption plan implemented (17/18)</b>
Polokwane	Yes	Yes	Yes
Blouberg	Yes	Yes	Yes
Molemole	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lepelle-Nkumpi	Yes	Yes	Yes

Capricorn	Yes	Yes	Yes
Makhado	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thulamela	Yes	Yes	Yes(shared with Vhembe)
Musina	Yes	Yes	Yes(shared with Vhembe)
Collins Chabane	Yes	Yes	Yes(shared with Vhembe)
Vhembe	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greater Giyani	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maruleng	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greater Letaba	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greater Tzaneen	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ba-Phalaborwa	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mopani	Yes	Yes	Yes
Makhuduthamaga	Yes	Yes	Yes
Elias Motsoaledi	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fetakgomo/Tubatse	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ephraim Mogale	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sekhukhune	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mogalakwena	Yes	Yes	Yes
Modimolle/Mookgophong	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bela-Bela	Yes	Yes	Yes

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street. POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.coghsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**



Lephalale	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thabazimbi	Yes	Yes	Yes
Waterberg	Yes	Yes	Yes

Municipalities have shown commitment in the fight against fraud and corruption over the past three financial years and this is substantiated by the development and implementation of anti-corruption strategies and fraud prevention plans. The fraud and corruption strategies were evaluated to ensure alignment to the provincial anti-corruption strategy. 27 municipalities in the province have compiled and adopted anti-corruption plan and these plans were being implemented.

#### 16.1.7. IMBIZOS

The principle of public participation holds that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process. Public participation implies that the public's contributions will influence developmental decisions. The national government views public participation as a means of empowerment and as an important element of democratic governance. It is against this background that public participation is encouraged within municipalities.

Over the three financial years Ministers, MECs, Executive Mayors/Mayors ensured that they engage communities on developmental matters that concern them. Provincial EXCO held 01 Imbizo for the financial year 2015/16 at Greater Giyani local municipality. In 2016/17 Provincial EXCO held 08 Imbizos. In 2017/18, 07 Provincial EXCO Imbizos were held. MEC for Coghsta held 04 Imbizos in Maruleng, Lepelle Nkumpi and Ephraim Mogale Local municipalities in 2015/16 and 01 Imbizo in Polokwane in 2016/17. In 2017/18 the MEC held 03 Imbizos at Lepelle Nkumpi, Greater Letaba and Ba-Phalaborwa.

**PROVINCIAL EXCO IMBIZO:**

2016/17			2017/18		
DATE	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	PLACE	DATE	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	PLACE
03/06/2016	Ephraim Mogale	Elandskraal	30/05/2018	Ephraim Mogale	Mabitsi(Ward 12)
24/06/2016	Blouberg	Marobjane	30/06/2018	Blouberg	Bloslag village
16/09/2016	Polokwane	Moletji	30/06/2018	Polokwane	Solomondale
14/10/2016	Collins Chabane	Mudavula	26/10/2018	Belabela	Belabela town ship
21/10/2016	Makhuduthamaga	Manganeng	15/09/2018	Lephalale	Rietfontein
11/11/2016	Ba-Phalaborwa	Makhushane	18/08/2017	Greater Giyani	Gandlanani
21/04/2017	Mogalakwena	Ga-Masenya	13/07/2018	Greater Letaba	Buga
19/05/2017	Elias Motsoaledi	Zaaiplaas			

**PROVINCIAL MEC IMBIZO:**

2016/17			2017/18		
DATE	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	PLACE	DATE	NAME OF MUNICIPALITY	PLACE
16/09/2016	Polokwane	Moletji village	25/05/2018	Lepelle-Nkumpi	Ga-Rafiri Zebediela village
			15/03/2018	Greater Letaba	Ramotshinyadi
			13/03/2018	Ba-Phalaborwa	Namakgale

### 16.1.8.FUNCTIONALITY OF AUDIT COMMITTEES AND MPAC

All 27 municipalities in the province established MPAC committees, Audit Committees and Internal Audit Units.

The table below indicates the status of MPAC and Audit Committees in municipalities:

NO	NAME OF THE MUNICIPALITY	PERFORMANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE	MUNICIPAL PUBLIC ACCOUNT COMMITTEE	INTERNAL AUDIT COMMITTEE
1	Waterberg	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Thabazimbi	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Modimolle/Mookgopong	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Bela-Bela	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Mogalakwena	Yes	Yes	Yes
6	Lephalale	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	Capricorn	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	Polokwane	Yes	Yes	Yes
9	Blouberg	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	Molemole	Yes	Yes	Yes
11	Lepelle Nkumpi	Yes	Yes	Yes
12	Vhembe	Yes	Yes	Yes
13	Thulamela	Yes	Yes	Yes

NO	NAME OF THE MUNICIPALITY	PERFORMANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE	MUNICIPAL PUBLIC ACCOUNT COMMITTEE	INTERNAL AUDIT COMMITTEE
14	Musina	Yes	Yes	Yes
15	Makhado	Yes	Yes	Yes
16	Collins Chabane	Yes	Yes	Yes
17	Mopani	Yes	Yes	Yes
18	Greater Giyani	Yes	Yes	Yes
19	Greater Letaba	Yes	Yes	Yes
20	Greater Tzaneen	Yes	Yes	Yes
21	Maruleng	Yes	Yes	Yes
22	Ba-Phalaborwa	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	Sekhukhune	Yes	Yes	Yes
24	Elias Motsoaledi	Yes	Yes	Yes
25	Ephraim Mogale	Yes	Yes	Yes
26	Fetakgomo/Tubatse	Yes	Yes	Yes
27	Makhuduthamaga	Yes	Yes	Yes

#### **16.1.9.MUNICIPAL PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (MPAC)**

The municipal public accounts committees (MPAC) were established in all municipalities in the province. Provincial and district MPAC forums convened on a quarterly basis. Chairpersons of MPACs formed part of Audit Committee meetings as observers.

#### **16.1.10. AUDIT COMMITTEES**

The audit committee plays a vital role in the municipal governance framework as it provides Council with independent assurance. All municipalities have established Internal Audit Units.

All the audit/ performance audit committees are effective and functional. The committees performed their advisory role and all members demonstrated their independency by declaring their interests in all meetings. We also observed a professional relationship between the audit/performance committees and the internal audit function which allowed the audit committees to carry out their functions as per the approved Charters.

#### **16.1.11.CHALLENGES**

Although all ward committees were functional, there were some challenges affecting the effectiveness of these committees and that includes:

- The demarcation process at Collins Chabane local municipality resulted in twelve ward committees.
- Inadequate resources and incentives
- Lack of appropriate skills particularly contextual understanding of the tasks at hand.

All municipalities were able to ensure the involvement of stakeholders within their communities in public participation processes; Municipal reports have been silent on the area of managing petitions and complaints.

### **16.1.12.SUPPORT INTERVENTIONS**

- The Department conducted capacity building sessions for all ward committee members.

## **17. OTHER RELATED MATTERS**

### **17.1. INTRODUCTION**

Cross-cutting interventions are specific issues that are not addressed directly by the five (5) key performance areas although contextualized on Back to Basics 10 point plan. These interventions deal with how municipalities should organise themselves and mobilise human and financial support in order to discharge their mandate as provided in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. Progress of municipal performance regarding these interventions was assessed in the following focus areas:

- Integrated Development Planning;
- Spatial Development Frameworks; and
- Disaster Management.

### **17.2. INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING (IDP)**

The White Paper on Local Government envisaged the IDP to be one of the mechanisms to promote and support the process towards developmental local government. The Municipal Systems Act entrenched the integrated development planning process as a legislated requirement for all municipalities to engage in and develop Integrated Development Plans. The IDP is a municipality's 5-year strategic plan that must be reviewed on an annual basis to track progress in implementation of the development programmes and inform future development planning. It has become the central pillar for development planning in South Africa, as it seeks to integrate development planning and programmes across all the three spheres of government into one document.

## PROVINCIAL ANALYSIS

- All 27 municipalities approved and submitted their IDP frameworks to the department.
- IDP's and SDBIP's were aligned in the following municipalities for 2016/17 financial year: Vhembe, Thulamela, Musina, Collins Chabane, Makhado, Sekhukhune, Elias Motsoaledi, Ephraim Mogale, Fetakgomo/Tubatse, Makhuduthamaga, Waterberg, Modimolle/Mookgophong, Mogalakwena, Thabazimbi, Bela-Bela, Lephalale, Capricorn, Molemole, Blouberg, Maruleng, Greater Letaba, Ba-Phalaborwa, Greater Giyani. In 2017/18 there was IDP and SDBIP alignment in 23 municipalities except Mopani, Greater Tzaneen, Polokwane and Blouberg. The following are IDP credibility ratings in accordance with the IDP Framework.

RATING	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
High	Mopani, Maruleng Waterberg, Mookgopong, , Bela-Bela, Lephalale, Modimolle, Thabazimbi, Vhembe, Thulamela, Musina, Capricorn, Polokwane, Lepelle Nkumpi, Blouberg, Sekhukhune, Elias Motsoaledi, Ephraim Mogale, Makhuduthamaga, Fetakgomo (20)	Mopani, Greater Letaba, Maruleng, Greater Giyani, Greater Tzaneen, Ba-Phalaborwa, Capricorn, Blouberg, Vhembe, Musina, Makhado, Thulamela, Collins Chabane, Sekhukhune, Fetakgomo/Tubatse, Waterberg, Lephalale, Modimolle/Mookgophong, Belabela, Thabazimbi and Mogalakwena (21)	Capricorn, Lepelle-Nkumpi' Molemole, Waterberg, Ephraim Mogale, Fetakgomo-Tubatse, Elias Motsoaledi, Vhembe, Maruleng, Greater Giyani, Ba-Phalaborwa (11)

<b>Medium</b>	Greater Letaba, Mogalakwena, Molemole and Elias Makhado, Molemole, Aganang Motsoaledi (2) (5)	Sekhukhune, Modimolle-Mookgophong, Lephalale, Mogalakwena, Belabela, Collins Chabane, Thulamela, Musina, Makhado, Greater Tzaneen, Greater Letaba (11)
<b>Low</b>	Tubatse, Mutale, Greater Tzaneen, Greater Giyani and Ba-Phalaborwa (5)	Makhuduthamaga, Ephraim Blouberg, Polokwane, Makhuduthamaga, Thabazimbi, Mopani (5)

### 17.3. IDP RATING

- **High IDP credibility ratings:** The rating was at 67% (20/30) in 2015/16 and improved to 78% (21/27) in 2016/17 but declined to 41% (11/27) in 2017/18
- **Medium IDP credibility rating:** 5/30 municipalities rated medium 2015/16. 2/27 municipalities rated medium in 2016/17 and 11/27 rated in 2017/18
- **Low IDP credibility rating:** In 2015/16 however 5/30 were rated low and in 2016/17, 04/27 were rated low. In 2017/18 05/27 municipalities were rated low



#### 17.4. ALIGNMENT OF IDP & SDBIP

##### PROVINCIAL ANALYSIS

Only four municipalities (Greater Tzaneen, Polokwane, Lepelle Nkumpi and Mopani District) had their SDBIP not aligned with the IDP in 2016/17 as compared to 2015/16 whereby two municipalities did not align (Greater Tzaneen and Mutale). In 2017/18 four municipalities did not align their IDPs and their SDBIPs (Mopani, Greater Tzaneen, Polokwane and Blouberg)

Generally there were some municipalities in the province still unable to develop credible IDPs in accordance with the applicable framework. Non alignment of SDBIP with IDP/BUDGET had implications in performance auditing and this resulted in disclaimers and qualified audit opinions particularly on predetermined objectives.

The implication of implementing SDBIPs which are not aligned to IDP/Budget result in negative findings on predetermined objectives.

Municipality	IDP Framework approved	IDP Framework submitted	IDP/SDBIP Alignment (15/16)	IDP/SDBIP Alignment (16/17)	IDP/SDBIP Alignment (17/18)
Mopani	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Greater Letaba	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greater Tzaneen	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Maruleng	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greater Giyani	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>IDP Framework approved</b>	<b>IDP Framework submitted</b>	<b>IDP/SDBIP Alignment (15/16)</b>	<b>IDP/SDBIP Alignment (16/17)</b>	<b>IDP/SDBIP Alignment (17/18)</b>
Ba-Phalaborwa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vhembe	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thulamela	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Musina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Makhado	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Collins Chabane	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes
<b>Waterberg</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Mogalakwena	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Modimolle/Mookgophong	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bela-Bela	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thabazimbi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lephalale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Sekhukhune</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Elias Motsoaledi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ephraim Mogale	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fetakgomo/Tubatse	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Makhuduthamaga	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Hensa Towers Building, 20 Rabe Street. POLOKWANE, 0700, Private Bag X9485, Polokwane, 0700  
 Tel: (015) 285 5000, (015) 294 2000, Website: <http://www.cogsta.limpopo.gov.za>

**Integrated Sustainable Human Settlements**

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>IDP Framework approved</b>	<b>IDP Framework submitted</b>	<b>IDP/SDBIP Alignment (15/16)</b>	<b>IDP/SDBIP Alignment (16/17)</b>	<b>IDP/SDBIP Alignment (17/18)</b>
<b>Capricorn</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Polokwane</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
<b>Molernole</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Lepelle-Nkumpi</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<b>Blouberg</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

### 17.5. DISASTER MANAGEMENT

The aim of the Disaster Management Act, Act 57 of 2002, is to ensure a uniform approach towards disaster risk management on all spheres of government. The Disaster Management Act focuses amongst others, on disaster prevention and risk reduction, mitigation of severity and consequences of disasters, emergency and preparedness, and a rapid and effective response to disasters.

The Disaster Management Amendment Act 16 of 2015 focuses on the following:

- To clarify policy on rehabilitation and functioning of disaster management centres.
- To provide for an extending reporting system by organs of state on information relating to disasters.
- Expenditure on response and recovery.
- Challenges pertaining to risk reduction.
- Approach towards risk assessments.
- Climate change and early warning systems; and
- Declaration and classification of disasters.

The Provincial Disaster Management Centre (PDMC) is established in terms of section 29 of the Disaster Management Act and forms an integral part of the departmental support to municipalities. The PDMC is also responsible for implementing the Fire Brigade Services Act, Act 99 of 1987. The main objective of the PDMC is to oversee the overall resilience of communities and infrastructure to disaster risk, strengthen the capacity of the province and municipalities in pre-empting and responding to disasters, as well as ensuring cross-functional disaster management in Limpopo. Hazards are dynamic in nature and never static, therefore, a scientific proactive approach towards disaster management is imperative. As an example, the effects of global warming and climate change are impacting in Limpopo Province as a causal factor in disaster. Managing disasters such as floods, drought, tornadoes, and veld fires requires government and communities working together in a coordinated way through a coherent disaster management system.

For instance, municipalities are obliged to provide first response role to disasters, and should always be in a position to effectively manage disasters. Disaster management plans should be included in the municipal IDPs. The effectiveness of disaster management at local level is dependent on the oversight and leadership role of the PDMC.

Realising the severity and magnitude of the drought disaster which the provincial farmers experienced with increased frequency of heat waves and some boreholes drying up, the Department supplied emergency water through trailers, jojo tanks and drinking troughs to the farmers in order to prevent increased number of mortalities.

#### **17.6. CHALLENGES**

- The disaster management function is still viewed as a PDMC/Municipal Disaster Management Centre (MDMC) function, and not as a multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral function.
- Dedicated capacity for disaster management in provincial sector Departments remains a major challenge. This has resulted in limited participation of sector Departments in disaster management activities; and
- The majority of provincial sector Departments still does not have a Level 1 Disaster Management Plan. However, the PDMC has plans in place to address this issue.

### 17.7. SUPPORT INTERVENTIONS

- Sector Departments should comply with Section 38 of the Disaster Management Act.
- Legislative compliance from all role players should be an ongoing priority and Provincial Disaster Management Centres had to fulfil this legal requirement.

### 18. CONCLUSION

- The report on Institutional Transformation and Organizational Development highlighted challenges on the filling of senior management vacancies as result of most contracts lapsing. This will however improve in the next reporting cycle as a province has put plans in place to support municipalities
- Municipalities continued to provide quality basic services to communities. Provision of water still remained a huge challenge in communities. There is a need for improvement on waste collection in rural areas as this is a measure challenge.
- Collection of revenue by municipalities should be prioritised to ensure that municipalities remain financially viable, especially households and government debts which remained high over a period and this led to municipalities being unable to render services due to financial constraints.
- The establishment of ward committees and council stability were key aspects of Good Governance and Public Participation. This was further complemented by the implementation of Intergovernmental Relations Framework.

MEC: MAKAMU R.B (MPL)  
MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

2020/02/20  
DATE

---

**PROCLAMATION • PROKLAMASIE**

---

**PROCLAMATION 19 OF 2020****PROMULGATION****NOTICE OF APPROVAL OF THE REZONING OF PORTION 1 OF ERF 778 LOUIS TRICHARDT TOWNSHIP FROM "RESIDENTIAL 1" TO "RESIDENTIAL 3" WITH A SIMULTANEOUS APPLICATION TO INCREASE THE DENSITY FROM 45 UNITS PER HECTARE TO 65 UNITS PER HECTARE (AMENDMENT SCHEME 345)**

We, RWM Projects Pty Ltd, being the authorized agent of the registered owners of Portion 1 of Erf 778 Louis Trichardt Township Registration Division LS, Limpopo Province, hereby give notice that the Authorized official of Makahado Municipality has approved the application for the rezoning of Portion 1 of Erf 778 Louis Trichardt Township from "Residential 1" to "Residential 3" with a simultaneous application to increase the density from 45 units per hectare to 65 units per hectare for the purpose of erecting dwelling units on the above mentioned property on the 04<sup>th</sup> of November 2019.(Decision A.O 609.04.11.19)

Any reservations concerning this approval should be directed to the Municipal Manager of Makhado Local Municipality at this address or private bag X2596, Louis Trichardt 0920 within a period of 30 days from the date of this publication (19 June 2020). Address of the applicant: RWM Projects, P.O.Box 3285, Louis Trichardt, 0920, Fax: 086 511 3079, Cell: 073 130 4632 or 0737042600

19-26

**PROKLAMASIE 19 VAN 2020****PROMULGERING****KENNISGEWING VAN GOEDKEURING VAN DIE HERSONERING VAN GEDEELTE 1 VAN ERF 778 LOUIS TRICHARDT DORP VAN "RESIDENSIËLE 1" TOT "RESIDENSIËLE 3" MET 'N EENVOUDIGE AANSOEK OM DIE DIGTHEID VAN 45 EENHEDE per hektaar tot 65 eenhede per hektaar te verhoog (wysiging van 34)**

Ons, RWM Projects Pty Ltd, synde die gemagtigde agent van die geregistreerde eienaars van Gedeelte 1 van Erf 778 Louis Trichardt Township Registrasie Afdeling LS, Limpopo Provinsie, gee hiermee kennis dat die gemagtigde amptenaar van Makahado Munisipaliteit die aansoek vir die hersonering van Gedeelte goedgekeur het. 1 van Erf 778 Louis Trichardt Dorpsgebied van "Residensieel 1" na "Residensieel 3" met 'n gelyktydige aansoek om die digtheid van 45 eenhede per hektaar te verhoog na 65 eenhede per hektaar met die doel om wooneenhede op die bogenoemde eiendom op die 04ste tyd op te rig van November 2019. (Besluit AO 609.04.11.19)

Enige besprekings met betrekking tot hierdie goedkeuring moet binne 'n tydperk van 30 dae vanaf die datum van hierdie publikasie( 19 Junie 2020), gerig word aan die Munisipale Bestuurder van Makhado Plaaslike Munisipaliteit by hierdie adres of privaatsak X2596, Louis Trichardt 0920. Adres van die applikant: RWM Projects, P.O.Box 3285, Louis Trichardt, 0920, Faks: 086 511 3079, Sel: 073 130 4632 of 0737042600

19-26

---

**LOCAL AUTHORITY NOTICES • PLAASLIKE OWERHEIDS KENNISGEWINGS**

---

**LOCAL AUTHORITY NOTICE 46 OF 2020****REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIVE CONDITIONS IN TERMS OF SECTION 55(2) OF THE LEPHALALE MUNICIPAL SPATIAL PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT BY-LAW, 2017**

Notice is hereby given that I, **Dries de Ridder** Town and Regional Planner, being the authorised agent of the owner of **Portion 35 of the farm Rietspruit 527 LQ**, in terms of Section 55(2) of the Lephalele Municipal Spatial Planning and Land Use Management By-Law, 2017 have applied for the **removal of restrictive condition B in Title Deed T66012/2011**. Particulars relating to the application will lie for inspection during normal office hours at the office of the Executive Manager, Development Planning Directorate, Lephalele Civic Centre, Cnr Joe Slovo and Douwater Road, Onverwacht, for a period of 30 days from **12 June 2020**. Objections to or representations in respect of the application must be lodged with or made in writing to the Municipal

Manager, Lephalele Municipality, Private Bag X136, Lephalele, 0555, within a period of 30 days from **12 June 2020**. Postal address of applicant: Dries de Ridder Town and Regional Planner, 5A Herman Street, Ellisras, 0555. PO Box 5635, Onverwacht, 0557. Telephone Number: 014 763 4184. **Dates of the notices: 12 and 19 June 2020.**

12-19

**PLAASLIKE OWERHEID KENNISGEWING 46 VAN 2020****OPHEFFING VAN BEPERKENDE VOORWAARDES IN TERME VAN ARTIKEL 55(2) VAN DIE LEPHALALE MUNISIPALE RUIMTELIKE BEPLANNING EN GRONDGEBRUIKBESTUUR VERORDENING, 2017**

Kennis geskied hiermee dat ek, **Dries de Ridder** Stads- en Streeksbeplanner, synde die gemagtigde agent van die eienaar van **Gedeelte 35 van die plaas Rietspruit 527 LQ**, ingevolge Artikel 55(2) van die Lephalele Munisipale Ruimtelike Beplanning en Grondgebruikbestuur Verordening, 2017, aansoek gedoen het vir die **opheffing van beperkende voorwaarde B in die Akte van Transport T66012/2011**. Besonderhede aangaande hierdie aansoek lê ter insae gedurende normale kantoorure by die kantoor van die Uitvoerende Bestuurder, Direktooraat Ontwikkeling Beplanning, Lephalele Burgersentrum, h/v Joe Slovo en Douwaterstraat, Onverwacht, vir 'n periode van 30 dae vanaf **12 Junie 2020**. Besware teen of voorleggings ten opsigte van die aansoek moet geopper word by of op skrif gestel en gerig word aan die Munisipale Bestuurder, Lephalele Munisipaliteit, Privaatsak X136, Lephalele, 0555, binne 'n periode van 30 dae vanaf **12 Junie 2020**. Posadres van aansoeker: Dries de Ridder Stads- en Streeksbeplanner, Herman Straat 5A, Ellisras, 0555. Posbus 5635, Onverwacht, 0557. Telefoon Nommer: 014 763 4184. **Datums van plasings: 12 en 19 Junie 2020.**

12-19

## LOCAL AUTHORITY NOTICE 47 OF 2020

# MODIMOLLE-MOOKGOPHONG LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

email: records@modimolle.gov.za  
OR Tambo Square, Harry Gwala St. MODIMOLLE  
x1008, MODIMOLLE, 0510  
☎ (014) 718-2000 ✉ (014) 717-4077



www.lm368.gov.za  
Cnr Mandela & Six Street, MOOKGOPHONG, 0560  
x234, MOOKGOPHONG, 0560  
☎ (014) 743-6600 ✉ (014) 743-2434

2 June 2020

**THIS IS A CERTIFIED EXTRACT OF THE VIRTUAL COUNCIL MEETING  
HELD ON 29 MAY 2020**

<b>A481/5/2020</b>	<b>FINAL MEDIUM TERM REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE AND FRAMEWORK 2020/2021</b>
<u>ITEM A481/5/2020</u>	<u>CM 29/5/2020</u>
	16/5/16

The Mayor was given the opportunity to present her budget speech.

**RECOMMENDED:**

- A. That the report by the Mayor regarding the Medium Term Revenue And Expenditure And Framework 2020/21 as contained in the Council Agenda dated 29 May 2020, be noted.
- B. That Council adopt the Annual Budget for 2020/21 Medium Term Revenue and Expenditure Framework (MTREF), as well as the budget related policies and tariffs.
- C. That the Accounting Officer submit approved annual budget and supporting documentation to National and Provincial Treasury within 10 working days in accordance with Section 21A.
- D. That the Mayor responds after the Council meeting to queries / inputs from the community and inform them that the Budget is funded.
- E. That the recalculations of salary scale be done by Corporate Services to ensure that they are correct.

Yours faithfully

  
**DR'S MHLANGA**  
**ACTING MUNICIPAL MANAGER**

Vision: "A Leading Municipality in the Republic of South Africa"



# MODIMOLLE-MOOKGOPHONG LOCAL MUNICIPALITY



email: [records@modimolle.gov.za](mailto:records@modimolle.gov.za)  
 OR Tambo Square, Harry Gwa a St MODIMOLLE  
 x1008, MODIMOLLE, 0510  
 ☎ (014) 718-2000 - (014) 717-4077

[www.lim368.gov.za](http://www.lim368.gov.za)  
 Cnr Mandela & Six Street, MOOKGOPHONG, 0560  
 x234, MOOKGOPHONG, 0560  
 ☎ (014) 743-6600 - (014) 743-2434

## MUNICIPAL NOTICE

### RESOLUTION ON LEVYING PROPERTY RATES IN TERMS OF SECTION 14 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT MUNICIPAL PROPERTY RATES ACT, 2004, (ACT NO. 6 OF 2004)

Date 29 May 2020

Modimolle-Mookgophong Local Municipality

### RESOLUTION LEVYING PROPERTY RATES FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 1 JULY 2020 TO 30 JUNE 2021

Notice is hereby given in terms of section 14(1) and (2) of the Local Government: Municipal Property Rates Act 2004 that Modimolle-Mookgophong Local Municipality resolved by way of council resolution number A481/5/2020, to levy the rates on properties reflected in the schedule below with effect from 1 July 2020

PROPERTY RATES CATEGORIES	CENT AMOUNT IN THE RAND RATE
(1) Assessment rates :	
(a) Residential properties	0.01246
(b) Industrial properties	0.01193
(c) Business and Commercial properties	0.02407
(d) Agricultural properties	0.00221
(e) Mining properties	0.02407
(f) Properties owned by an organ of state and used for public service purpose	0.02407
(g) Public service infrastructure properties	0.00234
(h) Properties owned by public benefit organizations and used for specified public benefit activities:	
(i) Properties used for multiple purposes	Per use
(j) Game Farming	0.00221
(k) Vacant Land	0.01529
(l) Religious use	0.01193

In accordance with the Rates Policy 2020/2021, the following reduction on the market value of the property and rebates on rates payable and exemptions be and hereby granted.

**(2) Exemptions (in terms of section 15 of the MPRA and the Property Rates Policy), other than in terms of Impermissible Rates (section 17 of the MPRA) :**

- (a) Municipal Property 100%
- (b) Residential 1 Properties, additional amount to the value of the property, not being taxed R 15 000.00
- (c) Public Service Infrastructure 100%
- (d) Rights registered against properties 100%
- (e) Public Benefit Organizations (on application) 100%

**(3) Reductions (in terms section 15 of the MPRA and the Property Rates Policy) :**

- (a) Destruction of property as a cause of disaster (on application) 80%

**(4) Rebates (in terms section 15 of the MPRA and the Property Rates Policy) :**

- (a) Privately Owned Town (serviced by the owner) 20%
- (b) Agricultural Properties 30%
- (c) Developed Properties (not transferred by a developer yet) 10%
- (d) Registered Indigents :

The owner must be the registered owner and occupant of the applicable property, whose monthly aggregated monthly income is proved to the satisfaction of the Municipal Manager, not to exceed R4 000.00 100%

- (e) Retired owners & medical unfit applicants :

Property owners over 60 years of age, permanent occupants and the sole owner of the property concerned, whose monthly aggregated income is proved to the satisfaction of the Municipal Manager, to be :

equal or less than R 4 000.00	100%
between R4 001.00 and R6 000.00	50%
between R6 001.00 and R 8 500.00	20%

Full details of the Council resolution and rebates, reduction and exclusions specific to each category of owners of properties or owner of specific category of properties as determined through criteria in the municipality's rates policy are available for inspection on the municipality's website, offices or Libraries

**The Tariffs can be perused at the following Areas:**

1. Modimolle civic centre library
2. Mookgophong civic centre library, Mr Maswanganyi
3. Vaalwater/Mabatlane library, Mr Tema

Enquiries must be directed to [mokwelej@modimolle.gov.za](mailto:mokwelej@modimolle.gov.za)

Contact numbers: 014 718 2031

The Tariffs is also available on the municipal website, [www.mmlm.gov.za](http://www.mmlm.gov.za).



**ACTING MUNICIPAL MANAGER  
DR S MHLANGA**

*Vision: "A Leading Municipality in the Republic of South Africa"*

**LOCAL AUTHORITY NOTICE 48 OF 2020****AMENDMENT OF LAND USE SCHEME OR REZONING IN TERMS OF SECTION 54(1) OF THE LEPHALALE MUNICIPAL SPATIAL PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT BY-LAW, 2017****AMENDMENT SCHEME NUMBER: 24**

Notice is hereby given that I, **Dries de Ridder** Town and Regional Planner, being the authorised agent of the owner of **Erf 467 Marapong Township**, in terms of Section 54(1) and 66(1) of the Lephale Municipal Spatial Planning and Land Use Management By-Law, 2017 have applied for the amendment of the Lephale Land Use Scheme, 2017, by the rezoning of the property described above, situated in Leebea Street, Marapong from **Residential 1, one dwelling unit per erf to Residential 2, one dwelling unit per 250m<sup>2</sup> and consent use for a boarding house**. Particulars relating to the application will lie for inspection during normal office hours at the office of the Executive Manager, Development Planning Directorate, Lephale Civic Centre, Cnr Joe Slovo and Douwater Road, Onverwacht, for a period of 30 days from **19 June 2020**. Objections to or representations in respect of the application must be lodged with or made in writing to the Municipal Manager, Lephale Municipality, Private Bag X136, Lephale, 0555, within a period of 30 days from **19 June 2020**. Postal address of applicant: Dries de Ridder Town and Regional Planner, 5A Herman Street, Ellisras, 0555. PO Box 5635, Onverwacht, 0557. Telephone Number: 014 763 4184. **Dates of the notices: 19 and 26 June 2020.**

19-26

**PLAASLIKE OWERHEID KENNISGEWING 48 VAN 2020****WYSIGING VAN GRONDGEBRUIKSKEMA OF HERSONERING IN TERME VAN ARTIKEL 54(1) VAN DIE LEPHALALE MUNISIPALE RUIMTELIKE BEPLANNING EN GRONDGEBRUIKBESTUUR VERORDENING, 2017****WYSIGINGSKEMA NOMMER: 24**

Kennis geskied hiermee dat ek, **Dries de Ridder** Stads- en Streeksbeplanner, synde die gemagtigde agent van die eienaar van **Erf 467 Marapong Dorpsgebied**, ingevolge Artikel 54(1) en 66(1) van die Lephale Munisipale Ruimtelike Beplanning en Grondgebruikbestuur Verordening, 2017, aansoek gedoen het vir die wysiging van die Lephale Grondgebruikskema, 2017, deur die hersonering van die bogenoemde eiendom, geleë te Leebeastraat, Marapong van **Residensieel 1, een wooneenheid per erf na Residensieel 2, een wooneenheid per 250m<sup>2</sup> en toestemmingsgebruik vir 'n losieshuis**. Besonderhede aangaande hierdie aansoek lê ter insae gedurende normale kantoorure by die kantoor van die Uitvoerende Bestuurder, Direkoraat Ontwikkeling Beplanning, Lephale Burgersentrum, h/v Joe Slovo en Douwaterstraat, Onverwacht, vir 'n periode van 30 dae vanaf **19 Junie 2020**. Besware teen of voorleggings ten opsigte van die aansoek moet geopper word by of op skrif gestel en gerig word aan die Munisipale Bestuurder, Lephale Munisipaliteit, Privaatsak X136, Lephale, 0555, binne 'n periode van 30 dae vanaf **19 Junie 2020**. Posadres van aansoeker: Dries de Ridder Stads- en Streeksbeplanner, Herman Straat 5A, Ellisras, 0555. Posbus 5635, Onverwacht, 0557. Telefoon Nommer: 014 763 4184. **Datums van plasing: 19 en 26 Junie 2020.**

19-26