



THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Municipal Assessment Tool

TRIAL Version 1.3

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Background

With the advent of democracy in 1994, South Africa shifted from a highly centralised system under apartheid to a decentralised system constituted as national, provincial and local spheres of government which are distinctive, interdependent and interrelated. Although distinctive the Constitution of the Republic enjoins all spheres to cooperate with one another in mutual trust and good faith to secure the well-being of all citizens. Within this framework of cooperative governance, the Constitution obliges national and provincial governments to support and strengthen the capacity of municipalities to manage their own affairs, to exercise their powers and to perform their functions [Section 154(1)].

Similarly legislative authority over the performance of local government resides with the National Department of Cooperative Governance and provincial departments of local government. Sections 47 and 48 of the Local Government Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000 respectively compels the MEC for local government and the Minister to compile annual reports of municipal performance. Additionally, National Treasury has, through the Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003, the responsibility to promote good budget and fiscal management by municipalities.

Why a performance assessment tool for local government?

The 2011 municipal elections brought into stark relief that despite advances in service delivery the pace of improvements and the quality of services provided do not in many cases match the expectations of a significant number of citizens. Recurring community protests, poor financial and administrative management, weak technical and planning capacity, and weak governance have exposed some uncomfortable truths about the state and well-being of municipalities.

Despite the plethora of capacity building and support activities of national and provincial departments over the past 10 years or so, many municipalities are falling into and/or are still in deep distress, partly due to design and coordination gaps hampering successful implementation of such programmes. The question of why all of these initiatives have produced less than optimal results is valid? The general view is that it is largely due to a lack of focus – past attempts have been ad-hoc lacking a structured and coherent approach to developing municipal capacity, and the temptation has been to produce a shopping list of actions. As a consequence, effort and energy is distributed over a broad front and overall impact was diffused and minimal.

An additional explanation for the limited success was the inability of the national and provincial government departments that impact local government to develop a cohesive plan and fully co-operate to ensure a unified approach in their engagements with municipalities within their respective mandates. The coordination and alignment of interventions of departments and agencies impacting on local government is unsatisfactory and remains a challenge.

There are various factors that impact negatively on service delivery. The first relates to municipal institutional performance; impacted strongly on by leadership and management capacity, and the second relates to broader aspects such as weak coordination of departments and agencies impacting on local government aggravated by lack of a spatial or area-based focus and fragmented, weak and/or unreliable data.

The third relates to the broader socio-economic environment within which the municipality operates. In municipalities where social and economic endowments are at a low ebb, this, in some instances may affect the municipality's ability to fully carry out its mandate. Since municipalities are supposed to rely strongly on own revenue to finance service delivery, a weak rates base affects the municipality's ability to generate sufficient revenues to finance operations, attract skilled and qualified staff and extend services. Currently there are many municipalities strongly dependant on grants.

So while the constitutional and legislative basis for municipal performance monitoring and support exists, the critical shortcoming in all of this is that no **integrated minimum floor of norms and standards of performance** for the efficient and effective functioning of local government (administratively, politically and in terms of service delivery) exist. Where norms and standards exist these are dispersed across a number of entities and departments such as National Treasuries Section 71 reports or the Blue and Green Drop certification by Water Affairs to name only two. There is thus no consistent and integrated set of key performance data on municipalities that brings together various pieces of information to form an integrated and holistic picture of the municipality. This militates against crafting coordinated responses, be it in terms of support or other interventions. Moreover political oversight structures such as the Local Government MinMec, the Ministerial Implementation Forum for Outcome 9 on local government and the President's Coordinating Council do not have at their disposal critical and integrated municipal level information to provide strategic leadership over the local government sector.

Objectives of the municipal assessment tool

1. To develop a performance assessment tool that provides holistic integrated information on the institutional performance of municipalities against key indicators to enable strategic leadership over the local government sector. In time, the information generated through the performance assessments may be analysed to provide a national perspective that may inform policy reform initiatives.
2. To provide for a comprehensive and robust evidence base for providing tailored support and/or intervention measures to municipalities in a coordinated and differentiated manner.
3. Guide national and provincial departments by means of the performance information obtained through the assessments to enable them to better support municipalities in identified areas of underperformance.

Performance assessment process

The institutional assessment process proposed for municipalities is similar in approach to the performance assessment process developed by DPME for national and provincial departments (PAT). It consists of a 6 step process as follows:

- i. Under the supervision and coordination of the provincial department responsible for local government, the municipality carries out a self-assessment using a standard questionnaire and internal validation by Municipal Manager and Executive Mayor

- ii. DPME in collaboration with the DCoG, National Treasury, Auditor-General, sector departments and the relevant provincial department responsible for local government conduct validation of the self-assessment against evidence and drawing on secondary data (produced by existing tools, the Auditor General, the NT, DCoG, sector department assessments, etc)
- iii. At times subject matter experts could be called in to conduct assessment on level 4 and confirm level 3 requirements (explained in table below)
- iv. Engagement between the assessment team and management team of the municipality to discuss results
- v. Municipality develops improvement plan to address area of weakness and provincial local government departments support and monitor implementation and feed reports to DPME on a regular basis.

INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

What performance areas we will be assessing?

While it is tempting to want to include a multitude of institutional performance areas to be assessed, the approach encouraged here is to focus on the fundamentals. That is a floor of minimum institutional performance areas that urgently require attention and consolidation given the current state of performance of many municipalities. **Getting the basics right is the emphasis in this iteration of the municipal assessment tool and this will pave the way for adding further performance areas in the future.** Moreover detail performance reports are already in place particularly in areas of municipal finance, auditing and sector reports (particularly water and sanitation). These should continue and this assessment tool draws on these as sources (for validation and general data) rather than attempts to duplicate them.

The Municipal Performance Areas that will be assessed by this tool fall into the following 6 categories:

1. Planning
2. Human Resources
3. Financial
4. Service Delivery
5. Community Engagement
6. Governance

The manner in which the tool is designed is consistent with the theory of change logic or results-based approach. Practically this means that for each key performance area, example Integrated Development Planning,

- ✓ A high level definition or objective is defined.
- ✓ Next the tool spells out the core performances (or performance standards) that are critical to reaching this objective. These are limited in number and range between 2 and 6 performance standards depending on the performance area.
- ✓ The tool then proceeds to list the standard or measures of performance for each performance standard against which the municipality will be assessed to determine the level of performance.

The tables at the end of this document lay out the format for capturing the elements (key performance area, performance standards, standards or measures, best evidence, and performance level) for each performance area.

It is intended that each of the above performance areas will be assessed against a set of core performance standards using the best available evidence. On the basis of this evidence, each standard is scored using the level 1 to 4 descriptors as shown below.

Descriptors of levels of performance

Level	Description
Level 1	Municipality is non-compliant with legal/regulatory requirements or established norms and standards
Level 2	Municipality is compliant with legal/regulatory requirements
Level 3	Municipality is fully compliant with legal/regulatory requirements and norms and standards as set out
Level 4	Municipality is fully compliant with legal/regulatory requirements, norms and standards as set out, and is performing well and smartly (not just complying)

How will the results be used?

The results from the assessments will be used in the following ways:

1. As a management tool for the Executive Mayor and Municipal Manager to reflect on the holistic performance of the municipality and to take corrective steps to address areas of underperformance.
2. As a tool for coordinating the support and intervention programmes of provincial departments of local government & national departments and to tailor and integrate the support and intervention programmes according to the specific performance gaps for each municipality.
3. Nationally as a tool providing critical integrated municipal level information to enable strategic leadership over the local government sector and guide local government policy.

Institutional Arrangements

The challenges of service delivery and municipal performance are varied, multi-dimensional, multi-sectoral and cross-cutting. This situation and complexity calls for a mechanism with high level political oversight to dramatically turn the situation facing municipalities around.

To work such a mechanism with its political oversight structure should be entrusted to lead interactions and interventions to create a consistent sense of urgency around the issues of local government performance emanating from the performance assessments based on the above tool. This would entail the following:

- Foreground the role of provincial departments of local government and engage the Offices of the Premier regarding monitoring, support and/or intervention in municipalities in terms of Section 139 of the Constitution and the proposed Monitoring, Support and Intervention Bill.
- Produce a municipal level diagnostic based on the performance assessment tool above and facilitate development of an improvement plan.
- Identify political and administrative support initiatives and/or interventions given the unique situation in each municipality.
- Set out practical steps to give effect to the initiatives/ interventions in terms of the improvement plan.
- Monitor progress, report and evaluate impact and provide feedback to the President and Cabinet.
- Provide strategic leadership over the local government sector and guide policy reform using the evidence and knowledge from country-wide municipal assessments.

Given the above the principle tasks would be to provide a basis for improving municipal planning, support, finance and institutional performance in a manner that is responsive or suited to the unique institutional and socio-economic context of each municipality as well as to improve cross sphere and cross departmental

coordination and management of information and constant monitoring and evaluation of the local government sector.

Structure

It is envisaged that the overall structure will consist of two components; a technical component and a political oversight component.

The technical component will comprise two sub-components as follows:

1. A Monitoring and Evaluation sub-component with the key responsibility of facilitating municipal area-based data coordination, analysis and options for improving performance. This sub-component will drive the data driven machinery to get a precise picture of the situation in each municipality using the assessment tool. Analyse the major constraints to service delivery performance. Identify the political and administrative initiatives/interventions and propose options for overcoming the constraints. This sub-component will be led by DPME supported by DCoG, National Treasury and sector departments as required.
2. A Planning and Intervention sub-component with the primary responsibility for policy alignment, planning and decision-making and coordination of interventions in conjunction with provinces based on the evidence from the M&E sub-component. This sub-component will be an inter-departmental team made up of key departments impacting on local government. Its role will be to review options generated by the M&E sub-component, link up with provinces, determine cross-departmental initiatives or sector specific interventions, extract commitments from relevant national, provincial and municipal role players and agree on mechanisms to track and monitor actions. This sub-component will be convened by DCoG and DPME.

The products of the technical component will be fed into a political oversight structure comprising a small group of Ministers chaired by Minister of Performance Monitoring, Evaluation and Administration in The Presidency.

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT TOOL

1. Key Performance Area: Integrated Development Planning		Overall Score
<p>Definition: The municipality's planning processes conform to legislative and regulatory requirements and the development plans have clear and measurable outputs and targets and are aligned to the budget and effectively monitored.</p>		
<p>Performance Standard: 1.1 The Integrated Development Plan (IDP) reflects credible plans for maintenance, upgrade, extension and building of new infrastructure, extension of basic services, and is spatially referenced</p>		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDP is not prepared according to prescripts and annually reviewed and/or adopted within specified timeframes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No IDP IDP is non-compliant to prescripts IDP not adopted within specified timeframe 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDP is prepared according to prescripts and annually reviewed and adopted within specified timeframes. Spatial Development Framework developed and informs physical development as per IDP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council resolution and MEC approval of the IDP Spatial Development Framework 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Infrastructure development plans, sector master plans and frameworks as relevant, are adopted and inform the IDP (and annexed to IDP) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disaster Management Plan Land Use Management Framework and System; Water Services Development Plan (WSDP); Water Resources Plan; Forestry Plan; Integrated Transport Plan; Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP); Roads & Storm Water Master Plan; Energy Master Plan (Electricity Master Plan); Infrastructure Investment Plan; Housing Plan; Informal Settlement Upgrading Plan (ISUP); Area Based Plans (Land Reform); 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Projects in infrastructure plans are spatially referenced, and location, status and condition of existing infrastructure mapped and maintenance plans are in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure Asset Management Register Mapped Infrastructure Asset Management Plan/Long-term infrastructure upgrade and maintenance plan Geo-spatially referenced infrastructure investment plan (integrated infrastructure master plan) Integrated engineering/town planning office & GIS system 	

Performance Standard: 1.2 The IDP includes extension of basic services plan		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of service backlogs is not determined 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of backlogs determined Technology and service level are in line with national minimum norms and standards and informed by settlement type, conditions and cost efficiency considerations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantification of backlogs per settlement Approved standards per settlement type and conditions 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Projects and costs to eliminate backlogs determined but projects funded & commissioned not adequate to meet nationally set targets for access to basic services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pipeline of projects to address backlogs and implementation plan Integration of plans of all service providers 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Projects funded and scheduled for implementation are adequate to meet nationally set targets for access to basic services Programme information management and monitoring system in place to track project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure programme information and programme management and monitoring system to track implementation. Integrated project reporting inclusive of all service providers Evidence that MIS / PMS is operational 	

Performance Standard: 1.3 Annual Plan and Budget gives expression to and is aligned with IDP		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service Delivery and Budget Implementation Plan (SDBIP) not tabled and approved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No SDBIP SDBIP is not approved 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service Delivery Budget SDBIP is tabled within 14 days after approval of budget and approved SDBIP gives effect to IDP and meets requirements as per the MFMA in terms of service delivery targets by top manager and by ward 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approved SDBIP 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Operating revenue and expenditure plan in place Capital expenditure plan linking the SDBIP to the budget in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revenue and expenditure plans Capital expenditure plan Long-term infrastructure upgrade and maintenance plan 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; SDBIP made public by ward and progress communicated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of Community/ward meetings Published notices SDBIP available in libraries and at the municipal offices long-term infrastructure upgrade and maintenance plan available in libraries and at the municipal offices 	

Performance Standard: 1.4 Performance against IDP and SDBIP		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery programmes do not have clear outputs and targets that are measurable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outputs and targets per programme not defined or measurable 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery programmes have clear outputs and targets that are measurable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measurable outputs and targets per programme Minutes of meetings with respect to public participation Operational plans in place 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework for the IDP and SDBIP in place and monitoring reports are produced regularly to track progress and inform improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M&E framework Monitoring system(s) Monitoring reports 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Management and/or programme meetings use performance reports and initiate remedial steps to address under performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of Management meetings Monitoring reports 	

2. Key Performance Area: Human resource planning and quality		Overall Score
Definition: The municipality's critical posts are filled by qualified and competent staff and plans exist to ensure the supply of critical skills and or meet critical skills gaps		
Performance Standard: 2.1 Municipal Manager, Corporate Services, Engineering Services, Financial Services, Development and Town Planning Services & Community Services meet set competency requirements		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSA Amendment Act of 2011 and MFMA regulations regarding minimum competency criteria for appointments not adopted as policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No policy 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MSA Amendment Act of 2011 and MFMA regulations regarding minimum competency criteria for appointments adopted as policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corporate service approval Council approval MEC approval Proof of policy 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; a) MM, CFO and Engineering Services meet competency criteria as per (MSA Amendment Act of 2011 & MFMA regulations) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competency reports 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; All posts meet prescribed competency criteria as per DCoG and NT Regulations where prescripts exist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competency reports HR policy Post advertisements 	

Performance Standard: 2.2 Municipality has an HR plan and vacancy rates and skills gaps are minimal and it demonstrates ability to retain and or source human capacity		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No approved organisational structure in place • No approved Human Resource (HR) Plan in place 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved organisational structure in place • Approved HR Plan in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved organogram • Approved HR Plan • Council approved Annual report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above standard(s) met, and; • Municipal Manager and all section 57 posts filled within 3 months 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment contracts • Published adverts • Appointment letters 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above standard(s) met, and; • Critical skills gaps and vacancies for professional and technical positions (engineers, technicians, registered planners, chartered accountants, technologists) filled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff profile and vacancies • Critical skills gap assessment report • Appointment letters • Post advertisements 	

Performance Standard: 2.3 Operating costs for governance and corporate management as a percentage of total operating costs		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expenditure on salaries and wages of the operating budget is more than the guideline prescribed by NT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 71 reports • NT guidelines 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expenditure on salaries and wages as a proportion of the operating budget is in line with guideline prescribed by NT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 71 reports • NT guideline 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above standard(s) met, and; • Executive management costs as a % of total personnel & operating costs are within prescribed limits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NT reports • NT circulars • NT guideline 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above standard(s) met, and; • Councillor remuneration as a % of total operating costs are within prescribed limits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NT reports • NT circulars • SALGA circulars 	

Performance Standard: 2.4 Performance agreements of municipal manager and senior management reflect the SDBIP		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Management practises does not comply with Regulation R805 flowing from MSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance agreements do not comply 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Management practises comply with Regulation R805 flowing from MSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signed performance agreements 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Performance agreements of senior managers submitted & approved before 1 July by Council Performance agreements of senior managers are consistent with SDBIP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signed performance agreements SDBIP Performance score cards 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Performance bonuses reflect individual performance in line with institutional performance, Substandard performance and/or misconduct of senior managers are dealt with in compliance to Regulation R344 flowing from MSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signed performance agreements SDBIP Performance assessment results Performance score cards 	

3. Key Performance Area: Financial management		Overall Score
Definition: A local government system that demonstrates sound and sustainable financial management capabilities and consistently achieves unqualified/clean audit opinions		
Performance Standard: 3.1 Auditing outcomes of local government		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audited financial statements are not tabled on time and/or does not comply with A-G requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AG report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audited financial statements are tabled on time and complies with A-G requirements External Audit Committee/MPAC in place & meets as scheduled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AG report Minutes of meetings 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Internal Audit with suitably qualified staff in place, meets as scheduled and that reports to Accounting Officer and External Audit Committee. Appropriate policies & processes on asset management, supply chain management and procurement in place & implemented accordingly. Appropriate financial delegations are in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of meetings Asset management policy and procedure Supply Chain Management policy and procedure Procurement Policy and procedure Anti-corruption strategy Approved HR plan Approved financial delegations 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Municipality acts on audit reports and findings from External Audit Committee/MPAC, Internal Audit Unit and A-G Improvement plan sets out clear actions for each department and managers responsible for implementation of the plan Financial and administrative processes are consistently implemented down to project level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvement Plan Improvement plan implementation monitoring reports AG report Monitoring and risk management (early-warning) system Departmental Improvement Plans 	

Performance Standard: 3.2 Budgeting and cash management		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budgets are not prepared and/or approved according to MFMA prescripts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NT reports AG reports 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budgets are prepared and approved according to MFMA prescripts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council resolution Section 71 report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Cash balances are positive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 71 report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Cash coverage is at least 3 months and cash as % of operating revenue conforms to National Treasury guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 71 report 	

Performance Standard: 3.3 Revenue management		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revenue management does not comply to the provisions as set out in the MFMA 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revenue management complies to the provisions as set out in the MFMA Appropriate revenue management policies are in place Current debtors (30 days) as proportion of own revenue are 12% and less 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tariff and indigent policies Credit control policies Debtor age analysis Year on year escalation of outstanding debtors 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Average monthly collection on billing (excluding arrears) at 90% and above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 71 reports 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Revenue improvement plan in place and implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revenue improvement plan Revenue improvement plan implementation monitoring reports Section 71 reports and proof of improved revenue 	

Performance Standard: 3.4 Expenditure management		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expenditure management does not comply with provisions as set out in the MFMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expenditure management not in line with National Treasury norms 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expenditure management complies with the provisions as set out in the MFMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over-spending on operational expenditure in line with National Treasury norms Under-spending on capital expenditure less than in line with National Treasury norms 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Spending on repairs and maintenance as a proportion of operational expenditure is in line with percentage prescribed by NT Spending per project is monitored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proof of spending on repairs and maintenance Implementation against the upgrade and maintenance plan 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Expenditure improvement plan and strategy in place to contain costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expenditure improvement plan Expenditure improvement plan implementation monitoring reports Section 71 reports and proof of cost controls 	

4. Key Performance Area: Service delivery		Overall Score
Definition: Access to functional and adequate services conforming to minimum norms and standards for basic services		
Performance Standard: 4.1 Water and Sanitation service delivery		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water and sanitation services delivery does not comply with regulations under Section 9 of the Water Services Act 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water services delivery complies with regulations under Section 9 of the Water Services Act 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate education in respect of effective water use A minimum of 25 litres per person per day or 6 kilolitres per household per month At a minimum flow rate of not less than 10 litres per minute within 200 metres of a household; and with an effectiveness such that no consumer is without a supply for more than seven full days in any year The provision of appropriate health and hygiene education A toilet meeting set norms and standards 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Water services interruptions does not continue for a period of more than 24 Consumers are provided with access to alternative water services comprising at least 10 litres of potable water per person per day; and/or sanitation services sufficient to protect health where longer interruptions occur. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual report Interruptions and service failure reports SDBIP Monthly consumption report Indigent policy Indigent register WSDP Water and sewer master plan 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Any major, visible or reported leak in its water services system is repaired within 48 hours of becoming aware thereof. A an audit of its water services development plan is included in the annual report on the implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual report Water services audit report Interruptions and service failure reports 	

Definition: Access to functional and adequate services conforming to minimum norms and standards for basic services		
Performance Standard: 4.2 Drinking Water Quality management		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Services Authority (WSA) scored less than 50% against Blue Drop requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue Drop Report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA scored between 50% and 75% against Blue Drop requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue Drop Report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA scored between 75% and 90% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue Drop Report • Monthly laboratory tests reports submitted to relevant government departments • Quarterly technical flow reports 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA scored an overall mark of at least 90% against Blue Drop certification requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue Drop Certification 	

Definition: Access to functional and adequate services conforming to minimum norms and standards for basic services		
Performance Standard: 4.3 Waste Water Quality management		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA scored less than 50% against Green Drop requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Drop Report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA scored between 50% and 80% against Green Drop requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Drop Report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA scored between 80% and 90% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Drop Report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA scored an overall mark of at least 90% against Green Drop certification requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Drop Certification 	

Definition: Access to functional and adequate services conforming to minimum norms and standards for basic services		
Performance Standard: 4.4 Refuse and solid waste management		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient licensed landfill sites and/or not all residents have access to a minimum collection/removal service at least once a week 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All residents have access to at least a basic collection/removal service at least once a week All landfill sites are licensed Compliance with NEMA / Waste Management Act prescripts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landfill permits Annual report Approved by-law Compliance reports SDBIP report Monthly Management / Performance Reports Integrated Waste Management Plan Monthly report to Department of Health Monthly report to Department of Environmental Affairs 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Litter prevention is promoted Planning to ensure adequate future landfill sites are done 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landfill permits Annual report Integrated Waste Management Report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Recycling and re-use is facilitated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landfill permits Annual report Recycling reports 	

Definition: Access to functional and adequate services conforming to minimum norms and standards for basic services		
Performance Standard: 4.5 Access to electricity and/or alternative energy		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all indigent households have access to at least an amount of energy (50kWh per household per month) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDP Annual report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All indigent households have access to at least an amount of energy (50kWh per household per month) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDP Annual report Indigent policy Indigent register 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; All residents are informed at least one day before any planned interruptions in the service Supply interruptions caused by a failure within an area serviced by a specific substation does not occur more than once in a month Compliance with NERSA regulations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual report Incident report Interruption register NERSA regulations compliance report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; All interruptions are repaired within 48 hours Energy efficiency and demand management is practised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual report 	

Definition: Access to functional and adequate services conforming to minimum norms and standards for basic services		
Performance Standard: 4.6 Municipal transportation network		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all residents have a local road with access to public facilities and/or a settlement of a minimum of 50 persons or at least 5 homesteads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual report 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All residents have a local road with access to public facilities and/or a settlement of a minimum of 50 persons or at least 5 homesteads 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual report Plan on rural road requirements as per the National Transport Act 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Planned, regular maintenance and renewal programmes implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual report Schedule of maintenance and renewal programmes Traffic management plans Urban renewal plan 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Road condition monitoring system (Visual Condition Index) in place and utilised to inform planned and unplanned maintenance Effective public transport system in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual report VCI reports Public transport plans 	

5. Key Performance Area: Community engagement		Overall Score
Definition: Local government has effective structures and systems in place to ensure that a coherent two way communication strategy that keeps citizens informed of key issues and developments as well as enables citizens to express their concerns.		
Performance Standard: 5.1 Functional Ward Committees		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all ward committees are established and meet regularly 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All ward committees are established and meet regularly Councillor attends all ward committee meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attendance register Minutes of meetings 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Quarterly ward level community meetings held in all wards Participatory ward level service improvement plans developed for each ward 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of meetings Ward level service delivery improvement plans 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; Implementation of ward level service delivery plans monitored and quarterly feedback provided to residents by WCs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports on progress with implementation of plans presented at community meetings 	

Performance Standard: 5.2 Community liaison		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no citizen services and complaints register in place 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Citizen services and complaints register in place 80% of critical complaints and call outs responded to within 48 hours 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaints register Interruption / service failure response reports Time taken to resolve critical queries and complaints Council communication system rating by citizens 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; 90% of critical complaints and call outs responded to within 48 hours Citizens are provided with feedback in respect of the resolution of complaints Executive fulfils public engagement obligations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proof of response Citizen centre rating by citizens Interruption / service failure response reports Time taken to resolve critical queries and complaints Council communication system rating by citizens Reports on public communication Minutes of meetings Report on public engagements Petitions register 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above standard(s) met, and; All critical complaints and call outs responded to within 48 hours Regular awareness is undertaken informing community of developments in the municipality including new projects and operation and maintenance activities Presidential hotline is linked to MCC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proof of awareness conducted Interruption / service failure response reports Time taken to resolve critical queries and complaints Council communication system rating by citizens Hotline query resolution reports 	

6. Key Performance Area: Governance		Overall Score
Definition: Quality governance arrangements and political leadership. Municipal councils fulfilling their constitutionally & legislatively prescribed roles and responsibilities		
Performance Standard: 6.1 Political leadership and governance		Score
Standards	Evidence	Level
Council does not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approve budget timeously; and/or • monitors financial and non-financial performance quarterly and mid-year reviews; and/or • consider annual reports of the previous financial year by 31 January; and/or • consider the oversight report by 31 March; and/or • submit audited financial statements timeously to the Auditor-General 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 71 report • Annual report • AG report 	
Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approves budget timeously; • monitors financial and non-financial performance quarterly and mid-year reviews; • consider annual reports of the previous financial year by 31 January; • consider the oversight report by 31 March; and • submit audited financial statements timeously to the Auditor-General 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 71 report • Council resolutions • Annual report • AG report • Section 57 report • Section 72 reports • SDBIP • IDP 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above standard(s) met, and; • Council oversees the performance of the administration through council & committee meetings. • The mayor provides the link between the council and administration and is responsible for regular monitoring and for tabling reports before the council. • Proper delegation of specific responsibilities and delegated powers to the mayor or executive committee • Performance rewards and bonuses are awarded commensurate with achievement of policy outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of meetings • Approved delegations • Performance Assessments • Performance Agreements of senior management reporting to the MM • Approved delegations 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above standard(s) met, and; • Councillors conduct themselves as per the Code of Conduct set out in Schedule 1 of the Systems Act • Implementation of the Access to Information Act 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance register of meetings • Declaration and/or disclosures of interests • Personal gain • Rewards, gifts and favours • Unauthorised disclosure of information • Intervention in administration and council property 	

CONTACT DETAILS:

DEPARTMENT OF PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Postal address: Private Bag X944, Pretoria, 0001

Hassen Mohamed

Deputy Director-General: Outcomes Facilitation

Tel: +27 (0)12 308 1855

Cell: +27 (0)84 678 9115

Fax: +27 (0)86 683 5455

E-mail: hassen@po.gov.za

Jackie Nel

Project/Outcomes Manager

Tel: +27 (0)12 308 1884

Cell: +27 (0)72 557 0655

Fax: +27 (0)86 2755 164

E-mail: jacquelinen@po.gov.za