



**national treasury**

Department:  
National Treasury  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Enquiries: **Jan Hattingh**  
Tel: **012 315 5009**

E-mail: [Jan.Hattingh@treasury.gov.za](mailto:Jan.Hattingh@treasury.gov.za)

## **PRESS RELEASE**

### **31 August 2010**

#### **Local Government Budgets 2009/10 Financial Year Fourth Quarter Local Government Section 71 Report – Preliminary Results**

---

##### **SUMMARY:**

1. The fourth quarter local government budget statement was released today by the National Treasury. The statement covers revenue and expenditure for the twelve months of the 2009/10 municipal financial year, which ended on 30 June 2010. The publication also includes information on the spending of local government conditional grants. The statement is available on the National Treasury's website: [www.treasury.gov.za](http://www.treasury.gov.za).
2. National Treasury publishes this information in terms of section 71 of the Municipal Finance Management Act, 2003 (Act No. 56 of 2003)(MFMA), and in terms of section 44(3) of the 2009 Division of Revenue Act.
3. This information, referred to as the In-year Management, Monitoring and Reporting System for Local Government (IYM), will enable provincial and national government to exercise oversight over municipalities, and identify possible problems in the implementation of municipal budgets and conditional grants.
4. All information in this publication is based on the section 71 MFMA reports that each Municipal Manager and Chief Financial Officer were required to sign and submit to the National Treasury by 16 August 2010. Therefore, any queries on the budget, revenue or expenditure figures reflected in the statement must be referred to the relevant Municipal Manager or Chief Financial Officer. Queries on conditional grants may be referred to the national department responsible for administering each grant.
5. The information released with this press statement aggregates the municipal financial performance information for the fourth quarter of the 2009/10 financial year for 280 municipalities. The coverage of municipal financial information in terms of Section 71 of the MFMA has increased from 239 municipalities published for the first quarter and 274 for the second quarter of the 2009/10 financial year to 280 municipalities for the third quarter of 2009/10 and remained the same for the fourth quarter.
6. The budgeted figures disclosed are based on the 2009/10 adjusted budget statements tabled in the various municipal councils during January and February 2010.
7. Some of the notable trends that emerge from this information include:

## **HIGHLIGHTS:**

### ***Aggregated trends***

8. The fourth quarter local government budget statement of revenue and expenditure, published by the National Treasury in terms of Section 71 of the MFMA, covers spending for the twelve months of the 2009/10 financial year. It also includes spending on conditional grants in terms of Sections 44(3) of the 2009 DoRA.
9. As at 30 June 2010 (fourth quarter YTD results for the 2009/10 financial year), municipalities in aggregate spent 92.2 per cent or R196.6 billion of the R213.3 billion total adjusted budget. On the revenue side (billed revenue) they collected in aggregate, 95.1 per cent or R210.8 billion of the R221.8 billion total adjusted revenue budget.
10. Metropolitan municipalities collected 92.1 per cent of their billed revenue by the end of the fourth quarter or R120.4 billion of the total adjusted revenue budget of R130.8 billion. Cape Town collected the highest proportion of its budgeted revenue at 96.4 per cent with eThekweni following at 96.0 per cent.
11. Of the aggregated adjusted capital budget amounting to R47.8 billion, R39.7 billion or 83.1 per cent has been spent as at 30 June 2010. Metropolitan municipalities' contribution of the total capital adjusted budget accounts for R24.9 billion. Metropolitan municipalities spent 88.6 per cent or R22.1 billion as at 30 June 2010. Overspending occurred in eThekweni at 112.6 per cent or R6.7 billion out of a R6.0 billion adjusted capital budget, followed by Cape Town at 83.3 per cent or R4.7 billion out of a R5.6 billion adjusted capital budget and City of Tshwane at 82.0 per cent or R2.2 billion of a R2.7 billion adjusted capital budget. The lowest capital spending was in the Nelson Mandela Bay at 78.9 per cent.
12. Aggregated municipal consumer debts amount to R56.1 billion as at 30 June 2010 (unaudited figures) of which government's contribution represents 5.2 per cent or R2.9 billion. The largest component relates to households which account for 56.3 per cent or R31.6 billion.
13. Metropolitan municipalities were owed a total of R30.6 billion as at 30 June 2010. This is an increase of R1.2 billion or 3.9 per cent from the same period in the previous year. The City of Johannesburg is still owed the largest amount at R8.4 billion, although this is a decrease of R713 million when compared to the same period in the previous year. It is followed by Ekurhuleni Metro at R7.8 billion, Cape Town at R5.0 billion and eThekweni at R4.6 billion.
14. Consumer debts owing to secondary cities decreased from R11.9 billion reported in the third quarter to R11.7 billion as at 30 June 2010. However, when compared to the corresponding period last year, consumer debtors have increased from R8.3 billion to R11.7 billion or 40.9 per cent. As with the metropolitan municipalities consumer debtors over 90 days constitute a very large proportion, comprising of R9.3 billion or 79.8 per cent of the total amount outstanding.
15. As at 30 June 2010, municipalities owed their creditors R11.6 billion. This represent an increase of R3.5 billion from the previous quarter. Free State had the highest percentage of creditors outstanding for more than 90 days at 36.0 per cent, followed by North West at 31.0 per cent, Limpopo at 28.9 per cent and Northern Cape at 18.0 per cent. The creditor age analysis results differ vastly from quarter to quarter. Of concern are the figures reported in the period 0 to 30 days for Gauteng and KwaZulu-Natal.

### ***Conditional Grants***

16. Through the Division of Revenue Act, 2009 (Act No.12 of 2009), R21.9 billion was originally allocated to local government for both direct and indirect grants. However, this amount did not include the unconditional grant component in the form of the Equitable Share which amounts to R23.8 billion. This brings the total amount allocated to local government to

R45.7 billion. Direct conditional grants to municipalities amounted to R19.3 billion for the 2009/10 financial year.

17. These allocations have since been adjusted in line with the December adjustment gazette reflecting additional allocations, new allocations, re-allocations, rollovers and technical adjustments to the local sphere of government. These adjustments were done in terms of Sections 6(3) and 37 and re-allocations in terms of Section 29 of the 2009 Division of Revenue Act.
18. The total revised amount for conditional grants available to municipalities was R22.2 billion for the 2009/10 financial year ended on 30 June 2010. An amount of R19.3 billion was allocated as direct conditional grants of which R18.9 billion was transferred as at 31 March 2010. According to expenditure reports provided by the national departments, only 79.4 per cent was spent against the total conditional allocations. This has declined by 3.7 per cent from 83.1 per cent of the 2009 fourth quarter.
19. It should be noted that the expenditure reported by national departments for the fourth quarter period excludes performance by all metropolitan municipalities receiving the Municipal Infrastructure Grant (MIG Cities). Metropolitan municipalities' report on the entire capital programme, hence no reports specifically for MIG cities are required in terms of Section 11(2)(b) of the Division of Revenue Act, 2009. Secondly, the EPWP incentive grant performance is not reflected in the publication due to its "after the event performance nature".
20. The Municipal Systems Improvement Grant (MSIG) reflects an under spending of 68.7 per cent against their allocated amount of R200 million as reported by the national transferring officer. However, municipalities reported different amounts for all the quarters for MSIG expenditure. A total of 94.3 per cent was reported by the municipalities at the end of the municipal financial year, this indicates the inconsistencies of reporting by municipalities when reporting to the transferring national officers and National Treasury.
21. Revenue reported is based on billed revenue and not collected revenue. All revenue figures should be analysed by taking into account the municipality's cash flow and ageing debtors reported.

### ***Over and under spending***

22. As indicated above, the National Treasury is again publishing the over- and under-spending of municipalities as at the end of the financial year – 30 June 2010. The following points are worth noting:
  - 22.1. In aggregate, municipalities underspent their total budgets by R16.7 billion. This is almost 11.7 per cent of the total municipal budget. When compared to previous years, no improvement in the level of underspending has been noted. In 2008/09 aggregate net underspending was R16.6 billion or 9.1 per cent of the total municipal budget;
  - 22.2. Underspending of the operating budget in 2009/10 was R15.1 billion, while overspending was R6.5 billion. Underspending was a particular concern in the Free State and North West at 18.8 per cent and 11.8 per cent;
  - 22.3. Municipalities' net underspending of their capital budgets in 2009/10 was R8.1 billion or 17.1 per cent. This is very concerning, as it indicates either weaknesses in the ability of municipalities to compile credible budgets, or to manage the implementation of their infrastructure programmes; and
  - 22.4. In 2009/10 municipalities underspent their conditional grants by R3.6 billion or 15.9 per cent. In 2008/09 aggregate net underspending of conditional grants was R3.2 billion or 17.1 per cent. This suggests that conditional grant spending performance in municipalities has remained largely unchanged.

23. The above figures reflect the aggregate situation. Tables 12a, b and c show the number of municipalities that overspent and underspent their operating, capital and conditional grants budgets, respectively. In this regard:
- 23.1. 29 municipalities overspent their total adjusted budgets by more than 15 per cent, while 27 underspent their total adjusted budgets by more than 15 per cent;
- 23.2. Despite the total amount of underspending of conditional grants it is notable that 226 municipalities over or underspent their conditional grants allocations by 10 per cent. This certainly indicates improved management in spending; and
- 23.3. A similar trend is observed with regards to capital spending, which is positive.

### **General Issues**

24. To align the required electronic reporting with the Municipal Budget and Reporting Regulations, repairs and maintenance now form part of the asset management reporting. This will assist in eliminating the distortion by under-reporting of repairs and maintenance due to classification discrepancies when municipalities capture this expenditure. While the new budget formats begin to deal with this problem, it will only be fully resolved once there is a uniform Municipal Standard Chart of Accounts in place. Municipalities will start to use these new reports on 1 July 2010 for the new municipal financial year 2010/11. However, in order to allow the municipalities to align their systems with the new reporting requirements, a phased approach will be followed for the next 2 years with regard to returns that need to be lodged with the National Treasury in terms of Section 71 and 74 of the MFMA.

### **STRUCTURE OF INFORMATION RELEASED:**

The information released on National Treasury's website as part of this process includes the following:

- Press Release – this document
- Municipal Budget Statements:
  - a. Cash Flow closing balances as at 30 June 2010
  - b. Over and under spending on the Section 71 outcomes as at 30 June 2010
  - c. Over and under spending on Conditional Grants as at 30 June 2010
  - d. High-level summary of revenue for 280 municipalities
  - e. High-level summary of expenditure for 280 municipalities
- Summary per function (electricity, water, etc):
  - a. High level summary of revenue per function
  - b. High level summary of expenditure per function
- Consolidation of revenue and expenditure numbers for each municipality in one file
- Detail per province per municipality:
  - a. Eastern Cape
  - b. Free State
  - c. Gauteng
  - d. KwaZulu-Natal
  - e. Limpopo
  - f. Mpumalanga
  - g. Northern Cape

- h. North West
- i. Western Cape
- Summary of Conditional Grant (CG) Information:
  - a. Consolidated Conditional Grant information for all municipalities
  - b. Per grant type
- CG - Detail per province per Municipality:
  - a. Eastern Cape
  - b. Free State
  - c. Gauteng
  - d. KwaZulu-Natal
  - e. Limpopo
  - f. Mpumalanga
  - g. Northern Cape
  - h. North West
  - i. Western Cape
- Summary Information (Section 71):
  - a. Summary of total monthly operating expenditure – 4th Quarter – 280 municipalities
  - b. Summary of total monthly capital expenditure – 4th Quarter – 280 municipalities
  - c. Summary – 4th Quarter – Metros
  - d. Conditional Grant summary – 4th Quarter – Metros
  - e. Summary – 4th Quarter – Top 21 municipalities
  - f. Conditional Grant summary – 4th Quarter – Top 21 municipalities
  - g. Summary – 4th Quarter – Provinces
  - h. Conditional Grant summary – 4th Quarter – Provinces
  - i. Analysis of Sources of Revenue – 4th Quarter – 280 municipalities
- Non Compliance:
  - a. List of Non Compliance to Section 71 of the MFMA

All information is available on the National Treasury's website at [www.treasury.gov.za](http://www.treasury.gov.za).

This information will assist policy makers, researchers, sector specialists, elected representatives, academics and those responsible for implementation. The MFMA envisages that regularly published budget implementation information will enable and empower communities to hold their Municipal Councils accountable. A summary of key aggregated tables is included and can be found as part of Annexure A.

## SUMMARY TABLES:

## Aggregated revenue and expenditure for municipalities

Table 1: National aggregated revenue and expenditure as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	Adjusted Budget			Fourth Quarter 2009/10				Year to date: 30 June 2010				Fourth Quarter 2008/09				Q4 of 2008/09 to Q4 of 2009/10
	Operating	Capital	Total	Operating	Capital	Total	4th Q as % of adj bud	Operating	Capital	Total	Total as % of adj bud	Operating	Capital	Total	Total as % of adj bud	
<b>Expenditure</b>																
Category A (Metro)	98 365 821	24 887 667	123 253 488	28 002 271	8 166 086	36 168 356	29.3%	94 357 700	22 050 553	116 408 253	94.4%	22 459 117	9 927 436	32 386 554	94.9%	11.7%
Category B (Local)	57 028 086	17 150 143	74 178 229	14 204 575	4 222 348	18 426 924	24.8%	52 010 635	11 651 833	63 662 468	85.8%	11 650 424	3 804 969	15 455 393	90.1%	19.2%
Category C (District)	10 075 911	5 747 687	15 823 599	3 455 446	2 441 034	5 896 480	37.3%	10 568 781	5 922 414	16 491 195	104.2%	2 193 637	959 146	3 152 783	96.3%	87.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>165 469 818</b>	<b>47 785 497</b>	<b>213 255 315</b>	<b>45 662 292</b>	<b>14 829 468</b>	<b>60 491 760</b>	<b>28.4%</b>	<b>156 937 116</b>	<b>39 624 799</b>	<b>196 561 915</b>	<b>92.2%</b>	<b>36 303 178</b>	<b>14 691 551</b>	<b>50 994 729</b>	<b>93.4%</b>	<b>18.6%</b>
<b>Revenue</b>																
Category A (Metro)	105 863 030	24 887 667	130 750 697	24 980 125	8 166 086	33 146 211	25.4%	98 345 702	22 050 553	120 396 255	92.1%	21 286 703	9 927 436	31 214 139	90.9%	6.2%
Category B (Local)	59 158 998	16 327 903	75 486 901	12 832 947	3 986 903	16 819 850	22.3%	58 370 676	10 890 895	69 261 571	91.8%	11 455 807	3 749 693	15 205 500	95.8%	10.6%
Category C (District)	11 076 309	4 440 006	15 516 315	4 299 733	2 253 573	6 553 306	42.2%	15 416 854	5 736 369	21 153 222	136.3%	1 797 294	969 336	2 766 630	117.6%	136.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>176 098 337</b>	<b>45 655 576</b>	<b>221 753 913</b>	<b>42 112 805</b>	<b>14 406 562</b>	<b>56 519 367</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>172 133 232</b>	<b>38 677 816</b>	<b>210 811 048</b>	<b>95.1%</b>	<b>34 539 803</b>	<b>14 646 466</b>	<b>49 186 269</b>	<b>94.1%</b>	<b>14.9%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

## Aggregate revenue trends for Metros

Table 2: Metros aggregated revenue as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	Adjusted Budget			Fourth Quarter 2009/10				Year to date: 30 June 2010				Fourth Quarter 2008/09				Q4 of 2008/09 to Q4 of 2009/10
	Operating Revenue	Capital Revenue	Total	Operating Revenue	Capital Revenue	Total	4th Q as % of adj bud	Operating Revenue	Capital Revenue	Total	Total Revenue as % of adj bud	Operating Revenue	Capital Revenue	Total	Total Revenue as % of adj bud	
Cape Town	25 348 675	5 602 499	30 951 173	6 996 200	1 725 981	8 722 181	28.2%	25 159 063	4 665 997	29 825 061	96.4%	5 420 397	2 118 005	7 538 402	97.9%	15.7%
Ekurhuleni Metro	14 996 606	2 272 350	17 268 956	2 828 204	1 143 672	3 971 876	23.0%	13 662 238	1 860 141	15 522 378	89.9%	2 464 223	891 508	3 355 731	87.9%	18.4%
eThekweni	20 495 487	5 950 166	26 445 653	4 714 912	2 137 734	6 852 646	25.9%	18 696 787	6 702 089	25 398 876	96.0%	3 647 773	2 382 291	6 030 064	87.5%	13.6%
City Of Johannesburg	25 402 455	5 473 900	30 876 355	6 004 872	1 027 845	7 032 717	22.8%	22 565 784	4 330 931	26 896 716	87.1%	5 800 615	2 348 799	8 149 414	88.5%	(13.7%)
Nelson Mandela Bay	5 179 569	2 911 819	8 091 389	1 072 633	1 134 305	2 206 938	27.3%	4 755 382	2 296 211	7 051 593	87.1%	656 380	757 535	1 413 915	91.4%	56.1%
City Of Tshwane	14 440 238	2 676 933	17 117 171	3 363 304	996 548	4 359 853	25.5%	13 506 447	2 195 184	15 701 631	91.7%	3 297 315	1 429 298	4 726 613	91.5%	(7.8%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>105 863 030</b>	<b>24 887 667</b>	<b>130 750 697</b>	<b>24 980 125</b>	<b>8 166 086</b>	<b>33 146 211</b>	<b>25.4%</b>	<b>98 345 702</b>	<b>22 050 553</b>	<b>120 396 255</b>	<b>92.1%</b>	<b>21 286 703</b>	<b>9 927 436</b>	<b>31 214 139</b>	<b>90.9%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

## Aggregate expenditure trends for Metros

Table 3: Metros aggregated expenditure as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	Adjusted Budget			Fourth Quarter 2009/10				Year to date: 30 June 2010				Fourth Quarter 2008/09				Q4 of 2008/09 to Q4 of 2009/10
	Operating Expenditure	Capital Expenditure	Total	Operating Expenditure	Capital Expenditure	Total	4th Q as % of adj bud	Operating Expenditure	Capital Expenditure	Total	Total Exp as % of adj bud	Operating Expenditure	Capital Expenditure	Total	Total Expenditure as % of adjusted budget	
Cape Town	23 598 284	5 602 499	29 200 783	7 428 204	1 725 981	9 154 184	31.3%	23 109 405	4 665 997	27 775 403	95.1%	4 868 347	2 118 005	6 986 352	94.9%	31.0%
Ekurhuleni Metro	15 611 039	2 272 350	17 883 389	3 682 362	1 143 672	4 826 034	27.0%	14 130 489	1 860 141	15 990 630	89.4%	2 881 258	891 508	3 772 767	85.6%	27.9%
eThekweni	18 013 061	5 950 166	23 963 227	4 745 546	2 137 734	6 883 280	28.7%	17 091 396	6 702 089	23 793 485	99.3%	3 878 418	2 382 291	6 260 709	91.9%	9.9%
City Of Johannesburg	22 480 843	5 473 900	27 954 743	5 840 830	1 027 845	6 868 675	24.6%	21 657 952	4 330 931	25 988 883	93.0%	6 026 350	2 348 799	8 375 149	104.3%	(18.0%)
Nelson Mandela Bay	5 243 401	2 911 819	8 155 220	2 190 885	1 134 305	3 325 190	40.8%	5 192 597	2 296 211	7 488 808	91.8%	1 204 595	757 535	1 962 130	90.8%	69.5%
City Of Tshwane	13 419 192	2 676 933	16 096 125	4 114 444	996 548	5 110 992	31.8%	13 175 860	2 195 184	15 371 043	95.5%	3 600 149	1 429 298	5 029 447	94.8%	1.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>98 365 821</b>	<b>24 887 667</b>	<b>123 253 488</b>	<b>28 002 271</b>	<b>8 166 086</b>	<b>36 168 356</b>	<b>29.3%</b>	<b>94 357 700</b>	<b>22 050 553</b>	<b>116 408 253</b>	<b>94.4%</b>	<b>22 459 117</b>	<b>9 927 436</b>	<b>32 386 554</b>	<b>94.9%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

## Aggregated revenue and expenditure for Secondary cities

Table 4: 21 Secondary cities aggregated budgets and expenditure as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	Adjusted Budget			Fourth Quarter 2009/10				Year to date: 30 June 2010				Fourth Quarter 2008/09				Q4 of 2008/09 to Q4 of 2009/10
	Operating Expenditure	Capital Expenditure	Total	Operating Expenditure	Capital Expenditure	Total	4th Q as % of adj bud	Operating Expenditure	Capital Expenditure	Total	Total Exp as % of adj bud	Operating Expenditure	Capital Expenditure	Total	Total Exp as % of adj bud	
Emaahleni (Mp)	959 635	328 378	1 288 013	195 087	4 109	199 196	15.5%	875 582	75 566	951 149	73.8%	290 923	59 413	350 336	214.8%	(43.1%)
Madibeng	767 382	263 499	1 030 881	205 316	28 483	233 799	22.7%	667 396	77 759	745 155	72.3%	-	25 013	25 013	85.1%	834.7%
Steve Tshwete	663 046	355 399	1 018 445	169 932	74 052	243 984	24.0%	633 632	150 519	784 152	77.0%	115 509	62 131	177 640	74.6%	37.3%
Buffalo City	2 804 726	729 855	3 534 582	971 491	204 626	1 176 117	33.3%	2 483 042	402 972	2 886 014	81.7%	665 858	179 559	845 417	82.3%	39.1%
Govan Mbeki	805 772	108 670	914 443	184 725	20 834	205 560	22.5%	786 214	60 229	846 443	92.6%	179 173	24 475	203 648	88.1%	0.9%
Majhabeng	1 222 018	260 388	1 482 406	215 126	52 358	267 484	18.0%	859 944	145 605	1 005 549	67.8%	-	16 827	16 827	33.3%	1489.6%
City Of Matlosana	1 197 941	357 706	1 555 647	264 462	69 825	334 288	21.5%	1 003 864	200 736	1 204 600	77.4%	242 665	77 251	319 916	81.3%	4.5%
Rustenburg	1 609 495	348 792	1 958 287	580 398	58 711	639 109	32.6%	2 062 650	221 525	2 284 175	116.6%	247 729	60 159	307 888	86.4%	107.6%
Mogale City	1 116 937	152 526	1 269 463	307 468	41 216	348 684	27.5%	964 547	99 892	1 064 439	83.8%	247 855	32 487	280 343	88.1%	24.4%
Msunduzi	2 753 579	263 002	3 016 582	560 972	32 299	593 270	19.7%	2 177 000	175 886	2 352 887	78.0%	584 299	115 761	700 060	107.9%	(15.3%)
Newcastle	942 596	148 213	1 090 809	222 178	43 576	265 754	24.4%	917 764	100 745	1 018 509	93.4%	198 285	23 747	222 032	984.0%	19.7%
Stellenbosch	704 092	223 303	927 395	129 653	90 099	219 752	23.7%	505 532	153 721	659 252	71.1%	117 117	58 056	175 173	82.1%	25.4%
Mbombela	1 718 227	1 339 190	3 057 417	698 771	266 753	965 524	31.6%	1 727 969	925 426	2 653 395	86.8%	222 813	251 643	474 456	68.0%	103.5%
Polokwane	1 091 460	1 297 758	2 389 218	312 382	338 624	651 006	27.2%	974 825	897 217	1 872 042	78.4%	187 149	350 091	537 240	82.6%	21.2%
Sol Plaatje	901 778	161 693	1 063 471	172 479	39 359	211 838	19.9%	766 327	117 635	883 961	83.1%	160 237	9 626	169 863	83.1%	24.7%
Mangaung	2 693 617	928 321	3 621 939	780 544	260 786	1 041 330	28.8%	2 594 285	702 491	3 296 776	91.0%	896 430	164 326	1 060 756	90.4%	(1.8%)
Tlokwe	569 293	140 709	710 002	159 247	50 582	209 830	29.6%	554 513	106 892	661 404	93.2%	121 870	31 549	153 418	87.2%	36.8%
uMhlatuze	1 442 768	286 309	1 729 077	349 669	55 363	405 032	23.4%	1 398 129	234 599	1 632 727	94.4%	282 821	110 815	393 636	77.8%	2.9%
George	893 511	280 972	1 174 484	182 563	98 103	280 667	23.9%	638 552	239 953	878 505	74.8%	162 195	114 260	276 455	84.1%	1.5%
Drakenstein	940 719	293 079	1 233 798	284 563	130 510	415 073	33.6%	919 866	251 966	1 171 832	95.0%	353 979	112 098	466 076	105.0%	(10.9%)
Emfuleni	2 909 435	251 117	3 160 552	1 029 896	99 250	1 129 146	35.7%	2 721 458	302 524	3 023 982	95.7%	495 186	(26 797)	468 389	67.7%	141.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28 708 028</b>	<b>8 518 881</b>	<b>37 226 909</b>	<b>7 976 925</b>	<b>2 059 517</b>	<b>10 036 442</b>	<b>27.0%</b>	<b>26 233 089</b>	<b>5 643 857</b>	<b>31 876 947</b>	<b>85.6%</b>	<b>5 772 094</b>	<b>1 852 489</b>	<b>7 624 583</b>	<b>86.6%</b>	<b>31.6%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

## Operating Expenditure per functions for Metros

Table 5: Metros aggregated budgets and expenditure per function as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

	Budget		Fourth Quarter 2009/10		Year to date: 30 June 2010		Fourth Quarter 2008/09		Q4 of 2008/09 to Q4 of 2009/10
	Main appropriation	Adjusted Budget	Actual Expenditure	4th Q as % of adj bud	Actual Expenditure	Total Exp as % of adj bud	Actual Expenditure	Total Exp as % of adj bud	
<b>R thousands</b>									
<b>Water</b>									
Cape Town	2 947 207	2 857 366	846 736	29.6%	2 759 372	96.6%	606 099	99.8%	39.7%
Ekurhuleni Metro	4 440 118	2 452 409	592 181	24.1%	2 229 199	90.9%	501 121	97.4%	18.2%
eThekwini	2 564 098	2 564 098	939 831	36.7%	2 817 625	109.9%	641 067	89.0%	46.6%
City Of Johannesburg	3 783 728	3 757 011	892 686	23.8%	3 708 007	98.7%	881 830	108.8%	1.2%
Nelson Mandela Bay	393 333	378 227	217 085	57.4%	401 689	106.2%	155 604	125.2%	39.5%
City Of Tshwane	1 534 975	1 570 567	462 846	29.5%	1 500 519	95.5%	366 210	86.7%	26.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15 663 459</b>	<b>13 579 678</b>	<b>3 951 365</b>	<b>29.1%</b>	<b>13 416 410</b>	<b>98.8%</b>	<b>3 151 931</b>	<b>98.6%</b>	<b>25.4%</b>
<b>Electricity</b>									
Cape Town	5 269 374	5 075 072	1 712 144	33.7%	5 152 726	101.5%	918 079	89.0%	86.5%
Ekurhuleni Metro	556 603	6 141 779	1 525 698	24.8%	5 787 588	94.2%	937 959	87.5%	62.7%
eThekwini	5 716 807	5 762 510	1 372 819	23.8%	5 271 652	91.5%	1 115 110	84.4%	23.1%
City Of Johannesburg	6 555 881	6 889 873	1 738 131	25.2%	6 496 496	94.3%	1 478 962	99.1%	17.5%
Nelson Mandela Bay	1 649 032	1 774 111	613 080	34.6%	1 652 856	93.2%	239 871	73.2%	155.6%
City Of Tshwane	4 132 372	4 227 720	1 280 165	30.3%	4 333 844	102.5%	967 493	104.1%	32.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>23 880 069</b>	<b>29 871 064</b>	<b>8 242 038</b>	<b>27.6%</b>	<b>28 695 162</b>	<b>96.1%</b>	<b>5 657 475</b>	<b>91.5%</b>	<b>45.7%</b>
<b>Waste Water Management</b>									
Cape Town	1 303 626	1 344 133	426 883	31.8%	1 434 154	106.7%	348 493	104.9%	22.5%
Ekurhuleni Metro	445 502	50 376	47 341	94.0%	50 175	99.6%	1 391	51.4%	3303.7%
eThekwini	891 874	895 421	258 161	28.8%	862 111	96.3%	188 982	93.6%	36.6%
City Of Johannesburg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nelson Mandela Bay	370 009	348 699	80 060	23.0%	280 744	80.5%	94 512	86.1%	(15.3%)
City Of Tshwane	718 622	766 837	373 728	48.7%	900 996	117.5%	318 878	127.6%	17.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 729 633</b>	<b>3 405 465</b>	<b>1 186 172</b>	<b>34.8%</b>	<b>3 528 180</b>	<b>103.6%</b>	<b>952 256</b>	<b>104.6%</b>	<b>24.6%</b>
<b>Waste Management</b>									
Cape Town	1 588 255	1 596 966	497 573	31.2%	1 602 561	100.4%	399 089	100.1%	24.7%
Ekurhuleni Metro	637 840	759 131	209 355	27.6%	686 810	90.5%	154 068	109.5%	35.9%
eThekwini	851 840	851 840	200 346	23.5%	739 386	86.8%	176 146	102.1%	13.7%
City Of Johannesburg	1 214 047	1 057 566	200 258	18.9%	991 387	93.7%	297 804	94.2%	(32.8%)
Nelson Mandela Bay	236 186	243 468	108 246	44.5%	273 867	112.5%	34 570	73.8%	213.1%
City Of Tshwane	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>4 528 169</b>	<b>4 508 971</b>	<b>1 215 778</b>	<b>27.0%</b>	<b>4 294 011</b>	<b>95.2%</b>	<b>1 061 676</b>	<b>98.4%</b>	<b>14.5%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database



## Expenditure per functions for secondary cities

Table 6a: 21 Secondary cities aggregated budgets and expenditure per function as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	Budget		Fourth Quarter 2009/10		Year to date: 30 June 2010		Fourth Quarter 2008/09		Q4 of 2008/09 to Q4 of 2009/10
	Main appropriation	Adjusted Budget	Actual Expenditure	4th Q as % of adj bud	Actual Expenditure	Total Exp as % of adj bud	Actual Expenditure	Total Exp as % of adj bud	
<b>Water</b>									
Buffalo City	247 708	247 708	75 544	30.5%	230 050	92.9%	65 408	95.1%	15.5%
City Of Matlosana	69 670	33 159	19 301	58.2%	114 673	345.8%	48 750	106.7%	(60.4%)
Drakenstein	52 671	52 671	16 451	31.2%	44 831	85.1%	36 505	127.8%	(54.9%)
Emalahleni (Mp)	101 387	101 387	16 601	16.4%	93 743	92.5%	23 169	-	(28.3%)
Emfuleni	438 929	379 750	85 912	22.6%	338 467	89.1%	79 497	80.8%	8.1%
George	90 933	93 809	19 867	21.2%	65 826	70.2%	17 621	75.9%	12.7%
Govan Mbeki	136 174	136 174	11 301	8.3%	101 565	74.6%	30 384	110.4%	(62.8%)
Madibeng	77 989	77 989	37 678	48.3%	66 922	85.8%	-	32.0%	-
Mangaung	316 419	320 546	90 663	28.3%	307 971	96.1%	97 034	97.6%	(6.6%)
Matjhabeng	170 122	253 549	59 071	23.3%	176 418	69.6%	-	25.3%	-
Mbombela	96 119	114 025	31 932	28.0%	99 443	87.2%	21 595	87.2%	47.9%
Mogale City	190 343	133 683	36 712	27.5%	123 592	92.5%	36 998	86.0%	(0.8%)
Msunduzi	263 121	292 722	81 607	27.9%	291 608	99.6%	76 539	106.2%	6.6%
Newcastle	205 759	205 258	38 762	18.9%	162 923	79.4%	38 238	-	1.4%
Polokwane	176 973	175 372	35 816	20.4%	140 802	80.3%	39 086	-	(8.4%)
Rustenburg	242 727	242 727	106 488	43.9%	311 902	128.5%	31 151	101.9%	241.8%
Sol Plaatje	94 457	99 857	19 874	19.9%	79 640	79.8%	23 318	85.7%	(14.8%)
Stellenbosch	47 324	70 417	10 540	15.0%	35 159	49.9%	8 865	77.3%	18.9%
Steve Tshwete	29 707	41 589	9 842	23.7%	39 435	94.8%	7 093	90.3%	38.7%
Tlokwe	34 508	35 380	6 205	17.5%	23 918	67.6%	10 057	107.0%	(38.3%)
uMhlathuze	160 028	173 729	40 939	23.6%	162 206	93.4%	33 687	91.4%	21.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 243 064</b>	<b>3 281 499</b>	<b>851 106</b>	<b>25.9%</b>	<b>3 011 094</b>	<b>91.8%</b>	<b>724 998</b>	<b>102.0%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

Table 6b: 21 Secondary cities aggregated budgets and expenditure per function as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	Budget		Fourth Quarter 2009/10		Year to date: 30 June 2010		Fourth Quarter 2008/09		Q4 of 2008/09 to Q4 of 2009/10
	Main appropriation	Adjusted Budget	Actual Expenditure	4th Q as % of adj bud	Actual Expenditure	Total Exp as % of adj bud	Actual Expenditure	Total Exp as % of adj bud	
<b>Electricity</b>									
Buffalo City	745 003	745 003	213 008	28.6%	677 342	90.9%	182 221	95.2%	16.9%
City Of Matlosana	301 221	272 008	48 184	17.7%	244 643	89.9%	62 230	102.8%	(22.6%)
Drakenstein	360 915	360 915	108 271	30.0%	389 802	108.0%	102 532	110.7%	5.6%
Emalahleni (Mp)	380 477	380 477	89 669	23.6%	386 224	101.5%	97 197	-	(7.7%)
Emfuleni	786 094	769 515	177 152	23.0%	806 631	104.8%	128 056	87.6%	38.3%
George	242 061	240 093	49 343	20.6%	184 972	77.0%	40 258	78.5%	22.6%
Govan Mbeki	237 432	237 432	87 941	37.0%	231 255	97.4%	39 420	90.2%	123.1%
Madibeng	175 233	175 233	33 965	19.4%	167 418	95.5%	-	(41.5%)	-
Mangaung	1 045 194	1 040 083	321 792	30.9%	1 039 591	100.0%	308 391	98.0%	4.3%
Matjhabeng	209 942	209 942	39 108	18.6%	196 437	93.6%	-	28.1%	-
Mbombela	55 897	55 402	27 978	50.5%	64 192	115.9%	11 695	76.0%	139.2%
Mogale City	318 382	342 055	89 309	26.1%	280 494	82.0%	72 453	78.1%	23.3%
Msunduzi	938 462	785 036	216 592	27.6%	812 665	103.5%	127 854	100.4%	69.4%
Newcastle	251 742	271 624	41 150	15.1%	220 108	81.0%	43 765	-	(6.0%)
Polokwane	334 312	333 812	79 475	23.8%	291 196	87.2%	68 003	-	16.9%
Rustenburg	676 977	676 977	193 857	28.6%	891 178	131.6%	66 200	83.1%	192.8%
Sol Plaatje	254 569	256 169	47 002	18.3%	220 341	86.0%	35 614	93.8%	32.0%
Stellenbosch	159 871	167 449	37 728	22.5%	147 990	88.4%	27 912	95.6%	35.2%
Steve Tshwete	197 453	210 959	56 759	26.9%	207 396	98.3%	34 091	87.6%	66.5%
Tlokwe	197 028	188 423	54 054	28.7%	196 640	104.4%	39 442	99.2%	37.0%
uMhlathuze	532 379	593 911	157 072	26.4%	624 344	105.1%	97 738	76.2%	60.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8 400 643</b>	<b>8 312 516</b>	<b>2 169 408</b>	<b>26.1%</b>	<b>8 280 858</b>	<b>99.6%</b>	<b>1 585 073</b>	<b>106.8%</b>	<b>36.9%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

Table 6c: 21 Secondary cities aggregated budgets and expenditure per function as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	Budget		Fourth Quarter 2009/10		Year to date: 30 June 2010		Fourth Quarter 2008/09		Q4 of 2008/09 to Q4 of 2009/10
	Main appropriation	Adjusted Budget	Actual Expenditure	4th Q as % of adj bud	Actual Expenditure	Total Exp as % of adj bud	Actual Expenditure	Total Exp as % of adj bud	
<b>Waste Water Menegement</b>									
Buffalo City	248 524	248 524	107 022	43.1%	239 551	96.4%	77 470	100.5%	38.1%
City Of Matlosana	208 717	98 257	(3 776)	(3.8%)	(7)	(0.0%)	(21 004)	26.3%	(82.0%)
Drakenstein	47 528	47 528	12 454	26.2%	35 545	74.8%	26 716	131.8%	(53.4%)
Emalahleni (Mp)	24 446	24 446	7 546	30.9%	36 009	147.3%	5 049	-	49.5%
Emfuleni	245 929	243 794	23 413	9.6%	87 126	35.7%	18 559	52.4%	26.2%
George	107 293	123 137	23 536	19.1%	81 757	66.4%	21 387	74.9%	10.1%
Govan Mbeki	55 359	55 359	9 937	18.0%	51 731	93.4%	14 059	116.9%	(29.3%)
Madibeng	14 515	14 515	14 732	101.5%	30 677	211.3%	-	63.6%	-
Mangaung	103 531	99 900	22 925	22.9%	91 406	91.5%	43 656	107.0%	(47.5%)
Matjhabeng	-	-	14 171	-	36 674	-	-	24.6%	-
Mbombela	20 874	89 757	23 809	26.5%	81 359	90.6%	4 715	85.1%	405.0%
Mogale City	61 549	48 078	10 916	22.7%	33 255	69.2%	8 504	75.0%	28.4%
Msunduzi	20 929	8 446	1 752	20.7%	7 761	91.9%	36 761	106.2%	(95.2%)
Newcastle	49 156	44 133	10 787	24.4%	41 344	93.7%	12 596	-	(14.4%)
Polokwane	24 149	24 149	5 492	22.7%	20 582	85.2%	8 719	-	(37.0%)
Rustenburg	62 328	62 328	26 580	42.6%	71 168	114.2%	8 979	73.3%	196.0%
Sol Plaatje	31 876	32 429	6 327	19.5%	29 509	91.0%	3 661	75.6%	72.8%
Stellenbosch	42 187	58 962	7 682	13.0%	29 057	49.3%	6 753	78.7%	13.8%
Steve Tshwete	25 777	33 256	7 994	24.0%	32 136	96.6%	5 714	93.5%	39.9%
Tlokwe	25 636	62 065	6 838	11.0%	25 159	40.5%	5 324	98.7%	28.4%
uMhlathuze	84 160	93 839	16 729	17.8%	78 900	84.1%	15 774	77.9%	6.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 504 464</b>	<b>1 512 902</b>	<b>356 867</b>	<b>23.6%</b>	<b>1 140 701</b>	<b>75.4%</b>	<b>303 390</b>	<b>89.9%</b>	<b>17.6%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

Table 6d: 21 Secondary cities aggregated budgets and expenditure per function as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	Budget		Fourth Quarter 2009/10		Year to date: 30 June 2010		Fourth Quarter 2008/09		Q4 of 2008/09 to Q4 of 2009/10
	Main appropriation	Adjusted Budget	Actual Expenditure	4th Q as % of adj bud	Actual Expenditure	Total Exp as % of adj bud	Actual Expenditure	Total Exp as % of adj bud	
<b>Waste Management</b>									
Buffalo City	185 901	185 901	43 570	23.4%	130 825	70.4%	36 138	82.4%	20.6%
City Of Matlosana	89 943	39 448	10 548	26.7%	37 094	94.0%	9 089	89.5%	16.0%
Drakenstein	37 629	37 629	10 787	28.7%	34 400	91.4%	13 053	94.2%	(17.4%)
Emalahleni (Mp)	38 602	38 602	10 091	26.1%	44 110	114.3%	8 619	-	17.1%
Emfuleni	177 764	180 851	23 388	12.9%	96 858	53.6%	22 684	35.0%	3.1%
George	39 081	39 589	7 567	19.1%	28 526	72.1%	7 452	92.2%	1.5%
Govan Mbeki	41 370	41 370	6 117	14.8%	33 014	79.8%	8 373	108.8%	(26.9%)
Madibeng	33 415	33 415	-	-	10 334	30.9%	-	-	-
Mangaung	75 829	74 714	19 414	26.0%	76 265	102.1%	25 838	111.4%	(24.9%)
Matjhabeng	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mbombela	56 236	253 021	78 139	30.9%	221 801	87.7%	17 025	95.9%	359.0%
Mogale City	68 500	60 762	19 411	31.9%	59 489	97.9%	18 019	97.3%	7.7%
Msunduzi	196 758	200 376	46 773	23.3%	191 811	95.7%	23 827	124.3%	96.3%
Newcastle	73 894	72 977	11 321	15.5%	49 058	67.2%	14 946	-	(24.2%)
Polokwane	51 321	50 821	13 568	26.7%	37 276	73.3%	19 872	-	(31.7%)
Rustenburg	75 431	75 431	42 719	56.6%	99 050	131.3%	9 160	64.6%	366.4%
Sol Plaatje	31 275	31 275	10 449	33.4%	31 299	100.1%	4 496	81.1%	132.4%
Stellenbosch	26 055	27 115	5 406	19.9%	21 482	79.2%	4 503	78.7%	20.1%
Steve Tshwete	28 497	31 730	7 821	24.6%	30 520	96.2%	5 885	95.7%	32.9%
Tlokwe	32 088	16 266	11 632	71.5%	32 503	199.8%	6 009	89.2%	93.6%
uMhlathuze	40 526	40 235	11 932	29.7%	47 618	118.4%	7 495	79.1%	59.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 400 114</b>	<b>1 531 527</b>	<b>390 653</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>1 313 333</b>	<b>85.8%</b>	<b>262 481</b>	<b>93.3%</b>	<b>48.8%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

## Aggregated Municipal Debtors Age Analysis

**Table 7a: Debtor Age Analysis as at 30 June 2010**

R thousands	0 - 30 Days		30 - 60 Days		60 - 90 Days		Over 90 Days		Total		Bad Debt Written Off	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
<b>Debtor Age Analysis By Income Source</b>												
Water	1 546 878	9.9	690 806	4.4	539 211	3.5	12 827 552	82.2	15 604 446	27.8	95 567	0.6
Electricity	2 872 480	36.3	702 904	8.9	353 415	4.5	3 990 124	50.4	7 918 924	14.1	22 508	0.3
Property Rates	1 626 485	13.6	539 374	4.5	388 098	3.2	9 411 976	78.7	11 965 934	21.3	110 810	0.9
Sanitation	406 324	10.3	161 465	4.1	120 384	3.1	3 250 564	82.5	3 938 737	7.0	57 984	1.5
Refuse Removal	294 787	8.2	116 941	3.3	98 616	2.8	3 075 206	85.8	3 585 550	6.4	56 373	1.6
Other	764 670	5.9	407 495	3.1	293 947	2.3	11 572 498	88.8	13 038 610	23.3	479 731	3.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>7 511 624</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>2 618 985</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>1 793 672</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>44 127 921</b>	<b>78.7</b>	<b>56 052 201</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>822 973</b>	<b>1.5</b>
<b>Debtor Age Analysis By Customer Group</b>												
Government	426 945	14.8	152 949	5.3	95 095	3.3	2 217 555	76.7	2 892 544	5.2	42 628	1.5
Business	2 212 479	33.7	417 062	6.3	260 046	4.0	3 683 336	56.0	6 572 924	11.7	38 454	0.6
Households	3 400 800	10.8	1 462 547	4.6	980 386	3.1	25 701 701	81.5	31 545 434	56.3	734 334	2.3
Other	1 471 400	9.8	586 427	3.9	458 144	3.0	12 525 328	83.3	15 041 299	26.8	165 328	1.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>7 511 624</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>2 618 985</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>1 793 672</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>44 127 921</b>	<b>78.7</b>	<b>56 052 201</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>980 745</b>	<b>1.7</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

1. All figures are unaudited.

## Debtors' Age Analysis for the Metros

Table 7b: Metros Debtors Age Analysis as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	0 - 30 Days		31 - 60 Days		61 - 90 Days		Over 90 Days		Total	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
<b>4th Quarter ended 30 June 2010</b>										
Nelson Mandela Bay	293 629	24.9%	75 685	6.4%	25 681	2.2%	784 277	66.5%	1 179 271	3.9%
Ekurhuleni Metro	872 507	11.2%	320 508	4.1%	219 610	2.8%	6 372 595	81.9%	7 785 219	25.4%
City Of Johannesburg	614 074	7.3%	536 072	6.4%	388 155	4.6%	6 864 645	81.7%	8 402 946	27.5%
City Of Tshwane	836 609	23.6%	74 590	2.1%	108 745	3.1%	2 524 854	71.2%	3 544 798	11.6%
eThekwini	819 370	17.7%	251 800	5.4%	132 457	2.9%	3 431 948	74.0%	4 635 575	15.2%
Cape Town	999 918	19.8%	280 635	5.6%	131 312	2.6%	3 632 266	72.0%	5 044 130	16.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4 436 107</b>	<b>14.5%</b>	<b>1 539 288</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>1 005 960</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>23 610 584</b>	<b>77.2%</b>	<b>30 591 939</b>	<b>16.7%</b>
<b>4th Quarter ended 30 June 2009</b>										
Nelson Mandela Bay	228 903	23.8%	63 896	6.6%	21 657	2.3%	647 888	67.3%	962 344	3.3%
Ekurhuleni Metro	732 039	10.8%	278 097	4.1%	211 297	3.1%	5 577 655	82.0%	6 799 089	23.1%
City Of Johannesburg	2 432 958	26.7%	500 473	5.5%	322 012	3.5%	5 860 906	64.3%	9 116 349	31.0%
City Of Tshwane	813 388	23.5%	115 825	3.4%	100 488	2.9%	2 424 792	70.2%	3 454 493	11.7%
eThekwini	850 830	18.2%	196 567	4.2%	124 160	2.7%	3 499 704	74.9%	4 671 262	15.9%
Cape Town	832 056	18.8%	221 963	5.0%	184 920	4.2%	3 190 151	72.0%	4 429 089	15.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5 890 174</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>1 376 820</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>964 535</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>21 201 095</b>	<b>72.0%</b>	<b>29 432 625</b>	<b>16.7%</b>
<b>Movement between 30 June 2009 and 30 June 2010</b>										
Nelson Mandela Bay	64 727		11 789		4 023		136 389		216 928	
Ekurhuleni Metro	140 467		42 411		8 312		794 940		986 130	
City Of Johannesburg	(1 818 884)		35 599		66 143		1 003 738		(713 403)	
City Of Tshwane	23 221		(41 235)		8 257		100 062		90 305	
eThekwini	(31 460)		55 232		8 297		(67 757)		(35 687)	
Cape Town	167 862		58 672		(53 608)		442 115		615 041	
<b>Total</b>	<b>(1 454 067)</b>		<b>162 468</b>		<b>41 425</b>		<b>2 409 489</b>		<b>1 159 314</b>	
<b>Growth rate Q4 of 2008/09 to Q4 of 2009/10</b>										
Nelson Mandela Bay	28.3%		18.5%		18.6%		21.1%		22.5%	
Ekurhuleni Metro	19.2%		15.3%		3.9%		14.3%		14.5%	
City Of Johannesburg	(74.8%)		7.1%		20.5%		17.1%		(7.8%)	
City Of Tshwane	2.9%		(35.6%)		8.2%		4.1%		2.6%	
eThekwini	(3.7%)		28.1%		6.7%		(1.9%)		(0.8%)	
Cape Town	20.2%		26.4%		(29.0%)		13.9%		13.9%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>(24.7%)</b>		<b>11.8%</b>		<b>4.3%</b>		<b>11.4%</b>		<b>3.9%</b>	

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

Table 7c: Metros Debtors Age Analysis by Customer Group as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	0 - 30 Days		30 - 60 Days		60 - 90 Days		Over 90 Days		Total		Bad Debt Written Off	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
<b>Debtor Age Analysis By Customer Group</b>												
Government	211 916	15.7%	67 542	5.0%	19 937	1.5%	1 052 601	77.9%	1 351 996	4.4%	-	-
Business	1 466 436	38.8%	244 843	6.5%	156 313	4.1%	1 909 960	50.6%	3 777 552	12.3%	-	-
Households	2 065 723	11.9%	876 866	5.1%	559 186	3.2%	13 827 136	79.8%	17 328 911	56.6%	-	-
Other	692 032	8.5%	350 037	4.3%	270 524	3.3%	6 820 887	83.9%	8 133 480	26.6%	116 598	1.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4 436 107</b>	<b>14.5%</b>	<b>1 539 288</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>1 005 960</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>23 610 584</b>	<b>77.2%</b>	<b>30 591 939</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>116 598</b>	<b>.4%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

## Debtors' Age Analysis for secondary cities

Table 8a: 21 Secondary cities Debtors Age Analysis as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	0 - 30 Days		31 - 60 Days		61 - 90 Days		Over 90 Days		Total	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
Buffalo City	121 226	18.2%	37 090	5.6%	23 356	3.5%	483 477	72.7%	665 149	5.7%
City Of Matlosana	61 308	6.8%	27 728	3.1%	21 760	2.4%	793 660	87.7%	904 456	7.8%
Drakenstein	46 064	19.7%	9 340	4.0%	7 237	3.1%	170 706	73.2%	233 347	2.0%
Emalahleni (Mp)	50 899	10.3%	19 653	4.0%	15 688	3.2%	410 106	82.6%	496 345	4.3%
Emfuleni	121 578	6.7%	42 481	2.4%	41 260	2.3%	1 600 500	88.6%	1 805 819	15.5%
George	26 853	32.1%	3 258	3.9%	2 631	3.1%	51 024	60.9%	83 766	0.7%
Govan Mbeki	18 564	4.6%	15 350	3.8%	12 062	3.0%	360 168	88.7%	406 144	3.5%
Madibeng	39 590	8.4%	23 512	5.0%	18 688	4.0%	389 769	82.7%	471 559	4.0%
Mangaung	160 819	13.9%	60 138	5.2%	38 674	3.3%	894 915	77.5%	1 154 546	9.9%
Matjhabeng	70 619	8.7%	40 258	5.0%	32 185	4.0%	667 690	82.4%	810 751	7.0%
Mbombela	40 478	12.5%	1 818	0.6%	15 087	4.7%	266 829	82.3%	324 212	2.8%
Mogale City	151 915	21.2%	25 979	3.6%	3 558	0.5%	533 828	74.6%	715 280	6.1%
Msunduzi	191 256	38.1%	25 020	5.0%	17 467	3.5%	268 234	53.4%	501 978	4.3%
Newcastle	112 267	20.1%	13 126	2.4%	10 617	1.9%	421 299	75.6%	557 309	4.8%
Polokwane	62 283	25.6%	12 988	5.3%	10 461	4.3%	157 373	64.7%	243 105	2.1%
Rustenburg	117 649	9.2%	47 600	3.7%	35 140	2.7%	1 084 307	84.4%	1 284 696	11.0%
Sol Plaatje	53 464	8.6%	26 920	4.3%	21 987	3.5%	517 966	83.5%	620 337	5.3%
Stellenbosch	21 388	20.3%	4 569	4.3%	3 602	3.4%	75 988	72.0%	105 547	0.9%
Steve Tshwete	4 446	16.2%	2 367	8.6%	1 264	4.6%	19 367	70.6%	27 444	0.2%
Tlokwe	44 342	27.7%	5 022	3.1%	3 954	2.5%	107 015	66.7%	160 333	1.4%
uMhlatuze	49 002	56.6%	6 186	7.1%	2 506	2.9%	28 948	33.4%	86 641	0.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 566 010</b>	<b>13.4%</b>	<b>450 404</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>339 185</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>9 303 168</b>	<b>79.8%</b>	<b>11 658 767</b>	<b>4.8%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

Table 8b: 21 Secondary cities Debtors Age Analysis by Customer Group as at 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010

R thousands	0 - 30 Days		31 - 60 Days		61 - 90 Days		Over 90 Days		Total		Bad Debt Written Off	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
<b>Debtor Age Analysis By Customer Group</b>												
Government	74 971	16.6%	24 643	5.5%	17 149	3.8%	335 270	74.2%	452 032	3.9%	26 068	5.8%
Business	494 463	34.4%	82 214	5.7%	55 744	3.9%	803 389	56.0%	1 435 809	12.3%	18 255	1.3%
Households	791 979	10.6%	273 450	3.7%	209 540	2.8%	6 215 294	83.0%	7 490 263	64.2%	400 719	5.3%
Other	204 598	9.0%	70 096	3.1%	56 753	2.5%	1 949 214	85.5%	2 280 662	19.6%	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 566 010</b>	<b>13.4%</b>	<b>450 404</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>339 185</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>9 303 168</b>	<b>79.8%</b>	<b>11 658 767</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>445 042</b>	<b>3.8%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

## Aggregated Municipal Creditors Age Analysis

**Table 9: Creditor Age Analysis as at 30 June 2010**

R thousands	0 - 30 Days		30 - 60 Days		60 - 90 Days		Over 90 Days		Total	
	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
<b>Creditor Age Analysis</b>										
Bulk Electricity	1 156 562	92.7%	18 612	1.5%	23 931	1.9%	48 648	3.9%	1 247 753	10.7%
Bulk Water	567 352	54.9%	39 664	3.8%	44 668	4.3%	382 248	37.0%	1 033 932	8.9%
PAYE deductions	169 641	95.1%	1 870	1.0%	1 747	1.0%	5 215	2.9%	178 472	1.5%
VAT (output less input)	(54 266)	111.1%	(2 257)	4.6%	(1 195)	2.4%	8 891	(18.2%)	(48 828)	(.4%)
Pensions / Retirement	226 056	91.5%	2 039	.8%	1 538	.6%	17 554	7.1%	247 187	2.1%
Loan repayments	368 832	96.7%	1 159	.3%	1 294	.3%	9 963	2.6%	381 247	3.3%
Trade Creditors	5 182 806	94.9%	115 350	2.1%	57 439	1.1%	105 159	1.9%	5 460 755	46.9%
Auditor-General	8 112	26.6%	2 059	6.8%	1 924	6.3%	18 361	60.3%	30 457	.3%
Other	2 923 989	94.1%	54 266	1.7%	14 301	.5%	113 659	3.7%	3 106 216	26.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10 549 084</b>	<b>90.6%</b>	<b>232 762</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>145 647</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>709 698</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>11 637 191</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

1. All figures are unaudited.



# Conditional grants transfers, payments and expenditure as at 30 June 2010

Table 10: 4th QUARTER ENDED 30 JUNE 2010

## CONDITIONAL GRANTS TRANSFERRED FROM NATIONAL DEPARTMENTS AND ACTUAL PAYMENTS MADE BY MUNICIPALITIES: PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Summary: All Provinces

	Total Available 2009/10	Year to date		Fourth Quarter		YTD Expenditure		% Changes from 3rd to 4th Q		% Changes for the 4th Q	
		Approved payment schedule	Transferred to municipalities for direct grants	Actual expenditure National Department by 30 June 2010	Actual expenditure by municipalities by 30 June 2010	Actual expenditure National Department	Actual expenditure by municipalities	Actual expenditure National Department	Actual expenditure National Department	Exp as % of Allocation National Department	Exp as % of Allocation by municipalities
<b>R thousands</b>											
<b>National Treasury (Vote 8)</b>											
Local Government Restructuring Grant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Local Government Financial Management Grant	299 990	299 990	299 990	64 520	128 625	225 470	332 737	36.2%	81.5%	75.2%	110.9%
Neighbourhood Development Partnership (Schedule 6)	551 395	551 393	508 136	189 677	227 357	561 191	504 999	(25.1%)	177.8%	101.8%	91.6%
Neighbourhood Development Partnership (Schedule 7)	110 000	109 998	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Sub-Total Vote</b>	<b>961 385</b>	<b>961 381</b>	<b>898 640</b>	<b>254 197</b>	<b>355 982</b>	<b>786 661</b>	<b>837 736</b>	<b>(15.5%)</b>	<b>133.1%</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>87.1%</b>
<b>Provincial and Local Government (Vote 5)</b>											
Municipal Systems Improvement Grant	200 000	200 000	200 000	54 846	71 649	137 484	188 507	194.0%	79.6%	68.7%	94.3%
Disaster Relief Funds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Internally Displaced People Management Grant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Sub-Total Vote</b>	<b>200 000</b>	<b>200 000</b>	<b>200 000</b>	<b>54 846</b>	<b>71 649</b>	<b>137 484</b>	<b>188 507</b>	<b>194.0%</b>	<b>79.6%</b>	<b>68.7%</b>	<b>94.3%</b>
<b>Transport (Vote 33)</b>											
Public Transport Infrastructure and Systems Grant	2 418 177	2 418 177	2 418 177	52 645	2 042 726	3 011 269	4 278 745	(95.1%)	253.6%	124.5%	176.9%
Rural Transport Grant	9 800	9 800	9 800	1 686	-	1 686	3 034	-	(100.0%)	17.2%	31.0%
<b>Sub-Total Vote</b>	<b>2 427 977</b>	<b>2 427 977</b>	<b>2 427 977</b>	<b>54 331</b>	<b>2 042 726</b>	<b>3 012 955</b>	<b>4 281 779</b>	<b>(95.0%)</b>	<b>253.3%</b>	<b>124.1%</b>	<b>176.4%</b>
<b>Public Works</b>											
Expanded Public Works Programme Incentive Grant (Municipality)	201 751	201 751	314 431	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Sub-Total Vote</b>	<b>201 751</b>	<b>201 751</b>	<b>314 431</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Minerals and Energy (Vote 30)</b>											
Integrated National Electrification Programme (Municipal) Grant	932 961	932 964	914 414	129 712	215 707	593 396	806 295	(25.6%)	7.1%	63.6%	86.4%
National Electrification Programme (Allocation in-kind) Grant	1 465 751	1 491 980	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Backlogs in the Electrification of Clinics and Schools (Allocation in-kind)	150 000	130 113	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Electricity Demand Side Management (Municipal) Grant	175 000	175 000	171 000	45 242	70 627	88 621	86 218	13.1%	673.2%	50.6%	49.3%
Electricity Demand Side Management (Eskom) Grant	75 000	75 000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Sub-Total Vote</b>	<b>2 798 712</b>	<b>2 805 057</b>	<b>2 707 507</b>	<b>174 954</b>	<b>286 334</b>	<b>682 017</b>	<b>892 513</b>	<b>(18.4%)</b>	<b>36.0%</b>	<b>24.4%</b>	<b>31.9%</b>
<b>Water Affairs and Forestry (Vote 34)</b>											
Backlogs in Water and Sanitation at Clinics and Schools Grant	331 774	331 766	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Implementation of Water Services Projects	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Regional Bulk Infrastructure Grant	571 021	571 021	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Water Services Operating and Transfer Subsidy Grant (Schedule 6)	871 278	871 278	848 796	29 686	259 710	556 823	862 091	(79.8%)	36.9%	63.9%	98.9%
Water Services Operating and Transfer Subsidy Grant (Schedule 7)	242 500	130 007	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Municipal Drought Relief Grant	53 700	53 700	53 700	-	21 440	-	30 993	-	124.4%	-	57.7%
<b>Sub-Total Vote</b>	<b>2 070 273</b>	<b>1 957 772</b>	<b>1 778 340</b>	<b>29 686</b>	<b>281 150</b>	<b>556 823</b>	<b>893 083</b>	<b>(79.8%)</b>	<b>41.1%</b>	<b>26.9%</b>	<b>43.1%</b>
<b>Sport and Recreation South Africa (Vote 19)</b>											
2010 World Cup Host City Operating Grant	507 557	507 557	507 557	175 712	382 473	465 701	604 604	202.8%	504.3%	91.8%	119.1%
2010 FIFA World Cup Stadiums Development Grant	1 661 107	1 661 106	1 661 107	-	429 099	2 802 742	1 987 908	(100.0%)	133.5%	168.7%	119.7%
<b>Sub-Total Vote</b>	<b>2 168 664</b>	<b>2 168 663</b>	<b>2 168 664</b>	<b>175 712</b>	<b>811 572</b>	<b>3 268 443</b>	<b>2 592 512</b>	<b>(58.2%)</b>	<b>228.5%</b>	<b>150.7%</b>	<b>119.5%</b>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>10 828 762</b>	<b>10 722 601</b>	<b>10 495 559</b>	<b>743 726</b>	<b>3 849 414</b>	<b>8 444 383</b>	<b>9 686 131</b>	<b>(65.9%)</b>	<b>169.6%</b>	<b>78.0%</b>	<b>89.4%</b>
<b>Provincial and Local Government (Vote 5)</b>											
Municipal Infrastructure Grant	11 433 487	11 407 484	11 076 912	1 235 267	2 933 717	6 736 444	9 019 323	(42.1%)	35.7%	58.9%	78.9%
<b>Sub-Total Vote</b>	<b>11 433 487</b>	<b>11 407 484</b>	<b>11 076 912</b>	<b>1 235 267</b>	<b>2 933 717</b>	<b>6 736 444</b>	<b>9 019 323</b>	<b>(42.1%)</b>	<b>35.7%</b>	<b>58.9%</b>	<b>78.9%</b>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>11 433 487</b>	<b>11 407 484</b>	<b>11 076 912</b>	<b>1 235 267</b>	<b>2 933 717</b>	<b>6 736 444</b>	<b>9 019 323</b>	<b>(42.1%)</b>	<b>35.7%</b>	<b>58.9%</b>	<b>78.9%</b>
Unallocated amounts	(82 246)	-	-	-	-	(58 242)	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>22 180 003</b>	<b>22 130 085</b>	<b>21 572 471</b>	<b>1 978 993</b>	<b>6 783 131</b>	<b>15 180 827</b>	<b>18 647 212</b>	<b>(54.2%)</b>	<b>89.0%</b>	<b>79.4%</b>	<b>97.9%</b>

1. Unallocated funds e.g DBSA, ESKOM, and Neighbourhood Development Grant.

2. Spending of these grants is done at National department level and therefore no reporting is required from municipalities.

3. Includes unallocated amounts

Sources: DoRA Monthly reports by the national transferring officer and Municipal sign-offs and electronic verification.

All the figures are unaudited.

In future provincial Treasuries will be required to provide the National Treasury with a payment schedule

in the same format as the provincial payment schedule that correspond with the amount in Budget Statement 1 and 2.

**Table 11a: Over and under spending of total municipal budget for the 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010 (Preliminary results)**

R thousands	Code	Main appropriation	Adjusted Budget	Year to date: 30 June 2010	Total Expenditure as % of main appropriation	Total Expenditure as % of adjusted budget	(Over)	Under	Net (Over)/Under as % of adjusted budget
<b>Summary per Province</b>									
Eastern Cape	EC	17 076 666	18 424 838	17 249 084	101.0%	93.6%	(1 638 580)	2 814 334	6.4%
Free State	FS	10 360 282	10 383 055	8 128 564	78.5%	78.3%	(174 249)	2 428 740	21.7%
Gauteng	GT	64 681 138	70 327 269	64 635 029	99.9%	91.9%	(4 080)	5 696 319	8.1%
Kwazulu-Natal	KZ	39 751 179	41 023 142	38 284 835	96.3%	93.3%	(204 770)	2 943 076	6.7%
Limpopo	LP	7 624 658	8 916 949	11 217 280	147.1%	125.8%	(4 013 162)	1 712 831	(25.8%)
Mpumalanga	MP	9 771 204	10 600 384	9 481 327	97.0%	89.4%	(1 405 875)	2 524 932	10.6%
North West	NW	9 337 745	9 681 452	7 481 612	80.1%	77.3%	(325 887)	2 525 727	22.7%
Northern Cape	NC	3 346 619	3 480 137	2 966 476	88.6%	85.2%	(371 046)	884 707	14.8%
Western Cape	WC	39 989 984	40 418 090	37 117 707	92.8%	91.8%	(180 684)	3 481 067	8.2%
<b>Total</b>		<b>201 939 475</b>	<b>213 255 315</b>	<b>196 561 915</b>	<b>97.3%</b>	<b>92.2%</b>	<b>(8 137 650)</b>	<b>25 011 734</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
							<b>Net</b>	<b>16 693 400</b>	

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

**Table 11b: Over and under spending of municipal operating budget for the 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010 (Preliminary results)**

R thousands	Code	Main appropriation	Adjusted Budget	Year to date: 30 June 2010	Total Expenditure as % of main appropriation	Total Expenditure as % of adjusted budget	(Over)	Under	Net (Over)/Under as % of adjusted budget
<b>Summary per Province</b>									
Eastern Cape	EC	12 011 586	13 033 461	12 553 434	104.5%	96.3%	(1 144 336)	1 624 363	3.7%
Free State	FS	8 249 903	8 171 501	6 635 360	80.4%	81.2%	(168 759)	1 704 899	18.8%
Gauteng	GT	54 385 871	59 022 924	55 355 266	101.8%	93.8%	(15 213)	3 682 871	6.2%
Kwazulu-Natal	KZ	29 390 533	30 742 507	28 345 012	96.4%	92.2%	(153 772)	2 551 267	7.8%
Limpopo	LP	4 762 000	5 023 204	6 945 117	145.8%	138.3%	(2 546 554)	624 642	(38.3%)
Mpumalanga	MP	6 599 162	7 403 209	7 611 059	115.3%	102.8%	(1 470 887)	1 263 037	(2.8%)
North West	NW	6 836 972	6 929 961	6 444 490	94.3%	93.0%	(506 027)	991 498	7.0%
Northern Cape	NC	2 657 372	2 808 433	2 477 500	93.2%	88.2%	(359 818)	690 751	11.8%
Western Cape	WC	31 632 012	32 334 620	30 569 878	96.6%	94.5%	(172 014)	1 936 755	5.5%
<b>Total</b>		<b>156 525 412</b>	<b>165 469 818</b>	<b>156 937 116</b>	<b>100.3%</b>	<b>94.8%</b>	<b>(6 537 380)</b>	<b>15 070 082</b>	<b>5.2%</b>
							<b>Net</b>	<b>8 532 702</b>	

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

**Table 11c: Over and under spending of municipal capital budget for the 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010 (Preliminary results)**

R thousands	Code	Main appropriation	Adjusted Budget	Year to date: 30 June 2010	Total Expenditure as % of main appropriation	Total Expenditure as % of adjusted budget	(Over)	Under	Net (Over)/Under as % of adjusted budget
<b>Summary per Province</b>									
Eastern Cape	EC	5 065 079	5 391 377	4 695 650	92.7%	87.1%	(696 663)	1 392 390	12.9%
Free State	FS	2 110 379	2 211 555	1 493 204	70.8%	67.5%	(19 512)	737 863	32.5%
Gauteng	GT	10 295 267	11 304 345	9 279 764	90.1%	82.1%	(262 923)	2 287 504	17.9%
Kwazulu-Natal	KZ	10 360 646	10 280 635	9 939 823	95.9%	96.7%	(888 640)	1 229 452	3.3%
Limpopo	LP	2 862 658	3 893 745	4 272 164	149.2%	109.7%	(1 747 654)	1 369 235	(9.7%)
Mpumalanga	MP	3 172 041	3 197 175	1 870 268	59.0%	58.5%	(60 658)	1 387 565	41.5%
North West	NW	2 500 773	2 751 491	1 037 122	41.5%	37.7%	(5 035)	1 719 404	62.3%
Northern Cape	NC	689 248	671 704	488 976	70.9%	72.8%	(69 046)	251 775	27.2%
Western Cape	WC	8 357 972	8 083 471	6 547 829	78.3%	81.0%	(61 976)	1 597 617	19.0%
<b>Total</b>		<b>45 414 063</b>	<b>47 785 497</b>	<b>39 624 799</b>	<b>87.3%</b>	<b>82.9%</b>	<b>(3 812 107)</b>	<b>11 972 805</b>	<b>17.1%</b>
							<b>Net</b>	<b>8 160 698</b>	

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

**Table 11d: Over and under spending of conditional grants adjusted allocations for the 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010**

R thousands	Code	Main allocation	Revised allocation	Year to date: 30 June 2010	Total Expenditure as % of main allocation	Total Expenditure as % of revised allocation	(Over)	Under	Net (Over)/Under as % of adjusted budget
<b>Summary per Province</b>									
Eastern Cape	EC	3 679 085	3 702 921	2 836 649	77.1%	76.6%	(530 958)	1 397 230	23.4%
Free State	FS	1 182 635	1 222 649	1 012 606	85.6%	82.8%	(57 475)	267 518	17.2%
Gauteng	GT	3 595 035	3 697 657	3 624 177	100.8%	98.0%	(494 468)	567 948	2.0%
Kwazulu-Natal	KZ	4 600 795	4 604 032	4 186 618	91.0%	90.9%	(568 460)	985 873	9.1%
Limpopo	LP	2 956 628	2 962 166	2 306 624	78.0%	77.9%	(98 676)	754 218	22.1%
Mpumalanga	MP	1 635 070	1 724 834	1 136 185	69.5%	65.9%	(233 844)	822 493	34.1%
North West	NW	1 327 288	1 320 119	908 887	68.5%	68.8%	(70 693)	481 925	31.2%
Northern Cape	NC	556 576	601 083	190 921	34.3%	31.8%	-	410 162	68.2%
Western Cape	WC	2 276 691	2 344 542	2 444 544	107.4%	104.3%	(315 061)	215 059	(4.3%)
<b>Total</b>		<b>21 809 803</b>	<b>22 180 003</b>	<b>18 647 212</b>	<b>85.5%</b>	<b>84.1%</b>	<b>(2 369 635)</b>	<b>5 902 426</b>	<b>15.9%</b>
							<b>Net</b>	<b>3 532 791</b>	

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

Schedule 7 grants are excluded

**Table 12a: Over and under spending of total budget for the 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010**

Number of municipalities	Code	(Over)			On Target		Under		
		More than 15%	Between 10% and 15%	Between 5% and 10%	Between 0% and -5%	Between 0% and 5%	Between 5% and 10%	Between 10% and 15%	More than 15%
<b>Summary per Province</b>									
Eastern Cape	EC	6	3	-	15	2	12	5	2
Free State	FS	3	-	-	1	-	18	2	1
Gauteng	GT	-	-	-	1	3	5	4	2
Kwazulu-Natal	KZ	5	1	-	3	5	29	7	11
Limpopo	LP	6	1	-	6	3	10	2	2
Mpumalanga	MP	3	-	-	4	-	10	3	1
Northern Cape	NC	2	-	1	9	2	17	1	-
North West	NW	1	-	-	2	-	16	5	-
Western Cape	WC	3	-	-	1	1	14	3	8
<b>Total</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>27</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

**Table 12b: Over and under spending of operating budget for the 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010**

Number of municipalities	Code	(Over)			On Target		Under		
		More than 15%	Between 10% and 15%	Between 5% and 10%	Between 0% and -5%	Between 0% and 5%	Between 5% and 10%	Between 10% and 15%	More than 15%
<b>Summary per Province</b>									
Eastern Cape	EC	5	-	1	17	1	14	4	3
Free State	FS	3	-	-	-	2	15	1	4
Gauteng	GT	-	1	-	-	3	4	1	6
Kwazulu-Natal	KZ	5	-	3	3	9	23	8	10
Limpopo	LP	6	1	-	8	3	5	5	2
Mpumalanga	MP	3	1	-	5	2	9	-	1
Northern Cape	NC	2	-	-	7	3	15	4	1
North West	NW	2	-	3	3	1	12	1	2
Western Cape	WC	3	-	-	1	2	12	5	7
<b>Total</b>		<b>29</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>36</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

**Table 12c: Over and under spending of capital budget for the 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010**

Number of municipalities	Code	(Over)			On Target		Under		
		More than 15%	Between 10% and 15%	Between 5% and 10%	Between 0% and -5%	Between 0% and 5%	Between 5% and 10%	Between 10% and 15%	More than 15%
<b>Summary per Province</b>									
Eastern Cape	EC	5	-	1	21	1	14	3	-
Free State	FS	1	-	1	1	-	21	-	1
Gauteng	GT	2	-	-	2	-	10	1	-
Kwazulu-Natal	KZ	7	3	2	5	2	37	3	2
Limpopo	LP	3	1	-	6	1	17	1	1
Mpumalanga	MP	1	-	1	5	-	14	-	-
Northern Cape	NC	4	-	-	10	-	15	1	2
North West	NW	-	-	-	3	-	21	-	-
Western Cape	WC	1	-	-	1	-	20	5	3
<b>Total</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

**Table 12d: Over and under spending of conditional grants adjusted allocations for the 4th quarter ended 30 June 2010**

Number of municipalities	Code	(Over)			On Target		Under		
		More than 15%	Between 10% and 15%	Between 5% and 10%	Between 0% and -5%	Between 0% and 5%	Between 5% and 10%	Between 10% and 15%	More than 15%
<b>Summary per Province</b>									
Eastern Cape	EC	6	-	-	-	2	35	1	1
Free State	FS	3	2	2	1	1	13	1	2
Gauteng	GT	1	-	1	1	-	11	1	-
Kwazulu-Natal	KZ	8	3	1	3	4	38	-	4
Limpopo	LP	4	1	-	4	1	15	4	1
Mpumalanga	MP	-	-	-	3	-	18	-	-
Northern Cape	NC	-	-	-	2	-	28	1	1
North West	NW	2	1	-	3	-	15	3	-
Western Cape	WC	4	1	-	3	2	19	-	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>

Source: National Treasury Local Government Database

Schedule 7 grants are excluded