



Western Cape
Government

BETTER TOGETHER.

DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

As already explained in the attached circular by the Department, this additional information will be used to compile a report on the performance of municipalities for the 2010/11 municipal financial year (as prescribed by the Municipal Systems Act).

Please ensure that the information is accurate as it will also be used in national reports that will be submitted to the Provincial Legislature, National Minister and the National Council of Provinces (NCOP).

The completed questionnaire must be signed-off by the Municipal Manager and submitted back to the Department by **13 July 2012**. An electronic copy must be e-mailed back to siyabonga.mngxe@pgwc.gov.za. Each municipality should only complete those questions as indicated as we recognise the difference between B and C municipalities.

Your co-operation in this regard will be appreciated.

CONTACT PERSON : Siyabonga Mngxe Tel: 0214833415 Cel:072 281 3297

Details of your Municipality

1 Name of municipality:	Drakenstein Municipality
2 Demarcation Code of municipality:	WCO23 Category B
3 Details of the person co-ordinating the completion of this questionnaire:	
Name:	Ms NG Ndolela
Designation:	Manager: Strategic Planning
Telephone: e.g.(+27 11 888 8888)	021-807 6219
Fax: e.g.(+27 11 888 8888)	866014098
E-mail address: eg.(someone@somewhere.co.za)	nomfundon@drakenstein.gov.za
Alternative contact person:	Mr G Cain (gurswin.cain@drakenstein.gov.za)
4 I confirm that this questionnaire has been completed	

Certification by Municipal Manager

I hereby certify that the information provided in this questionnaire is complete and correct:

Name:	Johann Mettler
Municipal Manager	Yes
Signature:	
Date:	
E-mail address: e.g.(someone@somewhere.co.za)	johann.mettler@drakenstein.gov.za / ceo@drakenstein.gov.za

Institutional Status and Capacity *(B and C Municipalities complete)*

Human Resource Management

1 Have your municipalities compiled and approved the following HR policies and plans? Please indicate whether these policies and plans have been developed or workshopped with management and staff	Comments
5 Recruitment and Selection Policy	Yes, Labour is consulted with in the development of this policy, the policy is also on the intranet for easy access.
5 Performance Management Policy	Yes (The municipality is currently reviewing the Policy.)
5 Skills Development Plan What percentage of your total budget is spent on the implementation of your skills development plan?	Yes, labour consulted and copies distributed to all directorates.
5 Employment Equity Plan	Yes, and the plan is on the intranet for easy access.
6 HRM and HRD Policies	Yes, Labour is consulted with in the development of all HR policies, HRD policy was thoroughly workshopped.

Capacity and skills development initiatives	Details
2 Please provide a list of capacity building and skills development initiatives that your municipality has implemented during 2010/11, including training courses	List is attached.

Performance Rewards	Details
3 Were there any performance rewards paid out to Section 56/57 Managers in 2010/11? If yes, how many managers received, how much was spent on rewards per beneficiary?	Yes
	Six (6) S57 Managers.
	Mr LP Coetzee R78 903.93
	Dr ST Kabanyane R95 573.83
	Mr T Mathee R78 903.93
	Mr KH Mrali R80 072.79
	Dr P Naidoo R80 075.29
	Mr CM Petersen R78 903.93

Service delivery (B and C Municipalities complete - C also for District Management Areas)

1 Indicate the number of households that gained access for the first time to the following basic infrastructure services during the year

	2010/11
1.1 Housing (refer to waiting list for RDP houses)	215
1.2 Water (on site)	303
1.3 Sanitation (households dependant on bucket system)	0
1.4 Refuse removal (once a week at site)	352
1.5 Electricity (in house)	607
1.6 Streets and storm water system (frontage to a gravel street)	All formal households have access. Systems upgraded to ± 166 houses.

2 Serviced households - the total number of households received the following services as at June 2011

Type of service	Total nr of households in municipal area	Total nr of households that are serviced	% serviced	Nr of indigent households	% indigent households
2.1 Housing (refer to waiting list for RDP houses)			150		
2.2 Water (on site)	41 107	40 213	97.8		
2.3 Sanitation (households dependant on bucket system)	41 107	40 213	97.8		
2.4 Refuse removal (once a week at site)	51 286	51 286	100%	10 854	
2.5 Electricity (in house)		All formal	100%		100%
2.6 Streets and storm water system (frontage to a gravel street)		All formal			

3 Major Backlogs

Major backlog locality	Number of households	Total cost to adress	Timeframe to be addressed
1.1 Housing	24 638		
1.2 Water	894(no service)		
1.3 Sanitation (upgrading from bucket system)	890(no service 81,buckets 38 unimproved VIP 771)		Rural subsidice scheme
1.4 Refuse Removal	No Backlogs		Rural subsidice scheme
1.5 Electricity	None	n/a	n/a
1.6 Streets and stormwater	Gravel to tar and stormwater.	R245million	10 years ±

4 What are your biggest challenges faced by the municipality in addressing the service delivery backlogs (infrastructure) ? (Give brief explanation)

Comments	
1	To retain existing scarce skills staff e.g engineers, technicians and artisans and to attract new incumbents to vacancies in view of the country wide shortage being experienced. Serious consideration should be given to a scarce skills allowance in order to retain such skills in local government and not to loose out to the private sector.
2	Upgrading of old network
3	Long processes due to environmental assessments and procurement processes and other legislative requirements before actual service can be implemented
	Adequate provision of funds to effect the required upgrading of streets and stormwater systems
	Adequate provision of funds for extension of road network in terms of Integrated Transport Master plan
	Lack of funds for both Capital and Operations and Maintenance for replacement and upgrading needs. Population growth and economic growth and development necessitates budget growth far in excess of the 5%.
	Insufficient MIG allocations from National to Western Cape and to Drakenstein. Specific funding must also be allocated from National for asset maintenance to prevent asset stripping and to keep current infrastructure operational.
	Provision of basic services on privately owned land in sustainable & economically financial viable manner
	Lack of land
	Lack of funds (and also MIG/RBIG restructured for continuous retain skilled/trained use personnel)

5 What is the % of your total capital expenditure that you have spent on each service?

	2009/10
4.1 Housing	3.66%
4.2 Water	14.85
4.3 Sanitation (upgrading from bucket system)	32.61
4.4 Refuse Removal	1.4
4.5 Electricity	12.3
4.6 Streets and stormwater	8

6 What % of your total capital budget was spent for the 2010/11 financial year

% spent	Reasons for under spending
93%	Certain planning process was not in place, late start of tender processes.

Provision of Free Basic Services (B and C Municipalities complete - C only for District Management Areas)

1 Number of indigent households in the demarcated area
 10 854

2 When does a household qualify as indigent according to your indigent policy?
 All households earning less than R2 626 per month

5 Date on which indigent list was last updated
 Jun-11

6 Analysis of Free Basic Services	Only Indigent Households			Non - Indigent Households			Areas where the municipality does not provide the service directly (eg Eskom agreements)				
	Number of Households in 2010/11	Unit per Household in 2010/11	Rand Value for 2010/11	Number of Households in 2010/11	Unit per Household in 2010/11	Rand Value for 2010/11	Number of Households in 2010/11	Unit per Household in 2010/11	Target Group	Rand Value for 2010/11	Agency responsible to deliver services on behalf of the municipality
6.1 Provision of free basic electricity	10854	100kwh	20,858	25300	100	48618.00	2056	100	Saron,Gouda	1,579	
6.2 Provision of free basic water	10854	10kl	9,721	12777	10	11443.00					
6.3 Provision of free basic sewerage	10854	R 87.50	10,031	31136	R -	0.00					
6.4 Provision of free basic refuse removal	19854	R 87.50	1,314	34146	R -	0.00					
6.5 Specify any other free services you provide in the space hereunder											
6.5.1											
6.5.2											
6.5.3											
6.5.4											
Total	52416		R41,924.00	103359		R60,061.00	2056			R1,579.00	

Good Governance (B and C Municipalities complete)

		Comments (give brief explanation where applicable)
1	Have all administrative delegations been adopted and implemented?	Yes
2	If your answer is no, give the reason why not?	
3	Has the system of delegation in terms of Section 59 of the Municipal Systems Act, of 2000, been adopted?	Yes
4	If your answer is no, give the reason why not?	
5	Has the municipality defined in terms of Section 53 of the Municipal Systems Act, of 2000, roles and responsibilities of committees and political office bearers?	Yes
6	By-Laws: Please indicate new developed, revised By-Laws. What public participation initiatives conducted prior to adoption of By-Laws. Date of public participation. Were the By-Laws gazetted? If yes, what is the date of publication?	1. Review of the By-law relating to the Establishment of Improvement Districts. Date adopted 15 June 2011.
		2. Review of the Advisory Board for Nature Reserves. Date adopted 15 June 2011. No public participation was conducted and the By-laws were not gazetted as no amendments were made.
7	If your answer is no, give the reason why not?	
8	How many of the following meetings did take place in the year?	2010/11
	Council	10
	Executive mayoral committee	19
	Portfolio committees (indicate per committee)	Finance : 3; Social, Rural & Economic Development: 1; Corporate Strategic and HR: 2
	Municipal Management meeting	42
	IDP Representative Forum meetings	The Municipality did not established an IDP Representative Forum.
	Ward committee meetings	31

9	Please give examples of public communication and participatory initiatives employed by your municipality. Make specific reference to IDP/Budget and performance management representative forums, timing of meetings, approximate numbers attending, the purpose of the meetings and the groups represented.	The Municipality has a communications unit which implements its Communication Strategy and Policy. Customer satisfaction surveys are conducted and Functional Complaints Management Systems are implemented. Newsletters are distributed to the community at least quarterly. IDP and Budget Roadshows were held in 31 wards and Ward Development Plans were compiled. Most of the meetings were held weekly in the evening, but community participation and communication was not satisfactory. The Municipal website as well as the press also serves as a tool for community participation.
Public Meetings		
10	How many of the following meetings that took place in the year did not have a quorum? Please provide reasons (for quorums not achieved) where applicable	2010/11
Council		None
Executive mayoral committee		None
11	Does the municipality have a "Code of Conduct" for staff members and councillors and has it been developed and workshopped with all	Yes
12	If your answer is no, give the reason why not?	
13	Has the "Code of Conduct" been communicated to the local community?	Yes, through IDP roadshows.
14	If your answer is no, give the reason why not?	
15	Have all staff members and councillors declared their interest in accordance with the Code of Conduct?	Yes
16	If your answer is no, give the reason why not?	
17	Is any staff member and/or councillor in arrears with payment of municipal rates for more than three months?	No
18	If your answer is yes, give the reason why and what your municipality is doing to correct the situation	
19	Does your municipality have an ethics officer	No
20	If your answer is no to any of the above, give the reason/s why not?	An appointment must still be made.
21	Are your ward councillors available on pre-determined dates to address constituent needs?	Yes
22	Are these dates published?	Yes
23	Public satisfaction on services: What satisfaction surveys undertaken by the municipality during 2010/11	Service Delivery and Community Satisfaction Survey Project.
24	What was the overall satisfaction of the public on the Municipality, Services provided by the municipality and office bearers?	The survey suggested that Drakenstein households and businesses are most troubled with the unsatisfactory provision of essential services, community facilities and services ,economic development,account and billing services and performance of staff.

Local Economic Development (LED) (B and C Municipalities complete - C also for District Management Areas)

1 Strategy	Comments (give brief explanation where applicable)
1.1 Has your municipality compiled and adopted a LED strategy: date of approval by Council?	Yes. Approved strategy October 2006.
1.2 If no, give reasons. If yes, how was it developed - service provider or internally	The strategy was developed by external service providers.
1.3 Have you consulted and involved the relevant stakeholders (business, women and youth) in the development of your LED?	Yes
1.4 If no, by when will it be compiled and implemented?	
1.5 If yes to 1.1, what are your biggest challenges in implementing?	Staff capacity and too little staff to implement strategies
1.6 If yes, give an indication of the employment growth (<i>or decline</i>) in the municipal area and quantify the permanent jobs created by your municipality in capital projects?	There has been a decline in employment growth due to many factories closing down. No permanent jobs are created by the municipality only temporary work opportunities.
1.7 Is LED performed "on behalf of " the municipality by an official?	By an official.
1.8 Please indicate the "placement" of the LED officer within the Municipal Organogram;	LED Officers are part of the LED and Tourism Section which fall within the Directorate of Strategic Services .
1.9 Does LED proposals feature in Departmental Business Plans and performance?	Yes
1.10 Does your municipality implement your capital projects in a labour intensive way	Yes
1.11 If yes, how many tempory jobs were created during the 2010/11 municipal financial year?	830 temporary work opportunities.
1.12 How does the municipality monitor implementation?	Quarterly reports are submitted to the Executive Mayoral Committee on progress on LED Projects as well as EPWP and job creation projects.

Challenges and priorities *(B and C Municipalities to complete)*

1 What were the municipality's three (3) biggest challenges during the 2010/11 year. Specifically challenges related to political and administrative governance, service delivery, bulk infrastructure maintenance, expansion etc internal capacity and constraints

Comments	
1	In terms of Internal capacity and constraints - budget constraints around the organogram. The appropriateness of the organogram in relation to functions that has to be fulfilled. The non existence of the implementation of the TASK job evaluation system.
2	In regard to maintenance the fact that no proper maintenance plan exists and the amount of money allocated towards the maintenance of our buildings.
3	Scarce skills / retention of technical staff.
4	Financial limitation to implement priority projects.

2 What were the municipality's three (3) biggest spending priorities during the last year? Why, please comment on motivations

Comments	
1	Waste Water Management- R 82 million was spent due to Paarl WWTW phase 2 upgrades and extension, Pentz street upgrading and extensions pump station, WWTW Wellington rehabilitation and extension and the start of new projects Bulk gravity outfall sewer Carolina Road and Weshank
2	Water - R 39 million was spent due to Windmeul Paarl reticulation new reservoir, Groenheuwel high pressure main installation , Masterplan upgrading to Newton, network upgrading and replacement. WWTW Paarl mountain and new pipe line from Withoogte and Antonies vlei.
3	Electricity- R 26 million was spent due to Electrification distribution, upgrading of old network, extension of mains and general distribution and electrification of housing projects.
4	
5	