

SECTION F: IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

1. SERVICE DELIVERY

The implementation plan of the municipality for delivery of services is primarily informed by community needs. The community needs are identified continuously during the planning process through public consultations. These needs are largely informed by the following keys aspects which also inform our developmental objectives and path as an institution; viz:

- population growth;
- and historical service delivery backlogs.

The implementation plan framework as outlined herein takes into account the following aspects to ensure coherent and sustainable service delivery:

- Regular and continuous maintenance of existing infrastructure;
- New Capital Works and other ward-based projects

As a small municipality with a narrow revenue base, our major infrastructure projects and other service delivery needs are funded from the Municipal Infrastructure Grant (MIG), thus the MIG is our major source for funding of capital projects and infrastructure maintenance.

For this reason, our implementation plan for capital projects is aligned with the National MIG management and procedures in the following framework.

1.2 The vision of the MIG programme

The vision of the MIG programme is to provide all South Africans with at least a basic level of service by the year 2013 through the provision of grant finance aimed at covering the capital cost of basic infrastructure for the poor.

1.3 Key Principles

The MIG complements the equitable share grant for local government, however, it is provided conditionally to municipalities. The key principles underpinning the design of the MIG are outlined below:

- a) **Focus on infrastructure required for a basic level of service:** The MIG programme is aimed at providing only basic infrastructure.
- b) **Targeting the poor:** The programme is aimed at providing services to the poor and funds will therefore be targeted to reach them.
- c) **Maximizing economic benefits:** The programme will be managed to ensure that the local economic spin-offs through providing infrastructure are maximized. This includes employment creation and the development of enterprises.
- d) **Equity in the allocation and use of funds:** The mechanism for distributing funds must provide for equitable access to such funds by the poor in order to make uniform progress in closing the infrastructure gap.
- e) **Decentralization of spending authority within national standards:** Decisions relating to the prioritization of municipal infrastructure spending, such as the identification, selection and approval of projects, are taken through the IDP and budgeting processes with the following provisions:
 - The operating finance and management arrangements must be in place;
 - A degree of national and provincial influence over capital spending, expressed through clear norms, standards and spending conditions must be retained; and
 - Unintended consequences should be limited: the grant must promote sound management practices, not the reverse.
- f) **Efficient use of funds:** Funding must be used to provide the greatest possible improvement in access to basic services at the lowest possible cost. This implies the following:

TOKOLOGO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY Reviewed IDP 2011/12

- There should be an appropriate selection of service levels.
- Incentives and conditions must ensure that other funds are mixed with grantfunds to minimize leakage to non-eligible households and service levels.
- The mechanism to disburse funds should be simple and easy to monitor, and the outcomes of municipal spending should be easy to evaluate.

g) **Reinforcing local, provincial and national development objectives:** This implies the following:

- The funding mechanism must be consistent with the planning processes of local, provincial and national government.
- Nodal municipalities associated with the Urban Renewal Strategy and the Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Programme must receive proportionally greater allocations of funding.
- Spatial integration must be promoted.
- The emphasis placed on the selection of appropriate service levels.
- The formula should promote appropriate municipal performance relative to policy objectives.

h) **Predictability and transparency:** Funds should be provided to individual municipalities on a three-year basis, consistent with medium term budgeting practice, with minimal in-year changes and with year to year changes based only on clearly defined conditions. It is also essential for municipalities and other stakeholders to easily understand how the funds are distributed.

1.4 How MIG Funds are integrated into Tokologo Local Municipality Budget

All MIG funds allocated to projects are contained in the annual capital budget of the municipality. This implies that the process for funding a MIG project is as follows:

- The project is identified in the IDP.
- A three year capital plan based on project business plans (or feasibility studies) is prepared.
- A MIG project registration form is completed
- Funds (including MIG funds) are then allocated to the project in the municipal budget.

1.5 Implementation framework of MIG

1.5.1 How MIG is linked to the IDP

All MIG projects are identified in the IDP, taking into account the MIG conditions which require to be met. This implies that:

- For the first three years of the five year infrastructure plan in the IDP, the total amount of capital grant funds provided for in the IDP must equal the medium term allocation of MIG funds (and other capital grants) to the municipality given in the annual Division of Revenue Act (DORA).
- Each project to be funded with MIG funds, as part of the current year's budget, must appear in the IDP, which is typically updated in the previous year.
- The IDP must contain details of the level of service to be applied for all infrastructure and the rate at which the overall backlog in providing infrastructure is to be reduced.
- The IDP must include an assessment of the operating expenditure of all infrastructure under the control of the municipality, with an assessment of the operating revenue which will be raised to cover this expenditure.

1.5.2 Funding Projects where non-poor residents and Businesses benefit

MIG funds are mainly used to fund basic infrastructure to the poor. Yet almost all projects provide infrastructure which also serves those who are non-poor, including businesses. This means we will have to raise capital from other sources (excluding MIG and other capital grants from government) to finance the part of the infrastructure which does not serve the poor. The municipality will source the additional funds from the following sources of revenue to the extent that these funds are not already committed for other purposes:

- Internal capital funds;
- Capital contributions by non-poor consumers;
- Private sector funding;

- Equities; and
- Loans.

1.5.3 Operation and maintenance of infrastructure

It is essential for infrastructure which is provided under the MIG programme to be properly operated and maintained. Therefore one of the conditions of MIG funds is that the municipality must prove that it has the capacity to manage the infrastructure.

This requires a sound viability assessment of the planned infrastructure investment programme. This assessment must be linked to the IDP and sector plans.

1.5.4 The role of national departments in the MIG Programme

Nine national departments participate in the MIG programme. Their responsibilities are summarized below:

Department	Policy	Support	Regulation
Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs	Responsible for implementing MIG policy on behalf of all departments.	Establishes MIG administrative structures; administers transfers of funds; provides support to PMUs	Monitors performance of overall MIG programme.
National Treasury	Overall allocation of funds, through DORA.		Establishes specific MIG conditions
Water Affairs	Sets norms and standards for water services infrastructure.	Planning oversight.	Monitors conditions specific to water services.
Public Works	Establishes criteria relating to poverty alleviation.	Provides advice on labour based construction and	Monitors poverty alleviation conditions.

TOKOLOGO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY Reviewed IDP 2011/12

		procurement.	
Minerals and Energy	Only becomes active once electricity funding is incorporated into MIG		
Roads & Transport	Policy relating to municipal roads and transport.		Monitors performance relating to specific roads and transport conditions.
Human Settlement	Co-ordination of housing and infrastructure policy; synchronization of housing and infrastructure funding.		
Sport and Recreation	Policy relating to sport and recreation.		Monitors performance relating to specific sport and recreation conditions.
Environmental Affairs and Tourism	Policy relating to municipal solid waste (refuse) services.		Monitors environmental performance.

2. DEALING WITH GROWTH AND HISTORICAL BACKLOGS

One of the major service delivery challenges that the municipality is faced with is to maintain a sound balance between provision of basic services in line with the population growth trends and dealing with the historical backlogs. However, our main objective is to eradicate the current service delivery backlog over a period of 3 years, which will enable us to primarily focus on meeting new service delivery demands.

Comprehensive studies have been undertaken to quantify the institutional backlogs. Based on the findings, a substantial portion of the Capital Budget should be directed to service delivery backlogs.

The extent of the current service delivery backlog is summarized as follows:

TOKOLOGO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY Reviewed IDP 2011/12

Table: Summary of service delivery backlog

Basic Service	Estimated Backlog per area Area			
	Dealesville	Boshof	Boshof/ Hertzogville	Hertzogville
Water Supply	773 houses	233 houses	2226 houses	518 houses
Water Treatment works	1998 (year last refurbished)	1998 (year last refurbished)	1998 (year last refurbished)	1998 (year last refurbished)
Sanitation reticulation	773 houses	233 houses	2226 houses	518 houses
Roads	?? kilometers	?? kilometers	?? kilometers	?? kilometers
Electricity Supply	?? houses	?? houses	?? houses	?? houses
Refuse Removal	?? houses	?? houses	?? houses	?? houses
RDP Houses	?? houses	?? houses	?? houses	?? houses

Source: Tokologo Local Municipality: Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan, 2008

3. THE MUNICIPALITY'S COMPREHENSIVE INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN (CIP)

3.1 Objectives

The Tokologo Local Municipality's Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan is aimed at achieving the following goals:

- Creating an integrated framework for sustainable service delivery, aligning developmental, financial and institutional aspects
- Defining action plans per sector to accelerate towards achieving the set targets
- Ensure that funding is available and accessible to achieve targets through life cycle costing, financing and access to grants
- Ensure that an M&E framework to monitor delivery is available

4. HOW IS THE CIP ALIGNED TO THE IDP

4.1 Inputs from the IDP to the CIP

Municipal planning is legally governed by the framework prescribed for the IDP: it has created a planning regime that ensures that all projects initiated in a municipality contribute to the medium and long term vision for the municipality. The CIP build on the foundation laid in the IDP to formulate a model for growth and development in the municipality. In particular, it should accommodate the following inputs from the IDP:

- Land Use Management
- Regional & Town Planning
- Human Settlement patterns
- Socio-economic modelling.
- Local Economic Development Strategies
- Regional, Provincial & National growth strategies
- Financial modelling in terms of MIAM, MIIF, and IIP over the MTEF budgeting cycles.
- Sectoral planning and modelling

All of these should provide inputs into the CIP and serve as sources for more detailed level information to give effect to programmatic development rather than project based planning.

4.2 Inputs form the CIP to the IDP

The CIP provides a prioritised list of initiatives to implement the visions of the IDP. Thus, by using the inputs to shape a more comprehensive IDP, the outputs from the IDP process will be more defined and will generate the base for ongoing monitoring and evaluation towards a programmatic approach for infrastructure management. The key advantage of the CIP is to ensure that the various sector plans and operational implementation plans are coordinated to improve service delivery that is both sustainable and viable throughout the development cycle of the human habitation.

This methodology has the benefit of advancing the:-

- Phased implementation to address short and medium term goals addressing the differentiated needs per municipality
- Capacity building, stakeholder involvement & mobilisation, coordination and acceleration of government programmes focused on service delivery.
- Capacitating institutional structures and personnel development and core competencies within infrastructure management and service delivery sustainability.
- Aligning these interventions with support and funding programmes initiated by national departments.

4.3 Implementation Methodology

To ensure that both programmatic and project specific sustainability is developed and maintained the model for CIP will achieve the following:-

- Ensure that projects are identified, registered, budgeted for, and initiated to eradicate all backlogs in infrastructure in all communities within Tokologo Local Municipality by 2014, taking into consideration the future development needs of the area to ensure growth and local economic development
- Support the municipality in providing the necessary institutional capacity to provide the different services. This might also include options such as creating regional service delivery teams
- Develop the means to fund the capital and operating budgets for service delivery

4.4 Implementation Challenges

The following are details of implementation challenges which invariably affect the implementation of MIG related projects and thus delays or poor service delivery.

Main Cat	Main Category	Sub Category	Nature of Problems
1	Institutional functions impacting on project implementation	Policy issues	Unclear policies with regard to levels of service resulting in inappropriate designs and lack of affordability
		Administrative issues with approvals	Late submission of registration forms and time taken by the department to approve the projects procurement processes
			Late approvals of projects
			Legal and administrative challenges
		Administrative issues with payment, lacking financial skills	Municipal Supply Chain Management processes not engaged efficiently
			Late funding approvals received from other spheres of government
			Late submission of claims
			Administrative problems: financial sections are failing to process claims by consultants/contractors
		Late delivery of municipal budgets	The delay in the approval of the municipal capital budgets has prevented municipalities from implementing MIG projects.
	Institutional functions impacting on project implementation	Administrative issues with procurement	Procurement and BEE issues
			Time taken for approval by council
		Land & EIA approval	EIA approval
			Land issues not concluded
			Technical Reports and EIA reports

TOKOLOGO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY Reviewed IDP 2011/12

		Technical issues	IDP under revision
			Lack of coordinated planning of infrastructure
			Inappropriate technical solutions for the specific situation in a municipality
			Lack of technical reports and baseline information
			Lack of technical skills and capacity
			Lack of bulk supplies
			Insufficient allowance or consideration of geotechnical conditions on site.
		Operation & Maintenance capacity	Limited maintenance and operations budget prevents further infrastructure development
2	MIG implementation	Poor project management	Limited Project Management and planning capacity
			PMU not having adequate capacity
3	Contractors & consultants	Project management of contractors	Capacity of consulting engineer not sufficient
			Lack of materials due to supplier shortages
			Contractors are not monitored to ensure that projects are completed
			Fluid labour market
			Problems with empowerment joint ventures
			Delay getting emerging contractors on site
4	Other government functionaries	CoGTA	Waiting period for CoGTAt to register projects
			Late approval of projects by the dplg
		DWA	Delays in approval of the technical report from DWA
5	External parties	Community involvement	Community preventing some of the registered projects from being implemented

TOKOLOGO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY Reviewed IDP 2011/12

6. OPERATIONAL PLANS FOR 2011/12

The projects as contained in this IDP, were compiled to address the priority needs and represent the possible future scenario.

The Operational Plan plans in this section provides details of one year (2011/12) project plans, which will be translating into SDBIP, and ensures that the municipality successfully implement its programme of action and is able to monitoring plans by getting the responsible departments to:

- Use resources efficiently, to help allocate scarce resources to the most critical gaps and needs.
- Clearly define their capacity gaps and most critical resource requirements.
- Reduce risks where possible, and prepare contingency plans where necessary.
- Think about the long term future of the project, including how they will ensure sustainability of projects' targets and impacts.

Hereunder follows detailed operational plans for 2011/12 financial year, segmented by various departments and administrative units within the municipality.

6. 1 OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL MANAGER

IDP Objective	To ensure sufficient administrative capacity in a manner that responds to the institutional needs				
KPA:	Municipal Transformation and Institutional Development & Local Economic Development				
Project Details					
Project No.	Project Description	Location	Estimated Budget	Project Period	Funding Source
	Establish a prickly pears jam factory	Boshof	R 2 000 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Upgrading salt pans in Dealesville	Dealesville	R 1 500 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Upgrading of game farms in Hetzogville and Boshof	Hetzogville and Boshof	R 6 000 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Expansion of olive oil project in Dealesville	Dealesville	R 2 000 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Establishment of SMME hub in Dealesville	Dealesville	R 2 000 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Facilitation for rescacitation of gypsum and diamond mines in Tokologo	Tokologo	R 200 000	2011/12	• Unfunded

TOKOLOGO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY Reviewed IDP 2011/12

	Facilitation of glass manufacturing factory in Dealesville	Dealesville	R 200 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Upgrading of Caravan Park in Boshof	Boshof	R 4 500 000	2011/12	• N Tourism
	Facilitation for funding of all existing community projects in Tokologo	All	R 50 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Facilitate acquisition of farms for emerging farmers	All	R 50 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Review of LED Strategy	In house	R 250 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Development of a new 5 year Integrated Development Plan (IDP)	In house	R 350 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Local Community survey	In house	R 150 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Develop an Internal Audit Plan	In house	R nil (internal capacity)	2011/12	• N/A
	Establishment of a newsletter for the municipality	In house	R400 000	2011/2012	Own funds

6.2 FINANCE DEPARTMENT

IDPObjective	To ensure sound financial management practices				
KPA:	Financial Viability and Management				
Project Details					
Project No.	Project Description	Location	Estimated Budget	Project Period	Funding Source
	Revaluation of infrastructure assets	In house	R 1 500 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Review of Valuation Roll	In house	R 2 000 000	2011/12	•
	Clearing Audit Queries	In house	R 500 000	2011/12	• FMG
	Operation Clean Audit 2014	In house	R 300 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Identification of investment properties	In house	R 200 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Full implementation of integrated creditors system	In house	R 350 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Revenue data purification	In house	R 1 000 000	2011/12	• MSIG
	Review of finance related policies	In house	R 200 000	2011/12	• MSIG
	Developing an inventory costing model (water & electricity)	In house	R 500 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Compilation of GRAP compliant fixed asset register	In house	R 1 000 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Perform and impairment exercise for debtors	In house	R 500 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue

TOKOLOGO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY Reviewed IDP 2011/12

	Reconciling the Valuation Roll to the billing systems, GIS and the Deeds Register.	In house	R 500 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Compilation of the Annual Financial Statement 2010/11 and review of the Budget for 2012/13	In house	R 300 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue

6.3 TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT

IDP Objective	To ensure sustainable service delivery in a manner that responds to the needs of the community				
KPA:	Basic Service Delivery and Infrastructure Investment				
Project Details					
Project No.	Project Description	Location	Estimated Budget	Project Period	Funding Source
	Fencing of Cemetery	Boshof Seretse	R 753 270	2011/12	• MIG
	Drilling and Developing of Boreholes	Hertzogville (new)	R 1 776 992	2011/12	• MIG
	Drilling and Developing of Boreholes	Boshof (new)	R 2 680 110	2011/12	• MIG
	Upgrading of Water Network	Dealeville Phase 2 (multi year - total budget R 5 mil)	R 2 800 000	2011/12	• MIG
	Paving of roads – 3 km	Boshof	R 9 200 000	2011/12	• MIG
	Providing clean water and managing waste water	All Wards	R 2 200 000	2011/12	• MIG
	Upgrading of Roads -Phase1 (3 km)	Seretse	R 9 225 685	2011/12	• MIG
	Regional Bulk Infrastructure – Pahse 1	Hetzogville	R 61 000 000	2011/12	• DWA& MIG
	Regional Bulk Infrastructure – Pahse 2	Boshof / Dealeville	R 320 000 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Electrical House Connections	Boshof (250 households)	R 3 000 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Electrical House Connections	Dealeville (60 households)	R 800 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Paving of Roads – (5 km provincial road)	Dealeville	R 27 000 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Paving of Roads – (6 km internal roads)	Dealeville	R 18 000 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Water network	Smanga Park & New extension	R 8 000 000	2011/12	• Unfunded
	Infrastructure Master Plan	In house	R 3 000 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue & DBSA

TOKOLOGO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY Reviewed IDP 2011/12

6.4 CORPORATE SUPPORT SERVICES DEPARTMENT- (*Administration*)

Objective(s)	To provide administrative support				
KPA:	Municipal Transformation and Institutional Development				
Project Details					
Project No.	Project Description	Location	Estimated Budget	Project Period	Funding Source
	Implementation of Performance Management System to the lower levels of the organizational structure.	In house	R 350 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Development and implementation of an automated filing system.	In house	R 700 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Development of Human Resources Strategy	In house	R 200 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Implementation and monitoring of Human Resources related policies	In house	R nil (in house capacity)	2011/12	• N/A
	Review of Skills Development Plan and Employment Equity Plan and monitor and report on the implementation.	In house	R 1 200 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Implementation of reviewed organizational structure.	In house	R nil (in house capacity)	2011/12	• N/A
	Review of Institutional Delegations of Powers.	In house	R nil (in house capacity)	2011/12	• N/A
	Compilation of the Annual Report.	In house	R 250 000	2011/12	• Own Revenue
	Compiling of list of asset disposed but ownership not yet changed.				•

6.4 CORPORATE SUPPORT SERVICES DEPARTMENT – (*Human Settlement*)

Objective(s)	To facilitate the provision of integrated human settlement to the local community				
KPA:	Service Delivery and Infrastructure Development				
Project Details					
Project No.	Project Description	Location	Estimated Budget	Project Period	Funding Source
	Review of the Spatial Development Framework	In house	R 500 000	2011/12	• CoGTA
	Development of new residential sites (township establishment)	All wards	R 3000 000	2011/12	• CoGTA
	Management of beneficiary lists and allocations.	In house	R nil (in house capacity)	2011/12	• N/A
	Review of the Housing Chapter	In house	R 250 000	2011/12	• CoGTA

SCHEDULE 1: RECONCILIATION OF IDP STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND CAPITAL BUDGET

Strategic Objective	Goal	Goal Code	Ref	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10	Current Year 2010/11			2011/12 Medium Term Revenue & Expenditure Framework		
				Audited Outcome	Audited Outcome	Audited Outcome	Original Budget	Adjusted Budget	Full Year Forecast	Budget Year 2011/12	Budget Year +1 2012/13	Budget Year +2 2013/14
				R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000
To ensure sustainable provisions of Basic Service Delivery and Infrastructure Investment	PMU Unit	A								890		
	Retention Dealesville/Tshwarahanang: Water meters	B								68		
	Retention BoshofSeretse: Water meters	C								99		
	Retention Hertzogville Malebogo: Installation of 322 VIPs	D								168		
	Retention Dealesville/Tshwaraganang: Installation of 300 VIPs	E								111		
	Boshof Seretse Fencing of Cemetery	F								753		
	Hertzogville drilling and Developing of Boreholes	G								1,721		
	Boshof drilling and Developing of Boreholes	H								2,680		
	Dealesville/Tshwaraganang: Ugrading of Sewer Oxidation ponds	I								2,084		
	Providing clean water and managing waste water									2,200		
	Upgrading of Roads in Seretse Phase1	J								9,226		
	Regional Bulk Infrastructure	K								49,000		
	Electrical House connections									123		
	Repairs of Roads - Boshof, Hertzogville and Dealesville									357		
			1	-	-	-	-	-	-	69,480	-	-

TOKOLOGO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY Reviewed IDP 2011/12

SCHEDULE 2: CAPITAL EXPENDITURE ON NEW ASSETS BY CLASS

Description	Ref 1	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10	Current Year 2010/11			2011/12 Medium Term Revenue & Expenditure Framework		
		Audited Outcome	Audited Outcome	Audited Outcome	Original Budget	Adjusted Budget	Full Year Forecast	Budget Year 2011/12	Budget Year +1 2012/13	Budget Year +2 2013/14
		R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000	R'000
Infrastructure	3	-	-	117,595	14,845	-	14,845	59,144	65,058	71,564
Roads, Pavements & Bridges				20,292	-	-	-	-	-	-
Electricity Transmission & Reticulation				9,530	-	-	-	123	135	149
Dams & Reservoirs								4,568	5,025	5,527
Water purification								2,200	2,420	2,662
Water Reticulation				33,654	5,147	-	5,147	49,000	53,900	59,290
Sanitation Reticulation				54,119	8,894	-	8,894	279	307	338
Waste Management				-	62	-	62	2,084	2,292	2,522
Other				-	742	-	742	890	979	1,077
Community		-	-	12,349	-	-	-	753	828	911
Parks & gardens				852	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sportsfields & stadia				861	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clinics				677	-	-	-	-	-	-
Museums & Art Galleries				78	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cemeteries				2,881	-	-	-	753	828	911
Other				7,000						
Other assets		-	-	8,861	-	-	-	-	-	-
General vehicles				1,388	-	-	-	-	-	-
Civic Land and Buildings				6,134	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Land				1,339	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Capital Expenditure on new assets	1	-	-	138,805	14,845	-	14,845	59,897	65,887	72,475

SCHEDULE 3: REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE EXPENDITURE BY ASSET CLASS

Description	Ref	2007/8	2008/9	2009/10	Current Year 2010/11			2011/12 Medium Term Revenue & Expenditure Framework		
		Audited Outcome	Audited Outcome	Audited Outcome	Original Budget	Adjusted Budget	Full Year Forecast	Budget Year 2011/12	Budget Year +1 2012/13	Budget Year +2 2013/14
R thousand	1									
<u>Repairs and maintenance expenditure by Asset Class/Sub-class</u>										
<u>Infrastructure</u>		-	-	-	-	-	-	357	393	432
<i>Roads, Pavements & Bridges</i>								357	393	432