

cogta

Department: Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs PROVINCE OF KWAZULU-NATAL

# IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION OF CAPITAL PROJECTS FUNDED IN 2015/2016 FINANCIAL YEAR

SOUTHERN REGION

February 2018

The Evaluation Directorate



# CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	. 2
2.	REPORT OUTLINE	. 2
3.	SUPPORT PROVIDED PER SUPPORT PROGRAMME IN THE SOUTHERN REGION	.4
3.1.	THE MASSIFICATION PROGRAMME	.5
Elec	trification of 352 HH in Ward 6 Mandeni (Mathunzi, Izimpohlo, St Cyprian & Abashumi)	.6
Okh	ahlamba electrification of 500HH in Sandlwane	10
Ubu	hlebezwe electrification of 1100HH in Ufafa, Mahehle and Umkhunya	14
Umz	umbe electrification of 322 households in Amen Creche-Ekubusisweni and KwaMgayi	19
Sum	mary of the Massification Programme support provided in the Southern region	23
4.	OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE SUPPORT PROVIDED IN THE SOUTHERN REGION	24

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

The Evaluation of capital projects aims to assess the value for money in the capital projects that the Department had invested in over the years. The evaluation of the capital projects within the 2015/2016 financial year will be a two part report, which will cover two regions of the Province of KwaZulu-Natal being the Northern region which covers projects within Umkhanyakude, Zululand, King Cetshwayo and Umzinyathi districts. While the Southern region cover projects within Ilembe, Uthukela, Ugu and Harry Gwala districts. This evaluation report presents the findings of 2015/2016 funded capital projects of the Southern region.

# 2. REPORT OUTLINE

This report presents the findings of the evaluations conducted on ten Capital projects within the Northern region. Considering the magnitude of information produced on the analysis of each project, it was deemed fit that the findings include the use of indicators, to enable the reader to obtain as much detail as to the project and factors that influence or inhibit the success of the projects that had been supported. Each project report covers 6 assessment areas as per the Capital projects value chain which is as follows.

# Area 1: Project conceptualisation

This area will consider the conceptualisation and design process of the project and aims to establish if this process was conducted. The following indicators will be used to assess this area.

Area of assessment	Indicator	Good	Bad
Source of project need	%Project needs based on community engagements & on Government priorities/Legislative prescripts: % with no source of project needs	100%:0%	0%:100%
Project within IDP	Project within 2015/2016 IDP: Project not within 2015/2016 IDP	1:0	0:1
Feasibility study and design of project	Feasibility study& design conducted: Feasibility study& design not conducted	1:0	0:1
	%Feasibility study &design conducted in- house: %Feasibility study &design outsourced	N/A	N/A

# Area 2: The support application process

This area assesses the relevance and the efficiency of the support application process and how it influences the projects that are being supported. The following indicators are used to assess this area

Area of assessment	Indicator	Good	Bad
Support application compliance	Extent of compliance in submission of business plans, MoAs & Council resolutions	Below 100%	100%
Timing of funding transfer	On time indicator=Planned time +/-Actual receipt (Departmental perspective)	0 or +ve figure	-ve figure
	On time indicator=Planned time +/-Actual receipt (Municipal perspective)	0 or +ve figure	-ve figure
Funding adequacy	Satisfaction on funding adequacy: Dissatisfaction on funding adequacy ratio	1:0	0:1
Period of support application	Period of support application process	N/A	N/A

### Area 3: Project inputs and expenditure

This area presents the funds received and establishes if the deliverable costs had deviated and if expenditure challenges had been experienced.

Area of assessment	Indicator	Good	Bad
Funding arrangement	Funding transferred in full or in tranches	N/A	N/A
Funding requested against funding received	Funds received against funds requested	100%	Below 100%
Cost per deliverable	Cost per deliverable	N/A	N/A
	Subsequent changes in the cost per deliverable	0%	1% and above
Financial performance	actual expenditure in duration/planned expenditure in duration	0% or +ve figure	-ve figure

# Area 4: Project implementation

This area considers the implementation of the projects as assess project implementation in terms of time and scope. This area will also consider challenges experienced in project implementation and working relations between project stakeholders. The following indicators are used to assess this area.

Area of assessment	Indicator	Good	Bad
Delays time in commencement of implementation	Implementation commencement delay time in months	0	1 and above
Duration in implementation ahead of time on behind schedule	Implementation time in surplus or in deficit as per cashflow reports (in months)	0 and +ve figure	-ve figure
Deliverable delay from planned completion	Ongoing Completion time beyond planned completion time as of the time of site visit	0	1 and above
Structures in place to monitor scope and quality	Project Steering Committee in place with relevant stakeholders	In place	Not in place
	Meeting frequency	Monthly & quarterly	Not meeting
Project implemented/ completed on time	d/ completed on Project implemented/completed in time: Project not implemented/completed in time ratio		0:1
Project implemented/ completed on scope	Project implemented/completed on scope: Project not implemented/completed on scope ratio	1:0	0:1
Project implemented/completed in budget	Project implemented/completed within budget: Project not implemented/completed on within budget	1:0	0:1
Submission of progress reports to the Department	Municipality submits reports to the Department: Municipality does not submit reports to the Department	1:0	0:1
Challenges experienced	%Challenges are internally focused: % Challenges are externally focused	N/A	N/A
Working relations internally and externally with stakeholders	%Good working relation internally: %Bad working relation internally ratio	100%:0%	0%:100%
	%Good working relation externally: %Bad working relation externally ratio	100%:0%	0%:100%

## Area 5: Project outcomes

The outcomes of the project are measured by project utilisation. This area looks into the functionality of the project utilisation and level of usage by project end users. The following indicators are used to measure this area.

Area of assessment	Indicator	Good	Bad
Planned outcomes against actual	%Functional connections: % non-functional	70%-100%: 0%-	0-50% :50%-
outcomes	connections	30%	100%
	% project used by end user: % project not used	70%-100%: 0%-	0-50% :50%-
	by end user	30%	100%
	% Community satisfaction: %Community	70%-100%: 0%-	0-50% :50%-
	dissatisfaction	30%	100%

## Area 6: Value for money summary

This provides a summary of the project status according to the value for money elements being Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness. The findings would assist in establishing which areas needed to be optimised to ensure that the project would be implemented effectively.

# 3. SUPPORT PROVIDED PER SUPPORT PROGRAMME IN THE SOUTHERN REGION

A brief profile of the projects supported in the Northern region

Support programme	Massification
Total investment in the 2015/2016 financial year	R 60 956 000
Projects supported	4 projects
	Electrification of 352 HH in Ward 6 Mandeni (Mathunzi, Izimpohlo, St Cyprian & Abashumi)
Projects supported	Okhahlamba electrification of 500HH in Sandlwane Ubuhlebezwe electrification of 1058 HH in Ufafa, Mahehle and Umkunya
	Umzumbe electrification of 322 households in Amen Creche-Ekubusisweni and KwaMgayi

# **3.1. THE MASSIFICATION PROGRAMME**



Funding received	R8 000 000								96%
r unung rooorrou	Planned	Actu	al						
Deliverable	352 functional		nouseholds	with function	onal				
Denterable		electrified conn				67%		67% 67	%
	households		ng for energ				E00/E00/		
Project	December 2015						50%50%		
commencement		Marc	h 2016			33%		33% 33%	
Completion	May 2016	Proje	ect still in pro	ogress		55%		55% 55%	
Planned project	8 months			0					
duration			onths						
Expenditure	R8 000 000		00 000 or 1	7% over					4%
Actual progress	In progress		nditure ogress			Conceptualisati	on Support I application	Project Inputs Implement	ation Project outcom
Date of visit	6 February 2018		Jy1633				application		
Need for the project			- 1 - 1 <b>- 1</b>						
ELEMENT 1: PRO.	protests. The munic already being impler Municipality would v infrastructure was er	mented in vork within asy to inst	the Evutha the deep r	area. A pa	artnershi	ip with ES	KOM was	created whe	
Area of	Indicators		Good	Bad	Actua	al	Explanati	on	
measurement									
Source of project	%Project needs based o	n	100%:0	0%:100	100%	:0%	Informed a	as a result of	communi
need	community engagements		%	%			protests.		
	Government						•		
	priorities/Legislative pres								
	% with no source of proje	ect							
	needs		1:0	0:1					
Project within IDP		Project within 2015/2016 IDP:			0:1		Project no	t within IDP	
	Project not within 2015/2 IDP								
Feasibility study	Feasibility study& design	1	1:0	0:1	1:0		Conducter	d feasibility s	tudy but
and design of		onducted: Feasibility study&			1.0			ghly due to p	
project	design not conducted						nunity protes		
p	%Feasibility study &desi	an	N/A	N/A	0%:10	00%		cipality used	
	conducted in-house:	5					designs		
	%Feasibility study &desi	gn					0		
	outsourced	-							
	ORT APPLICATION PRO	CESS		T					
Area of measurement	Indicators		Good	Bad	Actua	al	Explanati	on	
Support	Extent of compliance in		Below	100%	100%				
application	submission of business p	olans	100%	10070		liance			
compliance	MoAs & Council resolution		10070		comp	lianoo			
Timing of funding	On time indicator=Planne		0 or +ve	-ve	-3 mc	onths	Project wa	as supposed	to
transfer	+/-Actual receipt (Depart	mental	figure	figure				e in Septemb	
	perspective)		-	-				ipality submit	
								ation to the D	
								per 2015. As	
								e transferred	in
							December		
	On time indicator=Plann		0 or +ve	-ve	0			ty noted that	
	+/-Actual receipt (Munici	pal	figure	figure				ferred in time	before th
	perspective)			1			hudaat ad	justment.	

	PORT APPLICATION PROCESS	0	Devi	A . f 1	
Area of	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement		1.0	0.4		
Funding adequacy	Satisfaction on funding adequacy: Dissatisfaction on funding adequacy ratio	1:0	0:1	0:1	When the project went to tender i was realised during surveying tha an extra R1.4 million was needed to fund the project. This was a result new households moving in the areas after the premarketing phase. Other cases related to houses being built in inaccessible areas, increasing costs per
					connection. This delayed the project as a result
Period of support	Period of support application	N/A	N/A	21 working	
application				days	
	JECT INPUTS & EXPENDITURE		Ded	A = 4 + = 1	<b>F</b> ourte estimation
Area of measurement	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
Funding arrangement	Funding transferred in full or in tranches	N/A	N/A	Full	
Funding requested against funding received	Funds received against funds requested	100%	Below 100%	100%	
Cost per deliverable		N/A	N/A	R 21 448 Per	
	Cost per deliverable			connection	
	Subsequent changes in the cost per deliverable	0%	1% and above	R25 201 or 17% variance	An extra R1.4 was needed to func the project. This was discovered when conducting the surveying after the premarketing phase.
Financial performance	actual expenditure in duration/planned expenditure in duration	0% or +ve figure	-ve figure	-17%	R9 400 000/R8 000 000 or 17% over expenditure.
ELEMENT 4: PRO	JECT IMPLEMENTATION				
Area of	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement Delays time in commencement of implementation	Implementation commencement delay time in months	0	1 and above	4 months	Project was supposed to commence in December 2015 but commenced in April 2016.
Duration in implementation ahead of time on behind schedule	Implementation time in surplus or in deficit as per cash flow reports (in months)	0 and +ve figure	-ve figure	-19 months	Project was supposed to take 8 months but took 19 months.
Deliverable delay from planned completion	Ongoing Completion time beyond planned completion time as of the time of site visit	0	1 and above	12 months	22 months
Structures in place to monitor scope and quality	Project Steering Committee in place with relevant stakeholders	In place	Not in place	In place	A project Steering Committee consists of the Municipality, Consultant and the Department.
	Meeting frequency	Monthly & quarterly	Not meeting	Monthly	
	How Quality of the deliverable is ensured			ed by the consi used to confirm	ulting engineer, councillor, induna m numbers

<b>ELEMENT 4: PRO</b>	JECT IMPLEMENTATION	N			
Area of measurement	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
Project implemented/ completed on time	Project implemented/completed in time: Project not implemented/completed in time ratio	1:0	0:1	0:1	<ol> <li>Additional funds were sourced for implementation of project before going to tender</li> <li>Meters which were brought to Eskom for encoding in February 2017 were only brought back in September 2017</li> </ol>
Project implemented/ completed on scope	Project implemented/completed on scope: Project not implemented/completed on scope ratio	1:0	0:1	0:1	There was an addition of 21 households to the initial scope.
Project implemented/com pleted in budget	Project implemented/completed within budget: Project not implemented/completed on within budget	1:0	0:1	0:1	An additional R1.4 million was needed for the project, to which funds were sourced from savings from another project was used to fund the shortfall. Realised underestimation of costs when surveys are conducted.
Submission of progress reports to the Department	Municipality submits reports to the Department: Municipality does not submit reports to the Department	1:0	0:1	1:0	
Challenges experienced	%Challenges are internally focused:% Challenges are externally focused	N/A	N/A	33%:67%	<ul> <li>Sourcing of R1.4 million before going for tender.</li> <li>Working relations with Eskom. Not participating in project processes</li> <li>Community protests when delays are experienced</li> </ul>
Working relations internally and externally with stakeholders	%Good working relation internally:%Bad working relation internally ratio	100%:0%	0%:100%	100%:0%	
	%Good working relation externally:%Bad working relation externally ratio	100%:0%	0%:100%	0:100%	Working relations with Eskom. Not participating in project processes.
ELEMENT 5: PROJ Area of	IECT OUTCOMES	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement	indicators	0000	Dau	Actual	
Planned outcomes against actual	%Functional connections: % non- functional connections	70%- 100%: 0%-30%	0-50% :50%- 100%	96%:4%	Out of the 4 households visited, all had functional connections.
outcomes	% project used by end user: % project not used by end user	70%- 100%: 0%-30%	0-50% :50%- 100%	96%:4%	Only 13 households in the area are waiting for the energising process.
	% Community satisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction	70%- 100%: 0%-30%	0-50% :50%- 100%	96%:4%	Communities were highly satisfied with the project.

<b>ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINA</b>	ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS							
Cost of maintenance of th	e project	Project will be handed	over to Eskom					
Recommendations ELEMENT 7: VALUE FO		<ul><li>protects challenge</li><li>Improve commun</li><li>Also consider the</li></ul>	<ul> <li>Also consider the funding of O&amp;M in areas under the Municipal electricity grid.</li> </ul>					
		ATURS						
Vfm element	Finding		Explanation					
Economy	Not Economica		Project experienced117% expenditure.					
Efficiency Not efficient			Project was not implemented in time, scope and budget					
Effectiveness	Effective		Out of 4 households visited, all had functional connections.					





Above: Infrastructure installed in Mathunzi and a meter installed in one of the households





Above: One of the households with fully functional connections in the St Cyprian area



Above: Households electrified in the Izimpohlo area and a meter installed in one of the households

Okhahlamba electr	ification o	f 500HH in Sandlwane				100% 100%
Funding received		R20 000 000.00				100% 100%
•		Planned	Actua			
Deliverable		500 functional	Est 50	0 functional	67%	64%
		connections	conne	connections		50%50%
Project commence	ment	November 2015	June 2	2016		
Completion		June 2016	Nover	nber 2017	33%	36%
	Planned project duration		17 mo	nths		
Expenditure			R17 4	00 000 or		
		R20 000 000.00	87%			0% 0%
Actual progress		Complete	Comp	lete	Conceptualisation	Support Project Inputs Implementation Project outcomes
Date of visit		8 February 2018				application
Need for the projec	t		nfrastructure	were prioriti		e areas neglected in terms of re also protests in the area which
FI FMENT 1:PRO	IFCT CON			_00.		
Area of	Indicato		Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement	maiouto		0000	Duu	/ lotuul	
Source of project	%Project	needs based on	100%:0%	0%:100	100%:0%	Project also informed by protests
need		ity engagements & on	100 /0.0 /0	%	100 /0.0 /0	in area which resulted in the
	Governm					project being prioritized
	priorities/	Legislative prescripts:				F
		o source of project				
	needs					
Project within IDP	Project w	vithin 2015/2016 IDP:	1:0	0:1	0:1	Project not in project list.
	Project n	ot within 2015/2016				
	IDP					
Feasibility study		y study& design	1:0	0:1	1:0	
and design of		d: Feasibility study&				
project		ot conducted				
		ility study &design	N/A	N/A	0%:100%	In 2013 a service provider was
		d in-house:				appointed to conduct a study and
		ility study &design				develop a sector plan
	outsource					
		LICATION PROCESS				
Area of	Indicato	rs	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement			<b>.</b>	1000/	4000/	
Support		compliance in	Below	100%	100%	
application		on of business plans,	100%		compliance	
compliance		Council resolutions	0.07.000		1 month	1 month hohind Duciness plan
Timing of funding transfer		ndicator=Planned time	0 or +ve	-Ve figuro	-1 month	1 month behind. Business plan
liansier	perspecti	receipt (Departmental	figure	figure		states that project to commence in November but Department
	perspect	ve)				received Business plan for
						processing in December 2015.
	On time i	ndicator=Planned time	0 or +ve	-ve	0	Municipality noted that funding
		receipt (Municipal	figure	figure		was transferred in time before the
	perspecti					budget adjustment.
Funding		ion on funding	1:0	0:1	0:1	Funding initially enough, but with
adequacy		y: Dissatisfaction on				people moving in after the
		idequacy ratio				premarketing & surveying phase,
	<b>U</b>					there was an increased demand.
						This escalated the costs and
			1			affecting funding received
						allecting fulfulling received
Period of support application	Period of	support application	N/A	N/A	15 working	

<b>ELEMENT 3: PRO</b>	JECT INPUTS & EXPENDITURE				
Area of	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement					
Funding arrangement	Funding transferred in full or in tranches	N/A	N/A	Full	
Funding requested against funding received	Funds received against funds requested	100%	Below 100%	100%	
Cost per deliverable	Cost per deliverable	N/A	N/A	R40 000 per cor	nnection
	Subsequent changes in the cost per deliverable	0%	1% and above	0%	R34800 or -13% variance
Financial performance	actual expenditure in duration/planned expenditure in duration	0% or +ve figure	-ve figure	0%	R17 400 000 or 87%
<b>ELEMENT 4: PRO</b>	JECT IMPLEMENTATION	1			
Area of	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement Delays time in commencement of	Implementation commencement delay time in months	0	1 and above	4 months	The project was supposed to commence in November 2015 but commenced in March 2016.
implementation Duration in implementation ahead of time on behind schedule	Implementation time in surplus or in deficit as per cashflow reports (in months)	0 and +ve figure	-ve figure	-9 months	The project was supposed to take 8 months but took 17 months
Deliverable delay from planned completion	Ongoing Completion time beyond planned completion time as of the time of site visit	0	1 and above	0 months	
Structures in place to monitor scope and quality	Project Steering Committee in place with relevant stakeholders	In place	Not in place	In place	Technical meetings and Project Steering Committees in place that consisted of the municipality, the service provider and councillors.
	Meeting frequency	Monthly & quarterly	Not meeting	Monthly	Meetings on a monthly basis.
	How Quality of the deliverable is ensured	Using the		nittees, the municipality was able to ual deliverables.	
Area of measurement	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
Project implemented/ completed on time	Project implemented/completed in time: Project not implemented/completed in time ratio	1:0	0:1	0:1	<ol> <li>Increasing number of households, increasing demand.</li> <li>Delays in planned outages/energizing from Eskom.</li> <li>Delays were experienced in procurement processes that resulted in the consulting engineer not being appointed on time.</li> <li>Delays experienced by the contractor in obtaining materials</li> </ol>
Project implemented/ completed on scope	Project implemented/completed on scope: Project not implemented/completed on scope ratio	1:0	0:1	1:0	On scope there were a lot deviations as the initial scope was 440 at premarketing and had but estimates of 500 HH allowed us to make provisions.
Project implemented/co mpleted in budget	Project implemented/completed within budget: Project not implemented/completed on within budget	1:0	0:1	1:0	Below budget. Experienced a R2.6 million saving.

Area of measurement         Indicators         Good         Bad         Actual         Explanation           Submission of progress reports to the Department         Municipality submits reports to be actual the Department         1:0         0:1         1:0         Consolidation of monthly reports submited           Challenges Area of the Department         Moral impact and the Department focused % Challenges are internally focused % Challenges are internally focused % Challenges are internally focused         N/A         N/A         0%:100%         1: Increasing number of households, increasing demand. 2: Delays in portarement processes resulting in the consulting engineer not being appointed on time.         2: Delays in portarement processes resulting in the consulting engineer not being appointed on time.         3: Delays in portarement processes resulting in the consulting engineer not being appointed on time.         3: Delays in portarement processes resulting in the consulting engineer not being appointed on time.           Working relations internally and relation internally ratio         100%:0         0%:100         00:00%         Bod Morking relations for concile and does not give accurate information on the status of the project.           Heterensity ratio         100%:0         0%:0         0%:00%         0%:00%         Morking relations with Eskon: The Municipality to push Eskon to give a a test for outages           ELEMENT 5: PROVECT UTCOME         70%         0:50%         100%:0%         100%:0%         100%:0%         100%:0%         100	ELEMENT 4: PRO	JECT IMPLEMENTATION						
Submission of progress reports to the Department         Municipality submits reports to the Department         On- Challenges         On- Submitted         Consolidation of monthly reports submitted           Challenges         %Challenges are internally tocsed: % Challenges are internally schemelinges are internally experienced         NA         NA         NA         1: Increasing number of households, increasing demand. 2: Delays in planned outgass/energizing by SKNM 3: Delays in procurement processes resulting in the consulting engineer not being appointed on time. 4: Delays in contractor in obtaining materials           Working relations internally ratio         100%:0         0%:100         1000% %         0000% %         Good internal working relationship internally ratio           Working relations internally ratio         100%:0         0%:100         00%:100         0000% %         Working relations with Estom. The working relation metanally ratio           ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES         Good         Bad         Actual         Explanation           Area of masement         indicators mon-functional connections: % mon-functional connections: % mon-functional connections: % mon-functional connections: % mon-functional connections         70%- 100%         0.50%- 0%:00%         Uotifices         Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lighting strikes.           Viscommunity dissatisfaction mon-functional connections         70%- 0%:00%         0.50%- 0%:00%         2%:00%         Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lighting str		Indicators		Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation	
progress reports to the Department       the Department       Department       submitted         Challenges experienced       %Challenges are internally focused.*S Challenges are externally focused       NA       NA       NA       1: Increasing number of households, increasing demand. 2. Delays in planned outgestenergraing by ESKOM 3: Delays in contractor in obtaining materials internally with stakeholders         Working relations internally with stakeholders       %Good working relation internally ratio       100%:0       0%:100       000:100%       Good internal working relations shift internally ratio         ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES       Totagestener weesurement       Indicators       Good 0%:100       0%:100       Working relations internally ratio         Planned outcomes against actual outcomes       %Functional connections % %Community asistifaction       70%- 100%       0.50%- 100%       100%:0%       Households are electrified however as a result the neighbourhood is prone to lighting strikes.         Viscommunity asistifaction: %Community asistif		Municipality cubroite years	rda da	1.0	0.1	1.0	Concellidation of monthly reports	
Internality         does not submit reports to the Department         NA         NA         NA           Challenges experienced         %Challenges are internally focused. % Challenges are externally focused. % Challenges are protein appointed on time. 4 Delays in procurement processes recuting any external materials. % Challenges are externally and externally ratio relation internally ratio relation internally ratio focused working relation externally focused. % %         NA         NA         NA         NA         1 Increasing number of households. Delays in procurement processes recuting appointed on time. 4 Delays in processes recuting endiance and the project.           Working relation internally and externally focused.         100%.0         0%:100         000%         Good internal working relations with Eskom. The Municipality to push Eskom to give a date for outages           Working relation strenally ratio relation arreanally ratio against actual outcomes         Indicators         Coold         Bad         Actual         Explanation           Project Used by end user: % project used by end user: % % Community stristaction; % Community stristaction; % Community d				1:0	0:1	1:0		
Department         Department         Challenges         %Challenges are internally focused: % Challenges are internally focused: % Challenges are externally focused         N/A         N/A         0%:100%         1: Increasing number of households, increasing demand, 2: Delays in portneted on time.           Working relations internally with stakeholders         %Good working relation internally ratio         100%:0         0%:100         0%:100%         1: Increasing number of households, increasing demand, 2: Delays in portneted on time.           Working relations internally with stakeholders         %Good working relation internally ratio         100%:0         0%:100         0%:100%         Good internal working relation internally ratio         100%:0         0%:100         Good internal working relation internally ratio         100%:0         0%:100         Working relation externally 'KBad working relation internally ratio         100%:0         0%:100         Working relation externally 'KBad working relation internally ratio         100%:0         0%:100%         Working relation working relation         Working relation           Planned outcomes         indicators         Good         Bad         Actual         Explanation           Planned outcomes         %Functional connections: % ropect not used by end user: % ropect used by end user: 10%; %Community satisfaction: %Comm							Submitted	
Challenges experienced       % Challenges are internally focused % Challenges are externally focused       N/A       N/A       N/A       0%:100%       1: Increasing number of nucleositols, increasing demand. 2: Delays in picorument processes resulting in the consulting engineer not being appointed on time. 4: Delays in picorument processes resulting in the consulting engineer not being appointed on time. 4: Delays in concurrence to the project mot resonciled and does not give accurate information on the status of the project         Working relations internally and externally with stakeholders       % Good working relation internally and externally with stakeholders       100%:0       0%:100 %       100.0% %       Good internal working relationship relation active actually. %Bad working relation active actually. %Bad working relation active actually. %Bad working relation active actually. %Bad working relation active actually.       100.% %       0%:100 %       100%:0% %       100%:0% % </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>								
experienced coused: % Challenges aré externally focused with the set of the externally focused with the set of the externally focused with the set of the external set of the project of the project of the external set of the project of the p			lv	N/A	N/A	0%:100%	1: Increasing number of	
Image: second secon		focused: % Challenges a						
Working relations internally and externally with stakeholders     %Good working relation internally and externally with externally with stakeholders     %Good working relation internally and externally with externally with stakeholders     100%.0 %     %%.100     100.0% %     Good internation on the status of the project       Working relations internally and externally with stakeholders     %Good working relation weternative with relation internally relation externally with externally with stakeholders     100%.0 %     0%:100		externally focused						
Image: second								
Working relations internally and externally with stakeholders         %Good working relation internally and externally with stakeholders         %Good working relation internally and externally with stakeholders         100%.0 %         0%:100 %         100.0% %         Good internal working relations of the project           Working relations internally and externally with stakeholders         %Good working relation internally with the status of the project         100%.0 %         0%:100 %         100%:0%         <								
Working relations internally and extenally with stakeholders     %Good working relation internally and extenally with stakeholders     100%:0 %     0%:100 %     100.0% %     Good internal working relationship       Working relations internally and extenally with stakeholders     %Good working relation internally ratio     100%:0 %     0%:100 %     0%:100 %     Good internal working relationship       Working relation internally with stakeholders     MGood working relation externally: %Bad working relation externally ratio     100%:0 %     0%:100 %     Working relations with Eskorn. The Municipality to push Eskorn to give a date for outages       ELEMENT 5: ROJECTOTOMES     Good     Bad     Actual     Explanation       Planned outcomes     NFunctional connections: % non-functional connections project not used by end user: % project will be handed over to Eskorn     100%:0 %-30%								
Working relations internally and externally with stakeholders         %Good working relation internally %Bad working relation internally %Bad working relation externally with stakeholders         00%.0 %         0%.100 %         0%.100 %         Cool internal working relations with Eskom. The Municipality to push Eskom to give a date for outages           ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES         Good         Bad         Actual         Explanation           Planned outcomes against actual outcomes         %Functional connections mon-functional connections working relations         70%- 100%         0.50%- 100%         100%.0%         Households are electrified however as result the neighbourhood is prone to lighting strikes.           % project used by end user with outcomes         % project used by end user %Community atisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction:								
Working relations internally and externally with stakeholders     %Good working relation internally %Bad working relation internally ratio     100%.0 %     0%:100 %     100.0% %     Good internal working relationship       Working relations internally with stakeholders     %Good working relation internally ratio     100%.0 %     0%:100 %     0%:100 %     0%:100 %     Good internal working relationship       ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES     Formation acternally ratio     Good     Bad     Actual     Explanation       Planned outcomes against actual outcomes     %Functional connections % non-functional exel by end user % % project used by end user % % project used by end user % % community disstistaction % Community disstistaction								
Working relations internally and externally and externally with stakeholders         %Good working relation internally: %Bad working relation internally ratio         100%.0 %         0%:100 %         100/0%         Good internal working relation swith Eskom. The Municipality to push Eskom to give a date for outages           ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES         Good         Bad         Actual         Explanation           Planned outcomes         No-functional connections: % non-functional connections: % of community satisfaction: wCommunity satisfaction: wCommunity dissatisfaction: %Community dissatisfactin: %Community dissatisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction: %Com								
Image: Notice of the project         of the project           Working relations internally: %Bad working relation internally: %Bad working relation internally: %Bad working relation externally: %Bad working relation externally ratio         0%: 0%         0%: 100 %         0%: 100 %         Good internal working relation externally ratio           ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES         600d         Bad         Actual         Explanation           Planned         %Functional connections: % non-functional connections: % non-functional connections: % norfunctional connections: % norfunctista set cont water a sease set cont waterex sex set							not reconciled and does not give	
Working relations internally and externally with stakeholders         %Good working relation internally: %Bad working relation internally rules         100%:0 %         0%:100 %         100:0% %         Good internal working relationship           externally with stakeholders         %Good working relation externally: %Bad working relation externally: %Bad working relation working: %Bad working: %Bad working: %Bad working: %								
internally and externally with stakeholders       internally: %Bad working relation internally ratio       %       %       %         stakeholders       internally ratio       00%:100       0%:100%       Working relations with Eskom. The Municipality to push Eskom to give a date for outages         ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES         Area of measurement       Indicators       Good       Bad       Actual       Explanation         Planned outcomes against actual outcomes       %Functional connections: % non-functional connections: % project not used by end user: % project not used by end user: % project not used by end user: % %Community astisfaction       70%- 100%       0-50% 100%       100%:0%       Households are electrified however as a result the neighbourhood is prone to lighting strikes.         ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS       25%-75%       Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lighthing strikes while using electricity.         ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS       •       Project will be handed over to Eskom         Recommendations       •       •       •       •         •       •       •       •       •       •         •       •       •       •       •       •         •       •       Project will be handed over to Eskom       •       •       •         Recommendations       •						100.00/		
externally with stakeholders         relation internally ratio         construction           Stakeholders         "Good working relation externally: %Bad working relation externally: ratio         100%:0         0%:100         Working relations a date for outages a date for outages           ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES         Indicators         Good         Bad         Actual         Explanation           Planned outcomes         Indicators         Good         0%:00%         100%:0%         Households are electrified however as a result the neighbourhood is prone to lighting strikes.           Victomes         "% Functional connections: % non-functional connections against actual outcomes         70%- 0%-30%         0-50% 100%         100%:0%         Households are electrified however as a result the neighbourhood is prone to lighting strikes.           % project not used by end user: % project not used by end user: % project not used by end user: % foo%-30%         70%- 100%: 100%         0-50% 100%         100%:0%         Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.           ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS         Edement of the project         Project will be handed over to Eskom         Project will be handed over to Eskom           Recommendations         Project will be handed over to Eskom         • The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of						100:0%	Good internal working relationship	
stakeholders       %Good working relation externally: %Bad working relations with Eskom. The Municipality to push Eskom to give a date for outages         ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES       Good       Bad       Actual       Explanation         Planned outcomes against actual outcomes       %Functional connections: % 100%. 100%				%	70			
externally: %Bad working relation externally ratio       %       %       Municipality to push Eskom to give a date for outages         ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES       Area of measurement       Indicators       Good       Bad       Actual       Explanation         Planned outcomes against actual outcomes       %       %       0.50%, 100%.       100%.0%, 50%, 100%.       Households are electrified however as a result the neighbourhood is prone to lighting strikes.         %       % project used by end user.%, roject not used by end user       70%, 0%-30%, 100%.       0.50%, 100%.       100%.0%, 28%.75%.       Households are electrified however as a result the neighbourhood is prone to lighting strikes.         % project used by end user.%, owcommunity dissatisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction:       70%, 100%.       100%.0%, 28%.75%.       Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.         ELEMENT 6: SUST-INAB/LITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS       Economical       Project will be handed over to Eskom       Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.         Recommendations       the project       Project will be handed over to Eskom       Not effective         Provincial level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.       Provincial level engagement sesions need to be revived so as to allow for				100% <sup>.</sup> 0	0%·100	0%.100%	Working relations with Eskom The	
relation externally ratio       a date for outages         ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES       Good       Bad       Actual       Explanation         Planned outcomes       Indicators       600d       100%: 050%       100%: 050%       100%: 050%         outcomes       non-functional connections: % outcomes       70%-       0-50%       100%: 050%       100%: 050%         % project used by end user       %       70%-       0-50%       100%: 050%       prone to lighting strikes.         % community satisfaction:       %       70%-       0-50%       100%: 050%       100%: 050%         % Community dissatisfaction:       %       70%-       0-50%       100%: 050%       100%: 050%         % Community dissatisfaction:       %       70%-       0-50%       100%: 050%       100%: 050%         % Community dissatisfaction:       %       70%-       0-50%       100%: 050%       100%: 050%         0%-30%       100%:       :50%-       0%-30%       00%: 30%       100%: 00%: 30%       100%: 00%: 30%       100%: 00%: 30%         Scoat of maintenance of the project       Project will be handed over to Eskom       Eskom       Eskom         Recommendations       -       The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District offici								
Area of measurement         Indicators         Good         Bad         Actual         Explanation           Planned outcomes against actual outcomes         %Functional connections: % non-functional connections         70%- 100%: %ro%-30%         0-50% 100%         100%:0%         Households are electrified however as a result the neighbourhood is prone to lighting strikes.           % project used by end user: % project not used by end user         70%- 100%: %Community statisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction         70%- 100%: %0%-30%         0-50% 100%         100%:0%         Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lighting strikes while using electricity.           ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS         0-50% 100%         0-50% 100%         25%:75%         Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lighting strikes while using electricity.           Recommendations         *         The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.         •         The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.         •         Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them           ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR M								
measurement         view         out         <	ELEMENT 5: PROJ	ECT OUTCOMES						
Planned outcomes against actual outcomes         %Functional connections: % non-functional connections: % against actual outcomes         70%- 100%: %         0.50%- 100%: %         100%: %         100%         25%.75%         Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.           ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS         Project will be handed over to Esksom         The Department must be more involved in im	Area of	Indicators		Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation	
outcomes against actual outcomes         non-functional connections         100%: 0%-30%         :50%- 100%         as a result the neighbourhood is prone to lighting strikes.           % project used by end user: % Community satisfaction: % Community satisfaction: % Community dissatisfaction         70%- 100%: 0%-30%         0-50% 100%         100%:0%         100%:0%           * & Community satisfaction: % Community dissatisfaction         70%- 100%: 0%-30%         0-50% 100%         25%.75%         Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.           ELEMENT 6: SUST-INABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS         25%.75%         Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.           Recommendations         Project will be handed over to Eskom         •         The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.         •         The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.         •         Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them           ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS         Erforient         Project did not experience over expenditure	measurement							
against actual outcomes       0%-30%       100%       prone to lighting strikes.         % project used by end user: % project not used by end user       70%- 100%:       0-50% 100%:       100%:0%         % Community satisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction:       70%- 100%:       0-50% 100%       100%:0%         ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS       Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.         Economendations       Project will be handed over to Eskom         Recommendations       • The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.         • Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them         ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS       Explanation         Vfm element       Finding       Explanation         Efficiency       Not efficient       Project did not experience over expenditure         Efficiency       Not efficient       Project axperienced implementation delays         Efficiency       Not effective       Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households viset on statisfied because of	Planned	%Functional connections:	%			100%:0%	Households are electrified however	
outcomes       % project used by end user: % project not used by end user       70%- 100%: 100%: .50%- 0%-30%       100%:0%         % Community satisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction       70%- 100%: .50%- 100%: .50%- 100%       100%:0%       Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.         ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS       Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.         Cost of maintenance of the project       Project will be handed over to Eskom         Recommendations       • The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.         • Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them         ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS       Explanation         Vfm element       Finding       Explanation         Economical       Project did not experience over expenditure         Efficiency       Not efficient       Project experienced implementation delays         Efficiency       Not efficient       Project experienced implementation delays		non-functional connections	6					
Market         Market         Market         Market           % project used by end user: % project not used by end user: % project not used by end user: % % Community satisfaction: % Community statisfaction: % Community dissatisfaction         70%- 0%-30%         0-50% 100%: :50%- 0%-30%         25%.75%         Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.           ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS         70%- 0%-30%         100%: 100%:         25%.75%         Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.           Cost of maintenance of the project         Project will be handed over to Eskom         Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.           Recommendations         •         The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.           •         Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them           ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS         Explanation           Vfm element         Finding         Explanation           Economical         Project did not experience over expenditure           Efficiency         Not efficient         Project experienced implementation delays	-			0%-30%	100%		prone to lighting strikes.	
project not used by end user     100%: 0%-30%     :50%- 100%       % Community satisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction     70%- 100%: 0%-30%     0-50%- 100%     25%:75%     Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.       ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS     25%:75%     Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.       Cost of maintenance of the project     Project will be handed over to Eskom     experienced inplementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.       Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them       ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS     Project did not experience over expenditure       Vfm element     Finding     Explanation       Economical     Project did not experience over expenditure       Efficiency     Not efficient     Project experienced implementation delays       Effectiveness     Not efficient     Project did not experience over expenditure	outcomes							
Market Statistics       0%-30%       100%         % Community satisfaction:       70%-       0.50%       25%:75%       Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.         ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS       50%-       100%       100%       25%:75%       Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.         Cost of maintenance of the project       Project will be handed over to Eskom       Project will be handed over to Eskom         Recommendations       •       The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.         •       Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them         ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS       Explanation         Vfm element       Finding       Explanation         Economical       Project did not experience over expenditure         Efficiency       Not efficient       Project experienced implementation delays         Effectiveness       Not effective       Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of		% project used by end use	r: %	70%-	0-50%	100%:0%		
% Community satisfaction:       70%- 100%:       0-50%       25%:75%       Yes, but not fully as they have experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.         ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS       Project will be handed over to Eskom       Project will be handed over to Eskom         Recommendations       Project will be handed over to Eskom       •       The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.         ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS       •       Project did not experience over expenditure         Efficiency       Not efficient       Project did not experience implementation delays         Effectiveness       Not effective       Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households visited all had functional connections.		project not used by end us	er					
%Community dissatisfaction       100%: 0%-30%       :50%- 100%       experienced lightning strikes while using electricity.         ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS       Project will be handed over to Eskom       Project will be handed over to Eskom         Recommendations       Project will be handed over to Eskom       • The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.         • Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them         ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS         Vfm element       Finding       Explanation         Economy       Economical       Project did not experience over expenditure         Efficiency       Not efficient       Project experienced implementation delays         Effectiveness       Not effective       Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of					0 - 00/			
0%-30%       100%       using electricity.         ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS         Cost of maintenance of the project       Project will be handed over to Eskom         Recommendations         •       The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.         •       Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them         ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS         Vfm element       Finding       Explanation         Economy       Economical       Project did not experience over expenditure         Efficiency       Not efficient       Project experienced implementation delays         Effectiveness       Not effective       Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of						25%:75%		
ELEMENT 6: SUSTAINABILITY AND RECOMMENDATIONS         Cost of maintenance of the project         Recommendations       Project will be handed over to Eskom         Recommendations <ul> <li>The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.</li> <li>Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them           ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS           Vfm element         Finding         Explanation           Economy         Economical         Project did not experience over expenditure               Efficiency             Not efficient             Project experienced implementation delays               Effectiveness             Not effective             Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of</li></ul>			11					
Cost of maintenance of the project         Project will be handed over to Eskom           Recommendations <ul></ul>							<u> </u>	
Recommendations <ul> <li>The Department must be more involved in implementation of projects at ground level. District officials need to at least go on site instead of having district meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.             <ul></ul></li></ul>								
Interpretation       Interpretation       Interpretation       Interpretation         Interpretation       Interpretation       Interpret		e of the project	Proje					
meetings. Their Terms of Reference of the support officials needs to be clarified.         Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them         ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS         Vfm element       Finding         Economy       Economical         Project did not experience over expenditure         Efficiency       Not efficient         Project experienced implementation delays         Effectiveness       Not effective	Recommendations		•					
clarified.         Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them         ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS       Explanation         Vfm element       Finding       Explanation         Economy       Economical       Project did not experience over expenditure         Efficiency       Not efficient       Project experienced implementation delays         Effectiveness       Not effective       Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of								
Provincial level engagement sessions need to be revived so as to allow for engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them     ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS     Vfm element     Finding     Economy     Economical     Project did not experience over expenditure     Project did not experience over expenditure     Project experienced implementation delays     Not efficient     Project experienced implementation delays     Not effective     Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections.     However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of				•			and support onicials needs to be	
engagements between high level role players such as ESKOM and DOE on implementation bottlenecks that are relate to them         ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS         Vfm element       Finding       Explanation         Economy       Economical       Project did not experience over expenditure         Efficiency       Not efficient       Project experienced implementation delays         Effectiveness       Not effective       Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of			•		evel engage	ment sessions n	eed to be revived so as to allow for	
ELEMENT 7: VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS         Vfm element       Finding       Explanation         Economy       Economical       Project did not experience over expenditure         Efficiency       Not efficient       Project experienced implementation delays         Effectiveness       Not effective       Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of			1	engagemer	nts between	high level role p	layers such as ESKOM and DOE on	
Vfm element         Finding         Explanation           Economy         Economical         Project did not experience over expenditure           Efficiency         Not efficient         Project experienced implementation delays           Effectiveness         Not effective         Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of			25	implementa	tion bottlene	ecks that are rela	ate to them	
Economy         Economical         Project did not experience over expenditure           Efficiency         Not efficient         Project experienced implementation delays           Effectiveness         Not effective         Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of						tion		
Efficiency         Not efficient         Project experienced implementation delays           Effectiveness         Not effective         Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of						•		
Effectiveness         Not effective         Out of 4 households visited all had functional connections. However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of	-				-	-		
However 3 of the households were not satisfied because of								
	Enectiveness	INOL EIIEC(IVE						





Above: Infrastructure installed in Isandlwana. Even though households have fully functional connections, households are prone to lighting strikes to a point that appliance such as televisions are damaged.



Above: Households located in inaccessible areas and the first time installation of infrastructure made the project expensive, connecting 500 households with R18 million.



Above: Electricity infrastructure installed in the Isandlwana area.

	rification of 1100HH in Ufafa,		Umkhunya		
Funding received	R34 956 000 over 2 yea				
	Planned	Actual		100%	
Deliverable	<ul> <li>An 8km powerline between Mkhunya and Ofafa</li> <li>Contribution to connections in Ofafa, Mahehle and Mkhunya</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>An 8km powerline between Mkhunya and Ofafa</li> <li>Estimated 931 households connected</li> </ul>		88% 50%50% 54%
Project	No	1			
commencement Completion	November 2015 March 2016	January 20 August 20		_	
Planned project		August 20	10		12%
duration	5 months	6 months			0%
Expenditure	R24 956 000 (2015/2016)	R24 956 0	00 or 100%	Conceptu	ualisation Support Project Inputs Implementation Project outcomes application
Actual progress	Complete	In progres	S		
Date of visit Need for the project	13 February 2018	110			tests were however experienced in Ufafa
ELEMENT 1: PRO	targets. Funding received	of R35 millior ing aimed to line.	n was the De	partment's c	cope as part of the Premier's 100 day contribution to the estimated R130 million Ufafa, Mahehle and Umkhunya and fund
Area of	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement		4000/ 00/		4000/ 0	
Source of project need	%Project needs based on community engagements & on Government priorities/Legislative prescripts: % with no source of project needs	100%:0%	0%:100%	100%:0 %	<ul> <li>Community of Mkhunya were engaged to which project prioritized this area</li> <li>The municipality was also being reactive to the protests in Mahehle and Ufafa</li> </ul>
Project within IDP	Project within 2015/2016 IDP: Project not within 2015/2016 IDP	1:0	0:1	1:0	Project within project list but amounts not apparent.
Feasibility study and design of project	Feasibility study& design conducted: Feasibility study& design not conducted %Feasibility study &design	1:0 N/A	0:1	1:0 0%:100	Premarketing was conducted by
	conducted in-house: %Feasibility study &design outsourced			%	KZNCoGTA. A service provider was appointed to conduct surveying.
	PORT APPLICATION PROCE	1	D. I		
Area of measurement	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
Support application compliance	Extent of compliance in submission of business plans, MoAs & Council resolutions	Below 100%	100%	100% complian ce	
Timing of funding transfer	On time indicator=Planned time +/-Actual receipt (Departmental perspective)	0 or +ve figure	-ve figure	-1 month	Municipality submitted business plans stating that project would commence in November 2015. But business plans were submitted to the Department in 24 November and 3 December 2015
	On time indicator=Planned time +/-Actual receipt (Municipal perspective)	0 or +ve figure	-ve figure	0 months	Municipality noted that funding was transferred in time before the budget adjustment.
Funding adequacy	Satisfaction on funding adequacy: Dissatisfaction on funding adequacy ratio	1:0	0:1	0:1	Municipality noted that R35 million funding was not enough to fund 1100 households and its respective infrastructure, but made a difference.

ELEMENT 2: SUP	PORT APPLICATION PROCES	S			
Area of	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement					
Period of support	Period of support application	N/A	N/A	55 working days	
application	process				
	JECT INPUTS & EXPENDITUR				
Area of	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement					
Funding	Funding transferred in full or in tranches	N/A	N/A	Tranches	
arrangement Funding	Funds received against funds	100%	Below	100%	R24 956 000.00 (2015/16)
requested against	requested	100 /0	100%	100 /0	R10 000 000.00 (2014/15)
funding received	requested		10070		
Cost per		N/A	N/A	R23 589 per cor	nection
deliverable	Cost per deliverable			-	
		0%	1% and	0%	
	Subsequent changes in the cost		above		
Financial	per deliverable	0% or		0%	R24 956 000 or 100% for the
	actual expenditure in		-ve	0%	
performance	duration/planned expenditure in duration	+ve	figure		2015/2016 financial year
	JECT IMPLEMENTATION	figure			
Area of		Good	Bad	Actual	Evaluation
	indicators	Good	Dau	Actual	Explanation
measurement	Implementation	0	1 and	0 months	Dreiget was supposed to
Delays time in	Implementation	0	1 and	2 months	Project was supposed to commence in November 2015 but
commencement	commencement delay time in		above		
of	months				commenced in January 2016.
implementation					
Duration in	Implementation time in surplus	0 and	-ve	1 month	Project was supposed to take 5
implementation	or in deficit as per cashflow	+ve	figure		months but instead took 6 months.
ahead of time on	reports (in months)	figure			
behind schedule		-			
Deliverable delay	Ongoing Completion time	0	1 and	19 months	While the project is complete in
from planned	beyond planned completion		above		Mahehle and Ufafa, construction is
completion	time as of the time of site visit	- · · ·			still in progress in uMkhunya
Structures in	Project Steering Committee in	In place	Not in	In place	Project Steering Committees
place to monitor	place with relevant stakeholders		place		between the municipality, the
scope and quality					service provider and the
					Department. Department stopped
					attending or providing support after
	Meeting frequency	Monthly	Not	Monthly	funding was exhausted. Meetings on a monthly basis.
	Meeting nequency	&	meeting	wonuny	Meetings on a monthly basis.
		quarterly	Ŭ		
	How Quality of the deliverable			th the Project Steer	ing Committee also assess issues
	is ensured				by ESKOM as per set standard
Project	Project implemented/completed	1:0	0:1	0:1	The municipality noted if funds were
implemented/	in time: Project not				readily available the project would
completed on time	implemented/completed in time				have been completed on time.
	ratio			•	The project usually experienced 1 to 2
					month delays due to needed funds not
					being available when needed. The
					municipality as a result had to reduce
					the pace of projects to prevent riots
					and vandalism.
				•	ESKOM change technicians just as
					progress is picking up. New technicians often delay project
		1			teorniolaria olteri uelay project
					implementation as they have to bring

ELEMENT 4: PRO	ELEMENT 4: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION							
Area of measurement	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation			
Project implemented/ completed on scope	Project implemented/completed on scope: Project not implemented/completed on scope ratio	1:0	0:1	0:1	<ul> <li>As a result of limited funds the municipality had to do portions of project.</li> <li>Limited funds were as a result of increased demands because for electricity. People move in after the premarketing phase.</li> <li>Other cases included households with 2 wives and the heads of these households would demand that houses of the 2 wives be connected.</li> <li>ESKOM wanted new standard of split metering in Mkunya. The project as result delayed for 6 months.</li> </ul>			
Project implemented/com pleted in budget	Project implemented/completed within budget: Project not implemented/completed on within budget	1:0	0:1	1:0				
Submission of progress reports to the Department	Municipality submits reports to the Department: Municipality does not submit reports to the Department	1:0	0:1	1:0	Consolidation of monthly reports submitted.			
Challenges experienced	%Challenges are internally focused:% Challenges are externally focused	N/A	N/A	0%:100%	<ol> <li>People move in after the premarketing phase.</li> <li>Households with 2 wives and the heads of these households would demand that houses of the 2 wives be connected.</li> <li>ESKOM wanted new standard of split metering in Mkunya. The project as result delayed for 6 months.</li> <li>ESKOM change technicians just as project is at its ultimate momentum. New technicians often delay project implementation as they have to bring them to speed in project's operations.</li> </ol>			
Working relations internally and externally with	%Good working relation internally:%Bad working relation internally ratio	100%:0%	0%:100%	100:0%	Good internal working relationship			
stakeholders	%Good working relation externally:%Bad working relation externally ratio	100%:0%	0%:100%	0%:100%	<ol> <li>Working relations with ESKOM changing standards during project implementation. This escalates project costs and new standards must be factored in.</li> <li>Changing of technicians at peak of project implementation. This results in the loss of momentum and delaying the project.</li> </ol>			

ELEMENT 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES							
Area of	Indicators		Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation	
measurement							
Planned outcomes against actual outcomes	<ul> <li>%Functional connections: % non-functional connections</li> <li>% project used by end user: % project not used by end user</li> <li>% Community satisfaction: %Community dissatisfaction</li> </ul>		70%- 100%: 0%-30%	0-50% :50%- 100%	88%:12%	<ul> <li>Fully functional connections in Mahehle and Ufafa.</li> <li>Some households are fully connected in Mkunya, there is cable theft to connect illegal connections (Izinyoka). This has also caused interruptions in usage and has delayed project implementation.</li> </ul>	
			70%- 100%: 0%-30%	0-50% :50%- 100%	88%:12%		
			70%- 100%: 0%-30%	0-50% :50%- 100%	78%:22%	Households satisfied, except those not connected as they are concerned with delays due to zinyoka.	
	AINABILITY AND REC						
Cost of maintenance	e of the project	Project wil	l be handed	over to Esko	m		
Recommendations		<ul> <li>The Department needs to communicate more closely with municipalities.</li> <li>The Department needs to intervene in addressing implementation bottlenecks a provide specialised skills such as the clerk of works.</li> <li>Eskom standards need to be uniform and should not change during implementa as this escalates costs and affects the project being completed on time. The Department needs to intervene in this matter</li> </ul>			ssing implementation bottlenecks and f works. ould not change during implementation ct being completed on time. The		
ELEMENT 7: VALU	E FOR MONEY INDIC	ATORS					
Vfm element	Finding			Explanat			
Economy	Economical					ience over expenditure challenges	
Efficiency	Not efficient			The project experienced implementation challenges which has as resulted in its delay			
Effectiveness	Effective			Out of 8 households on 1households had no functional connection.			





Above: Part of the Umkhunya-Ofafa powerline. One of the households in Mkhunya which did not have functional connections due to the advent of cable thieves or izinyoka





Above: Illegal connections in Mkhunya. One of the functional connections in Mkhunya



Above: One of the households that have fully functional connections in Mahehle. Infrastructure installed in the Mahehle area.



Above: Connection of households in the Ufafa area.

and KwaMgayi					1 <mark>00%</mark> 1 <mark>00%</mark>	
Funding received		R8 000 000			_	
Deliverable		Planned Actual Estimated 322			67%	,
Deliverable		322 households with	function			64%
		functional connections	connect			50%50%
Project commence	ment	December 2015	Februar		_	200
Completion		June 2016	May 201		33%	36%
Planned project du	ration	6 months	16 mont			
Expenditure				849.83 or		
•		R8 000 000	94% exp	penditure		0% 0%
Actual progress		Complete	Comple	te	Conceptualisat	
Date of visit		15 February 2018				application
Need for the project	<b>`t</b>		to assist ES	KOM in el	ectrification so	as to hasten service delivery. The
						en connected to which they
		requested funding				
ELEMENT 1:PRO	JECT CO	DNCEPTUALISATION				
Area of	Indica	tors	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement						-
Source of project		ect needs based on	100%:0%	0%:100	0%:100%	The municipality associated
need		inity engagements & on		%		themselves with the Eskom
	Govern					project in the affected area.
		es/Legislative prescripts: no source of project				
	needs	no source of project				
Project within IDP		within 2015/2016 IDP:	1:0	0:1	0:1	Project not on project list. Shows
		not within 2015/2016				R10 million project funded by
	IDP					Department in Nkehlamandla
Feasibility study		ility study& design	1:0	0:1	1:0	
and design of		ted: Feasibility study&				
project		not conducted		N/A	00/ 1000/	Dramaduation was also adv. dance
		ibility study &design sted in-house:	N/A	N/A	0%:100%	Premarketing was already done by Eskom and the municipality
		ibility study &design				was using ESKOM's plans
	outsou					
ELEMENT 2:SUPP	ORT A	PPLICATION PROCESS	•			•
Area of	Indica	tors	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement						
Support		of compliance in	Below	100%	100%	
application compliance		sion of business plans, & Council resolutions	100%			
Timing of funding		e indicator=Planned time	0 or +ve	-ve	-2 months	Business plans submitted to the
transfer		al receipt (Departmental	figure	figure	-2 11011115	Department state that the project
	perspe		ilguio	nguro		was to start in December 2015.
	1 P -					The business plan was only
						received by the Department on th
						12 <sup>th</sup> of January 2016
		e indicator=Planned time	0 or +ve	-ve	0	The Municipality noted that funds
		al receipt (Municipal	figure	figure		were received on time.
Funding	perspe Satisfa	ctive) ction on funding	1:0	0:1	0:1	The municipality noted that
adequacy		acy: Dissatisfaction on	1.0	0.1	0.1	funding was not adequate. After
		adequacy ratio				design and costing new
		, , ,				households moved into the area
						affecting planned connections.
Period of support	Period	of support application	N/A	N/A	22 working	
application		S			days	

<b>ELEMENT 3: PRO</b>	JECT INPUTS & EXPENDITURE				
Area of measurement	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
Funding arrangement	Funding transferred in full or in tranches	N/A	N/A	Tranches	
Funding requested against funding received	Funds received against funds requested	100%	Below 100%	100%	R8 000 000
Cost per	Cost per deliverable	N/A	N/A	R25 000per c	connection
deliverable	Subsequent changes in the cost per deliverable	0%	1% and above	0%	
Financial performance	actual expenditure in duration/planned expenditure in duration	0% or +ve figure	-ve figure	94 %	R7 590 849.83 or 94%
	JECT IMPLEMENTATION	_			
Area of measurement	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
Delays time in commencement of implementation	Implementation commencement delay time in months	0	1 and above	2 months	The project was supposed to commence in December 2015 but commenced in February 2016
Duration in implementation ahead of time on behind schedule	Implementation time in surplus or in deficit as per cashflow reports (in months)	0 and +ve figure	-ve figure	-10 months	The project was supposed to take 6 months but took 16 months.
Deliverable delay from planned completion	Ongoing Completion time beyond planned completion time as of the time of site visit	0	1 and above	0	Project was completed in May 2017
Structures in place to monitor scope and quality Delays time in commencement of	Project Steering Committee in place with relevant stakeholders	In place	Not in place	In place	Project Steering Committees and Technical meetings which met once a month. Consisted of the municipality, Service provider, Eskom, KZNCoGTA and Clerk of works
implementation	Implementation commencement delay time in months	0	1 and above	Monthly	Meetings on a monthly basis.
	How Quality of the deliverable is ensured	Technical communit		assess quality	and PSC meetings looked into
Area of measurement	Indicators	Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
Project implemented/ completed on time	Project implemented/completed in time: Project not implemented/completed in time ratio	1:0	0:1	0:1	<ol> <li>Delays were experienced with the stealing of cables.</li> <li>Delays were also experienced when the municipality had to wait for ESKOM for outages. Delayed outages resulted in stealing of cables. Eskom need to be more efficient in terms of outages</li> </ol>
Project implemented/ completed on scope	Project implemented/completed on scope: Project not implemented/completed on scope ratio	1:0	0:1	0:1	The service provider had to redesign the network some problems experienced.

<b>ELEMENT 4: PRO</b>	JECT IMPLEM					
Area of	Indicators		Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement						
Project implemented/com pleted in budget	Project implemented/completed within budget: Project not implemented/completed on within budget		1:0	0:1	1:0	Spent on budget as this was a turnkey project, to which you have one person to account.
Submission of progress reports to the Department	Municipality su the Departmen	bmits reports to t: Municipality hit reports to the	1:0	0:1	1:0	Consolidation of monthly reports submitted.
Challenges experienced	%Challenges are internally focused:% Challenges are externally focused		N/A	N/A	0%:100%	<ol> <li>Constant electrical outages because of illegal connections (Izinyoka)</li> <li>Delays in planned outages result in the stealing of cables affecting the project.</li> <li>Getting dates from stakeholders to set meetings of PSCs and knowing processes to get approval delays processes</li> </ol>
Working relations internally and externally with stakeholders	%Good workin internally:%Ba internally ratio	g relation d working relation	100%:0%	0%:100%	100:0%	Good internal working relationship
	%Good working relation externally:%Bad working relation externally ratio		100%:0%	0%:100%	100%:0%	Good working relationships with external stakeholders.
ELEMENT 5: PROJ	IFCT OUTCOME	S				
Area of	Indicators		Good	Bad	Actual	Explanation
measurement						
Planned outcomes against actual outcomes	%Functional connections: % non-functional connections		70%- 100%: 0%-30%	0-50% :50%- 100%	100%0%	Functional connections. However in most households there have been power outages because of "izinyoka" and one household cannot use appliances as they get shocked and suspect that
						because they live near a powerline.
	% project used project not use	by end user: % d by end user	70%- 100%: 0%-30%	0-50% :50%- 100%	100%:0%	because they live near a
	% Community % Community	d by end user satisfaction: lissatisfaction	100%: 0%-30% 70%- 100%: 0%-30%	:50%-	100%:0% 80%:20%	because they live near a
ELEMENT 6: SUST	% Community % Community % Community of AINABILITY AN	d by end user satisfaction: lissatisfaction	100%: 0%-30% 70%- 100%: 0%-30%	:50%- 100% 0-50% :50%- 100%		because they live near a powerline.         One household cannot use appliances as they get shocked and suspect that because they
Cost of maintenance	% Community % Community % Community of AINABILITY AN	d by end user satisfaction: lissatisfaction D RECOMMENDA Project will be ha	100%: 0%-30% 70%- 100%: 0%-30% ATIONS anded over to	:50%- 100% 0-50% :50%- 100%	80%:20%	because they live near a powerline.         One household cannot use appliances as they get shocked and suspect that because they
Cost of maintenance Recommendations	% Community % Community % Community of AINABILITY AN e of the project	d by end user satisfaction: dissatisfaction D RECOMMENDA Project will be ha • Have a star • Professiona • KZN CoGT municipaliti	100%: 0%-30% 70%- 100%: 0%-30% TIONS anded over to ndardised rep als should be A should ass	:50%- 100% 0-50% :50%- 100% 0 Eskom porting syste seconded to sist in establi	80%:20% em. o municipalities	because they live near a powerline.         One household cannot use appliances as they get shocked and suspect that because they live near a powerline.         onal electrical units in small
Cost of maintenance Recommendations	Project not use % Community %Community of AINABILITY AN e of the project IE FOR MONEY	d by end user satisfaction: dissatisfaction D RECOMMENDA Project will be ha • Have a star • Professiona • KZN CoGT municipaliti	100%: 0%-30% 70%- 100%: 0%-30% TIONS anded over to ndardised rep als should be A should ass	:50%- 100% 0-50% :50%- 100% Deskom porting syste seconded to sist in establi them to becon	80%:20% m. o municipalities shing fully functi come licencing a	because they live near a powerline.         One household cannot use appliances as they get shocked and suspect that because they live near a powerline.         onal electrical units in small
Cost of maintenance Recommendations ELEMENT 7: VALL Vfm element	Project not use % Community %Community of AINABILITY AN e of the project IE FOR MONEY Finding	d by end user satisfaction: lissatisfaction D RECOMMENDA Project will be ha • Have a star • Professiona • KZN CoGT municipaliti INDICATORS	100%: 0%-30% 70%- 100%: 0%-30% TIONS anded over to ndardised rep als should be A should ass	:50%- 100% 0-50% :50%- 100% Deskom Destand Des	80%:20% m. o municipalities shing fully functi come licencing a <b>ion</b>	because they live near a powerline.         One household cannot use appliances as they get shocked and suspect that because they live near a powerline.         onal electrical units in small authorities
Cost of maintenance Recommendations	Project not use % Community %Community of AINABILITY AN e of the project IE FOR MONEY Finding Economi	d by end user satisfaction: lissatisfaction D RECOMMENDA Project will be ha • Have a star • Professiona • KZN CoGT municipaliti INDICATORS	100%: 0%-30% 70%- 100%: 0%-30% TIONS anded over to ndardised rep als should be A should ass	:50%- 100% 0-50% :50%- 100% Deskom Destabli e seconded to seconded to second secon	80%:20% m. o municipalities shing fully functi come licencing a ion I not experience	because they live near a powerline.         One household cannot use appliances as they get shocked and suspect that because they live near a powerline.         onal electrical units in small authorities         expenditure challenges
Cost of maintenance Recommendations ELEMENT 7: VALL Vfm element	Project not use % Community %Community of AINABILITY AN e of the project IE FOR MONEY Finding	d by end user satisfaction: lissatisfaction DRECOMMENDA Project will be ha Have a star Professiona KZN CoGT municipaliti INDICATORS cal ent	100%: 0%-30% 70%- 100%: 0%-30% TIONS anded over to ndardised rep als should be A should ass	:50%- 100% 0-50% :50%- 100% 0 Eskom 0 orting syste 0 seconded to ist in establi 0 them to be 0 Explanat Project did The project	80%:20% m. o municipalities shing fully functi come licencing a ion I not experience t faced implement	because they live near a powerline.         One household cannot use appliances as they get shocked and suspect that because they live near a powerline.         onal electrical units in small authorities



Above: One of the households in Ekubusisweni which find it difficult to use appliance as they experience electrical shocks.





Above: One the households with fully functional connections in the KwaMgayi area. It was noted that households often experienced power outages due to illegal power connections



Above: Illegal connections or izinyoka increase power demand and result in outages

# Summary of the Massification Programme support provided in the Southern region

	Element	Indicator	Actual Result
**Feasibility studies and projects designs developed         100%           The above indicators oupled with 25% of projects found within respective IDPs, indicate that the majority of these projects din ot pass through formal Municipal planning processes and were as a result of being reactive to community protests. Moreover the community engagements by municipalities occurred to address needs raised from protests.           Support application         Not ransfer coming abnead/or time (Expertmental perspective)         05.           % Projects within 25 working days         75%         75%           % transfer coming abnead/or time (Expertmental perspective)         05.         75%           % transfer coming abnead/or time (Expertmental perspective)         05.         75%           % transfer coming abnead/or time (Expertmental perspective)         05.         75%           % transfer coming abnead/or time (Expertmental perspective)         05.         75%           % transfer coming abnead/or time (Expertmental perspective)         05.         75%           % transfer coming abnead/or time (Expertmental perspective)         05%         75%           % transfer coming abnead/or time (Expertmental perspective)         05%         75%           % transfer coming abnead/or time (Expertmental perspective)         100%         75%           % transfer coming abnead/or time (Expertmental perspective)         100%         75%           % transfer coming abne	Project	%Project needs based on community engagements & on Government	75%
The above indicators coupled with 25% of projects found within respective (DFs, indicate that the majority of these projects did not pass through formal Municipal planning processes and were as a result of being reactive to community protests. Moreover the community engagements by municipalities occurred to address needs raised from protests. Support application % transfer coming ahead/or time (innuncipal perspective) % transfer coming abused applications are not submitted on time? If projects and were properly costed and were based on teasibility studies. why would the municipality note the randequacy of funds received? % project integret amount: % of projects and exception gas planned % of projects not exception gas planned % transfer coming ablanned % Project inplemented ahead/within duration % of projects inplemented within scope % which with a studies on the roughly to enable the development of a quality produc within proper estimated costs? % project inplemented within scope % which and the one project on transfer one project and were transfer one project and were the able of down and the project and were the able of the development of a quality produc within proper estimated costs? % project inplemented ahead/within duration % for projects inplemented ahead/within duration % fo	conceptualisation	priorities/Legislative prescripts	
through formal Municipal planning processes and were as a result of being reactive to community projects. Moreover the community engagements by municipalities occurred to address needs raised from protests. Support application           % transfer coming ahead/or time (Departmental perspective)         10%           % transfer coming ahead/or time (Department and the set of the set		%Feasibility studies and projects designs developed	100%
engagements by municipalities occurred to address needs raised from protests. Support application % transfer coming ahead/or time (Departmental perspective) % transfer coming ahead/or time (municipal pusines plans with set dates are submitted to the popartment on the month or planned implementation. This results in the Department thansferring functions beyond the planned mplementation date/month. Why is it that support applications are not submitted on time? If projects were properly costed and were based on feasibility studies, why would the municipality note the inadeguacy of funds received? Project Inputs % for projects without deviated costs per connections % of projects to experiencing expenditure challenges during % transfer coving as planned % project commencing as planned % project implementation % project implemented ahead/within duration % for projects with no implementation/completion time challenges % for projects with an implementation delays of months % project commencing as planned % project score and also experienced implementation % for projects with no implementation/completion time challenges % for projects with no implementation/completion time challenges % for projects with an implementation/completion time challenges % for projects with an implementation delays of months % project score and also experienced implementation delays of			
Support application         % transfer coming ahead/or time (Departmental perspective)         10%           % transfer coming ahead/or time (municipal perspective)         10%           % Process within 25 working days         75%           % statisfaction on funding adequacy         0%           The above indicators show a common noted trend within the region that Municipal business plans with set dates are submitted to the Department on the month of planned implementation this results in the Department transferring funds beyond the planned implementation dimerol (Fingets were properly costed and were based on feasibility studies, why would the municipality note the inadequacy of funds received?           Project inputs         % or elved requested amount:         100%           % or projects without deviated costs per connections         50%           % of projects not experiencing expenditure challenges during implementation         75%           implementation         75%           Project implementation         9%           % project commencing as planned         0%           % Project implemented ahead/within duration         0%           % Project implementation/completion time challenges         100%           % Project implementation/completion time challenges         0%           % Project implementation internally         100%           % Project implementation internally         100%           % of project with no imp			. Moreover the community
** transfer coming ahead/or time (municipal perspective)         100%           %Process within 25 working days         73%           %Statistation on funding adequacy         0%           The above indicators show a common noted tend within the region that Municipal business plans with set dates are submitted to the Department on the month of planned implementation. This results in the Department transferring funds beyond the planned implementation. This results in the Department transferring funds beyond the planned implementation. This results in the Department transferring funds beyond the planned implementation. This results in the Department transferring funds beyond the planned implementation. This results in the Department transferring funds beyond the planned implementation. This results in the Department transferring funds beyond the planned implementation. This results is the Department of 10%           ** of projects not experiencing expenditure challenges during the deviated costs per connections. Are feasibility studies and designs done throughly to enable the development of a quality product within proper estimated costs?           Project implementation         % register is project commencement         3 months           % Projects implemented within accope         0%         %           % for projects on the origing and multiplannet project implementation delays and were not implementation delays and were not implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside frames and estimated costs of projects common come net enable to assist in addressing implementation delays and were not implementation delayed outage/energising schedules, last minu challenges 0%           % for projects on the results and also ex			
%Process within 25 working days         75%           %Satisfaction on funding adequacy         75%           The above indicators show a common noted trend within the region that Municipal business plans with set dates are submitted to the Department on the month of planned implementation. This results in the Department transferring funds beyond the planned implementation discrimed. Why would the municipality note the inadequacy of funds received?           Project inputs         % received requested amount:         100%           % of projects without deviated costs per connections         50%           % of projects into taxperiencing expenditure challenges during implementation         75%           The indicators show that while all projects received their proposed amounts, half of them experienced deviated costs per connections. Are feasibility studies and designs done throughly to enable the development of a quality product within porce stimated costs?           Project implementation         % Project commencing as planned         0%           Average delay time in project commencement         3 months         3 months           % Project simplemented within scope         0%         3%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         100%           % dood working relation externally         20%         3%           % Projects implemented in externally         20%         3%           % dood working relation externally         20%         3%	Support application		
%Satisfaction on funding adequacy         D%           The above indicators show a common noted trend within the region that Municipal business plans with set dates are submitted to the Department on the month of planned implementation. This results in the Department transferring funds beyond the planned implementation date/month. Why is it that support applications are not submitted on time? If projects were properly costed and were based on feasibility studies. why would the municipality note the inadequacy of funds received?           Project Inputs         % received requested amount:         100%           % of projects without deviated costs per connections         50%           % of projects one to experiencing expenditure challenges during implementation         75%           The indicators show that while all projects received their proposed amounts, half of them experienced deviated costs per connections.         50%           Project implementation         % projects commencing as planned         9%           Average delay time in project commencement         3 months         % for projects implemented within scope         0%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         10%         %         6%           % forgets implemented within scope         0%         %         %         75%           % orgets awith an implementation delays and were not implementation of a somths         8 months         %           % forgets implemented within scope         0%         %			
The above indicators show a common noted trend within the region that Municipal business plans with set dates are submitted to the Department on the month of planned implementation. This results in the Department transferring funds beyond the planned implementation date/month. Why is it that support applications are not submitted to time? If projects were properly costed and were based on feasibility studies, why would the municipality note the inadequacy of funds received? Project Inputs 4 of projects without deviated costs per connections 50% 7 of projects without deviated costs per connections 50% 7 of projects received fluer proposed amounts, half of them experienced deviated costs per connections. Are feasibility studies and designs done thoroughly to enable the development of a quality product within proper estimated costs? Project implementation 8 % Project implementation 9 % 100% 7 % for point and the internation/completion 9 % 100% 7 % for point within in project commencement 3 months 8 % Projects implementated internation/completion time challenges 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10%			
Department on the month of planned implementation. This results in the Department transferring funds beyond the planned implementation date/month. Why is it that support applications are not submitted on time? If projects were properly costed and were based on fleasibility studies, why would the municipality note the inadequacy of funds received? Project Inputs  % received reguested amount: % of projects not experiencing expenditure challenges during 75% implementation % of projects not experiencing expenditure challenges during 75% received reguested amounts, half of them experienced deviated costs per connections. Are feasibility studies and designs done thoroughly to enable the development of a quality product within proper estimated costs? Project implementation % Project implemented in project commencement 7 a months % Project implemented within scope % structures in place to monitor scope quality and progress 100% % for projects with no implementation/completion time challenges % for projects with no implementation/completion time challenges % structures in place to monitor scope quality and progress 100% % Good working relation internally 100% % Good working relation externally 25% % progress accurate 75% Average delay time in project implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that all projects sepreinced implementation delays of 8 months The indicators reveal that all project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however the majority of the nunicipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut here specied with the implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that all projects steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however the majority of the nunicipalites did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut here specied withe incovertions % Project used by e			
implementation date/month. Why is it that support applications are not submitted on time? If projects were properly costed and were based on feasibility studies, why would the municipality note the inadequacy of funds received?  Project inputs Vereeived requested amount: Vereeiveve			
based on feasibility studies, why would the municipality note the inadequacy of funds received?  Project Inputs  % of projects without deviated costs per connections 60% % of projects without deviated costs per connections 75% implementation The indicators show that while all projects received their proposed amounts, half of them experienced deviated costs per connections. Are feasibility studies and designs done thoroughly to enable the development of a quality product within proper estimated costs? Project implementation  Average delay time in project commencement  % Project implemented aktinis accpe 9% % structures in place to monitor scope quality and progress 100% % Good working relation internally % Socod working relation internally % Socod working relation internally % forgicts and belays that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delays of 8 months The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulte within the expected timeframes? Like the northern region, projects had project stering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed entergoing schedules, last minut house forged encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation bottlenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department working to enable % forged encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation bottlenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the develays forged beginses. By Project seed by			
Project Inputs         % received requested amount:         100%           % of projects without deviated costs per connections         50%           % of projects not experiencing expenditure challenges during implementation         75%           The indicators show that while all projects received their proposed amounts, half of them experienced deviated costs per connections.         50%           Are feasibility studies and designs done thoroughly to enable the development of a quality product within proper estimated costs?         0%           Project implementation         % of projects implemented ahead/within duration         0%           % Projects implemented within scope         0%         0%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           % dow orking relation internally         100%           % Good working relation externally         25%           % projects superienced implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all project seperienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that all projects commerced in a projects with the scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulte within the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th maiophty of the municipalities did not have working re			properly costed and were
% of projects without deviated costs per connections         50%           % of projects not experiencing expenditure challenges during implementation         75%           The indicators show that while all projects received their proposed amounts, half of them experienced deviated costs per connections. Are feasibility studies and designs done thoroughly to enable the development of a quality product within proper estimated costs?           Project implementation         Øroject commencing as planed         0%           Average delay time in project commencement         3 months           % Project implemented within scope         0%           % structures in place to monitor scope quality and progress         100%           % for projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           % dod working relation internally         100%           % Good working relation internally         26%           % progress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside         80%           % progress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a res			4000/
% of projects not experiencing expenditure challenges during implementation         75%           The indicators show that while all projects received their proposed amounts, half of them experienced deviated costs per connections. Are feasibility studies and designs done thoroughly to enable the development of a quality product within proper estimated costs?           Project implementation         %project commencing as planned         0%           Verage delay time in project commencement         3 months           %Project implemented within scope         0%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           % of conjects and prediction internally         100%           % Good working relation externally         25%           % project suppress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that aprojects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of results within the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th majority of the municipalities did not have working relations	Project inputs		
implementation         implementation           The indicators show that while all projects received their proposed amounts, half of them experienced deviated costs per connections. Are feasibility studies and designs done throughly to enable the development of a quality product within proper estimated costs?           Project implementation         %project implemented anadadwithin duration         0%           %Project implemented anadadwithin duration         0%         0%           %Project implemented anadadwithin duration         0%         0%           %project simplemented anadadwithin duration         0%         0%           %project simplemented anadadwithin duration         0%         0%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         10%           %Good working relation internally         100%         28%           %Good working relation externally         28%         0%           % progress accurate         75%         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months         8 months           projects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulte within the expected timeframes?         Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th majority of t			
The indicators show that while all projects received their proposed amounts, half of them experienced deviated costs per connections.         Are feasibility studies and designs done thoroughly to enable the development of a quality product within proper estimated costs?         Project implementation       % project commencing as planned       0%         Average delay time in project commencement       3 months         % Projects implemented ahead/within duration       0%         % broject commencing as planned       0%         % brojects implemented ahead/within duration       0%         % brojects with no implementation/completion time challenges       0%         % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges       0%         % food working relation externally       25%         % cood working relation externally       25%         % progress accurate       75%         Average delay time in project implementation       8 months         The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation       8 months         The indicators reveal that all projects that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulte within the expected timeframes?       8         Like the northem region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however the majority of the municipalities and theayeed neroding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementati			75%
Are feasibility studies and designs done thoroughly to enable the development of a quality product within proper estimated costs?         Project implementation       %project commencing as planned       0%         Average delay time in project commencement       3 months         %Project implemented within scope       0%         % tructures in place to monitor scope quality and progress       100%         % do projects with no implementation/completion time challenges       0%         %Internal focused challenges       10%         %Good working relation internally       25%         % or projects experienced implementation       8 months         The indicators reveal that all project sepreinced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that a projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on score. It also reveals that an project sepreinced implementation delays and were not implemented on score. It also reveals that all project sepreinced implementation delays and were not implemented on score. It also reveals that all project sepreinced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulter within the expected timeframes?         Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however the majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed mocing of meters. Are we as a Depar	The indicators show that w		ioted poets per corrections
Project implementation         %project commencing as planned         9%           Average delay time in project commencement         3 months           %Project implemented ahead/within duration         9%           %Projects implemented within scope         0%           % structures in place to monitor scope quality and progress         100%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           %Internal focused challenges         10%           %Good working relation internally         25%           % projects with no implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that a projects commenced on average. 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resultewithin the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however the majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation bottlenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department working to enable the smooth implementation of projects on time?           Project outcomes         %Functional connections<			
Average delay time in project commencement         3 months           %Project implemented ahead/within duration         0%           %Projects implemented ahead/within duration         0%           % structures in place to monitor scope quality and progress         100%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           %Internal focused challenges         10%           %Good working relation externally         25%           % progress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that a projects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resultewithin the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation of pro			
%Project implemented ahead/within duration         0%           %Projects implemented within scope         0%           % structures in place to monitor scope quality and progress         100%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           % of projects with no implementation         10%           %Good working relation internally         100%           % Good working relation externally         26%           % progress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that all projects commenced on average         3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resultes within the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th majority of the municipalities of un have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementatio bottlenecks relating to external s	Project implementation		
%Projects implemented within scope         0%           % structures in place to monitor scope quality and progress         100%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           %Internal focused challenges         10%           %Good working relation internally         100%           %Good working relation externally         25%           % progress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resultewithin the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however the majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskorm as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation bottlenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department working to enable the smooth implementation of projects on time?           Project outcomes         % functional connections         96%           % project used by end user         96%         % posies on the latter mentioned findings. It is noted that issues such as lighting strikes, power outages due to "izinyoka" and usage faults, lead to damaged a			
% structures in place to monitor scope quality and progress         100%           % of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           %Internal focused challenges         10%           %Good working relation internally         100%           %Good working relation externally         25%           % progress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that a projects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulter within the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation to projects on time?           Project outcomes         %Functional connections         96%           % Community satisfaction         67%         67%           The indicators show that while most of the households had functional connections and the project is utilized by the end the end-user, community satisfaction of the project deliverabilis detind indires, hysically hu			
% of projects with no implementation/completion time challenges         0%           %Internal focused challenges         10%           %Good working relation internally         100%           %Good working relation internally         25%           % progress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that a projects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulter within the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation of projects on time?           Project outcomes         %Functional connections         96%           % project used by end user         96%         6%           % Community satisfaction         67%         67%           The indicators show that while most of the households had functional connections and the project is utilized by the end the end-user, community satisfaction of the project divergables were monitored, why are the aforementioned c			
%Internal focused challenges         10%           %Good working relation internally         100%           %Good working relation externally         25%           % progress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that a projects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulter within the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however the majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation bottlenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department working to enable the smooth implementation of projects on time?           Project outcomes         %Functional connections         96%           % Community satisfaction         67%           The indicators show that while most of the households had functional connections and the project is utilized by the end the end-user, community satisfaction of the project deliverables were monitored, why are the aforementioned challenges experienced at usage level? To what extent did feasibility studies uncover			
%Good working relation internally         100%           %Good working relation externally         25%           % progress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that a projects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulter within the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation bottlenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department working to enable the smooth implementation of projects on time?           Project outcomes         %Functional connections         96%           % project used by end user         96%         96%           % Community satisfaction         67%           The indicators show that while most of the households had functional connections and the project is utilized by the end the end-user, community satisfaction. If the quality of project deliverables were monitored, why are the aforementioned challenges experienced at usage level? To what extent di			
%Good working relation externally         25%           % progress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that a projects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulter within the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation bottlenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department working to enable the smooth implementation of projects on time?           Project outcomes         %Functional connections         96%           % project used by end user         96%         67%           The indicators show that while most of the projects diverges on the latter mentioned findings. It is noted that issues such as lighting strikes, power outages due to "izinyoka" and usage faults, lead to damaged appliances, physically hurt and inconvenienced users, which then resulter low as sisfaction. If the quality of project deliverables were monitored, why are the aforementioned challenges experienced at usage level? To what extent tid feasibility studies uncove			
% progress accurate         75%           Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that a projects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulte within the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however the majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation bottlenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department working to enable the smooth implementation of projects on time?           Project outcomes         %Functional connections         96%         67%			
Average delay time in project implementation         8 months           The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that a projects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulter within the expected timeframes?           Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however th majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation obtitenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department working to enable the smooth implementation of projects on time?           Project outcomes         %Functional connections         96% <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
The indicators reveal that all projects experienced implementation delays and were not implemented on scope. It also reveals that a projects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulter within the expected timeframes?         Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however the majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation bottlenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department working to enable the smooth implementation of projects on time?         Project outcomes       % Functional connections       96%       96%         % Community satisfaction       67%       67%         The indicators show that while most of the households had functional connections and the project is utilized by the end the end-user, community satisfaction of the project deliverables were monitored, why are the aforementioned challenges experienced at usage level? To what extent did feasibility studies uncover these issues prior project implementation, and incorporate them into designs and costing of projects?         Value for money       % projects economical       75%         % Effective       77%       77%			
projects commenced on average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 months on average. Beside feasibility studies and subsequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to ensure the delivery of resulter within the expected timeframes? Like the northern region, projects had project steering committees with KZNCoGTA officials as part of their constituents; however the majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minute changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation bottlenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department working to enable the smooth implementation of projects on time? Project outcomes %Functional connections 96% % Community satisfaction 67% The indicators show that while most of the households had functional connections and the project is utilized by the end the end-user, community satisfaction of the project diverges on the latter mentioned findings. It is noted that issues such as lighting strikes, power outages due to "izinyoka" and usage faults, lead to damaged appliances, physically hurt and inconvenienced users, which then resulte in low satisfaction. If the quality of project deliverables were monitored, why are the aforementioned challenges experienced at usage level? To what extent did feasibility studies uncover these issues prior project implementation, and incorporate them into designs and costing of projects? Value for money % Effective 75%	The fail and an an and the f		
majority of the municipalities did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/energising schedules, last minut changes to standards and delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist in addressing implementation bottlenecks relating to external stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department working to enable the smooth implementation of projects on time? Project outcomes %Functional connections 96% % project used by end user 96% % Community satisfaction 67% The indicators show that while most of the households had functional connections and the project is utilized by the end the end-user, community satisfaction of the projects diverges on the latter mentioned findings. It is noted that issues such as lighting strikes, power outages due to "izinyoka" and usage faults, lead to damaged appliances, physically hurt and inconvenienced users, which then resulte in low satisfaction. If the quality of project deliverables were monitored, why are the aforementioned challenges experienced at usage level? To what extent did feasibility studies uncover these issues prior project implementation, and incorporate them into designs and costing of projects? Value for money % projects economical 75% % Efficient 0% % Efficient 77%	projects commenced on feasibility studies and subs	average 3 months late and also experienced implementation delays of 8 sequent designs that resulted in scope changes, are projects well managed to e	months on average. Besides
% project used by end user         96%           % Community satisfaction         67%           The indicators show that while most of the households had functional connections and the project is utilized by the end the end-user, community satisfaction of the projects diverges on the latter mentioned findings. It is noted that issues such as lighting strikes, power outages due to "izinyoka" and usage faults, lead to damaged appliances, physically hurt and inconvenienced users, which then resulted in low satisfaction. If the quality of project deliverables were monitored, why are the aforementioned challenges experienced at usage level? To what extent did feasibility studies uncover these issues prior project implementation, and incorporate them into designs and costing of projects?         75%           Value for money         % projects economical         0%         0%         77%	majority of the municipalitie changes to standards an bottlenecks relating to exter the smooth implementation	es did not have working relations with Eskom as a result of delayed outage/ene d delayed encoding of meters. Are we as a Department able to assist i ernal stakeholders? Is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the D of projects on time?	rgising schedules, last minute n addressing implementation Department working to enable
% Community satisfaction         67%           The indicators show that while most of the households had functional connections and the project is utilized by the end the end-user, community satisfaction of the projects diverges on the latter mentioned findings. It is noted that issues such as lighting strikes, power outages due to "izinyoka" and usage faults, lead to damaged appliances, physically hurt and inconvenienced users, which then resulted in low satisfaction. If the quality of project deliverables were monitored, why are the aforementioned challenges experienced at usage level? To what extent did feasibility studies uncover these issues prior project implementation, and incorporate them into designs and costing of projects?           Value for money         % projects economical         75%           % Effective         0%	Froject outcomes		
The indicators show that while most of the households had functional connections and the project is utilized by the end the end-user, community satisfaction of the projects diverges on the latter mentioned findings. It is noted that issues such as lighting strikes, power outages due to "izinyoka" and usage faults, lead to damaged appliances, physically hurt and inconvenienced users, which then resulter in low satisfaction. If the quality of project deliverables were monitored, why are the aforementioned challenges experienced at usage level? To what extent did feasibility studies uncover these issues prior project implementation, and incorporate them into designs and costing of projects?         Value for money       % projects economical       75%         % Efficient       0%         % Effective       77%			
community satisfaction of the projects diverges on the latter mentioned findings. It is noted that issues such as lighting strikes, power outages due to "izinyoka" and usage faults, lead to damaged appliances, physically hurt and inconvenienced users, which then resulted in low satisfaction. If the quality of project deliverables were monitored, why are the aforementioned challenges experienced at usage level? To what extent did feasibility studies uncover these issues prior project implementation, and incorporate them into designs and costing of projects?           Value for money         % projects economical         75%           % Efficient         0%           % Effective         77%	The ball star 1 of 1		
Value for money       % projects economical       75%         %Efficient       0%         % Effective       77%	community satisfaction of t outages due to "izinyoka" in low satisfaction. If the qu level? To what extent did for	he projects diverges on the latter mentioned findings. It is noted that issues suc and usage faults, lead to damaged appliances, physically hurt and inconveniend ality of project deliverables were monitored, why are the aforementioned challe	h as lighting strikes, power ced users, which then resulted nges experienced at usage
%Efficient     0%       % Effective     77%		% projects economical	75%
% Effective 77%	- side iei iioiioy		
THE INVEGIVE ADVITION FOR THE DEPENDENT OF THE OWNER	The indicators show that E		

# 4. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE SUPPORT PROVIDED IN THE SOUTHERN REGION

# Conceptualisation and design

The feasibility study and succeeding project designs are the most important components that make or break a project. A general principle is that feasibility studies inform project designs and project designs inform project costs.

While a majority of the projects were informed by community protests, feasibility studies should have been conducted thoroughly to ensure that subsequent designs commensurate the set environment. This would ensure that after usage challenges experienced such as lighting strikes and electrical shocks are prevented. Most importantly thorough feasibility studies ensure adequate costs are presented for funding and would prevent the risk of deviated deliverable costs.

It is also concerning that Municipalities appoint service providers to conduct such important studies that often result in scope changes and after usage challenges.

Moreover feasibility studies should be more than conducting premarketing exercises of counting needy beneficiaries; they should include environmental scan practices such as PESTLE (Political, Economic, Social, Technological, Legislative and Environmental) analysis and risk assessments, to establish the needed deliverables which communities would be satisfied about.

### Support application

It is a common project management principle that time is money and costs escalate when time is misused. A common noted trend within the region was that Municipal business plans with set dates were submitted to the Department on the month of planned implementation. This as a result results in funds being transferred to municipalities after the planned due date. It then delays procurement processes, project commencements and project implementation. Most importantly delays result in escalated costs which affect the project scope and delivery targets. This could also explain why municipalities felt that the funds provided were inadequate.

The Department needs to put in place controls that prevent delays, such as cessation of support applications that arrive at a late period before implementation.

#### Project inputs and expenditure

Alike to what was noted in the Conceptualisation and design section, project designs inform project costs. It was noted that half of the projects supported experienced deviated costs per deliverables, while feasibility studies and subsequent designs had been developed. This questions the integrity of the studies and designs to produce deliverables with little error that affects project costs.

The aforementioned issue brings the need for the use of quality assurance agents such as quantity surveyors and other professionals to assure business plans and would ensure the delivery of relevant deliverables without expenditure issues.

#### **Project implementation**

While the feasibility study and its resultant design makes or breaks a project, project management is also an important element that determines the success or failure of projects. Delays in commencement, delays in implementation and scope changes are common symptoms of poor project management. This raises the question as to what endeavours have municipalities put in place to coordinate projects before during and after implementation. This also raises the question as to how municipalities manage their project lead times. The aforementioned issues bring the need for the Department to have a readiness checklist that would ascertain if projects are well coordinated before transfers can happen. Moreover it also brings the need for the Department to impart with its project management knowledge in Project Steering Committees when providing guidance.

It was also noted that all projects had Project Steering Committees and had Departmental officials of as part of their constituents. The main purpose of these committees is to report progress, assure deliverables and report implementation bottlenecks. However the projects experienced delays while the Project Steering Committees were in place. Projects experience challenges in working relations with role-players such as Eskom, with the existence of the aforementioned committees and with awareness of the Department. A question is asked as to how effective is the feedback loop between the municipalities and the Department in ensuring that implementation bottlenecks such as poor working relations with role-players are addressed, to ensure the smooth operation of projects.

#### Project outcomes

One of the major purposes of projects is to solve problems. This is why it's important that feasibility studies are conducted thoroughly so as to ensure that the project design and implementation is adapted to the set environment, and most importantly to solve the set problem. In the Southern region it was noted that issues such as lighting strikes, power outages due to "izinyoka" and usage faults, led to damaged appliances, physically hurt users and inconvenienced users, which resulted in low satisfaction. While municipalities would

note that they have delivered to their communities, the lack of thorough studies and their incorporation into project plans often bring such results.

Quality assurance is also an issue. If municipalities have measures in place to assure deliverables, why are households experiencing after usage challenges? Are quality assurance structures within municipalities properly constituted in enabling the passing of quality deliverables, by having relevant professionals?

In light of the above the Department needs to support municipalities in conducting more credible feasibility studies and establishing proper quality assurance structures, to prevent after usage challenges.

## Value for money indicators

While the majority of the projects were economical, efficiency challenges such as time and scope management affected the deliverables leading to the noted results.